THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

The Medvedev Years: An Examination of the External Forces & Internal Dynamics Affecting the Kremlin's Foreign Policy Decisions

being a Thesis submitted for the Degree of PhD of International Relations

in the University of Hull

by

Julian Mark Reder, Master of International Relations, Bond University

June 2013

Abstract:

The Medvedev Years: An Examination of the External Forces & Internal Dynamics Affecting the Kremlin's Foreign Policy Decisions

The central question of this thesis is what forces and personal dynamics ultimately shape the Kremlin's responses to foreign policy issues. The legacies of Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin are traced from the Soviet democratization during the 1980's and the constitutional empowerment of the Russian presidency during the 1990's. These two coexistent forces of empowering the average citizen in a country in which the President is the most powerful authority in decision-making are examined.

The forces of the Kremlin affect the current inner circle of Siloviki, Technocrats, and Yeltsin Liberals who are integral members of the policy formulation. Vladimir Putin and his handpicked successor, Dmitry Medvedev, were now at the helm of a government with these three groups of bureaucrats from 2008 to 2012. The Medvedev presidency was confronted with challenges in the post-Soviet space, which included Georgian military operations against Russia and an anti-Russian leader in Kyrgyzstan. In addition to this, the Kremlin was faced with the decisions to enforce sanctions against rogue regimes pursuing nuclear capability, specifically Iran and North Korea. The Arab Spring of 2011 brought with it momentous change in the Middle East and the Russian Federation was forced to decide whether to consent to sanctions against the Khadafy regime in Libya and the Assad regime in Syria.

The six foreign policy decisions in this thesis illuminate the Kremlin's internal dynamics as well as the handling of the external political forces enacted by Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin. Graham Allison's Governmental Politics Model, which analyzes foreign policy from a personal perspective of the chief decision-makers, is used throughout this body of doctoral research.

Acknowledgments:

I am personally indebted to many people for this achievement in my life. My PhD would not have been possible without the support of my parents, Zinaida and Igor, as well as my younger sister, Michelle. I am convinced that I was only able to achieve this because I stood on the shoulders of my family.

I would like to thank my grandfather, Abram Davidovich, for his many contributions to my life that made this possible. It was his life – the Soviet Union, World War 2, and coming to the United States that had the greatest impact on the course of my life and academic interests. It was a poignant moment when I was able to tell him about my meeting with Dr. Sergei Khrushchev. The grandson was now researching the Kremlin that shaped the lives of his forebears. I only hope I have done a small part in honouring my grandparents and great-grandparents who were citizens of the Soviet Union.

I was incredibly fortunate to have had my supervisor, Professor Caroline Kennedy, guide me through this rigorous process. I have benefitted immensely from her patience, advice, and kindness. She has been an amazing mentor without whom this doctoral dissertation would not have been possible. Thank you, Professor Kennedy.

I want to thank the University of Hull's Politics & International Studies Department for the opportunity to conduct my research. My time in the United Kingdom was truly memorable thanks to the wonderful department that gave me the forum to research the Russian Federation and the presidency of Dmitry Medvedev.

I am grateful to all the scholars whom I interviewed at the Harvard University Kennedy School of Government, Brown University Watson Institute of International Studies, Columbia University School of Public & International Affairs, New York University Centre for Global Studies, New School University, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, and American Enterprise Institute. Their scholarly insights will always be appreciated.

Lastly, I have dedicated my doctoral dissertation to the memory of my grandmother, Yelizaveta Davidovich, who has been sorely missed for the past fifteen years. It was her influence during my childhood that has remained with me during the many years since her passing. Today is a bittersweet moment as I reflect on how much I have progressed in the last fifteen years and only wish she were alive to witness this accomplishment in my life.

Table of Contents:

The Medvedev Years: An Examination of the External Forces & Internal Dynamics Affecting the Kremlin's Foreign Policy Decisions.

Introduction:

The Russian Federation has consolidated its political and foreign policy stances, strengths, and interests and has moulded its role in international affairs by virtue of the cataclysmic events, which occurred during its early years. Russian foreign policy has been seen by scholars through the prism of Soviet era-Cold War analysis, notwithstanding the structural transformations of the world stage and political evolution within the Russian Federation. Kremlinology is a vastly different era of study compared with Sovietology because of many factors, but few discern the difference and some assume Russian foreign policy is a mirror image of its predecessor.[1] The goal of this body of research is to illuminate the integral processes and evolutionary catalysts that can be attributed to Russia's distinct choices while navigating on the world stage. The author argues that Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev's foreign policy must be distinguished from its immediate predecessor, that of Boris Yeltsin. A much more vigorous, cohesive, and calculated foreign policy can be attributed to the current vision and pragmatism of Russia's leaders. However, broadly speaking scholarly research of the Russian Federation does not link the current successes or failures of Russia's foreign policy to the important events that are associated with its inception. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva, a public intellectual and relative of Nikita Khrushchev, notes that 'Gorbachev's legacy was not important during the Medvedev presidency.'[2] This research uses foreign policy analysis to understand the mechanisms and procedures of policy formulation in order to enhance the current understanding of Russia's role in world affairs.

[1] G. Arbatov, 'Sovietology and Kremlinology?', International Institute for Strategic Studies [online journal], 12:6, 208-209, < http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00396337008441111>, accessed 1 June 2012.

[2] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York

The fundamental issue arising within Russian political circles is what the new status on the world stage is. The impulses, synergies, and ideologies of those within the decision-making apparatus in the Kremlin warranted investigation. In theoretical terms, Soviet foreign policy has always been an important and commonly studied area of research, but the analysis of the mechanics of its decision-making has yet to take account of the effects of Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin's respective tenures within the realm of foreign policy-making in the Russian Federation.

The crux of this research therefore delves into Russian decision-making by analyzing the Russian Federation's behaviour in security, war, and diplomacy during the tenure of President Dmitry Medvedev from 2008 to 2012. The events of the early 1990's serve as a guide to understanding the transformational effects on the foreign policy apparatus inherited by Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev. This research expounds on the lasting legacies of Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin in terms of their respective impacts on the mechanisms and processes responsible for formulating the Kremlin's role in world affairs two decades after.

Conceptual Framework:

There are several issues that are addressed in relation to foreign policy decisions made during the tenure of Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev in the Kremlin's upper echelon. The first research question is what effect Mikhail Gorbachev's reforms had on current foreign policy formulation. The extent of Glasnost and Soviet democratization's reconfiguration in the foreign policy formulation in today's Russia is therefore a focal point of investigation. The aftermath and lasting legacy of the 1991 coup against Gorbachev is of central importance. The thesis takes into account the legacy of Gorbachev's reforms, which can summarily be described as empowering the average citizen in relation to the

government.[3]

The 'Yeltsonian' theme acknowledges and traces the legacy of the attempted coup against Boris Yeltsin and his transformational legacy on the powers and apparatus of the Russian presidency. The primary analysis involves the 1993 constitutional crisis in which Boris Yeltsin emerged victorious, and investigates how this event transformed the presidential system and apparatus with regards to foreign policy decisions in today's Russia under the helm of Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev. The attempted coup turned into a victory for the Russian President against the Russian legislative body and a powerful presidency was created during the early 1990's.

The thesis analyzes and expounds on how the two coups are related and what were early instances of their transformational effects, as well as the effects the Gorbachovian and Yeltsonian forces have had on contemporary Russian foreign policy decisions. This body of research is based on the governmental standpoint as outlined and advocated by Graham Allison's seminal work, *Essence of Decision*.[4] What can be derived from the actions of key players within the Kremlin in the context of personal dynamics and political forces of the system is an important research question in the following chapters. How the coups affected the operational mechanisms, as well as the individuals within the decision-making power structure is a research area addressed in this thesis.

