



RUSSIAN STUDIES

■ ANALYSIS

Studying Russian Politics through Western Lenses: Changes and Challenges 2
By Vladimir Gel'man, St. Petersburg

■ ANALYSIS

The Western Study of Contemporary Russia:
Double Bottoms and Double Standards 5
By Richard Sakwa, Canterbury

Studying Russian Politics through Western Lenses: Changes and Challenges

By Vladimir Gel'man, St. Petersburg

Abstract

In contrast to the Soviet period, Russia is now integrated into comparative political science and Russians contribute to Western studies of their country. Current scholars generally fall into three camps, pessimists, optimists, and realists. Their key task will be figuring out how Russia fits into the world today.

Overcoming the Cold War Legacy

For several decades before the Soviet collapse, research on Russian politics in the West (then known as “Sovietology”) formed a distinctive sub-field in political science. During this period, given the strategic priorities of the Cold War, the need to “know your enemy” fueled extensive programs to train specialists and launched a number of scholarly ventures. At the same time, the closed nature of the Soviet political system and limited opportunities for gathering and interpreting data forced scholars to engage in the mysterious art of “Kremlinology,” partially isolating studies of Russian politics from the major developments within comparative political studies. At the same time, Russian scholars did not contribute to Western research (though émigré circles served as an exception that proved the rule). Despite lively debates between scholars of “totalitarianism” (those who perceived the Soviet Union as a unique “totalitarian” society in a manner of the “evil empire”) and “revisionists” (those who considered the Soviet political system to be a peculiar version of the world-wide trend toward modernization), Sovietologists predicted neither the political changes under Mikhail Gorbachev nor the following demise of Communism and break-up of the Soviet Union, calling into question their professional credibility. There is still no consensus on how to explain these developments.

Over the last twenty years, numerous new data sources on Russian politics—ranging from mass surveys to elite interviews—became available, new information technologies dramatically increased research capacities, and Russia is no longer viewed in the West as the No.1 enemy (or even as an enemy at all). Yet, although the major focus of interest among area specialists in Europe and North America recently shifted to China and the Middle East, research on Russian politics still attracts new generations of Western scholars; moreover, some Russian scholars are now actively engaged in international discussions on the subject.

How should we assess the substantive achievements and shortcomings in this sub-field two decades after the end of the Communism and the Soviet Union? To what extent has recent scholarship improved our understand-

ing of post-Soviet Russian politics? What are the major issues worth in-depth analysis? What is the main picture of contemporary Russia in the popular and academic literature? What about biases or inclinations? And what are the authors missing that would be important to discuss?

Understanding Russian Politics: Pessimism, Optimism, or Realism?

One can trace the major trends shaping Western studies of Russian politics just by looking at the titles of English-language books on Russia which appeared after the Soviet collapse. In the mid-1990s, they sounded very promising, with works such as *Democracy from Scratch* (M. Steven Fish) and *The Rebirth of Politics in Russia* (Michael Urban et al.). In the 2000s, the tone became more uncertain and skeptical: *Russia's Unfinished Revolution* (Michael McFaul) and *Russia between Dictatorship and Democracy* (ed. by McFaul, Nikolay Petrov, and Andrei Ryabov) soon turned into *Democracy Derailed in Russia* (Fish, again) and even into *The Consolidation of Dictatorship in Russia* (Joel Ostrow et al.). By the early 2010s, *The Crisis of Russian Democracy* (Richard Sakwa) and *The Politics of Sub-National Authoritarianism in Russia* (ed. by Vladimir Gel'man and Cameron Ross) put an end to the great expectations of post-Soviet democratization in Russia. The multiple deficiencies of post-Soviet Russian politics, such as outrageously unfair and fraudulent electoral events, weak and impotent political parties, heavily censored (often self-censored) media, rubber-stamping legislatures at the national and sub-national levels, subordinated and heavily biased courts, the arbitrary use of the state's economic powers, and the endemic corruption provided considerable fodder for scholars, observers and journalists. However, besides the existing near-consensus about this (rather gloomy) picture, various groups of specialists differ starkly in their assessments of the Russian political regime and its major features as well as in their explanations of the pendulum-like trajectory of post-Soviet political development and their outlook for the future.

The most popular viewpoint perceived Russian political trends through lenses of growing dissatisfaction. This scholarly camp typically portrayed Russia as

“authoritarianism without authority” (Kathryn Stoner-Weiss) or as the major deviation from patterns of post-Communist democratization in Eastern Europe. However, a number of scholars vividly rejected this approach, affected by a normative bias, and argued that Russia is just a “normal country” (Andrei Shleifer and Daniel Treisman) with middling socio-economic development that actually faced multiple challenges not so dissimilar to many other states and nations from Latin America to East Asia. Accordingly, one should not simply write off Russia as a land of permanent political troubles, but analyze it as a case of the international phenomena of poor quality democratic institutions under “crony capitalism”. Also, some experts stressed the simultaneous co-existence of both democratic and authoritarian elements in the Russian political system and thus qualified it as a rather distinctive type of “hybrid regime” (Henry Hale) which would require a more nuanced understanding of the peculiarities of the causes and consequences of its political developments.

