
POLITICAL **ISSUE 3(33), 2019**
SCIENCE ISSUES

Academic journal

MOSCOW, 2019

POLITICAL SCIENCE ISSUES

Academic journal

Nikolay P. MEDVEDEV,

Chairman of the Editorial Board, Doctor of Political Sciences,
Professor of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Peoples' Friendship
University of Russia (RUDN University) (Russia, Moscow)

Editorial Board:

BOZHANOV Vladimir A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of World and National Literature, Belorussia National Technical University (Belorussia, Minsk)
DONAJ Lukasz	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Faculty of Political Science And Journalism, Department of International Relations (Poland, Poznan)
IRKHIN Yuri V.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Professor, Chair of Politology and Political Administration, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (Russia, Moscow)
KARAGZE Tatiana V.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Head of the Chair of Politology and Sociology of the Moscow State Pedagogical University (Russia, Moscow)
KOVALENKO Valery I.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Head of the Chair of Russian Politics of the Moscow State Lomonosov University (Russia, Moscow)
KOSIKOV Igor G.	Doctor of History Sciences, Chief Researcher, Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Russia, Moscow)
KRIVOKAPIC Boris	Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor, Business and Law Faculty, University "Union – Nikola Tesla" (Serbia, Belgrade)
MIKHAILOV Vyacheslav A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Head of the Chair of National and Federative Relations of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (Russia, Moscow)
NASIMOVA Gulnara O.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of Politology, School of Philosophy and Politology, Kazakh National University named after El-Farabi (Kazakhstan, Almaty)
NISNEVICH Yuli A.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, National Research University – Higher School of Economics (Russia, Moscow)
PAKHRUTDINOV Shukritdin I.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of Department "National interests and the stability of society" of the Academy of State and Social Construction under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)
PLYAYS Yakov A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of Politology of the Finance University under the Government of the Russian Federation (Russia, Moscow)
PRYAKHIN Vladimir F.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Chair of World Politics and Foreign Relations, Russian State Humanitarian University (Russia, Moscow)
PUSKO Vitaliy S.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Professor of the Chair of Politology, Moscow State Technical University named after N.E. Bauman (Russia, Moscow)
SALKIEWICZ- MUNNERLYN Ewa	Ph.D., MFA, Academy Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski (Poland, Krakow)
Olivier VEDRINE	Chief Editor of the Russian Edition of the French Review "Revue Défense Nationale", Speaker of the European Commission, Editor of the Franco-German Magazine on Foreign Politics "European Union Foreign Affairs Journal" and Rector of the Continental University in Kiev (France, Paris)

Editor-in Chief of the Review – Nikolay P. MEDVEDEV,
Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor of Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia
(RUDN University) (Russia, Moscow)

**ESTABLISHED BY LLC
"PUBLISHING HOUSE
"SCIENCE TODAY"**

The Journal is published with the participation of the Institute of modern policy of the Peoples' Friendship University (RUDN)

The Journal is registered by the Federal Service for Supervision of Mass Media, Communications and Protection of Cultural Heritage

Reg. Number PI No.FS77–46176
of August 12, 2011
The Journal is published quarterly

The journal is included in the database of the Russian Science Citation Index

The Five-year Journal's impact factor is 0,808

The Journal is included in Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

Academic papers published in the journal undergo obligatory editorial checking.

The authors' opinion not always coincides with the opinion of the Editorial Board.

At reprint of the article or a part of it the reference to the Journal is obligatory.

Address of the editorial office:
10, Zagoryevskaya street, building 4,
office 4, Moscow, Russia, 115598
Tel: (910) 463-53-42
www.voprospolitolog.ru,
www.souzpolitolog.ru
E-mail: voprospolitolog@yandex.ru,
souzpolitolog@yandex.ru

Executive Secretary
Shkurina S.S.

Computer-aided makeup by
Antsiferova A.S.

Translated by
Chernyshova E.V.

