Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society (SPPS) Vol. 147

ISSN 1614-3515

Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society (SPPS)

ISSN 1614-3515

Founded in 2004 and refereed since 2007, SPPS makes available affordable English-, German-, and Russian-language studies on the history of the countries of the former Soviet bloc from the late Tsarist period to today. It publishes between 5 and 20 volumes per year and focuses on issues in transitions to and from democracy such as economic crisis, identity formation, civil society development, and constitutional reform in CEE and the NIS. SPPS also aims to highlight so far understudied themes in East European studies such as right-wing radicalism, religious life, higher education, or human rights protection. The authors and titles of all previously published volumes are listed at the end of this book. For a full description of the series and reviews of its books, see

www.ibidem-verlag.de/red/spps.

Editorial correspondence & manuscripts should be sent to: Dr. Andreas Umland, c/o DAAD, German Embassy, vul. Bohdana Khmelnitskoho 25, UA-01901 Kyiv, Ukraine. e-mail: umland@stanfordalumni.org

Business correspondence & review copy requests should be sent to: ***ibidem*** Press, Leuschnerstr. 40, 30457 Hannover, Germany; tel.: +49 511 2622200; fax: +49 511 2622201; spps@ibidem.eu.

Authors, reviewers, referees, and editors for (as well as all other persons sympathetic to) SPPS are invited to join its networks at

www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=52638198614
www.linkedin.com/groups?about=&gid=103012
www.xing.com/net/spps-ibidem-verlag/

Recent Volumes

143 *Инна Чувычкина (ред.)*
Экспортные нефте- и газопроводы на постсоветском пространстве
Анализ трубопроводной политики в свете теории международных отношений
ISBN 978-3-8382-0822-0

144 *Johann Zajaczkowski*
Russland – eine pragmatische Großmacht?
Eine rollentheoretische Untersuchung russischer Außenpolitik am Beispiel der Zusammenarbeit mit den USA nach 9/11 und des Georgienkrieges von 2008
Mit einem Vorwort von Siegfried Schieder
ISBN 978-3-8382-0837-4

145 *Boris Popivanov*
Changing Images of the Left in Bulgaria
The Challenge of Post-Communism in the Early 21st Century
ISBN 978-3-8382-0667-7

146 *Lenka Krátká*
A History of the Czechoslovak Ocean Shipping Company 1948-1989
How a Small, Landlocked Country Ran Maritime Business During the Cold War
ISBN 978-3-8382-0666-0

147 *Alexander Sergunin*
Explaining Russian Foreign Policy Behavior
Theory and Practice
ISBN 978-3-8382-0752-0

148 *Darya Malyutina*
Migrant Friendships in a Super-Diverse City
Russian-Speakers and their Social Relationships in London in the 21st Century
With a foreword by Claire Dwyer
ISBN 978-3-8382-0652-3

149 *Alexander Sergunin, Valery Konyshev*
Russia in the Arctic
Hard or Soft Power?
ISBN 978-3-8382-0753-7

150 *John J. Maresca*
Helsinki Revisited
A Key U.S. Negotiator's Memoirs on the Development of the CSCE into the OSCE
With a foreword by Hafiz Pashayev
ISBN 978-3-8382-0852-7

Alexander Sergunin

EXPLAINING RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY BEHAVIOR

Theory and Practice

ibidem-Verlag
Stuttgart

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.d-nb.de abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

Cover picture: A Knight at the Crossroads. Viktor Vasnetsov, 1878. Oil on canvas. Source: Wikiart.org. Public domain.

∞

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem, säurefreien Papier
Printed on acid-free paper

ISSN: 1614-3515

ISBN-13: 978-3-8382-0752-0

Printed in the EU

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

A number of generous grants from different organizations made this book possible. First of all, I have to mention a number of grants from St. Petersburg State University (SPSU) (2008–2010) that were devoted to international security (both on the theoretical and practical levels). In 1993, 1996–98 and 2000–2003 I've conducted several research projects on Russian domestic debate on European security and EU-Russia relations which have been sponsored by the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI)[1]. In the same periods, the Research Support Scheme, Open Society Institute (Prague) (1996–98), NATO Democratic Institutions Fellowship Program (1997–99), John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation (2000–01), Finnish Institute of International Relations (UPI) (2000–01, 2004–06), East-West Institute (2000) and International Policy Fellowship (2003–04), Curriculum Development Competition program, Curriculum Resource Center (2007–08), Special Projects Office, Special and Extension Programs (2012) at the Central European University, funded my projects on the Russian and global post-Cold War security discourse and politics.