The Governmental Politics Model as first authored by Graham Allison and then with Philip Zelikow posits five important principles for analysis.[5] These principles provide the theoretical framework for analyzing the internal dynamics of the Kremlin.[6] The list of principles is as follows:

---

[3] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[4] Graham T. Allison and Philip D. Zelikow, Essence of Decision, (Boston, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publisher Inc., 1999).

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

1. Individual decision-makers are the key units for analysis.
2. Individuals who possess great influence exert and ultimately sway the decision-making according to their individual perceptions and priorities.
3. The individuals under scrutiny operate within informal and formal networks of power.
4. Personal friendship and animosities among decision-makers play an important role in decision-making.
5. Conflicting interests create a causal relationship with governmental bargaining. The result of this clash is a negotiated, compromised result.

The Governmental Politics Model is an excellent method to analyze Russian foreign policy on several grounds. First, the Kremlin is occupied by three distinct groups in which individuals have varying perceptions of the world stage. This emphasis on individuals and their respective perceptions is useful in understanding the Putin-Medvedev duo, as well as the Siloviki, Technocrats, and Yeltsin Liberals who are primary members of the policy formulation. Varying levels of influence is an inherent concept in the Governmental Politics Model and this, the author claims, is a key aspect that enhances the understanding of Russian foreign policy. Kremlin bureaucrats do not exude equal influence. Certain members of the Kremlin are more influential because of personal qualities that 'drown out' the less visible and ardent bureaucrats. Examining personal dynamics among the bureaucrats is also useful in the Medvedev presidency because of the very nature of the agreement that two men would serve as the leaders of the Russian Federation. The personal dynamics as well as the clash in perceptions and ideologies are instrumental in the analysis that is posited by the Governmental Politics Model and is used throughout this body of research.

As for the operational analysis of the mechanics of Russian foreign policy-making, the following organs are considered. These were selected based on importance in terms of involvement, role, and effectiveness in the formulation of foreign policy. The Russian presidency is examined considering the 'Gorbachovian' effects of democratization and the

importance of public opinion, as well as the 'Yeltsonian' effects of establishing a superior presidency with broad powers over the legislature and other branches of the Russian government.

The ultimate decision-making process for the Russian President involves the Security Council of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Ministry of Defence. Yeltsin's revitalization of the National Security Council has been an important factor in today's Russian foreign policy. His usage of it has created an important forum for dialogue among members of the political elite. The Russian Security Council's membership includes anyone the President desires.[7] There is no limit to how fluid the Security Council's membership is.[8] The age old clash of the generals and the diplomats as evidenced by the 1991 coup has fundamentally evolved to include the Russian Security Council which has many different schools of thought, agendas, and influences as a result of the open membership.[9] This policy apparatus can solely be attributed to Boris Yeltsin's lasting legacy.

The themes for the analysis of this thesis are the transformative forces of Gorbachev's legacy of democratization which led to disorder among the masses and Yeltsin's resistance to this disorder through the creation of an imperial presidency.[10] These opposing forces have clashed and coexisted and will continue to as long as the Russian presidency maintains its constitutional superiority and the Russian Federation's government is beholden to the public opinion of its constituency, which is linked to its democratically gained legitimacy. Voter preference, political expediency, the foreign policy apparatus, and the constitutional dominance of the presidency are important facets of the analysis for this

[7] Robert H. Donaldson, 'Boris Yeltsin's Foreign Policy Legacy.', University of Tulsa, [web page], (2000), < http://www.personal.utulsa.edu/~robert-donaldson/yeltsin.htm>, accessed 12 June 2012.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid.
[10] A. Schlesinger Jr., The Imperial Presidency (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2004).

thesis. The transformative forces enacted by Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin have therefore been researched in order to provide a better understanding of the decisions and policies of the Putin-Medvedev regime.

The political regime currently in the Kremlin as previously mentioned is composed of three groups. First, the Yeltsin Liberals are included in this thesis; they believe in a close relationship with the Western world and have remained loyal to the Putin era bureaucrats now occupying the Kremlin. Second, the Silovik faction is an important group because of its overall dominance in modern Russia. These bureaucrats are categorized as 'Putin-types.' Namely, they are former intelligence officers who are keen to maintain stability and have an 'intelligence officer's worldview.' Their goal is to maintain Russian prestige and security at any cost. The Technocrats can be described as 'Medvedev-types.' This is a fundamentally different group from the Siloviki. They are composed of economists, professors, and attorneys from the culturally and intellectually driven St. Petersburg, who were brought into government by Vladimir Putin. It is necessary to understand the ideological nature and personal dynamics of these three groups that contribute to the policy formulation in the Kremlin. The formulation of Russian foreign policy is derived from the cohesion and clashes of these three groups, which this body of research examines throughout the following chapters.

Literature Review:

The author has needed to locate important themes and nuances in the available literature to understand the Russian Federation's foreign policy during the presidency of Dmitry Medvedev. While no one has carried out the type of analysis which forms the basis of this thesis, there is a useful body of work in which to start the argument in this research. Andrei P. Tsygankov's *Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National*

Identity in 2006 has postulated that the post-Soviet Russian political spectrum is in search of its national identity.[11] This book puts forth the convincing argument that Russian foreign policy is the result of clashing schools of thought.[12] The Yeltsin years and early Putin years are analyzed by using the theoretical framework of Statism, Westernism, and Civilizationism. These three broad ideologies were deftly and analytically applied to the major political figures in the Russian Federation. This theoretical framework is the most expansive and inclusive litmus test for understanding the foreign policy decisions of the main players in the Russian government. Tsygankov also usefully distinguishes the divisions within individual schools of thought. Each school of thought grapples with the question of whether Russia's loyalty lies toward the Atlantic sphere or Eastward.[13] Westernizers, Statists, and Civilizationists fall into different camps regarding this question regardless of ideology. Tsygankov acknowledges this clash and overlap of ideologies. While Tsygankov's book is meant to provide a broad view of the foreign policy community, Putin's actions are not probed to the extent to ascertain that his beliefs can be characterized as both Statist and Westernist. The overlap is present in the book, but Tsygankov ultimately shies away from it being used as an important focal point in foreign policy analysis. The overlap of competing schools of thought therefore requires a fresh look and this is an important factor in assessing the overall direction of Russia's foreign policy during the Putin-Medvedev leadership.

Of course much depends on the date of any publication. Tsygankov's book was published during the beginning of Putin's second term and so at that point it had become apparent that this Russian political figure was the dominant actor in the Kremlin and

[11] A. Tsygankov, Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006).
[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid.

Russian society. Studies on Putin though at this point were still trying to make sense of the man and his inner circle. Tsygankov's work never meant to catapult Putin's importance in Russia, but as the events of the 2012 presidential election in Russia were unfolding, it became clear that Putin and his inner circle merited even further analysis. Tsygankov's research was a broad view that did not distinguish Putin for his fundamental and unshakable grasp on the Kremlin and its bureaucracy. The school of thought, not the individual, mattered in Tsygankov's research. While such a broad foreign policy assessment is important, in the author's view there must also be a thorough investigation of those occupying the Kremlin's power apparatus. Tsygankov aimed for a broad overview of the political spectrum and understandably neglected the inner workings of the Kremlin. This thesis seeks to add to and enhance this view.