The theoretical focus of explanatory paradigms for post-Soviet Russian politics is diverse and based upon different disciplinary approaches. Roughly speaking, scholars might be divided into “pessimists”, “optimists” and “realists” not only because of the conclusions of their analyses but also because of various logical foundations of their research. If one would compare scholarship with medical diagnostics, the causes of the multiple diseases of Russian politics are perceived as consequences of genetically-transmitted viruses, post-traumatic syndromes, or poisoning. “Pessimists” believed that the troubles of Russian politics are inherited from the past and thus cannot be healed by any treatment, at least in the short run. They concentrate heavily on the impact of Soviet legacies (and/or pre-Soviet) Russian history and culture, so it is no wonder that their understating of contemporary politics is merely path-dependent. Given the embeddedness of many pathologies in Russian politics (ranging from patrimonial leadership to the “imperial syndrome”), the argument of “pessimists” is that post-Soviet developments are nothing but a “flight from freedom” (Richard Pipes) to the natural continuity of Russian autocracy. By contrast, “optimists” view major post-Soviet political and economic problems as the temporary effects of Russia’s complex and rather traumatic transformation and especially of the weakening of the Russian state’s coercive capacity after the collapse of the Soviet Union in the 1990s and its complicated restoration in the 2000s (Vadim Volkov). The protracted post-traumatic syndrome, even though painful, according to this view, is gradually improving over time and there is significant hope that a rebirth of the Russian economy and society will occur under the guid-

ance of a strong Russian state, the way a broken arm heals in a cast. Finally, “realists” consider the process of turning Russia’s “growing pains” of the 1990s into the “chronic diseases” of the 2000s to be the result of purposeful actions by special interest groups resembling the poisoning of the social organism. The list of these “poisoners” who seek to maximize their power and wealth at the expense of the country’s prospects for progress include various segments of the Russian elite, be they “oligarchs”, “siloviki” or other so-called “Kremlin towers”, and the top leaders, including Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev. Many observers of current events in Russia see a vicious circle: the continuation of the status-quo will decrease possible antidotal effects for the Russian state and society, although it is too early to say to what extent the social organism of Russia will be able to develop immunity against the “poisoning”, or if it will be impossible to heal the disease.

Comparative Frameworks

The recent effort to integrate studies of Russian politics into the broader theoretical and comparative perspective of political science is another major advantage of the post-Communist changes. Previously, scholars included Russia only as a case study in broader historical examinations of political developments, such as the classic work of Barrington Moore on the origins of democracy and dictatorship or Theda Skocpol’s study of social revolutions, while contemporary comparisons were rather sporadic. Now, research on post-Communist Russian politics is legitimately placed into a three-dimensional comparative perspective: cross-national, cross-temporal, and intra-national (or cross-regional).

First and foremost, comparativists have included Russia into multiple cross-national quantitative studies of political values and attitudes (such as the World Values Survey), corruption perceptions (like those performed by Transparency International), quality of governance (produced by the World Bank and other agencies), and the like. These tools and measurements, although providing a rather mixed picture of Russia’s place in the contemporary global political map, are widely (if not routinely) used in many analyses produced by specialists on Russian/post-Soviet studies as well as by global experts. Second, beyond large-scale quantitative studies, more focused case-oriented comparisons of Russian politics involve numerous comparative referents, both contemporary and historical: the list of such parallels include party systems in early US history (Hale) and in Mexico under PRI (Ora John Reuter and Thomas Remington), ideological constellations in the French Third Republic and in Weimar Germany (Stephen Hanson), and state-business relations during the “gilded age” in

the US (Volkov). Third, given the political, social, and economic diversity of Russia's regions and localities, a great deal of research on comparative sub-national politics in Russia has been conducted by both Russian and Western scholars. Besides regular observations on Russia's regions such as Carnegie Moscow Center's Regional Monitoring Project, or the cross-regional Georing mass surveys of the Public Opinion Foundation (FOM), some comprehensive studies dealt with nationalist mobilization in Russia's ethnic-based republics (Dmitry Gorenburg), the use of fiscal federalism for electoral purposes (Treisman), political party development in the regions (Grigorii V. Golosov), the involvement of businessmen in regional politics (Scott Gehlbach, Konstantin Sonin, and Ekaterina Zhuravskaya), and a number of other issues. All in all, Russia is no longer perceived as an isolated object of study but rather as a comparatively-oriented case in the world-wide map of political phenomena.

What Has Been Done, and What Lies Ahead?

Probably, there are no major topics of empirical political analysis which scholars of post-Soviet Russian politics have not considered. Political institutions, patterns of governance, mass attitudes and behavior, the role of ideology, ethnicity and nationalism and many other political phenomena in Russia during the last two decades were not only mapped and described but also analyzed according to the state of the art standards of modern political science. To summarize, research on Russian politics is no longer isolated from mainstream empirical comparative research. Sometimes studies of post-Soviet Russian politics produced interesting counter-intuitive conclusions—such as the observation that popular protest in Russia's regions in the 1990s was merely a by-product of conflicts between federal and regional elites (Graeme Robertson) or the implications of the study of “virtual politics” in Russia, which serves not only as a tool of political manipulation but also as a major instrument for legitimizing the status quo political regime and eliminating alternatives to it (Andrew Wilson).