In the spring 2004 semester I was teaching a course of Russian foreign policy in the Department of Government, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY (as a part of the Fulbright exchange program). The fruitful dialogue with my students and colleagues was very helpful for developing and testing fresh ideas.

In 2003–2004 Prof. Pavel Tsygankov (Moscow State University) led a research project on the Russian post-Soviet IR and the earlier and shorter versions of this study were published both in Russia and the U.S. (Tsygankov and Tsygankov 2005; Sergunin 2003–2004).

Another research project on mapping the post-Cold War International Relations (IR) (both Western and non-Western) was launched by Dr. Arlene Tickner (University of Andes, Columbia) and Prof. Øle Wæver (University of Copenhagen) at the 2004 Montreal International Studies Association (ISA) Convention. Within this project, I was responsible for examining the Russian post-Soviet IR debate.

In 2004, Dr Arkady Moshes from the Finnish Institute of International Relations (UPI) has launched an ambitious research project on the EU-Russia relations with the title "Assessing Russia's European Choice". I was responsible for examining the Russian decision-making mechanism on Europe. The above-mentioned study was followed up by a book project led by Dr. Ted Hopf from the Ohio State University.

1 Merged with the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) in 2003.

In 2011–2015, a series of short-term projects on Russian policies in the East and North Europe was conducted with University of Helsinki, Free University Berlin (FUB), University of Tartu and Stockholm University. In 2015 I was a coordinator of a pilot project on German-Russian relations in the context of the Ukrainian crisis (joint project sponsored by the SPSU and FUB). The SPSU-sponsored project on BRICS initiated in 2015 was also helpful in understanding Russia's foreign policies toward key developing countries.

To sum up, this book is both an end-result and follow-up of these projects.

Along with the above-mentioned organizations and projects, I remain indebted to Professor Håkan Wiberg, ex-Director of COPRI, who played a key role in launching and executing the above-mentioned projects by being its principal consultant and by providing me with useful advice at all their stages. I also extend special thanks to Dr. Pertti Joenniemi, former Senior Research Fellow, COPRI / DIIS, for his extensive and insightful comments and suggestions during my work on the projects.

It is a pleasant duty to mention here my gratitude to many colleagues who have helped me with especially useful advice or materials for this book. They include: Dr. Roy Allison, Senior Lecturer, Oxford University (former Head, Russian and CIS program, Royal Institute of International Affairs); Dr. Derek Averre, Research Fellow, The University of Birmingham; Dr. Pavel Baev, Senior Research Fellow, International Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO); Vladimir Baranovsky, former Project Leader, Stockholm Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (until 1998), and currently Deputy Director, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Russian Academy of Sciences (IMEMO, RAS, Moscow); Dr. Christopfer Browning, (COPRI, Birmingham / Keele / Warwick universities); Professor Barry Buzan, University of Westminster; Dr. Olga Potemkina and Dr. Dmitry Danilov, Institute of Europe, RAS; Prof. Michael Emerson, Senior Research Fellow, Center for European Policy Studies, Brussels; Prof. Mathew Evangelista, Cornell University; Dr. Frank Fischer, Professor of Political Science, Rutgers University; Geir Flikke, Dr. Jakub Godzimirski and Dr. Iver Neumann, research fellows at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI); Prof. Tuomas Forsberg, University of Tampere; Flemming Splidsboel Hansen, Senior Researcher, DIIS; Prof. Lassi Heininen, University of Lapland; Dr. Zlatko Isakovic, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of International Politics and Economics (Belgrade); Dr. Lena Jonson, Senior Research Fellow, Swedish Institute of International Affairs; Prof. Valery Konyshev, St. Petersburg University; Dr. Wojciech Kostecki, Senior Research Fellow, Institute for Political Studies (Warsaw); Dr. Natasha Kuhrt, King's College, London University; Gunnar Lassinantti, ex-Project Leader, Olof Palme International Center (Stockholm); Professor Margot Light, London School of Economics;

