

The National Union Of Political Scientists

POLITICAL SCIENCE ISSUES

ISSUE 1(29), 2018

Academic journal

MOSCOW, 2018

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, Poznań)
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 25.03.2018
Format 60x84/16. Offset paper.
Offset print.
Number of printed sheets
Circulation 500 copies.
Order 000.

Printed at the LLC "Bely Vëter"
Str. Shchipok, 28,
Moscow, Russia, 115054
Tel.: (495) 651-84-56

CONTENTS

THEORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF POLICY

- Pyzh V. V., Frolov A. E.** Political Security of the State
and Political Stability of the Society as an Object of Political Analysis 4
- Medvedev N. P.** Effectiveness of Political Decisions:
Consensual and Representative Models..... 14

POLITICAL INSTITUTES AND PROCESSES

- Medvedev N. P., Glebov V. A., Madatov A. S.** To the Question
of Typologization of the Russian Regions 20
- Grishaeva O. N., Grishin O. E., Popov S. I.** Dynamics in the Development
of the Institute of Presidency in Russia..... 27

POLITICAL CULTURE AND IDEOLOGY

- Stepanov S. A., Ivanova E. A.** "Twitter Policy" as a Phenomenon
of the Modern Political Process 34
- Shangaraev R. N.** Ideology as a Soft Power Tool in Turkish Foreign Policy 42

ETHNOPOLITICS

- Hajiyev M. M.** National Traditions of the Peoples of Dagestan
and their Role in Social Cohesion..... 48

POLITICAL PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT

- Mikhailenko A. N.** TNCs and Diplomacy in the Conditions of Global 57

POLYCENTRICITY

- Murovih A. I., Nikitenko E. G.** The Point of Bifurcation
for the World Community and Russia 75
- Chernyavskiy S. I., Mehdiyev E. T.** Southern Gas Corridor in EU Energy Policy..... 83

REVIEWS

- Irkhin Yu. V.** Review of the Article by Rodionova M. E.
"Features of the Presidential Campaign in France: Results And Prospects" 89
- Medvedev N. P., Slizovsky D. E.** Review of the Article by Pyzh V. V.
and Frolov A. E. "Political Security of the State
and Political Stability of Society as an Object of Political Analysis" 91

- OUR AUTHORS 95

N. P. MEDVEDEV

*Doctor of Sciences (political sciences),
Professor, Peoples ' Friendship University of Russia,
Moscow, Russia*

V.A. GLEBOV

*Candidate of Sciences (law),
Deputy head of the Chair of political analysis and management,
Peoples ' Friendship University of Russia,
Moscow, Russia*

A.S. MADATOV

*Candidate of Sciences (philosophy),
Assistant Professor at the Chair of political analysis and management,
Peoples ' Friendship University of Russia,
Moscow, Russia*

TO THE QUESTION OF TYPOLOGIZATION OF THE RUSSIAN REGIONS

The article specifies the method of typologization of the Russian regions as the subjects of the Russian Federation. An attempt is made to update the existing scientific and practical model of classification of regions of modern Russia. The features of socio-economic and political criteria in assessing the status and resource capabilities of the region are emphasized. The article describes the differences in determining the ratings of Russian regions in the context of assessing the effectiveness of regional governments and in determining the types of relevant regions.

Key words: *region, subject of the Russian Federation, typologization, regional government, socio-economic development of the region, political development of the region.*

The problems of typologization of the Russian Federation regions are insufficiently investigated in the scientific literature. And the available scientific publications on this issue are usually associated with the characteristics of some very specific subjects of the Federation or with the study of socio-economic problems. At the same time, the problem of classification of Russian regions on the basis of complex criteria related to all spheres of regional public life becomes quite obvious. Although, in recent years, various public funds have tried to analyze the effectiveness of regional governments on the basis of complex indicators, but scientific generalizations in this area are clearly not enough.

Often, while classifying subjects of the Russian Federation, authors stress their socio-economic aspects related to financial, economic, budgetary and social differences and features that determine the socio-economic typology of the sub-

jects as Russian regions. Such a typology of the regions is quite general and there is a great diversity and ambiguity of approaches in the differentiation of regions, it should be also noted that many authors try to link the economic interests of the subjects (of course primarily of the regional political elite) with their political preferences.

There are several approaches within the framework of such classification. One of them is that 89 subjects of the Russian Federation are divided into donor and recipient regions according to their budget possibilities (in Europe they also have the name of beneficiary regions). As of today (at the end of 2017), according to various data, 11 subjects of the Russian Federation are donors, and 74 subjects are recipients. This information was announced at the final annual conference (December 2017) by the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin.