The study of politics under a non-democratic regime in contemporary Russia poses new challenges as well as constraints on the research agenda. On the one hand, present-day Russia should be considered a new El Dorado for those scholars who study corruption, clientelism, arbitrary rule, and institutional decay because it provides plenty of field evidence and fertile grounds for testing and building various theories. On the other hand, a number of research arenas have been systematically distorted due to political interference—in particular, electoral studies. In fact, the destruction of electoral competition in Russia raised the question of the validity of official electoral statistics: if this data is usable only for the study of electoral fraud (which is flourishing in Russia), should we seriously analyze voting behavior and the electoral strategies of political parties? At least, research tools should be attuned to electoral authoritarianism in Russia and beyond.

Unfortunately, research on post-Soviet Russian politics rarely provided major insights that might affect political studies beyond Russia and the post-Soviet world. Probably, the time is not ripe yet, and in the future we might expect that the accumulation of knowledge on Russian politics and interdisciplinary and international efforts within the scholarly community will result in new path-breaking studies that shake the world of political science not only because of new data from Russia but also because of new ideas that will emerge out of this country. But at least one major difference between Soviet and post-Soviet Russia should be taken into account: unlike in the Communist period, present-day Russia is no longer a world superpower that claims global leadership, but rather a semi-peripheral state which might become in the future either an Eastern province of Europe or a Western province of China. And, quite probably, such a country would never produce key insights for research on politics in the contemporary world. Addressing these issues over the next two decades will form an agenda for the new generations of scholars on Russian politics both in Russia and in the West.

About the Author

Vladimir Gel'man is a professor of the European University at St. Petersburg.

The Western Study of Contemporary Russia: Double Bottoms and Double Standards

By Richard Sakwa, Canterbury

Abstract

The study of Russian politics is challenging at the best of times, but contemporary Russia provides some specific difficulties that render the endeavour particularly difficult. For every statement there appears to be an equally valid contrary assertion, and for every fact a dozen qualifying indicators that hollow out the original assertion. One is left doubting whether contemporary scholarship really is coming to grips with Russian reality, its complexities and nuances. Some fundamental methodological issues are raised, but the pervasive ontological question remains unresolved: what is the nature of Russian reality, and by what means can we analyze and describe its key features?

Cognition and Methodology

Liliya Shevtsova (1998, p. 4) long ago identified the “double bottom” principle in the analysis of Russian reality, according to which “there is one thing on the surface and something completely different inside”. Profound methodological issues are involved; the bases of our epistemological understanding of our epoch are not clear. At the general level post-communist Russia has been engaged in the attempt to establish the foundations of democracy and to establish the rudiments of a market economy. However, in conditions where democracy becomes an end and not the means, and a *dirigiste* regime tries to manage economic processes, a fundamental duality becomes an inherent characteristic of the system. There is the thing in itself—for example, elections, legislation shaping the party system, reduction in the punitive legislation applicable to economic offenses—and the reality which appears to have negligible connection with the declared reality. This is not simply a question of the manipulations of the administrative regime, described by Andrew Wilson (2005) as “virtual politics”, or even the sociological realities of a society still operating the entrenched survival codes of the Soviet era as described by Alena Ledeneva (1998), but a process of inherent doubling to which the regime and the whole polity is susceptible to create a “dual state” (Sakwa 2010).

The response in part has been a revival of neo-Kremlinological studies of the minutiae of leadership politics, but while it is important to understand who is doing what to whom at any given point in time, such analyses by definition will only deal with one level and fail to get to grips with the constant interaction between the two levels of the polity. Thus detailed analyses of elite politics and its professional composition have generated important data on some of the actors shaping the policy process, notably the role of former security officials (Kryshchanovska and White 2003), but such studies leave out of account the contrary pressures. For example, the

role of the business elite has been stressed (Rivera and Rivera 2006), and at the same time macroeconomic policy for the last decade and longer has clearly been in the hands of a group of liberal economists and central bankers pursuing classical neo-liberal policies. At the sectoral level this is challenged by various notions of “national champions” and a state-shaped energy strategy, which only reinforces the elements of the “dual economy” noted by Hanson (2007).

Thus any model of straightforward state capture by a particular professional group or class has to be tempered by a broader consideration of the nature of the post-communist Russian state, the social forces to which it responds, and the ideological narratives within which it is framed. Work on the political economy of contemporary Russia has not always been tied in effectively with analysis of state development. The notion of a “dual economy” tries to bridge the gap, yet the specifically political aspects of this remain to be explored. Equally, those studies which focus on the development of political institutions, notably parliaments, elections, the judiciary and the general constitutional order, sometimes lack grounding in issues of political economy. If there is a single defining feature of contemporary Russia, it is fungibility between the economic and political orders. In her analysis of “how Russia really works” Ledeneva (2006) makes a brave attempt to come to grips with this reality. This opens up into the grand field of corruption studies and the view of Russia as a “mafia state”.