Prof. Marina Lebedeva, Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO); Dr. Raimundas Lopata, ex-Director, Institute of International Relations & Political Science, Vilnius University; Prof. Andrei Makarychev, Nizhny Novgorod Linguistic Universit / University of Tartuy; Dr. Andre Mommen, Department of Sociology, Amsterdam University; Dr. Arkady Moshes, Project Leader, Finnish Institute of International Relations (UPI); Kari Möttlöa, Special Adviser, Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs / University of Helsinki; Dr. Hans Mouritzen, Senior Research Fellow, COPRI / DIIS; Dr. Ingmar Oldberg, FOA (National Defense Establishment) / Swedish Institute of International Affairs; Prof. Bob Orttung, George Washington University; Dr. Alexander Pikaev, Senior Research Fellow, IMEMO, RAS; Prof. Mikhail Rykhtik, Nizhny Novgorod State University; Professor Klaus Segbers, Institute for East European Studies, FUB; Dr. Tatyana Shakleina, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of USA & Canada Studies (ISKRAN), RAS, Russia; Professor Jane Sharp, Department of War Studies, King's College (London); Dr. Hanna Smith, Aleksanteri Institute, University of Helsinki; Dr. Stephan Spigeleire, University of Leiden / the Hague Center for Strategic Studies; Dr. Fabrizio Tassinari, Senior Researcher, DIIS; Dr. Arlene Tickner (University of Andes, Columbia); Dr. Dmitry Trenin, Moscow Carnegie Center; Professor Ivan Tyulin, ex-First Vice-Rector, and Dr. Andrei Zagorsky, ex-Vice-Rector, Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO); Dr. Christian Wellmann, former Deputy Director, Schleswig-Holstein Institute for Peace Research; Prof. Øle Wæver, University of Copenhagen; Irina Y. Zhinkina, Senior Research Fellow, ISKRAN, RAS.

I am thankful to a number of research centers and institutions—the Department of International Relations Theory & History, SPSU; Department of Political Science, St. Petersburg campus, Higher School of Economics; Department of International Relations & Political Science, Institute of International Relations & World History, Nizhny Novgorod State University; Nizhny Novgorod Linguistic University, Russia; COPRI / DIIS, Denmark; Department of Government, Cornell University; SIPRI and Department of Political Science, Stockholm University, Sweden; International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, UK, and the Department of Politics, School of Sociology, Politics & Anthropology, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia, which provided me with excellent research environments and warm hospitality. Without their liberal support and help this work was not possible.

Alexander Sergunin
St. Petersburg State University, Russia
December 2015

Acronyms

ACV	Armored combat vehicle
ASEAN	Association of South-East Asian Nations
BA	Bachelor of Arts
BALTCOM	Baltic Communication System
BASREC	Baltic Sea Region Energy Cooperation
BEAC	Barents Euro-Arctic Council
BMD	Ballistic missile defense
BPS	Baltic Pipeline System
BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa
CBSS	Council of the Baltic Sea States
CERI	Center for International Studies, Paris
CES	Common Economic Space
CFDP	Council on Foreign and Defense Policy
CFE	Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
CFM	Committee on Financial Monitoring
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
COPRI	Copenhagen Peace Research Institute
CPRF	Communist Party of the Russian Federation
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union
CRM	Conflict Resolution and Mediation
CSCE	Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe
CSTO	Collective Security Treaty Organization
DAAD	German Academic Exchange Program
DC	Decile coefficient
DIIS	Danish Institute for International Studies
DPR	Donetsk People's Republic
EaP	Eastern Partnership
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction & Development
ECTS	European Credit Transfer System
ECU	European Currency Unit
EEZ	Exclusive economic zone
EEU	Eurasian Economic Union
ENP	European Neighborhood Policy
EST	European Security Treaty
EU	European Union
FEZ	Free economic zone
FIS	Foreign Intelligence Service
FOI	National Defense Establishment (Sweden)
FSS	Federal Security Service