Another classification is based on the different resource capabilities of the regions of Russia. In accordance with it, all Russian regions are divided into regions with sufficient resources and depressed (crisis) regions.

The first group includes strategically promising regions, although to date, some regions from this group remain subsidized due to the undeveloped natural resources and ineffective use of economic potential. As part of this approach, specialists¹, who have been for many years engaged in the studies of the formation of regional interests and problems of analysis of economic aspects of regional policy, divide the first group of strategically promising regions into four subgroups: regions with developed mining industry, trade and industrial regions, industrialized regions, agricultural and agro-industrial regions. Such classification is based on the principle of linking the economic potential and resources of the regions with their interests.

The first subgroup consists of regions with a developed extractive industry with a large export potential. It includes the Komi Republic, Bashkortostan, Tatarstan, Yakutia, Khabarovsk territory, Tyumen, Sakhalin, Magadan region, Yamalo-Nenets and Khanty-Mansi Autonomous districts. The availability of natural resources, budget independence, active foreign economic relations largely affect the direction of their model of socio-political development.

Regional elites of these subjects of the Russian Federation would like to engage in foreign economic activity independently, without the state control. Therefore, an important element of their strategy is to seek independence from the Federal center. The greatest success in this direction was achieved by the authorities of the Republic of Tatarstan. Tatarstan acquired ownership rights to subsoil and land and until recently disposed of a large share of oil produced in the territory of the Republic, although such actions of the state authorities of the subject of the Federation are in conflict with the Constitution of Russia. But, the actions

¹ See: Peregudov S. P., Lapina N. Yu., Semenenko I. S. Interest Groups and the Russian State. – M., 1999. – Pp. 187-195.

of Tatarstan were justified by the fact that from 1993 to 2017 between the Republic of Tatarstan and the Russian Federation there was a separate system of contractual relations. Now this Agreement is not extended and has no legal force.

Along with the republics, oil and gas regions (Khanty-Mansiysk and Yamal-Nenets Autonomous districts) have a great weight. The fuel and energy complex is the main Russian exporter, revenues from its activities provide a significant part of the country's budget revenues. In accordance with Russian legislation, in the context of the expansion of economic and political rights of the regions, no decision on the development of natural resources in the subject of the Federation can be made without the consent of the state authorities of the relevant subjects and local authorities.

As a rule, in the conditions of strict centralization of the Russian system of government, export-oriented regions with a developed extractive industry support the Federal government, even if not all agree with its policies.

According to experts, the second subgroup is formed by commercial and industrial regions of Russia. It includes the largest megacities Moscow and St. Petersburg, coastal areas with large ports: Kaliningrad, Murmansk, Kamchatka, Arkhangelsk regions, Primorsky Krai. Strategically, these regions are focused on the development of foreign trade relations. Today, these subjects of the Russian Federation accumulate a considerable part of the capital, they have their own private banks and financial-industrial structures.

They are interested in cooperation with external partners, and their future depends on how well they will be able to fit into the international division of labor. Federal legislation creates favorable conditions for the prospects of foreign economic integration of these regions.

The resources of commercial and industrial regions differ, and, consequently, their market strategies differ. Due to the limitations in the development of natural resources the Far East and the Kaliningrad region, as some experts believe, will develop as development zones for the neighboring countries. According to scientists, in the near future separatist trends may increase in these regions, but they will be economic, not political.

Regional and local elites of these regions, taking advantage of the strategic positions of their territories, seek to lower the level of influence of the Federal center and behave quite confidently and independently towards it. However, in their strife to free themselves from the dictates of the Center, they seek to establish their own control over the economic resources of the region. At the same time, from 2012 to 2018, as part of the fight against corruption, the control of federal law enforcement agencies over the activities of the regional leaders has sharply increased. As a result, the economic activity of regional governments has become fully controlled by the federal ministries.

The third subgroup includes industrialized regions (Udmurtia, Krasnoyarsk territory, Sverdlovsk, Nizhny Novgorod, Samara, Perm, Chelyabinsk, Novosi-

birsk, Tula, Tomsk regions). Their economic structure is dominated by high-tech military-industrial complex or traditional heavy industry. At present, the regions of this subgroup are undergoing a deep restructuring. However, regional elites see an access to an effective level of work in different ways. Most of them support the option of Russian modernization with the active participation of the state. At the same time, realizing that they cannot cope with their own problems, they count on the help of the Federal center.