Signed for printing on 25.09.2019
Format 60x84/16. Offset paper.
Offset print.
Number of printed sheets
Circulation 500 copies.
Order 48105.

Printed at the LLC "PrintUP"
Nagorny drive, 12c1,
Moscow, Russia, 117105
Tel.: +7 (495) 925-00-06

ISSN 2225-8922 (print)

12 issues a year plus

4 issues a year of the translated (eng.) version

Languages: Russian and English

<http://voprospolitolog>

Included in the list of peer-reviewed scientific publications of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Federation

Included in the Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

Materials of the journal are placed on the RSCI platform of the Russian scientific electronic library – Electronic Journals Library Cyberleninka

Subscription index of the journal in the Rospechat Agency catalogue is: 70035

Objectives and themes

Academic journal “Political Science Issues” is an international peer-reviewed scientific periodical in the field of political studies. The journal has an international character because of the composition of its Editorial Board, its editors, its contributing authors and topics of its publications.

The scientific journal is published since 2011 at the “Publishing House “Science Today”. Translated (eng.) version of the journal is published since 2016. Since its inception, the journal was guided by high scientific and ethical standards and today it is one of the leading political science journals in Russia.

The purpose of the journal is to promote scientific exchange and cooperation between Russian and foreign political scientists.

The journal is intended for the publication of the results of fundamental and applied scientific research. Thematic focus of the journal is reflected in the following permanent headings: “History and philosophy of politics,” “Political institutions, processes and technologies,” “Political regionalism and ethno-politics,” “Political culture and ideologies,” “Political problems of international relations and globalization.”

Format of publications: scientific articles, reviews, scientific materials, materials of round tables, scientific reviews, scientific reports devoted to research problems in the field of politics and political science.

The Editorial Board and the editors of the journal in their activities are guided by the principles defined by VAK of Russia for scientific journals, including: presence of the institute of peer review for the expert quality assessment of scientific articles; information openness of the publications; availability and compliance with the rules and ethical standards for the submission of manuscripts by the authors.

The target audience of the journal is Russian and foreign specialists-political scientists, as well as graduate students and masters in the fields of political science, state and municipal management and international relations.

The journal strictly adheres to the international publishing standards and publication ethics identified in the *COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics)* document. <http://publicationethics.org>.

Full details of the journal and its editorial policy, requirements to the preparation and publication of articles, archive (issues since 2011) and additional information are available on the website: <http://voprospolitolog.ru>

E-mail address: voprospolitolog@yandex.ru

CONTENTS

POLITICAL PROCESS IN RUSSIA

- Boltenkova L.F., Alekhnovich S.O.** To the Question of Continuity of the Russian Statehood 239
- Velikaya N.M.** Transformation of Local Self-Governance in Small and Medium Cities of Russia Through the Eyes of the Expert Community 246
- Astvatsaturova M.A.** Ethnopolitical Notes from the Diary of the North Caucasus Federal District 253

PROBLEMS OF EURASIAN AND POST-SOVIET COOPERATION

- Brusilovskiy D.A., Esipov I.I.** Two Worlds – Two Integrations: The Specificity of Connection of Civilizations with Islamophobia..... 261
- Musaev O.R., Karshiev Sh.C.** Some Aspects of Strengthening International Relations in Polyethnic States (On the Example of Uzbekistan)..... 272
- Shamarov P.V.** Russian Peacekeeping Model in the Post-Soviet Space 279