FTA	Free Trade Area
FUB	Free University Berlin
G-7	Group of Seven
G-20	Group of Twenty
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GRU	Glavnoe Razvedavatel'noe Upravlenie – the Main Intelligence Directorate of the General Staff
JHA	Justice and Home Affairs
IAN	International Affairs Network
ICTs	Information and communication technologies
IFRI	French Institute for International Studies, Paris
IISS	International Institute for Strategic Studies, London
IMEMO	Institute of World Economy & International Relations
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INTAS	International Technical Assistance (to the CIS countries), EU program
INTERREG	EU's program on interregional co-operation
IR	International Relations
ISA	International Studies Association
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
ISKRAN	Institute of USA & Canada Studies, RAS
KOR	Kaliningrad Defense District
LDPR	Liberal Democratic Party of Russia
LPR	Lughansk People's Republic
MA	Master of Arts
MED	Ministry for Economic Development
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MGIMO	Moscow State Institute of International Relations
MGU	Moscow State University
MNEPR	Multilateral Nuclear Environmental Program in the Russian Federation
MoD	Ministry of Defense
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Area
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDA	Northern Dimension Area
NDEP	Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership
NDI	Northern Dimension Initiative
NEGP	North European Gas Pipeline
NEP	New Economic Policy
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NIS	New Independent States
NPP	Nuclear power plant
NPT	New Political Thinking

NRC	NATO-Russia Council
NSS	National Security Strategy
NUPI	Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PCA	Partnership and Co-operation Agreement
PfP	Partnership for Peace (NATO program)
PHARE	Poland and Hungary, Aid for the Reconstruction of Economies
PIR-Center	Center for Russian Political Research
PR	Public relations
PRC	People's Republic of China
PRIO	Peace Research Institute Oslo
PTT	Power transition theory
RAAS	Russian Association of American Studies
RAND	Research & Development Corporation
RAS	Russian Academy of Science
RAU	Russian-American University
RFPF	Russian Foreign Policy Foundation
RISA	Russian International Studies Association
RISS	Russian Institute for Strategic Studies
ROC	Russian Orthodox Church
RPSA	Russian Political Science Association
RUSI	Royal United Services Institute
SCO	Shanghai Cooperation Organization
SEZ	Special economic zone
SIPRI	Stockholm Peace Research Institute
SPSA	Soviet Political Science Association
SPSU	St. Petersburg State University
START	U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty
TACIS	Technical Assistance to the Commonwealth of Independent States
TAPRI	Tampere Peace Research Institute
TEMPUS	Trans-European Mobility Program for University Studies
TLE	Treaty-limited equipment
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Science & Culture Organization
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UPI	Finnish Institute of International Relations
US	United States
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WEU	West European Union
WTO	World Trade Organization

Introduction

Russia in search of itself: a post-Soviet identity discourse

It became a common-place for the Western scholars and politicians to ascertain that post-Cold war Russia's foreign policy behavior is often unpredictable, irrational, anti-Western, aggressive / expansionist and even irredentist (Carafano 2015; Cox 2014; Gaddy and O'Hanlon 2015; Granholm et al. 2014; Gressel 2015; Lukas 2009; Mankoff 2009; Snetkov 2015; Stoner and McFaul 2015). Moscow's harsh reaction to NATO's 1999 Kosovo intervention (including Russian commandos' surprise move from Bosnia to the Pristina airport) and the Georgian 2008 offensive in South Ossetia, Crimea's takeover and Donbass rebels' support by Russia in 2014, Moscow's unexpected intervention to the Syrian civil war and air strikes against the Islamic State in 2015 are some examples of such a behavior.

Foreign policy analysts differ by their specific explanations of the Kremlin's foreign policies over the last quarter of the century (see the first chapter). However, many of them tend to see a clear connection between Russia's "unpredictable" and "aggressive" behavior and its ongoing search for a new national identity. Russia is still at the stage of nation-building. It never existed within the current borders as an independent state or had such economy, system of government, administrative and societal organization.

Shaping of a new identity always has two dimensions—domestic and international. The domestic dimension implies creating internal cohesion, reaching a national consensus on the fundamental principles of government and values, sharing some common cultural and spiritual features. Self-perception is also important. Internally, a nation perceives itself as a united entity, as a bounded community. In this case people treat other people as members of the same community. The international dimension suggests self-assessment in relation to people belonging to a different community rather than to the same one. Understanding differences between nations and uniqueness of its own nation is also crucial for the formation of an identity. As Richter rightly comments, 'National identity serves as the crucial organizing principle justifying and providing coherence to the state's domestic order, yet the boundaries defining this identi-

ty can be formulated only with reference to the external environment' (Richter 1996, 74).