Ian Bremmer and Samuel Charap's article *The Siloviki in Putin's Russia: Who They Are and What They Want* is a necessary and complementary analysis of the inner circle operating in today's Kremlin.[14] Tsygankov did not focus on Yeltsin or Putin's close advisors or influential members of their respective inner circles. Tsygankov's broad analysis neglected the impact of the members of Putin's 'inner sanctum' and their operational status quo. These however are important factors in the Kremlin, and Bremmer and Charap wrote brilliantly on the Silovik worldview and belief system. Namely, the neo-KGB influence and control of the state, as well as the clash with the Liberals who were left over from the Yeltsin years is a primary facet.[15] This is a necessary portion of any analysis of Putin's inner circle. While published before Medvedev's ascension to the presidency, it strongly argues that the Technocrats are an important group in this analysis of the Kremlin,

[14] Ian Bremmer and Samuel Charap, 'The Siloviki in Putin's Russia: Who They Are and What They Want', The Washington Quarterly [online journal], 30/1 (2006), 83–92 <http://www.units.muohio.edu/havighurstcenter/russianstudies/documents/siloviki.pdf>, accessed 18 July 2012.
[15] Ibid.

holding the reins of power within Putin's inner circle.[16] These individuals with academic, engineering, and law careers are loyal to Putin and compete for influence with the Liberals of the Yeltsin years who remained in power. The competing influences for control of the Kremlin's decisions within the inner circle is of central importance to this body of research and is a fundamental theme that compliment's the analysis provided by Tsygankov.

Dmitry Shlapentokh masterfully builds on Tsygankov's research, specifically the Eurasianist dilemma in his journal article on Alexander Dugin's advocacy of Eurasian political and economic integration.[17] The Russian Federation's identity crisis as to whether it is a European or Asian country continues in academic and political realms. Shlapentokh emphasizes that Eurasianism is broadly supported among nationalists who fall into the Civilizationist category of the Russian political spectrum and refuse to believe the Cold War was lost; furthermore, the nationalists believe that the conflict between the United States and Russia is irreconcilable.[18] While Tsygankov analyzed each category and persuasion of the Russian political spectrum, this journal article focused solely on what has been the most important ideological battle in recent Russian history. The Russian Federation's foreign policy has been pragmatic since the Putin era began but the country still oscillates between the East and West. The author pointed out that Dugin was not appalled with former United States National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski's statement admitting that the role of the United States in Eurasia is to control and influence important events on the world stage stemming from this region.[19] Dugin's ideological

[16] Ibid.

[17] Dmitry Shlapentolkh, 'Dugin Eurasianism: a window on the minds of the Russian elite or an intellectual ploy?' Studies in East European Thought [online journal], 59/3 (2007), 215 – 236 < http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11212-007-9030-y/fulltext.html>, accessed 19 July 2012.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

stance is rooted in this very notion, which he wholeheartedly opposes.[20] The nationalist sentiment is that Russian civilization is highly superior to the Western world and that the Russian leadership must strive to be independent and free of any Western intervention or entanglement.[21] The journal article proposes various options, which includes nationalist isolation or conciliatory engagement with the West.[22] It even outlines the faint but possible option of retaliating against a vastly superior United States and its armed forces.[23] All of these policy options discussed by Shlapentokh seem so unlikely that the journal article only discusses them in passing while arriving to the only logical option, which is to engage both the East and West by Russia playing an independent but important role on the world stage.[24] Shlapentokh's journal article however misses a crucial element of the Eurasianist dilemma in the Russian Federation's political discourse. Eurasianism does not wholly belong to the Civilizationist school of thought, but also belongs to the Statist category of the political spectrum. The Primakovian model, which advocated power balancing between East and West, was brought into practice by a Statist, not a Civilizationist.[25] Yevgeni Primakov advocated a statist approach to government and elevated power-balancing as a fundamental facet of Russian foreign policy.[26] Shlapentokh wilfully neglects this clash among Eurasianists and the journal article is not central in this debate.

While scholarly research has generally focused on broad ideologies, a new focus on the individual as more important than any ideology, inner circle, or event on the world stage is becoming an increasing trend in Social Science. James M. Goldgeier's book from

[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid.
[25] A. Tsygankov, Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006).
[26] Ibid.

1994 entitled: *Leadership Style and Soviet Foreign Policy* enhances the reader's understanding of the Soviet relationship between the political leader and national and international politics.[27] The leadership style, which Goldgeier asserts is formed during the early years of a politician's career, has a direct and lasting impact on the foreign policy decisions he or she makes in the prime of their careers.[28] This book is compatible with *Essence of Decision* in terms of its approach to understanding the motivations and styles of political leaders. There can be no thesis formulation without linking the actions of Russia's leaders to their formative experiences, which had an impact on their worldview, leadership style, and modus operandi. However, even Goldgeier acknowledges that personal leadership style does not account for all political courses and decisions.[29] Gorbachev is a case that defies this line of thinking.[30] Mikhail Gorbachev was a loyal Communist apparatchik and showed no signs of what ultimately became his reformist agenda, which decentralized the Soviet Union.[31] This acknowledgment is an important admission that personal leadership style, which is forged during a politician's early years, maintains its status as a fundamental factor in policy-making but is never to be used to develop a complete perspective of Russia's decisions.

Jeff Checkel attempts to dissect what exactly Mikhail Gorbachev's 'foreign policy revolution' entailed by examining institutional changes.[32] Instead of doing what he set out to do, Checkel's article dwells on what possibly contributed to the various changes in Soviet foreign policy during the Gorbachev years by theorizing that the evolution was a

[27] J. Goldgeier, Leadership Style and Soviet Foreign Policy (Baltimore, Maryland, The John Hopkins University Press, 1994).
[28] Ibid.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Ibid
[31] Ibid.
[32] Ibid.

result of 'policy windows' being taken advantage of by 'policy entrepreneurs.'[33] This analysis makes a broad assumption that ambitious apparatchiks were the key elements in what can be described as a new era of foreign policy. Checkel postulates that the international system is low in terms of importance when comparing it with the domestic situation and key political players involved.[34] This sort of analysis is deficient in explaining foreign policy in the response to unexpected events. Checkel emphasized several important shifts within the domestic political situation.[35] For example, Gorbachev's revision of the myopic Marxist-Leninist vision of international affairs and the growing influence of Yevgeni Primakov and Alexander Yakovlev were correlated to the new shift in foreign policy.[36] This analysis of the individual's thinking in the foreign policy agenda illustrates the importance of the individual in the policy-making apparatus, but Checkel makes no attempt to place it in perspective in light of the momentous and consequential changes in the world. The Cold War was turning into rapprochement, the threat of nuclear confrontation was becoming unlikely, and a new decentralized Soviet system was developing as a result of reforms. All of these factors are marginally important to Checkel, and he largely dwells on the emerging intellectual forces.[37] The Soviet Union's think tank and governmental ideologists were more influential than public or world opinion according to Checkel.[38] The analysis is deficient because his attempt to probe the institutional evolution of the Soviet foreign policy apparatus is admittedly based on assumptions.[39]

[33] Jeff Checkel, 'Ideas, Institutions, and the Gorbachev Foreign Policy Revolution.', World Politics [online journal], 45/2 (1993), 271-300 < http://www.jstor.org/stable/info/2950660?seq=1&type=ref#infoRef>, accessed 13 July 2012.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid.

Checkel correlates foreign policy based on outcomes and ideologies of emerging influences, and this is not a sufficient mode of analysis.