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND WORLD POLITICS

- Sardaryan G.T.** Reasons for the Crisis of Christian Democracy in Western Europe..... 285
- Milka Malfait, Chernyavskiy S.I.** The Russia-EU Perspective: National Security and Counterterrorism from a Different Angle..... 293
- Rustamova L.R.** Social and Humanitarian Cooperation Between Russia and Germany in the Conditions Of Sanctions 304
- Dubrovina O.V., Salamov R.R.** Paradiplomacy as a New Architecture of International Relations 311
- Haddad Mohannad** Strategies of Main Actors of World Policy Regarding the Middle East and Modern Syria (On the Example of the USA and the European Union)..... 316
- Jia Yuanpey** Experience, Prospects and Problems of Cooperation Between China and Turkmenistan in the Field of Natural Gas 323
- Burda M.A., Horeva E.E., Larkina M.A., Belyaeva V.P.** National-State Identity in Modern Europe in the Context of Migration and Political Processes..... 330
- Rodionova M.E.** Cooperation of Russia and Bulgaria: from History to Modernity. Dynamics of Relations in the Context of European Integration (On the 140th Anniversary of Diplomatic Relations Between Russia and Bulgaria)..... 337

REVIEWS

- Slizovskiy D.E., Medvedev N.P.** Reflections on the Read 342
- OUR AUTHORS 349
- AUTHORS' GUIDELINES 351

*Candidate of Military Sciences, Associate Professor,
Professor of the Academy of Military Sciences,
Department Specialist, Ministry of Defense
of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia*

RUSSIAN PEACEKEEPING MODEL IN THE POST-SOVIET SPACE

The article examines the national-state peacekeeping activities of the Russian Federation in the CIS, which is identified as a “specific force peacekeeping”, which in the interests of ensuring the national security of Russia allows the state to partially move away from a number of classical principles of peacekeeping and tasks of crisis settlement of the military contingents of the Commonwealth countries in conjunction with the warring parties.

The modern peacekeeping model of the Russian Federation in the CIS is singled out and justified, which is implemented on the basis of a pragmatic and expedient approach in order to increase Russia’s strategic, political, military and other influence in the Commonwealth under conditions of sufficiently cool United similar operations and the traditional hostile reaction of the leading countries of the West to Russian peacekeeping in the CIS.

The specificity of the implementation of the named Russian model in the Commonwealth is explained by the rigid timeframes of taking urgent political decisions at the beginning of the peacekeeping operations of the Russian Federation, the scale and intensity of conflicts, their significant negative impact on the national security of the country, regional and international situation.

The author formulates the concept of “network peacekeeping with variable geometry”, the use of which in modern Russian peacekeeping practice will increase the level of its national security.

Key words: *peacekeeping, peacekeeping operation, post-Soviet space, UN, CIS, NATO, conflict, crisis, national security.*

Implementation by the Russian Federation of its national-state peacekeeping activities (“PA”) in the post-Soviet space is identified by the Russian scientific and expert community as “specific peacekeeping” with a number of distinctive features. The main features of such operations are: “lesser legitimacy of the force (compared with the UN)” [12. P. 243] (in the CIS, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation does not have a supranational mandate of the UN or any other authorized organization) and insufficiently “qualitative results”

[10. P. 8] due to the simultaneous settlement of five different conflicts in the post-Soviet space [1. P. 70].

While accepting the indicated characteristics, we still believe that a more accurate substantive content of the Russian peacekeeping operations (“POs”) in the Commonwealth reflects the concept of **“specific peacekeeping by force.”** It allows the state a partial departure from a number of classic UN principles in the interests of ensuring its national security (“NS”), in particular, from the principal of “impartiality and multinational representation in the PO”, as well as joint involvement of the military contingents of the Commonwealth countries and conflicting parties in the resolution of the peacekeeping tasks [6. P. 140-153]. In particular, a similar situation was observed during the settlement of the Transnistrian and Georgian-South Ossetian conflicts (from 1992 to the present time and from 1992 to 2008, respectively). There, on the basis of previously signed interstate agreements (that is, without mandates of the UN, OSCE or CIS), our country not only deployed peacekeeping contingents of its armed forces, but also involved in peacekeeping units of the conflicting parties.

All this allows us to talk about the formation of the **“Russian model of peacekeeping”** within the CIS, which allows in a number of urgent cases (in case of threat to the NS of the Russian Federation) a forceful intervention in the crisis in order to quickly localize it and resolve it without proper international mandate in accordance with the views of the Russian leadership and on its military-political terms. The implementation of such model is primarily aimed not so much at a political settlement of the conflict as at the end of the phase of acute armed confrontation, restoration of relative stability and civil order in the crisis territories [2. Pp. 107-109].