As the humankind's history demonstrates, international impulses were often even more significant than domestic factors. For many countries, national debate on foreign relations has been an easiest way to form an identity of its own. They looked at the outer world as at the mirror to see what images they have got. The trouble is that there could be some aberrations and the external dimension of national identity can be formed on the nationalistic or even chauvinistic basis which most likely would have negative implications both for a nation and its neighbors.

Since the Russian foreign policy discourse definitely aims, among other things, at forming of a new national identity, it is important to examine whether this debate is immune from nationalism and xenophobia or not, whether it facilitates the birth of a new type of identity based on the democratic principles or can regress to authoritarianism and totalitarianism. This is also important in terms of civilizational orientations: whether Russia will choose European / Western orientation or the Asian / Eastern one? Or perhaps Russia would prefer a civilization of its own, as some Russian theorists claim? Self-perception and self-identification of the country is also crucial for becoming a reputable and authoritative actor on the international arena. If Russia to solve (or starts to solve) an identity 'puzzle' it could define properly its national interests, foreign policy priorities and formulate sound national security, military and foreign policy doctrines. It also would become more predictable and responsible international partner which could be able to contribute to the creation of a stable and secure systems both on the regional and global levels.

As far as the 'geographic dimension' of the Russian identity discourse is concerned Europe takes a unique position in Russian mentality and particularly in security thinking. For centuries Europe was a source of both cultural inspiration and security threat, advanced technologies and innovations which destroyed Russian traditions and values. In modern times, major wars and aggressions against Russia came from Europe ranging from the Polish invasion in the beginning of the 17th century to the Nazi aggression of 1941.

Some Russian historians date the origins of the Western offensive even by earlier times. They note that from the beginning of the 13th century Russians were mainly concerned with the German expansion to the Baltic lands. The German crusaders captured the Russian forts on the Dvina, and pushed into Russia before being defeated by Prince Alexander Nevsky in the 'Battle on the Ice' of Lake Chudskoe (Peipus) in 1242.

In addition to strategic-military dimensions, the German-Russian rivalry turned out very soon into the religious confrontation between Catholicism and Orthodoxy. This, however, did not prevent Orthodox Russians to support Catholic Poles and Lithuanians at the famous battle of Grünwald in 1410 resulted in the crushing defeat of the Teutonic Knights.

Even in the 20th century, Russia (and the Soviet Union) retained its perception of East Europe as a front-line against Western expansion either in the form of German *Drang nach Osten* or NATO 'aggressive plans.' Moscow's diplomacy, military doctrines and armed forces posture in the area were subordinated to the objectives of the global confrontation with the West.

It should be noted that civilizational or identity 'flavor' has always been present in the Russian debate on Europe.

Since the time of Peter the Great Russian elites looked at Europe with both hope and apprehension. They wanted to be Europeans by their habits and mode of life (sometimes even by language—for one and half century French was a main language spoken by the Russian aristocracy), but, at the same time, they had to assert their 'Russianness' in order to keep their national identity and links to the Russian people. Russia was always eager to be a part of Europe not only in geographic sense but also in terms of civilization. However, Europe with rare exception was reluctant to acknowledge Russia's 'Europeanness'. Russia's century-dated efforts to form a system of European alliances where Moscow could act on the equal footing with other great powers were a story of failure. Even within the framework of the *Entente Cordiale* Moscow has not been treated by Britain and France as a really equal partner. The West's reluctance to admit post-Communist Russia into major security and economic Euro-Atlantic institutions such as NATO and the EU convinced Kremlin that the old practice continued.

This contradiction between Russia's eagerness to be European and the West's unwillingness to recognize Moscow as a part of Europe has received much attention in Russian philosophy and social sciences and led to the split among the Russian political and intellectual elites. Since the mid-19th century controversy between the Slavophiles and Westerners could be traced as a main dividing line between different Russian foreign policy schools. While the Westerners are unreservedly in favor of Russia's joining Europe at any price—even at the expense of national interests and sovereignty, the Slavophiles believe that Russia forms the civilization of its own. According to the Slavophiles, Russia is neither Europe nor Asia and should retain its own identity. If Russians themselves

would respect their country and traditions, then foreigners (including Europeans) would do the same (see chapter 2).