The status of our understanding of any specific facet of contemporary Russia is contested, as is the epistemological basis of our knowledge. Gorbachev’s and Yeltsin’s presidencies, for example, remain the subject of dramatically opposed interpretations, and reflect a gulf in appreciations of their achievements. There remains a profound gulf between the overwhelmingly benign accounts of Gorbachev’s leadership by western scholars (notably, Brown 1996), and the rather more negative portraits current in Russia itself. Yeltsin’s leadership has been

the subject of two surprisingly positive western biographies. Although neither hides his weaknesses, notably his impulsiveness, jealousy of others in his entourage, and personalized style of ruling, they both ultimately rate him highly on both the normative and effectiveness dimensions (Aron 2000; Colton 2008). The great mass of the western literature, however, is highly critical of his leadership (for example, Reddaway and Glinski 2001).

The contested nature of Russian reality applies with no less force to specific incidents. For example, there is no good study of Sergei Kirienko's brief tenure as prime minister in 1998. Was he beginning to challenge the power of the "oligarchs" and was thus dismissed at their insistence; or did he fail utterly to grasp the depth of Russia's financial crisis and was it incompetence that led to his downfall? What about the October 1993 events, when the conflicting aspirations of the Russian presidency and the parliament headed by Ruslan Khasbulatov exploded into armed conflict? As the years pass, we seem to be ever less sure about who was doing what, when and why. Similarly, although we know a lot about the manoeuvrings that led to the first Chechen war (1994–96), does the unfurling of the second from 1999 force us to re-evaluate the deeper significance for Russia and Chechnya of the first? As for the sordid wheeler-dealing of privatization, is there a level at which we can agree with the view of Anatoly Chubais, the mastermind behind the rapid disbursement of state property, that the main thing was to break the state's monopoly on ownership as quickly as possible to prevent a communist restoration and to create a class with a stake in the new social order? The fact that this group was to a large extent not an independent middle class, a group that democratic theory suggests is essential for democracy, but a rapacious and criminalized oligarchy, has to be taken into account in our judgement. Yet the power of the bureaucracy over the economy was weakened (at least temporarily), and a market economy did emerge responsive to classic tools of economic management. No doubt in time, a relatively accurate picture will emerge. To date, however, the paucity of accounts of these turning points in post-communist Russian politics is remarkable. There have been some grand synoptic accounts (Hahn 2002; Hough 1997; McFaul 2001), but with the exception of Fish's work (2005) there have been few attempts at a grand synthesis.

Key Problems

The fungibility between the economic and political is accompanied by an analogous permeability between formal institutional processes and informal practices. One way of getting to grips with this is the application of various forms of network theory (Buck 2010; Kononenko

and Moshes (eds) 2010), but when taken in isolation this can at best give only a partial picture. From a very early point in Russia's post-communist trajectory observers noted the emergence of "clans" as functional substitutes mediating between the state and social forces in the absence of developed political parties and a functioning party *system*. I have argued that the notion of "factions" is more accurate, since this term conveys better the fluidity and temporality of these coalitions arching across the political and economic spheres (Sakwa 2011).

In a brief review it is impossible to do justice to the many detailed studies of Russian politics. The analysis of parties and elections is one of the central aspects of the field, and with good reason. As Hale (2006) notes, Russian parties operated in a distinctive political terrain, and were not able to defend the customary monopoly on political aggregation and representation, and hence "party substitutes" proliferated. The study of Russian regionalism and federalism has undergone an interesting trajectory. In the 1990s this was one of the central motifs in western studies of Russia, and a wealth of valuable analyses was produced. However, perhaps in conformity with the decline in the autonomy of Russia's "subjects of federation", the study of this field has also declined in scale, if not in quality. In recent years the study of internal micro-regions has been accompanied by the growth in the study of macro-regional blocs (Fawn (ed.) 2009). The fragmentation of Soviet space runs counter to the growth of the regionalizing impulse in other continents, and the dynamics of this process remain to be analyzed.

The issue of Russian national identity and national integration has been to the fore. Hosking (2006) notes the continued disjuncture between the Russian nation and the Russian state, while Tolz (2001) and Laruelle (2009) have provided perceptive studies of national identity. This blends into studies of Russian foreign policy, which have increasingly been focused by the constructivist emphasis on identity issues and long-term patterns in Russia's interaction with its European neighbors (Neumann 1995; Tsygankov 2010). The study of Russian foreign policy and relations with NATO and the United States is accompanied by the growing field of energy politics (Baev 2008). Russia's distinctive civilizational trajectory has encouraged a raft of perceptive studies.

In all of this the neo-Kremlinological question hangs over our study of contemporary Russia. It is for this reason that the publication of various missives by American diplomats in Russia published by WikiLeaks in late 2010 gained an almost canonical character so quickly. As the *Guardian* reported in a special section on the affair, "Russia is a land of rumor, misinformation and outright lies", and although the long report on Chechnya by William Burns, who was ambassador between

2005 and 2008, is a model of clarity and insight, the standard cable, however, is shocking for its crudeness, portraying Russia as “virtual mafia state” ruled by Medvedev’s Robin to Putin’s Batman (*Guardian* 2001).

New Approaches

The priority traditionally accorded to formal institutions is derived from the positivistic legal-constitutional tradition, although the counter-movement of the behavioral revolution from the 1950s went too far in prioritizing the social over the political. Social sciences did indeed have to “bring the state back in”, but how and in what way remains a matter of controversy. It is this problematic which is explored by the new field of International Political Anthropology (IPA). The new “discipline” of political anthropology has gained wide resonance in the social sciences, drawing on the work of Marcel Mauss (for example, Balandier 1970). Its focus is on the micropolitical level, as well as the role of symbolic artefacts—in which category even constitutions can be rendered.