James Goldgeier and Graham Allison's respective literature has contributed far more by analyzing the individual's motivation, ideology, and style when confronted with international and domestic events. Public opinion is highly important according to Goldgeier's book.[40] However, Checkel correlates outcomes based on assumed influence, while James Goldgeier and Graham Allison's respective literature provides decisive actions, statements, and decisions as evidence of the individual's mindset. Also, it is difficult for Checkel to even define a 'policy entrepreneur' and his framework has to be forced on the intended apparatchik. This is evidently a lack of explanation that does not fit well in academic research. Checkel carried out a more complete analysis of what a 'policy window' is but this was marginalized by his emphasis on Primakov and Yakovlev and their influence on Gorbachev's thinking.[41]

This thesis draws heavily on the institutional changes during the Gorbachev and Yeltsin years that affected the foreign policy apparatus during the tenure of President Dmitry Medvedev. The article written by Frederick Starr in 1995 analytically summarized the aftermath of the 1993 coup and its future trends.[42] The national chaos and economic stagnation were prime motives for Boris Yeltsin to seize the moment and expand the scope of presidential power.[43] The article alludes to the mass disorder characterizing Russia during the 1990's and systemic inefficiency of the government's bureaucracy.[44] Starr expounds on the authoritarian transformation of the Russian government after cataclysmic

[40] J. Goldgeier, Leadership Style and Soviet Foreign Policy (Baltimore, Maryland, The John Hopkins University Press, 1994).
[41] Ibid.
[42] S. Frederick Starr , 'The Paradox of Yeltsin's Russia.', The Wilson Quarterly [online journal] 19/3 (1995), 66-73
< http://www.jstor.org/stable/40259015>, accessed July 19, 2012.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.

democratization.[45] Starr discusses key issues such as the floundering economy, a rebellious and inefficient bureaucracy, and Yeltsin's attempt to manage the disorder.[46] Yeltsin came to prominence as an anti-Statist Liberal who foresaw a future which empowered the people.[47] Starr described Yeltsin's failure to rescue the economy or provide federal management for the new country.[48] The problems of the new country lay in its government's decentralized powers and operating mechanisms.[49] Starr wrote about how the Russian Federation's government was so decentralized that it lacked the ability to collect tax revenue from constituents and businesses.[50]

However, Starr does not cast blame on Yeltsin for his authoritarian tendencies or mass centralization of the government's power.[51] Rather he realistically assesses the Russian government's inability to serve its constituents' needs, as well as manage the new free market economy, which required guidance and supervision.[52] Starr has no qualms in asserting that Yeltsin's quasi-democracy with authoritarian impulses is the proper course.[53] The 1990's brought great changes and overwhelming problems according to the article; these conditions prevented the viability of a weak presidency to manage the affairs of a country in desperate need of a strong hand to guide it.[54] Starr emphasizes that disconnect between theory and practice exists; the democratization of the Soviet Union was intended to set it on a course of peace and prosperity.[55] The Yeltsin Administration was the first presidency to tackle these issues under the democratic framework established. Starr

[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Ibid.

concludes his article by insisting that Russia is 'under governed' given the vast and numerous problems facing the country, which is still in its developmental infancy.[56]

Shlapentokh's article dealing with Eurasianism did not discuss Vladimir Putin's power, which was established because of the 1993 coup, to categorically decide whether Russia sides with the East or West. His article dwelled on the value of the debate, but it largely ignores the fact that Putin can forge alliances without the consent of the legislative body or judiciary because of Yeltsin's 'atavistic actions' that reversed the democratization set in place from the Gorbachev years with respect to the Russian government. Ultimately, Frederick Starr's article about Yeltsin's expansion of powers to manage the disorder of the 1990's is related to the current debate faced by the Russian leadership about whether to align with the East or West.[57] The Russian presidency has the authority and powers to decide the question to this debate in the form of treaties, alliances, and diplomatic forums because of Yeltsin's legacy. Starr's article about Yeltsin's presidency is a succinct, scholarly analysis that provides great insights into the legacy of the first President of the Russian Federation.

Academic circles were not entirely cognizant of Yeltsin's unprecedented political moves and institutional reconfigurations. The 1990's in Russia saw widespread political chaos and economic stagnation, and because of his alcoholism, the consensus in the Western world was that Yeltsin was ineffectual and incapable of carrying out the responsibilities of office. The constitutional crisis was dismissed as being Yeltsin's attempt to bring back authoritarianism and scholarly research at the time did not wholly appreciate his contributions to foreign policy-making and presidential mechanisms. Neil Malcolm and Alex Pravda's journal article delicately lays out the important contributions made by

[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid.

Yeltsin to the Russian presidency by virtue of Yeltsin's actions, personal style, and responses to unpredictable events.[58] *Democratization and Foreign Policy* is one of the first and most important research articles that link democratic reform to foreign policy-making, which is a central idea of this thesis. It makes the case that democratization has led to different political groups and the politicization of foreign policy has contributed to the discourse becoming a myriad of ideologies attempting to influence Russia's direction on the world stage.[59] The authors correlate the divisions of the political spectrum with visions of Russia's role on the world stage, while Tsygankov's literature broadly and systematically addresses all these divisions.[60] Tsygankov's literature emphasized that elections and public opinion swayed the policy-makers to a powerful degree, but Malcolm and Pravda assert that this is a 'double-edged sword.'[61] Specifically they are referring to the political rallying and mobilization of the masses by political leaders to facilitate change in policy.[62] However, there is little supporting evidence for this claim. A vague mention of changing the nuances of foreign policy is mentioned in relation to Chechnya but nothing concrete is offered to support the claim that mobilizing public support earns political capital for politicians.[63] On the other hand, Yeltsin's decentralization of power of the legislature is a primary point of the article.[64] The authors make no attempt to hide the fact that the Duma is a relatively powerless institution after the constitutional crisis in which Yeltsin emerged the victor.[65] This was an important acknowledgement in the 1990's and was a foreshadowing of the vastly powerful Russian presidency that would continue to dominate

[58] Neil Malcolm and Alex Pravda, 'Democratization and Russian Foreign Policy.' International Affairs [online journal] , 72/3 (1996), 537-552, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2625556>, accessed 18 July 2012.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid.
[62]Ibid.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid.

the political arena. The article analyzes the quandary of the Yeltsin presidency.[66] Namely, power and influence are concentrated in a small circle of elites, but the forces of democratization affected Yeltsin's actions and inner circle.[67] Voter preference and public support remained cornerstones of the new leadership's legitimacy and no authoritarian behaviour would diminish that.[68] The authors concluded that political expediency and 'pandering' are now the guiding principles in democratic Russia.[69] Regardless of what will be written about the democratic transition, the Russian Federation's President will be forced to make foreign policy decisions with the conflicting forces of democratization and authoritarian impulses.