The entire Russian policy towards Europe over the two last centuries can be roughly described as a pendulum swing between the two above extremes. Periods of Europe-oriented Russian policy (Alexander I and its participation in the anti-Napoleonic coalition, *Entente Cordiale,* Litvinov's 'collective security' strategy in the mid-1930s, Gorbachev's Common European House concept, Kozyrev's early course) have been succeeded by the more nationalistic or globalist (the Soviet period) patterns. As the post-Cold War history shows, it is safe to assume that the 'pendulum model' will be effective in a foreseeable future as well.

With the collapse of the USSR and the disappearance of most dangerous threats from the West, the Russian policy makers suddenly found themselves in a new strategic and geopolitical situation. According to a majority of Russian theorists of the early 1990s which belonged to different foreign policy schools, main external threats to Russian security should originate—in the foreseeable future—from the South or East rather than West (Arbatov 1994, 71; Lukin 1994, 110; Vladislavlev and Karaganov 1992, 35; Zhirinovskiy 1993).

Under these circumstances, quite animated discussions on Russia's national interests have been started by the Russian political, military and intellectual elites. Do any constant Russian interests exist? Or should they be completely re-defined? What place in the set of the Russian foreign policy priorities should different regions take? For example, some analysts suggested that, from security point of view, Europe was no longer as important for Moscow as it was during the Soviet times (Fadeev and Razuvayev, 1994: 114; Baranovsky, 1996: 167). Others argued that the area will retain its traditional meaning as a border zone or bridge between the East and the West (Uspensky and Komissarov, 1993: 83; Institute of Europe, 1995: 21–23; Sergunin, 1996b: 112–115). Some Russian theorists underlined that given the changing nature of world power (economic power now matters more than military might) Europe became one of the global poles and, for this reason, Russia should pay more attention to economic cooperation with the EU (Pichugin, 1996: 93; Pierre and Trenin, 1997: 16–18; Trenin, 1997: 117–118; Zagorski, 1996: 67; Zagorski and Lucas, 1993: 77–107). Other analysts believed that the region was becoming strategically important again as NATO and the EU were moving to the Central and East European countries. To their minds, Russia and its allies were vulnerable for potential Western encroachments again as in the times of German crusaders or Hitler's *Blitzkrieg* (Gromov, 1995: 9–13;

Lyasko, 1995: 2; Trynkov, 1995: 65–68; *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 11 April 1996). With the resumption of Europe-Russia tensions in the wake of the Ukrainian crisis this theme became popular again (Guschin et al 2015; Krutikov 2014; Markov 2014; Sergunin 2014b; Tauscher 2015; Trenin 2015). At the same time, some Russian foreign policy schools insist on the need to pay more attention to the consolidation of the post-Soviet space under the Russian leadership (Bolgova 2015; Lukyanov and Krastev 2015; Michel 2014) and / or develop closer relations with the BRICS countries (Lukyanov 2011 and 2014; Okuneva 2012; Panova 2013; Simha 2013; Stuenkel 2014).

Similarly, an animated discussion is taking place with regard to the Russian threat perceptions and national security doctrines. What are the domestic and international determinants of Russian foreign policy? Which security threats are more vital—internal or external? What type of security—'hard security' or 'soft security'—is more important? What kind of threats (if any) is posed by the recent international developments? How should the post-Cold War dynamics be reflected in a national security, military and foreign policy doctrines? Does Russia need such doctrines at all? Whether the national security, foreign policy and military doctrines play an important role in shaping Russia's European strategy or they are empty declarations? It should be noted that the study of the doctrinal component of the Russian foreign policy and security discourses is particularly helpful in understanding how theories and concepts produced by the foreign policy schools are translated into the language of practical politics.