This approach corresponds to the prevailing world practice, only in the current century influential peacekeeping actors (members of the UN Security Council and NATO) more than 10 times forcefully intervened in internal conflicts of other countries without a UN mandate [9. p. 106]. Moreover, the concept of “Russian model of peacekeeping” proposed by us has an integrative nature and includes in its content both the post-Soviet conflict resolution model and the PA outside the CIS [15. Pp. 9-13].

We believe that such a peacekeeping approach of Russia, although it goes beyond the classical principles of peacekeeping, nevertheless predetermined the cessation of “hot” armed confrontation in the CIS, provided conditions for a political settlement and peace-building, stabilized the internal political situation, which is recognized by the UN leadership as the main goals of its PO [5. Pp. 1-2]. We also note that a number of researchers define the modern Russian PA in the post-Soviet space as “a timely policy to prevent the mass genocide of the civilian population,” thanks to which, after the collapse of the USSR, hundreds of thousands of people were saved who otherwise could have become innocent victims of the conflicts [16. P. 49].

We believe that the specifics of the PO of the Russian Federation in the CIS are also predetermined by the absence of a peacekeeping doctrine universally recognized by the world community, as a result of which conflict resolution takes place within the framework of a unique casual approach to choose the most preferred crisis management tools, and the POs in each case turn into a field testing laboratory for developing the theory of peacekeeping.

In this regard, we share the scientific approach that the process of formation of promising elements of a new global regulation system that started in the 2000s requires intensification of Russian efforts within the framework of the initiative doctrinal contribution of our state to the reform of the international PA. The latter, in our opinion, is connected, firstly, with the development of a domestic model of tools for the effective protection of the national interests (NI) of the Russian Federation abroad; secondly, the creation of a standardized algorithm for conducting Russian POs and, thirdly, the implementation in the world of a proactive foreign policy ideology aimed at improving Russia's international and peacekeeping ratings.

For example, as part of the resolution of the latest problem of the Georgian Armed Forces aggression against the South Ossetian during the "five-day war" in August 2008, which led to significant casualties by the civilian population (some of which had Russian citizenship) from the international legal point of view, in our view, could be qualified as *an attempt to carry out a national genocide*. This is a sufficient legal basis for engaging the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation in order to stop this hateful international crime and an armed attack on Russian peacekeepers.

We believe that if the above legal assessment was timely, actively and convincingly brought to the international community, this would significantly reduce the accusations on the part of the West of "unreasonable and excessive use by the Russian Federation of its armed force." At the same time, we emphasize that the priority of the Russian leadership remains the support of the compatriots living in the CIS countries [7. P. 55 (a)], which were the first to become victims of conflicts in the territory of the Commonwealth.

The peculiarity of the Russian PA in the CIS was also postulated, in our opinion, by the implementation by the country's leadership of a pragmatic and appropriate peacekeeping policy in the context of a rather "cool" attitude of the UN to the implementation of the PO in the Commonwealth and the traditionally hostile reaction of the West to such "illegitimate" actions of "super-autocratic Russia [9. P. 6]. We would also like to stress the geopolitical tendency of "our Euro-Atlantic partners" to the widespread internationalization of crises and the acute shortage of time within which the Russian leadership had to make urgent political decisions on the beginning of the PO and the introduction of Russian peacekeepers into conflict regions of the CIS. Moreover, all this was realized under the conditions of virtually unilateral military-political and material-financial responsibility of Russia for preserving peace in the hot spots of the Commonwealth.