For some Central Asian states, it is argued, constitutions are designed to demonstrate to international society the democratic credentials of the young state. Plenty of books deal with political anthropological issues, such as clientelism and patrimonialism, even though formally they do not consider themselves in this category. While the grand macropolitical movements of modernity have by no means exhausted their potential, notably political parties, trade unions and various social movements, and the study of individual motivations and collective action problems retain their validity, the micropolitical approach suggests that the study of the capillaries of power at the meso-level can provide important insights. This is not simply displacing the study of one process for the sake of another, but the complementary development of new approaches.

The post-communist Russian experience has once again demonstrated that democracy is as much about the development of certain cultural traits as it is about building robust institutions. This has been the focus of Tocquevillian discussions about the development of “habits of the heart” in civil society, the importance of social capital, and the long-term debate over the role of political culture. Much of this discussion has been self-serving and has done little more than reinforce existing patterns of international hegemony. Peter Gowan (1999, p. 2) notes how “The neo-liberals also took up the language of civil society to turn the liberal concept on its head. Instead of being a network of associations and institutions for invigilating state executives and market forces and articulating collective interests and concerns, it was to become a mixture of big business charitable foundations and self-help institutions for the deserving

poor on one side; and archipelagos of unaccountable quangos for managing a depoliticized, privatized, publicly passive individual consumer on the other”. Thus critiques of conventional approaches to global hegemonic discourses come to the surface. From a Foucauldian perspective, ideas have an innate disciplinary power, and when combined with harder forms sustain not only existing hierarchies of power but also mystify these systems and render them unintelligible to their subjects.

An expanded notion of the public sphere can provide a helpful way of thinking about practises of critique. Although for Habermas the idea of the public sphere was rooted in the development of a particular society at a particular time, it is nevertheless increasingly used in the examination of disparate societies at different levels of development. The idea brings together the development of collective organizations with the formation of political identities, giving voice to values, the articulation of views, and search after truth (*parrhesia*). Without these elements public discourse is reduced to little more than the dissemination of decontextualized “news”, the propagation of partial and often entrenched traditionalism, and the sphere of unbounded consumerism. This is a point stressed by Ikeda in his Postscript to the discussion with Gorbachev. He stressed that Walter Lippman, in his book *Public Opinion*, had “insisted on the importance of Socratic methods to the development and maturation of democracy” (2005, p. 157). He warned against the regression of all—not just American—democracy and dreamed of cultivating “the use of the dialogue methods of Socrates and Shakyamuni as far as possible and on the maximum number of levels, to stimulate individual cultural revolutions all over the world in the hope of cultivating citizens capable of thinking for themselves” (p. 158).

Of greatest interest is the interaction between legal postulates, institutional development and cultural predispositions. These are historically shaped but susceptible to changing patterns of governance as well as governmentality. The normalizing process is crucial here: why do certain patterns become “normal” for a given society at a certain time, although they may have been extremely “abnormal” for that same society in its own past, and for other societies at the same time. The normalizing process can be contrasted with liminality: the first represents closure and the reduction, if not suppression, of possibilities; whereas liminality suggests openness in historical development.

The Regime Question: Norms and Double Standards

At the heart of the contemporary western studies of Russia is the “accursed” regime question, an issue that has

been on the table for as long as Russia has engaged western observers. From the very beginning Russia appeared as something odd and disruptive both of the international order and of the given nature of things (Neumann 1999). This oddity at points has taken a strongly orientalist inflexion, with Russia perceived to be not only exotic but also as not quite meeting accepted standards of civilization, boorish and uncultured in its manners and juvenile in its demands to be taken seriously as an equal (for a critique of “orientalizing” discourses, see Brown 2010).

This infantilization was given form in the European Union’s assumption of a tutelary status vis-à-vis Russia in its various negotiations (Prozorov 2006), a stance that paradoxically mimics the regime’s stance towards its own population. Until at least the mid-2000s the EU assumed that it would become the undisputed hegemonic power in greater Europe, exercised through a blend of normative instruments and “soft power” (Zielonka 2007). In an extraordinary recrudescence of the logic of Soviet-style communism although with an inverted content, those who disputed the EU’s status were considered not only to be mistaken but somehow malevolent, since the EU project was so patently benign to all who would but see. This approach was manifested in numerous forms and couched in terms such as “external governance” to advance an EU-centred model of good governance. The notion of “Europeanization” as an endlessly expanding vision of a specific type of governmentality was both a cultural project but it has also struggled to find an adequate institutional form for the “outsider” countries.