Most research on Russia focuses on the personalities and actions of those occupying the highest corridors of power, but this begs the question of whether the scholarly analysis is biased or not. It is debateable whether any analysis of influential and powerful figures such as Boris Yeltsin or Vladimir Putin is untainted by political bias or scholarly myopia. *Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications* by The Rand Project Air Force is a comprehensive and integral study of the Russian Federation's current state of affairs, capabilities, and trends.[70] It reflects a systemic perspective of all facets of Russia's economy, political environment, responses to changes on the world stage, and historical background.[71] Unlike Goldgeier's work, which continued the trend of analyzing a country solely from the standpoint of its leaders, it makes no attempt to understand the individual

[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid.
[70] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.
[71] Ibid.

leader at the apex of power, but focuses on Russia's progress and transformation from the stagnant Yeltsin years.[72]

The report makes no attempt to hide the fact that it views Russia's internal progress as a path for Russian policy-makers to enhance and attain global influence.[73] In terms of security, the Russian Federation seeks to deter NATO as it openly dominates the global security architecture.[74] This comprehensive assessment made a specific effort to highlight and align the reader's thoughts with Russia's frustration over NATO's Missile Defence Shield in Prague, which created apprehension among the Russian public and political circles.[75] There was little debate in Russia as to whether the Kremlin should be conciliatory or combative toward NATO's efforts to ensure its security grasp in the post-Soviet space. This is an important aspect of this thesis; linking security measures with public opinion is a vital element in understanding Russian foreign policy. The intentions of individual leaders were not considered in this report, but the overall Russian sentiment among the masses and political circles is that Russia strives to be a great modern power.[76] This was the guiding principle that the authors felt summed up Russia's foreign policy.[77] Namely, it seeks to compete in a multipolar world, where it can once again sway influence in the international arena and over its former territory.[78] The report expounds on the Russian desire not to repeat the blunders of the 1990's and to be an independent power.[79] This collective realization among Russians is the core of the research that concluded that Russia's foreign

[72] Ibid.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Ibid.
[77] Ibid.
[78] Ibid.
[79] Ibid.

policy and the transformation of economy and infrastructure are inherent with those wishes.[80]

Roy Allison's journal article examining the 2008 Russian-Georgian War titled: *Russia Resurgent? Moscow's Campaign to "Coerce Georgia to Peace"* is an excellent pivot toward a scholarly recognition that Russia is now an assertive force striving to shape the international system in its favour.[81] Roy Allison is among the first major scholars to both recognize that the Russian Federation during the Medvedev years is seeking to use coercive diplomacy to solidify its interests in the post-Soviet space, which it still sees as belonging to its sphere of influence, and that this is directly stemming from the psychological mindset and perception of the top brass of the Kremlin.[82] Furthermore, Roy Allison correctly details that this foreign policy episode ranks as highly important and may be the most vital point in the Russian Federation's diplomacy on the world stage, which this body of research examines thoroughly in Chapter 2. Roy Allison also shrewdly notes that it merits further examination whether Russian's 'new interventionism' is the product of certain conditions that may have precipitated this or a concerted effort by the Kremlin to be recognized as an aspiring global power that will assert itself in order to maximize benefits for the Russian Federation.[83] The article elucidates on the fact that the Kremlin's characterization of this foreign policy episode is mired in anti-Western rhetoric, which serves the leaders of the Russian Federation abundantly in terms of gaining and maintaining political capital from constituents.[84] The multi-layered analysis of this conflict elevates it to major importance, emphasizes the importance of the perceptions of leaders in the Kremlin,

---

[80] Ibid.

[81] Roy Allison, 'Russia Resurgent? Moscow's Campaign to "'Coerce Georgia to Peace."' International Affairs, 84/6 (2008), 1145-1171 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25144986>, accessed 2 Jan. 2012.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid.

[84] Ibid.

and details the political pandering necessary to maintain public and political support of the Russian citizens.[85] This multi-faceted approach is an inherent method to examine the foreign policy episodes of major importance during the Medvedev presidency in this body of research.

The new democracy in the Russian Federation as a result of Gorbachev's reforms and the lasting legacy of these democratic forces of empowering the average citizen are best understood by a reading of Archie Brown's book, *The Gorbachev Factor*.[86] This book is exceptionally well written and chooses to examine the details and processes of the reforms that Mikhail Gorbachev enacted through a politically skilful manner in order to save the country by liberalization and decentralization.[87] Archie Brown specifically examines the gradual process that created democratic elections, a news media free of government control, and the new social compact that required the ultimate consent of the governed for the government to operate and govern.[88] Democratically-linked legitimacy was now the new political norm in a country that had not tolerated such 'revolutionary' and anti-Communist measures.[89] *The Gorbachev Factor* is an important book for understanding Gorbachev's lasting legacy; a legacy that remains relevant in the Russian Federation's foreign policy decisions today. It began a new trend in reassessing how important Gorbachev's tenure was. The Kremlin's policy formulation today has been indelibly shaped by Mikhail Gorbachev and his reforms. This is an important theme in this body of research and builds upon the work of Archie Brown in acknowledging its importance.

This thesis makes use of various news sources accessible online. The chapters include articles from *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The Wall Street Journal*,

[85] Ibid.
[86] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).
[87] Ibid
[88] Ibid.
[89] Ibid.

The London Telegraph, and *The Guardian*, as well as other news publications. These sources provide a critical view of the Kremlin and its policies, which illuminates much of the processes and mechanisms used in formulation of foreign policy decisions. The author chooses to largely use Russian sources, which have been translated into English for the benefit of the reader by Google Translate, in a secondary sense to broaden knowledge from a Russian vantage point. However, *Pravda*, *Izvestia*, *Kommersant*, and other Russian newspapers provide quality reporting, but fail to provide necessary criticism and scepticism that are needed to fully probe the Kremlin. For example, no American newspapers provided critical analysis before the United States launched military operations in Afghanistan or Iraq. In a similar case, no Russian newspaper provided a critical analysis of the Russian activity in Georgia's breakaway regions. The fact is that journalists are still citizens who are mired in the nationalist sentiment in which they grew up and live in while they write articles. Therefore, the author made a conscience decision to use Western sources that provide the necessary analysis that is not influenced by patriotic sentiment in addition to Russian sources.

The author has conducted research for this thesis at the Harvard University Kennedy School of Government, Brown University Watson Institute of International Studies, Columbia University School of Public & International Affairs, New York University Centre for Global Studies, New School University, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, and American Enterprise Institute. For the Russian viewpoint, the author has interviewed Dr. Sergei Khrushchev and Dr. Nina Khrushcheva, who are both well known academics in the field of Russian foreign policy.

Structure of Thesis:

This body of research examines Russian foreign policy in nine chapters. The introductory chapter contains an overview of the necessary themes that will play an important role in establishing the Russian Federation's foreign policy analysis. The introduction provides a perspective on the importance of understanding Russian foreign policy and the available research that attempts to do this. The issues worthy of examination have been established by the literature review and objectives that have been put forth to bridge scholarly gaps with the necessary analytical questions. Chapter 1 establishes the themes of this research by explaining the theoretical framework of the political forces affecting the Kremlin. Chapter 1 expounds on the Gorbachovian and Yeltsonian attributes of Russia's contemporary foreign policy formulation. The reforms and legacies of President Mikhail Gorbachev, the last leader of the Soviet Union, and President Boris Yeltsin, the first leader of the Russian Federation, are examined to link the evolutionary aspects of their influences on Russian foreign policy-making. Chapter 1 incorporated Graham Allison's Governmental Politics Model in order to apply this to the current foreign policy apparatus occupied by Russia's current leaders during the Medvedev presidency. An analysis of the respective departmental bureaucrats by virtue of Graham Allison's model provides the theoretical framework for analyzing foreign policy decisions.