Hence, we believe that, by analogy with the “network diplomacy” and the “principle of moving geometry” (allowing, on the basis of previously created institutions and reached agreements to form a new toolkit for the implementation of the relevant NI [4. P. 4-17]), the PA of the Russian Federation ensuring its NS should be organized on the basis of the so-called “network peacekeeping with variable geometry.” Such a mechanism involves a temporary and flexible *ad hoc* blocking on a pragmatic basis of any peacekeeping state or other actors with the same interests in the conflict region as Russia.

Given the potential of a peaceful political and diplomatic conflict settlement based on joint actions of the international community [7. Pp. 34, 58], we still believe that the PO of the Russian Federation in the CIS are, first of all, timely, mono-actor external impact on the conflict, the response time to which was predetermined by its parameters and the negative impact on the NS of Russia. At the same time, we believe that in the context of an active implementation by the consolidated West of its multivariate peacekeeping approaches [13. Pp. 40-48; 14. Pp. 28-32] to limit domestic POs to traditional UN peacekeeping operations is impractical from the geopolitical point of view and from the military point of view it is short-sighted and quite dangerous in the future.

It seems that, given the functional incapacity of the CIS to conduct effective POs, it is precisely the CSTO that remains the regional structure, whose leadership and dominance in peacekeeping will increase the strategic influence of the Russian Federation in the post-Soviet space, and will ensure the protection and promotion of its NI, both in the near and far abroad. It is facilitated by the prevailing military and technical presence of Russia in the CSTO countries, its experience and national-state resources for the implementation of a PA that meets the interests of strengthening the NS.

We believe that the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) in the field of security between Russia, China and the countries of Central Asia (without Turkmenistan) is deprived of such advantages from the point of view of realizing the NI of the Russian Federation.

Recall that the specified regional structure took shape in the mid-1990s in the process of consultations on establishing confidence in the military field in the border regions between the participants of the so-called “Shanghai Five” (Russia, Kazakhstan, China, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan). The SCO was officially founded in June 2001 after the sixth state, Uzbekistan, was included in the format of “five” [3].

We emphasize that the SCO, unlike the CSTO, does not have the status of a military-political union, which determines the nature of its activities, which is more anti-terrorist than peacekeeping [8. P. 66], and the spheres of its regional cooperation are focused on humanitarian, economic and scientific-technical issues, and not on the problems of crisis management.

Thus, the following conclusions can be made.

1. The peacekeeping activity of Russia in the CIS, in the absence of a supranational mandate, can be identified as a “specific force peacekeeping” that

allows, in the interests of ensuring the national security of the country, its partial departure from a number of general principles of peacekeeping, involvement of the military contingents of the Commonwealth countries and the conflicting parties in the resolution of the peacekeeping tasks.

2. The implementation of the Russian peacekeeping model within the CIS is expressed in a pragmatic-expedient approach of Russia in the interests of increasing its strategic, political and other influence in the Commonwealth in the context of the continued uninterested-neutral attitude of the UN to such operations and the traditionally hostile reaction of leading transatlantic actors to such “autocratic” Russian actions without “sufficient legal grounds.”

3. The specifics of the implementation of the Russian peacekeeping model in the CIS is dictated by the lack of time within which the country’s leadership had to make urgent political decisions at the beginning of the peacekeeping operation, the negative impact of conflicts on Russia’s national security, regional and international situation.

4. In the interests of strengthening the national security of Russia, it is advisable to use “network peacekeeping with variable geometry,” which implies a temporary and flexible unification of the country on the basis of a pragmatic-expedient approach with state and other peacekeeping actors with the same interests in the conflict region as Russia.

REFERENCES:

1. Babadjanov A. Ya. *Voyenno-politicheskoye sotrudnichestvo postsovetsskikh gosudarstv: problema sochetayemosti natsional'nykh podkhodov: nauch. izd.* [Military-political cooperation of the post-Soviet states: the problem of the compatibility of national approaches: scientific edition]. M.: Aspect Press, 2013 (In Russ.).