In addition to changes in the geopolitical landscape, there was a revolution in the paradigmatic basis of Russian post-Communist foreign policy and security thinking. The Marxist paradigm collapsed and Russian theorists started the search for new ones. The former theoretical and methodological uniformity has been succeeded by pluralism. On the one hand, this environment has been susceptible for the rise of new foreign policy schools and approaches. On the other hand, a number of unexpected problems emerged. Some Russian analysts borrowed Western theories without any critical evaluation or taking into account the situation in the Russian scholarship and politics. Others converted into anti-Communists and anti-Marxists with the same energy and vigor as they took stand on the Marxists principles before. Meanwhile, achievements and strongest points of the Soviet school of International Relations (IR) have been forgotten. The general economic decline in the country in the 1990s and the 'brain drain' from the Russian academia to the commercial

sector, government and foreign countries were also detrimental to the quality of the Russian security discourse.

In dealing with the 'paradigmatic revolution' and its implications for both Russian IR theory and foreign policy a student of Russian post-Communist foreign policy thinking confronts one more set of research questions. Is it possible to produce any categorization of the Russian foreign policy schools or not? Which criterion (criteria) should be used? Whether these schools are genuine Russian production or have been copied from the Western samples? In which direction does the Russian foreign policy debate move—further polarization of views or their convergence, reaching a sort of a foreign policy consensus? Is such a consensus possible in principle? If yes, what can unite and divide different currents of Russian security thought? What is the mainstream of the present-day Russian security thinking? Is a dialogue between the Russian and non-Russian (Western, Eastern) discourses—modern and post-modern problematiques—possible or not?

An important aspect of the problem is how the above discourse affected the decision-making process. The radical changes in the Russian decision-making system posed a number of questions which are also far from thorough exploration. What is the constitutional framework for Russia's foreign policy-making? Whether it matters or, in reality, different—unwritten—rules of the game exist? Who are the key figures in policy-making? Where are the core and the periphery of the decision-making system? What are the particular procedures? Whether there is some competition between the government agencies or not? If yes, how are their activities coordinated? Whether implementation system works properly or decisions simply remain on paper? Does some rivalry between political appointees and bureaucracy exist or not?

The study of the decision-making system not only provides the analyst with knowledge of the behind-the-scenes process but also encourages him to question why democratization of the above system has not been completed. Why is there still no effective parliamentary control over Russian foreign and security policies which could be comparable with the Western, democratic, standards? Why were the President and Parliament often unable to establish working relationship? What are the sources of conflict and areas of contention? Whether the Russian leadership succeeded in establishing civilian control over the military and intelligence community or not? In addressing these questions, a student of Russian foreign and security policies has to link this particular problem to the broader context of Russian domestic politics and highlight the difficulties

in creating of an effective foreign policy decision-making mechanism in a period of transition.

The post-Communist era brought about not only changes in the decision-making procedures but also some new political actors. Numerous pressure groups, NGOs and regional elites claimed their rights to take part in formulation of Moscow's international strategy and the federal government was unable to ignore these claims any longer. What kind of interest groups and regional elites has been involved in shaping Russia's foreign and security policies? Did they really affect Moscow's international course? If yes, whether their impact was negative or positive? A more theoretical question may be raised: whether their participation in foreign policy making can be interpreted as a sign of an emerging civil society in Russia or it is just an evidence of parochial politics in this country?

It should be noted that the lack of reliable sources limits the scope for profound analysis of the current decision-making system. Moreover, this system and regulations are extremely unstable in post-Communist Russia. Foreign policy legislation, procedures and key actors change so fast that it is very difficult to define by whom, when and why a decision has been taken, what can be expected in the near future and so on.

The above questions form the core of a broad research agenda which, however, can be reduced to the four main issues:

1. Which IR theories are applicable to explaining Russia's present-day foreign policy?
2. What are the main foreign policy schools in post-Communist Russia and what sort of theories do they produce?
3. How did the Russian threat perceptions and national security doctrines evolve in the post-Soviet period?
4. How does the Russian foreign policy decision-making system operate?

Sources. Despite the fact that a student of contemporary politics always feels a lack of sources (especially reliable ones) some of them are available. The data for this research were drawn primarily from eight main categories of sources:

Documents of international and intergovernmental organizations (CIS, BRICS, Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), EU, Council of Europe, OSCE, NATO, Nordic Council, Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS), Barents-Euro-Arctic Council (BEAC), etc.). These publications are helpful in reconstructing the international context in which Russian