Chapter 2 examines the decision to respond to Georgian forces militarily by the Russian Federation in August 2008, and specifically the internal dynamics that were inherent with the order to use military force against Georgia. The Russian Federation's first and only unilateral war against another country to date is an important episode in its foreign policy. Chapter 3 focuses on the Russian Federation's response to North Korea's nuclear testing in 2009 and the decision of whether to consent to sanctions on the United Nations

Security Council. Chapter 4 investigates the Kremlin's response to Kyrgyzstan's civil uprising and the Russian Federation's role in the ouster of President Kurmanbek Bakiyev in 2010. Chapter 5 examines Russia's decision to support sanctions against Iran in relation to the move to consent to United Nations Resolution 1929, which has been the most stringent set of sanctions against Iran in the history of the United Nations Security Council.[90]

Chapter 6 assesses Russian foreign policy in the response to the Libyan Civil War and the Kremlin's involvement in enforcing a no-fly zone that signalled the death knell for the Khadafy regime. These events have had a direct effect on the Russian Federation's decision not to support sanctions against the Assad regime in Syria. Chapter 7 examines Russia's reluctance and ultimate refusal to support sanctions or intervention in the Syrian Civil War after the Libyan outcome and its political consequences. The conclusion of the thesis emphasizes the importance of Russia's current political arena as a result of the Gorbachovian and Yeltsonian forces and the foreign policy as formulated by the Kremlin during the Medvedev presidency, as well as its intertwined state of internal dynamics with the presence of three distinct groups that are responsible for formulating and executing foreign policy decisions.

This doctoral dissertation focuses on six important foreign policy episodes during the Medvedev presidency. Russia's war with Georgia, which had innumerable consequences on the world stage, was a daring and unexpected event that solidifies Russia's standing as an assertive state aiming to maximize its power. This event began a new chapter in Russia's foreign policy and maintains an important place in this research. In the same vein, Russia's new power aspirations continue its trend of intervening in the post-Soviet space and the foreign policy episode with Kyrgyzstan, which was a strategic

[90] United Nations, 'Citing Iran's failure to clarify nuclear ambitions, UN imposes additional sanctions.', The United Nations News Centre, [web page] (2010), <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=34970&Cr=iran&Cr1=>, accessed 1 March, 2013.

competition between Moscow and Washington D.C. over military basing, serves as an important issue that illuminates the Kremlin's predispositions with respect to shaping the international system. The Russian Federation's decisions on the United Nations Security Council in relation to North Korea, Iran, Libya, and Syria further allow the author to assess the Kremlin's role in the age of liberal institutionalism, where power politics plays out in diplomatic settings. Each foreign policy episode was chosen specifically because of the wide-ranging political and diplomatic consequences on the world stage. International security has been the overarching Silovik concern and Russia's vital foreign policy episodes during the Medvedev presidency deal with this very aspect of the world stage.

Chapter 1: The Transformational Themes of the Kremlin & a Theoretical Framework

Mikhail Gorbachev was one of the most important historical figures of the twentieth century, but ironically he is known more for the end result of his reforms, not the actual transformation of the Soviet Union from totalitarian socialism to a democratic confederation of republics under the structural framework of a decentralized union. The scope of the reforms affected every citizen and former republic irreversibly. Gorbachev showed no signs of the reformer he would become during his early career, but the rhetoric immediately prior to his ascension to Secretary General provided glimpses into the mind of a man who started a revolution and lost his own country.[91]

Gorbachev's years in power had seen the most chaotic times within the Soviet Union, and the reforms were carried out within this confluence of events. The aftermath brought about serious questions as to the extent and relevance of his tenure, but Gorbachev remains to this day unapologetic for the course he took. In his closing speech as the Soviet Union was dissolved in 1991, Gorbachev expressed regret that the republics decided to secede, and he notes that it was done not by referendum or acting in accordance with popular will.[92] This statement speaks volumes about Gorbachev's thinking and political leanings. According to this philosophy, any government must act according to the wishes of the governed, and Gorbachev's democratic leanings were expressed vociferously in terms of the several years of reforms that reversed the Soviet Union's grasp on its denizens and empowered their voices.

Gorbachev was at times contradictory and polarizing. His career is difficult to describe if analyzed through the lens of a 'right or wrong' framework. Gorbachev believed in socialism, but he also believed that the government's role in the distribution of resources,

[91] J. Goldgeier, Leadership Style and Soviet Foreign Policy (Baltimore, Maryland, The John Hopkins University Press, 1994).

[92] Mikhail Gorbachev, 'End of the Soviet Union; Text of Gorbachev's Farewell Speech', The New York Times, 26 Dec. 1991, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 21 July 2012

wealth, and services should not impede or infringe on the liberties of citizens.[93] Gorbachev stated:

> The totalitarian system which deprived the country of an opportunity to become successful and prosperous long ago has been eliminated. A breakthrough has been achieved on the way to democratic changes. Free elections, freedom of the press, religious freedoms, representative organs of power, a multiparty system became a reality; human rights are recognized as the supreme principle.[94]

Gorbachev's democratization and program of Glasnost earned him praise from liberals and criticism from Soviet hardliners, but there is no question as to whether these policies transformed the Soviet Union irreversibly.

Gorbachev fully distinguished the Western European socialist model, which aimed for democratization and empowerment of its citizens, from the Communist control of the masses and subversion of freedoms in the domestic political environment. According to Jerry F. Hough, 'The essence of communism was an erection of an Iron Curtain against frightening market forces (especially foreign ones) but also against frightening modern Western culture.'[95] Gorbachev was simply not convinced that Western democratic principles would lead to an abrogation of the socialist model. For Gorbachev, personal and political freedoms were the necessary paths toward prosperity. Hough states: 'Just as Stalin justified his policy of autarky as necessary to build Soviet national power, Gorbachev makes the same claim for his policy of ending autarky.'[96] According to a PBS *Charlie Rose* interview in 2006 marking the fifteenth anniversary of the fall of the Soviet Union, Gorbachev believed that the course of democratization and decentralization was the only

---

[93] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[94] Mikhail Gorbachev, 'End of the Soviet Union; Text of Gorbachev's Farewell Speech', The New York Times, 26 Dec. 1991, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 21 July 2012

[95] Jerry F. Hough, 'Gorbachev's Politics.', Foreign Affairs [online journal] , 68/5 (1989), 26-41 < http://www.jstor.org/stable/20044198>, accessed 4 June 2012, 30.

[96] Ibid, 33.

viable option, given the decadent state of the Soviet economy and quality of life.[97] He, however, believed that the fall of the Soviet Union was not a result of his reforms, but rather because of the treachery of Boris Yeltsin's ploy.[98] Namely, Yeltsin played the part of saviour, which ended the 1991 coup, and then resorted to formally sever ties with the Soviet Union in the interest of accelerating the transformation of the Russian economy from market socialism to market capitalism.[99] Gorbachev quipped that if he could relive the past, Yeltsin would have been appointed an ambassador to relegate his position in the domestic political environment.[100] The responsibility for the fate of the Soviet Union is debateable, but the forces that created the viability for its end are unquestionable.