The tension within the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and the attempts to draw its six eastern neighbors into closer orbit through the Eastern Partnership (EaP) has been examined by Elena Korostoleva (2008–10). In recent years the EU’s self-confidence has endured numerous blows, notably though the failure to adopt a constitution. The coming into force of the rather modest Lisbon Treaty in December 2009 was but a pale substitute for the soaring ambitions evinced in earlier years, yet the new instruments do allow the EU to formulate its foreign policy “actress” with greater coherence. Russo-EU relations are a fundamental part of the continuing debate over the feasibility and effectiveness of “democracy promotion”. This has become quite an academic growth industry in recent years, reflecting the armed democracy advancement strategy pursued by the leading western powers on the ground. Two recent surveys of the topic examine the dilemmas, but at the same time reflect the classic lacunae of the topic: the lack of examination of different forms of democracy; the west-centric focus; avoidance of the problem of dedemocratization in established democracies; and the typical neglect

of the EU’s experience in this field (Barany & Moser (eds) 2009; Burnell and Youngs (eds) 2009).

It is when we come to the problem of comparative democratization that we run into the deepest problems. Classic debates over the relative weight to be given to agency-centred views of political change versus structural and historical patterns of causation have generated a rich literature applied to Russia, and while most commentators would suggest that a combination of the two is appropriate, quite what formula of combination is applicable remain unresolved, despite some brave attempts at answering the question (for example, Møller 2009). The spatial dimension is no less important: those countries close to the EU tend to become “Europeanized”, whereas those further away have tended towards authoritarianism. This law does not hold within the former Soviet area, however (with the exception of the anomalous case of the Baltic republics), since Belarus remains a stubborn outlier on the democracy gradient.

Conclusion

The western study of Russia appears to go through a standard cycle, with conventional tropes repeated over the ages. What begins as a rather benign sense of wonderment at Russia’s extraordinary combination of difference and sameness gives way to alienation and then hostility, typically accompanied by Russia’s engagement in the European state system followed by war in either a hot or cold form, before a new cycle begins where Russia is once again appreciated for what it is and not for what it might be. Russia is too similar to be completely alien, but too different to be quite assimilated into the western family. Russia reproduces in a different guise standard western social patterns and cultural norms, but at the same time takes these patterns to places that are utterly unfamiliar to Westerners.

Thus the double bottom is no more than a superficial manifestation of the inherent duality of Russian social forms. The response is either a programme for the full-scale westernization of Russia, which for Russian patriots entails the obliteration of all that makes Russia distinctively Russia, or some sort of alternative patriotic project which, when accompanied by *Sonderweg* aspirations, threatens to turn into yet another developmental blind alley accompanied by xenophobia and authoritarianism. There remains a fundamental tension between the liberal view of modernisation as inherently pluralistic and democracy-enhancing, and realist perspectives of great power contestation and power politics. These two great paradigms of our age are reflected in the endless debates about Russian national identity, which are then imported into the operation of the tandem power system as a whole.

What is missing in all of this is a sustained sense of critique. The Russian double bottom exposes the elements of pseudo-scientism in some of the west's social science. It even appears often that the more elaborate the methodology, the more puny and trivial the findings. It is remarkable how quickly much of what is written about post-communist Russia becomes dated. The short shelf life is often accompanied by a miniscule readership of ever-more specialist journals. This is emphatically not an attempt to denigrate the excellent work using sophisticated methodologies applied to understand the social and political realities of contemporary Russia, often in a comparative context (for example, Loveless and Whitefield 2011 on social inequality). Work using survey and polling data on electoral politics and voting behavior is crucial to our understanding of how citizen rights are applied and the degree to which trust and loyalty are fostered.

However, I do argue that Russia's multiple reality can only be grasped by a plurality of methodologies and a diversity of perspectives. This needs to be accompanied by a greater sense of critique, in the classical sense of the

word as an immanent examination of the categories of analysis and ideological paradigms employed. A notable example of just such an approach is Urban's recent analysis of the moral and political universe of a section of the Russian political elite, employing the instruments of semiotics to analyze the narratives and discourses of his interlocutors. This provides a profound insight into the contours of contemporary Russian political culture at the individual level. Urban argues that discursive practices reinforce authoritarianism, but he also suggests that they can provide a platform for the development of forms of deliberative democracy. His view that democracy is a "condition of society rather than merely a system of government" (2010, p. 188) has important implications for the whole field of comparative democratization. The glib assumption by the majority of Russian liberals that neo-liberalism is the natural form of organization of contemporary society needs to be challenged. Only through such a critique can a type and style of politics appropriate to present Russian conditions be devised.

About the Author

Richard Sakwa is Professor of Russian and European Politics at the University of Kent and an Associate Fellow of the Russia and Eurasia Programme at the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House. He has published widely on Soviet, Russian and post-communist affairs. Recent books include *Russian Politics and Society* (London & New York, Routledge, 4th edn 2008), and *Putin: Russia's Choice* (Routledge, 2nd edn 2008). His book on *The Quality of Freedom: Khodorkovsky, Putin and the Yukos Affair* came out with Oxford University Press in 2009, and his study *The Crisis of Russian Democracy: The Dual State, Factionalism, and the Medvedev Succession* was published with Cambridge University Press in 2011.