2. Bolshakov A. G., Zaznaev O. I. *Effektivnost' mirotvorcheskoy deyatel'nosti Rossii na postsovetsskom prostranstve: opyt i perspektivy ODKB* [The effectiveness of Russian peacekeeping in the post-Soviet space: the experience and prospects of the CSTO] // Bulletin of Economics, Law and Sociology of Kazan (Volga) Federal University. 2011. No. 3 (In Russ.).

3. *Chto takoye SHOS?* [What is the SCO?] / Officer. SCO website // <http://infoshos.ru/ru/?id=51> (In Russ.).

4. Denisov A. *SNG v 2009 godu: dostizheniya, problemy, perspektivy* [CIS in 2009: achievements, problems, prospects] // International life. 2010. No. 2 (In Russ.).

5. Handbook on United Nations Multidimensional Peacekeeping Operations. New York: United Nations. Peacekeeping Best Practices Unit / Department of Peacekeeping Operations, 2003.

6. Kavtaradze S. D. *Etnopoliticheskiye konfliktiy na postsovetsskom prostranstve* [Ethnic and political conflicts in the post-Soviet space]. M.: Publishing house “Exam”, 2005 (In Russ.).

7. *Kontseptsiya vneshney politiki RF (utv. Ukazom Prezidenta RF 30.11.2016 g.)* [The concept of foreign policy of the Russian Federation (approved by the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation on November 30, 2016)] // Russian newspaper. December 1, 2016 (In Russ.).

8. *Kornilenko A. V. Strategiya razvitiya rossiyskogo mirotvorchestva v global'noy sisteme mezhdunarodnoy bezopasnosti: avtoref. dis. ... kand. polit. nauk* [The development strategy of Russian peacekeeping in the global system of international security: abstract of thesis for the degree of Candidate of sciences (politology)]. M., 2015 (In Russ.).

9. *Mansfield E., Snyder J. Democratization and the Danger of War* // *International Security*. 1995. № 1. Vol. 20.

10. *Morozov Yu. V. Mirotvorchestvo kak instrument stabilizatsii obstanovki* [Peacekeeping as a tool to stabilize the situation] // *European Security: events, assessments, forecasts*. 2003. Issue 7 (In Russ.).

11. *Nikitin A. I. Uchastiye Rossii v mezhdunarodnom mirotvorchestve i perspektivy yego reformirovaniya* [Russia's participation in international peacekeeping and prospects for its reform] // *Security Index*. 2011. No 2. Volume 17 (In Russ.).

12. *Nikitin A. I. Konflikty i mirotvorcheskaya deyatel'nost': tipologizatsiya, metodologicheskiye aspekty* [Conflicts and peacekeeping: typologization, methodological aspects] // *Vestnik MGIMO*. 2010. No. 4 (In Russ.).

13. *Shamarov P. V. Mirotvorcheskaya deyatel'nost' SSHA: istoriko-pravovyye aspekty* [US Peacekeeping: Historical and Legal Aspects] // *Public and Private Law*. 2016. No. 3 (31) (In Russ.).

14. *Shamarov P. V. Pravovoye regulirovaniye mirotvorcheskoy deyatel'nosti stran Zapadnoy Yevropy* [Legal regulation of peacekeeping in Western Europe] // *Military Law Journal*. 2016. No. 11 (In Russ.).

15. *Shamarov P. V. Aktual'nyye politiko-pravovyye aspekty politiki Rossii v sfere mirotvorchestva* [Actual political and legal aspects of Russian policy in the field of peacemaking] // *Representative power – XXI century*. 2019. No. 4 (171) (In Russ.).

16. *Yeritsyan I. N. Mirotvorcheskaya deyatel'nost' Rossiyskoy Federatsii na territoriyakh nepriznannykh gosudarstv postsovetskogo prostranstva kak garant yeye natsional'noy bezopasnosti* [Peacekeeping activities of the Russian Federation in the territories of unrecognized states of the post-Soviet space as a guarantor of its national security] // *Bulletin of the Irkutsk State University. Series: "Political Science. Religious studies."* 2016. Vol. 15 (In Russ.).