No one understood better the power of public opinion than Mikhail Gorbachev. Every policy step, major program of reform, and foreign policy action was conveyed to the Soviet masses in order to gain legitimacy in the relationship between the government and the governed. 'As he (Gorbachev) put it at a closed meeting with a group of Soviet writers on 19 June 1986, "All our plans depend on influencing the people."'[101] Gaining the support of the masses was crucial to Perestroika and the Soviet-American rapprochement. Gorbachev's political style was forged in the years when denouncing Stalin and his infringement on personal liberty became publicly and intellectually acceptable. As James Goldgeier's *Leadership Style and Soviet Foreign Policy* postulates, a leader's political style is forged during his or her early years.[102] Based on this theory, it would be natural for Gorbachev to have a disdain for authoritarianism, especially because he was personally

[97] Charlie Rose, An Hour with Mikhail Gorbachev., [online video] (2006) < http://www.charlierose.com/view/interview/176>, accessed 20 April 2012.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Ibid.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Peter Frank, 'Gorbachev and the 'Psychological Restructuring' of Soviet Society.',
The World Today [online journal], 43/ 5 (1987), 85-87 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40395932>, accessed 19 June 2012, 86.
[102] J. Goldgeier, Leadership Style and Soviet Foreign Policy (Baltimore, Maryland, The John Hopkins University Press, 1994).

affected by Stalin's purges with the disappearance of his grandfather. Goldgeier cites Gorbachev's acquiescence in having East Germany decide whether it should reunify with its Western counterpart as stemming directly from his personal style of empowering the people.[103] Therefore, Gorbachev's affinity for freedom and aversion toward authoritarianism can be directly linked to his experiences from childhood and young adulthood.

Gorbachev's legacy and lasting impact on the Russian Federation was his successful attempt to reconfigure and transform the 'old system' to better suit the needs of the people by empowering them through democratization and transparency. According to Peter Frank:

> Democratisation is not a new word in Gorbachev's vocabulary; indeed, he has referred to it in practically every speech he has made since December 1984. Yet, according to Gorbachev, "It is difficult to get some comrades to understand what is meant by democratisation - that it is not just a slogan, but the essence of reconstruction." At the heart of the concept, Gorbachev explained, is the principle of electivity.[104]

Gorbachev believed that an informed citizenry with a democratically elected government will neutralize any social or historical impediment, and be the catalyst for societal and fiscal improvements. Gorbachev spent his years at the apex of power attempting to refashion the authoritarian impulses of the Communist apparatus and enhance the power of the people to either consent or reject the course chosen by democratically elected leaders. This was a vast and multi-faceted process, but the key points in time for the purpose of this specific body of research are the 1989 election and the 1991 coup.

Gorbachev's tenure as Secretary General forced him to confront the stagnant economy that had become the ultimate burden on Soviet innovation, ingenuity, and productivity. The economic reforms, as Gorbachev believed, could only be effective if they

---

[103] Ibid.

[104] Peter Frank, 'Gorbachev and the 'Psychological Restructuring' of Soviet Society.',
The World Today [online journal], 43/ 5 (1987), 85-87 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40395932>, accessed 19 June 2012, 86.

were complemented with political reforms.[105] When Gorbachev took the reins of power in 1985, it was inconceivable that democratic reforms could be enacted that entailed a free news media, fair elections, and an adoption of democratic principles in the Soviet Union.[106] Gorbachev's chief concern revolved around the economy and infrastructure, which his predecessors had been unable to fundamentally and conclusively rehabilitate.[107] It was unforeseeable to any Soviet politician at the time that the economic woes would bring about momentous political change. Perestroika and its inherent liberalization of the command economy forced the political elite to acknowledge and rectify the political system's inadequacies. The transformation of a command economy to market socialism was a fundamental change in the status quo, but with market socialism came the emphasis of the importance of the consumer. The individual and his or her choices in the new economy relegated the importance of the government, which prior to reforms allocated resources and goods according to its own goals and wishes. This was the beginning of the eventual 'Moscow Spring.'

Empowering the people became Gorbachev's primary goal when Perestroika began. Democratization for Gorbachev meant a more prosperous country and during the early years of his tenure he sought to accelerate reforms while still having the support of the intelligentsia and liberal Communists before Yeltsin's rapid ascent in terms of political influence.[108] The post 1990 period saw a much more reserved and conciliatory Gorbachev who sought to allay the fears and satisfy the wishes of opposite ends of the political spectrum.[109] This later set the stage for a decisive battle within the Soviet realms of power, which ended with Gorbachev's ouster. Gorbachev's approach to the new institution of the

[105] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).
[106] Ibid.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Ibid.
[109] Ibid.

Soviet presidency is a case in point. While certainly aiming to create a democratic leadership position in accordance with the democratization taking place, the election required a majority of Soviet deputies to consent to a candidate, not the citizens.[110] It was a step toward democratization, but lacked the true character of Gorbachev's reforms, which called for empowering the average citizen.

The reason that the hardliners opposed free and fair elections was because Glasnost had transformed the essence of the Soviet political culture. The transparency of government and newly formed news media created a new dynamic for Soviet politicians to struggle in when formulating and implementing policies. There is little doubt that hardliners who spent decades operating with absolute impunity were apprehensive when Gorbachev seized the moment to create a political environment in which politicians were held accountable for their actions by virtue of a new era of transparency and free news media. The constituents were now a major factor in the actions of every Soviet government official. Gorbachev became weary and cautious as he was losing support from both sides of the political spectrum, which ironically was keeping him in power. A delicate balancing act ensued for the rest of his tenure as Secretary General and President of the Soviet Union. The tide of democratization was uncontainable and the Soviet Union's demise was a result of this. In a speech about the progress of Perestroika in 1989, Mikhail Gorbachev stated:

> Reforming our political system is a powerful tool for tackling all those problems and implementing all our initiatives. We are building an open, democratic and free society which has learned the lessons of its past, a society based on law and responsibility, a society that keeps its citizens well informed, that rests on its citizens' initiative and enterprise, on Soviet socialist patriotism and dedication to humane socialism aimed at elevating the human being.[111]

[110] Archie Brown, 'Reform, Coup and Collapse: The End of the Soviet State', BBC, 17 Feb. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 13 May 2012.

[111] Mikhail Gorbachev, 'Text of Gorbachev Speech', Associated Press Archive [web document] (1989), < http://www.apnewsarchive.com/1989/Text-of-Gorbachev-Speech/id-9f9af12bfbeda79deebc76e1423b8ba8>, accessed 28 April 2012.

Yegor Ligachev's opposition toward the reforms stemmed from these very initiatives that Gorbachev believed were essential for transforming the Soviet Union into a prosperous country.[112] The conservative opposition defined its litany of grievances by denouncing the move from Soviet Communism to a Western European socialist democratic model, which was seen as a blasphemous revocation of the Communist mantra and Marxist-Leninism.[113] Glasnost was particularly criticized as being a vehicle for subversion and dissidence.[114] Communist totalitarianism could not survive with an engaged citizenry that had unlimited and comprehensive information about politics and policies. Furthermore, democratization weakened the elite bureaucrats who had formulated Soviet domestic and foreign policies without the consent or input of the governed. The tide of democratization eliminated the impunity and infallibility stemming from the patriotic discourse with regards to the Soviet government. The 1990 election of the Soviet presidency was not a microcosm of the effects of Gorbachev's reforms because it was only a political move aimed to satisfy both ends of the political spectrum, and it was vastly overshadowed by the election of 1989 and the coup of 1991. The 1990 election was more of the balancing act that Gorbachev came to utilize in order to ensure his political survival. These two events, the 1989 election and 1991 coup, were the cataclysmic moments that shook and evolved the very foundations of the Soviet Union.

Gorbachev's path of democratization did not take full effect during his tenure not least because of the institutional hindrances and systemic nature within which he was operating. 'Free and fair elections' were revolutionary in the Soviet political culture. *The New York Times* noted in March 1989 that after seven decades of a 'shamocracy' with uncontested elections and a powerless and ineffectual legislature, the Soviet Union is

[112] A. D'Agostino, The Gorbachev Revolution (New York, NY, New York University Press, 1998).
[113] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).
[114] Ibid.

reforming its electoral process in the true spirit of giving the people the opportunity to choose their leaders.[115] From the early days after the Communist Revolution to 1989, there had never been a true democratic contest of candidates vying for positions of power. The elite apparatchiks were a cabal with highly secretive methods and starkly different ambitions from Gorbachev's reforms. Yegor Ligachev, who initially supported reforms, became Gorbachev's arch-nemesis because of the Soviet government's inherent loss of power over the Soviet masses.[116] Namely, Gorbachev's reforms sought to empower the people and make government transparent and beholden to its constituents. Nothing possessed the potential to alter the status quo more than this new political path.