Further reading

- Aron, Leon (2000), *Boris Yeltsin: A Revolutionary Life* (London, HarperCollins).
- Baev, Pavel (2008), *Russian Energy Policy and Military Power: Putin's Quest for Greatness* (London, Routledge).
- Balandier, G. (1970), *Anthropologie politique* (Paris, 1967), translated as *Political Anthropology* (New York).
- Barany, Zoltan and Robert G. Moser (eds) (2009), *Is Democracy Exportable?* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Brown, Archie (1996), *The Gorbachev Factor* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- Brown, James D. J. (2010), "A Stereotype, Wrapped in a Cliché, Inside a Caricature: Russian Foreign Policy and *Orientalism*", *Politics*, Vol. 30, No. 3, 2010, pp. 149–159.
- Buck, Andrew (2010), "Network Mobilization and the Origins of the Putin Coalition", *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, Vol. 26, No. 4, December, pp. 445–70.
- Burnell, Peter and Richard Youngs (eds) (2009), *New Challenges to Democratisation* (Abingdon, Routledge).
- Colton, Timothy J. (2008) *Yeltsin: A Life* (New York, Basic Books).
- Fawn, Rick (ed.), *Globalising the Regional: Regionalizing the Global* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Fish, M. Steven (2005), *Democracy Derailed in Russia: The Failure of Open Politics* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Gorbachev, Mikhail and Daisaku Ikeda (2005), *Moral Lessons of the Twentieth Century: Gorbachev and Ikeda on Buddhism and Communism* (London, I. B. Tauris).
- Gowan, Peter (1999), "Neo-Liberalism and Civil Society", in Peter Gowan, *The Global Gamble: Washington's Faustian Bid for World Dominance* (London, Verso).

(continued overleaf)

- *Guardian*, “After WikiLeaks” special section 5 February 2010.
- Hahn, Gordon M. (2002), *Russia’s Revolution from Above, 1985–2000: Reform, Transition, and Revolution in the Fall of the Soviet Communist Regime* (New Brunswick, NJ, Transaction Publishers).
- Hale, Henry E. (2006), *Why Not Parties in Russia? Democracy, Federalism and the State* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Hanson, Philip (2007), “The Russian Economic Puzzle: Going Forwards, Backwards or Sideways?” *International Affairs*, Vol. 83, No. 5, September–October, pp. 869–89.
- Hosking, Geoffrey (2006), *Rulers and Victims: The Russian in the Soviet Union* (Cambridge, MA, Belknap).
- Hough, Jerry F. (1997), *Democratization and Revolution in the USSR, 1985–1991* (Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution).
- Kononenko, Vadim and Arkady Moshes (eds) (2010), *Russia as a Network State: What Works in Russia When Institutions Do Not?* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan).
- Korostoleva, Elena (2008–10), “Europeanising or Securitising the ‘Outsiders’? Assessing the EU’s Partnership-Building Approach with Eastern Europe”, ESRC-funded project, www.aber.ac.uk/interpol/en/research/EKPproject/.
- Kryshankovskaya, Olga and Stephen White (2003), “Putin’s Militocracy”, *Post-Soviet Affairs*, Vol. 19, No. 4, October–December, pp. 289–306.
- Laruelle, Marlene (2009), *In the Name of the Nation: Nationalism and Politics in Contemporary Russia* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan).
- Ledeneva, Alena V. (1998), *Russia’s Economy of Favours: Blat, Networking and Informal Exchange* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Ledeneva, Alena V. (2006), *How Russia Really Works: The Informal Practices that Shaped Post-Soviet Politics and Business* (Ithaca, NY, & London, Cornell University Press).
- Loveless, Matthew and Stephen Whitefield (2011), “Being Unequal and Seeing Inequality: Explaining the Political Significance of Social Inequality in New Market Democracies”, *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 50, No. 2, March, pp. 239–66.
- McFaul, Michael (2001), *Russia’s Unfinished Revolution: Political Change from Gorbachev to Putin* (Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press).
- Møller, Jørgen (2009), *Post-Communist Regime Change: A Comparative Study* (Abingdon, Routledge).
- Neumann, Iver B. (1995), *Russia and the Idea of Europe* (London, Routledge).
- Neumann, Iver B. (1999), *Uses of the Other: «the East» in European Identity Formation* (Manchester, Manchester University Press).
- Prozorov, Sergei (2006), *Understanding Conflict between Russia and the EU: The Limits of Integration* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan).
- Reddaway, Peter and Dmitri Glinski (2001), *The Tragedy of Russia’s Reforms: Market Bolshevism against Democracy* (Washington, DC, The United States Institute of Peace Press).
- Rivera, Sharon Werning and David W. Rivera (2006), “The Russian Elite under Putin: Militocratic or Bourgeois?”, *Post-Soviet Affairs*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 125–44.
- Sakwa, Richard (2010), “The Dual State in Russia”, *Post-Soviet Affairs*, Vol. 26, No. 3, July–September, pp. 185–206.
- Sakwa, Richard (2011), *The Crisis of Russian Democracy: The Dual State, Factionalism and the Medvedev Succession* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Shevtsova, Liliya (1998), “Beg na meste”, *Izvestiya*, 12 February, p. 4.
- Tolz, Vera (2001), *Russia: Inventing the Nation* (London, Arnold).
- Tsygankov, Andrei P. (2010), *Russia’s Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity*, 2nd edn (Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield).
- Urban, Michael (2010), *Cultures of Power in Post-Communist Russia: An Analysis of Elite Political Discourse* (New York, Cambridge University Press).
- Wilson, Andrew (2005), *Virtual Politics: Faking Democracy in the Post-Soviet World* (New Haven, CT, Yale University Press).
- Zielonka, Jan (2007), *Europe as Empire: The Nature of the Enlarged European Union* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