As to their political preferences, the above subjects of the Russian Federation fully supported the federal power during the 90th years of the last century and especially at the beginning of two thousandth.

The fourth subgroup consists of agricultural and agro-industrial regions (Central Black Earth region comprising Belgorod, Lipetsk, Bryansk, Voronezh, Kaluga, Kursk regions; Krasnodar and Stavropol regions, part of the Volga regions). These subjects of the Russian Federation exist at the expense of their own resources, fully provide themselves with food and partially consumer goods. But, often, some of these subjects are in the ranks of the beneficiary regions.

In political terms, the regions of this group were in opposition to the Federal government until the beginning of the two thousandth, and up to the adoption of measures to centralize the Russian system of power, they once formed the so-called Russian "red belt", the rural electorate of which was mainly Communist. Although, according to the results of the parliamentary elections of the last two convocations, these political features are no longer present.

Depressed (crisis) regions are a special qualification characteristic of regions, first of all, with poor resource opportunities. This group includes such subjects of the Russian Federation as the republics of the North Caucasus: Adygea, Kabardino-Balkaria, Dagestan, Ingushetia, as well as the republics of Altai, Buryatia, Tuva, Kalmykia. They have low economic potential, and the prospects for their development are problematic. In these regions, represented mainly by the republics, the depressed economy overlaps with the ethnic factor and the high level of unemployment. Here, the regional elites over the years of economic and political reforms have formed a rigid model of public administration and fully control the economy. At the same time, terrorism and religious extremism have not yet been completely eradicated in some of these regions. What significantly affects both economic activity and political stability of individual regions.

According to most experts, in recent years, depressed regions, with all the differences in the preferences and orientations of political regional elites, are characterized by the widespread use of administrative resources in the elections of all levels of government.

Within the framework of socio-economic typology, there are other approaches. So, some authors¹ divide all regions into poor (problematic) and rich. In turn, the poor regions are divided into backward (traditionally backward) and depressed, and the rich are divided into two large groups-traditionally developed and resource (program – developing).

Backward are those territories that for a significant period (decades) were at a low level of social and economic development. The main criteria for classifying a territory as backward is the low level of production of goods and services per capita, real per capita income, underdeveloped social and engineering infrastructure, extremely poor state of scientific, technical and human resources. The backward subjects of the Russian Federation include the republics of Adygea, Dagestan, Kabardino-Balkaria, Karachay-Cherkessia, Ingushetia, North Ossetia-Alania. Moreover, traditional territories may be located in unfavorable and favorable and satisfactory favorable natural conditions.

Authors call depressive such regions, which relatively recently (20-25 years ago), were sufficiently well developed or did not belong to the backward regions, but under the influence of various reasons were thrown back in their economic development. As a criterion of depression of the region is considered a significant decline in production in the traditional, leading to the subject of the Russian Federation sectors of production and resource base. As a rule, the following subjects of the Russian Federation are considered depressive: the Republic of Mari El, Mordovia, Udmurtia, Chuvashia, Bryansk, Kirov, Kurgan, Pskov, region, where due to a sharp decline in production volumes, primarily in the military-industrial and agro-industrial complexes, there has been a serious regional economic crisis. But, such estimates are changeable and many regions of this group may have recently changed their status.

From the above it follows that different authors put different meanings in the concept of “depressed region.”

Traditionally developed regions have emerged relatively long ago and, unlike the depressive ones, were able to adapt to the situation during the period of radical economic reforms for a number of objective and subjective reasons. These include: the Republic of Bashkortostan and Tatarstan, Sverdlovsk, Perm, Chelyabinsk region, Moscow and St. Petersburg.

Resource areas provide their relatively high well-being, mainly due to natural resources that have a high and stable demand in the world market (oil, gas, etc.).

¹ See: Federal center and subjects of the Federation. Confrontation or interaction. Collection of articles and documents. – M.: Publication Of The State Duma, 2001. – Pp. 42-44; Ivanchenko L. A. The Priorities of regional economy. – M., 1998. – P. 325; Seliverstov V. E., Bandman M. K., Guzner S. S. Methodological bases of development of the Federal program of the help to depressed and backward regions. Theoretical problems of Economics // Economics and sociology. – 1996. – № 1. – P. 24.