ABOUT THE RUSSIAN ANALYTICAL DIGEST

Editors: Stephen Aris, Matthias Neumann, Robert Orttung, Jeronim Perović, Heiko Pleines, Hans-Henning Schröder, Aglaya Snetkov

The Russian Analytical Digest is a bi-weekly internet publication jointly produced by the Research Centre for East European Studies [Forschungsstelle Osteuropa] at the University of Bremen (www.forschungsstelle.uni-bremen.de), the Center for Security Studies (CSS) at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETH Zurich), the Resource Security Institute, the Institute of History at the University of Basel (<http://histsem.unibas.ch/seminar/>) and the Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies at The George Washington University. It is supported by the German Association for East European Studies (DGO). The Digest draws on contributions to the German-language *Russland-Analysen* (www.laender-analysen.de/russland), the CSS analytical network on Russia and Eurasia (www.res.ethz.ch), and the Russian Regional Report. The Russian Analytical Digest covers political, economic, and social developments in Russia and its regions, and looks at Russia's role in international relations.

To subscribe or unsubscribe to the Russian Analytical Digest, please visit our web page at www.res.ethz.ch/analysis/rad

Research Centre for East European Studies at the University of Bremen

Founded in 1982, the Research Centre for East European Studies (Forschungsstelle Osteuropa) at the University of Bremen is dedicated to socialist and post-socialist cultural and societal developments in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

In the area of post-socialist societies, extensive research projects have been conducted in recent years with emphasis on political decision-making processes, economic culture and the integration of post-socialist countries into EU governance. One of the core missions of the institute is the dissemination of academic knowledge to the interested public. This includes regular email services with nearly 20,000 subscribers in politics, economics and the media.

With a collection of publications on Eastern Europe unique in Germany, the Research Centre is also a contact point for researchers as well as the interested public. The Research Centre has approximately 300 periodicals from Russia alone, which are available in the institute's library. News reports as well as academic literature is systematically processed and analyzed in data bases.

The Center for Security Studies (CSS) at ETH Zurich

The Center for Security Studies (CSS) at ETH Zurich is a Swiss academic center of competence that specializes in research, teaching, and information services in the fields of international and Swiss security studies. The CSS also acts as a consultant to various political bodies and the general public. The CSS is engaged in research projects with a number of Swiss and international partners. The Center's research focus is on new risks, European and transatlantic security, strategy and doctrine, area studies, state failure and state building, and Swiss foreign and security policy.

In its teaching capacity, the CSS contributes to the ETH Zurich-based Bachelor of Arts (BA) in public policy degree course for prospective professional military officers in the Swiss army and the ETH and University of Zurich-based MA program in Comparative and International Studies (MACIS); offers and develops specialized courses and study programs to all ETH Zurich and University of Zurich students; and has the lead in the Executive Masters degree program in Security Policy and Crisis Management (MAS ETH SPCM), which is offered by ETH Zurich. The program is tailored to the needs of experienced senior executives and managers from the private and public sectors, the policy community, and the armed forces.

The CSS runs the International Relations and Security Network (ISN), and in cooperation with partner institutes manages the Crisis and Risk Network (CRN), the Parallel History Project on Cooperative Security (PHP), the Swiss Foreign and Security Policy Network (SSN), and the Russian and Eurasian Security (RES) Network.

The Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies, The Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University

The Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies is home to a Master's program in European and Eurasian Studies, faculty members from political science, history, economics, sociology, anthropology, language and literature, and other fields, visiting scholars from around the world, research associates, graduate student fellows, and a rich assortment of brown bag lunches, seminars, public lectures, and conferences.

The Institute of History at the University of Basel

The Institute of History at the University of Basel was founded in 1887. It now consists of ten professors and employs some 80 researchers, teaching assistants and administrative staff. Research and teaching relate to the period from late antiquity to contemporary history. The Institute offers its 800 students a Bachelor's and Master's Degree in general history and various specialized subjects, including a comprehensive Master's Program in Eastern European History (<http://histsem.unibas.ch/bereiche/osteuropaeische-geschichte/>).

Resource Security Institute

The Resource Security Institute (RSI) is a non-profit organization devoted to improving understanding about global energy security, particularly as it relates to Eurasia. We do this through collaborating on the publication of electronic newsletters, articles, books and public presentations.

Any opinions expressed in Russian Analytical Digest are exclusively those of the authors.

Reprint possible with permission by the editors.

Editors: Stephen Aris, Matthias Neumann, Robert Orttung, Jeronim Perović, Heiko Pleines, Hans-Henning Schröder

Layout: Cengiz Kibaroglu, Matthias Neumann, Michael Clemens

ISSN 1863-0421 © 2010 by Forschungsstelle Osteuropa, Bremen and Center for Security Studies, Zürich

Research Centre for East European Studies • Publications Department • Klagenfurter Str. 3 • 28359 Bremen • Germany

Phone: +49 421-218-69600 • Telefax: +49 421-218-69607 • e-mail: fsopr@uni-bremen.de • Internet: www.res.ethz.ch/analysis/rad