The existing inequality of natural-climatic, geographical, economic, historical and other conditions of development of subjects of the Federation objectively causes inequality of living standards of their inhabitants who, being citizens of the uniform Russian state, have to enjoy equal constitutional rights. This state of affairs cannot but cause serious political tension between the regions. Therefore, the regional policy of the federal center should be aimed at ensuring uniform social standards and equal social protection, guaranteeing the social rights of citizens established by the Constitution of Russia, regardless of the place of residence and economic opportunities of the regions. And this problem for many years remains one of the most difficult and unsolvable tasks for the Government of the Russian Federation.

Over the past six years, the method of determining the rating of regions has changed, but according to some experts, the situation with the typology of regions has not changed significantly, a group of regions with a “relatively high level of development and the level of development above average” includes little more than 10 subjects of the Russian Federation. Among them are Moscow and St. Petersburg (“the largest financial, economic and industrial centers”), “the largest regions of industrial specialization” are Moscow, Perm, Samara and Chelyabinsk regions, which concentrate a quarter of the total population of Russia.

The group of regions with an “average level of development” comprises, according to experts, 20 subjects of the Russian Federation. Its composition, if we compare the year 2001 to the beginning of 2018, has changed significantly. 16 regions are in the group with the level of “below average”. The largest (by the number of subjects of the Russian Federation) group is that comprising regions “with a low level of development”. And the dynamics of changes in the composition of this group is estimated as “insignificant”.

And the last, fifth, group “with extremely low level of development” according to the authors of various typologies and regional forecasts, includes about 10 regions. At the same time, it is often noted that “the group has a stable core of 8 regions,” and that all these regions “require more active state support and that the assistance measures provided through the federal programs are insufficient to solve the accumulated problems.”

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that the typology of regions should not be confused with the ratings of the same regions related to the effectiveness of regional governments. Regular determination of such ratings primarily depends on the subjective factor and the place of regions in this rating often changes radically. As for the type of region, the place of the region in a particular group changes very rarely, as here the dependence on the effectiveness of the regional government (subjective factor) is much less significant.

At the same time, the results of studies related to the typology of Russian regions can help to more accurately determine the parameters of the state long-term planning and regional development in the Russian Federation.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC LIST:

1. *Gaiduk V. V., Demyanenko Yu. A.* Regional interests and problems of political decentralization // Issues of politology. – 2013. – № 2.
2. *Goncharov P. K.* Crimea is Russian: new accents in the system of arguments // Issues of politology. – 2016. – № 2.
3. *Drobizheva L. M.* On the strategy of the state national policy of the Russian Federation // Issues of national and federal relations. – 2013. – № 2.
4. *Ivanchenko L. A.* Priorities of regional economy. – M., 1998.
5. *Irkhin Yu. V.* Neoinstitutional paradigm: possibilities and limits for political analysis and design // Issues of politology. – 2013. – № 3.
6. *Karaje T. V.* Political space/ time: the content of concepts // Issues of politology. – 2012. – № 2.
7. *Kosikov I. G.* National-state policy of Russia in the North Caucasus // Issues of national and federal relations. – 2012. – № 4.
8. *Medvedev N. P.* Political regionalism. Textbook. – M., 2005.
9. *Medvedev V. N.* Prospects of modernization of public administration in modern Russia // Issues of politology. – 2011. – № 1.
10. *Medvedev V. N.* Some aspects of public administration reform in Russia: state and prospects // Regional and municipal governance: political, economic and legal issues. – 2015. – № 1-2.
11. *Meshcheryakova O. M.* Multi-party system and the order of replacement of the highest official of the subject of the Russian Federation (some questions of the theory and practice) // Issues of politology. – 2012. – № 3.
12. *Mikhailov V. A., Mikhailova N. V.* Formation and development of autonomy in Soviet Russia and its forms // Issues of national and federal relations. – 2012. – № 2.
13. *Nigmatullina T. A.* Politicization of ethnicity in the context of regional federalism // Issues of national and federal relations. – 2016. – № 3.
14. *Nisnevichy Yu. A.* What is democracy? // Issues of politology. – 2012. – № 1.
15. *Peregudov S. P., Lapina N. Yu., Semenenko I. S.* Interest Groups and the Russian State. – M., 1999.
16. *Seliverstov V. E., Bandman M. K., Guzner S. S.* Methodological bases of development of the Federal program of the help to depressed and backward regions. Theoretical problems of Economics // Economics and sociology. – 1996. – № 1.
17. *Suleymanova Sh. S.* Intern-ethnic issues of modern Russia // Issues of national and federal relations. – 2012. – № 1.