In another article from March 26, 1989, *The New York Times* described the election as a step forward in terms of making the Soviet legislature more accountable, but only two-thirds of the seats available are multi-candidate contests.[117] According to the article, one-third of the seats were limited to one candidate, which effectively became an appointment.[118] The wheels of democratization were not spinning at full speed, but nonetheless, it was a momentous occasion in which Soviet voters had substantial reasons to participate in the election.[119] Mikhail Gorbachev's consent to this limited democratic contest is an extension of his balancing act with respect to the political forces that were keeping him in power. Multi-candidate elections were introduced, but multi-party elections were not even a conceivable idea at that point. Gorbachev's motives may have ranged from his desire to sustain socialism in the Soviet Union to limiting the competing forces for the Secretary General position and the new presidency. According to Hough:

---

[115] 'A Vote for Soviet Democracy', The New York Times, 26 March, 1989, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 12 June 2012.

[116] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[117] Bill Keller, 'Soviet Voters Deal Humiliating Blow to Party Officials', The New York Times, 28 March, 1989, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 12 June 2012.

[118] Ibid.

[119] Ibid.

> The vast majority of Russians, even highly educated Russians, including the intelligentsia are very leery of the possibility that a multiparty democracy would lead to the establishment of separatist parties in union and autonomous republics that would gain majority support.[120]

Furthermore, Gorbachev aimed to save the union from falling apart, not accelerate its fragmentation. David Speedie, senior fellow at the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, opines: 'Gorbachev, was a thoughtful, visionary man who tried to create a new union agreement with his constituents.'[121] This cautious approach did not win him favour within the liberal ranks of the Soviet political spectrum and the Communist hardliners were alienated well before the election because of the weakening of the Soviet government's power by virtue of democratization and Glasnost.[122] David Speedie notes, 'Gorbachev has been widely criticized within Russia and outside Russia. He's known as the man who ended the country.'[123]

1989 Election:

Mikhail Gorbachev commented on this historic significance of the 1989 election:

> Those developments were the result of perestroika in the Soviet Union, where democratic changes had reached the point by March 1989 that for the first time in Russia's history democratic, competitive elections took place. You remember how enthusiastically people participated in those elections for a new Soviet Congress. And as a result thirty-five regional Communist Party secretaries were defeated. By the way, of the deputies elected, 84 percent were Communists, because there were a lot of ordinary people in the party--workers and intellectuals.[124]

Democratic reforms accelerated rapidly from 1987 to 1990 to the point where political dissent was acceptable and popular support bolstered democratic reforms while

---

[120] Jerry F. Hough, 'Gorbachev's Politics.', Foreign Affairs [online journal] , 68/5 (1989), 26-41 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20044198>, accessed 4 June 2012, 35.

[121] Speedie, D., 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 11 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

[122] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[123] Speedie, D., 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 11 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

[124] Katrina vanden Heuvel & Steve F. Cohen, 'Gorbachev on 1989', The Nation, 16 Nov. 2009, in The Nation Archive [online database], accessed 29 June 2012.

eroding the power of conservative forces aiming to reverse the path taken by the Soviet leadership.[125] Gorbachev's inherent open-mindedness created a window of opportunity for political pluralism, which the liberals made use of for their own purposes. Boris Yeltsin remains a prime example of someone who gained power and influence because political dissent was no longer taboo.[126] Archie Brown opines that Gorbachev's democratization and the 1989 election were primary elements of the course taken, but Gorbachev sought to reform the system, not abandon it.[127] Therefore, Gorbachev truly was firmly in the middle of the spectrum, but the introduction of political pluralism was the beginning of the final chapter of the Soviet Union because its very existence now assured Soviet citizens that dissent was acceptable. Soviet citizens were now responsible for choosing their political destiny.

The crack in seventy years of unshakable and unquestionable leadership in the Soviet Union was a harbinger of a new age, where denizens were in control of their lives. People flocked to vote in large numbers and voter apathy diminished. The predictability and predetermination of who would occupy positions in the corridors of power became a remnant of the past. Democratization began by offering options to well-informed citizens who benefited from Glasnost. The government's new transparency and the newly formed news media, which was free of government control, empowered the citizens to make informed decisions. 35 regional secretaries were voted out and a ripple of change began to infiltrate all aspects of Soviet society.[128] People were excited because of the abundance of new opportunities to shape their lives and choose their government. The Soviet era created mass voter apathy, which can be best illustrated by Soviet citizens not participating in

[125] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).
[126] Ibid.
[127] Ibid.
[128] Ibid.

anything known to be sanctioned by the government. Public confidence in the government was nonexistent in relation to Soviet bureaucratic politics and policy agendas, but it remained inconceivable to successfully oppose the government. Elections were the only venue by which accountability could be ascertained. The 1989 election, while not producing a highly proportionate change in the government's composition, nullified the Communist party's unquestionable and unanimous control of the echelons of power. The Soviet government, specifically the Communist hardliners, became weary and anxious of what the future held for them. Popular support became the necessary tool for achieving the goals of those elected and this in itself was a revolutionary concept in a country that was defined by disdain for liberal democracy.

The elevation of popular support firmly gave the liberal leaders, such as Boris Yeltsin, the upper-hand when confronted with the hardliners. For example, Yegor Ligachev gradually lost influence as the liberals were gaining momentum and he resigned from his position with full recognition that he was fighting a 'losing battle.' The Communist party began to lose legitimacy and this is why Boris Yeltsin, the antithesis to Ligachev, began a meteoric rise to power after resigning from the Communist party because of the lack of progress in reforming the country.[129] Ligachev chose to battle the new reforms by Gorbachev when the Soviet Union's authority over its constituents diminished, while Yeltsin welcomed this newfound liberalization that people were now becoming accustomed to. The nature of holding power in the Soviet Union had changed dramatically and now required popular consent and legitimacy for political purposes. This set the stage for the coup of 1991 in which the hardliners desperately sought to return to the previous power apparatus when their grasp on the country was firm and unquestionable.

[129] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).

The coup of August 1991 in the Soviet Union was symptomatic of several important political clashes. In the realms of foreign policy, this can be best demonstrated by the clash of the military elite with the foreign policy ministers, and in the domestic political scene it is apparent that that staunch Soviet Communists were apprehensive as the pendulum of power was swinging toward the liberals, who sought to write a new chapter in the Soviet Union with a decentralized and democratized central government with the viability of the Soviet republics being able to secede from it. The opposing forces that maintained Gorbachev's power by neutralizing each other and having him serve as their contact point embarked in a battle that was ultimately decided by popular consent. Legitimacy by the consent of the governed was after years of democratization and Glasnost a superior force in the affairs of the state when compared with military strength.

Soviet hardliners who staged the coup against Gorbachev in 1991 executed their plans with the conviction that the Soviet people thirsted for stability and were averse to the instability that was brought along with democratization.[130] The eight man committee, which sought a return to the pre-Gorbachev era state of affairs, operated under the guise of 'saving the union from annihilation.'[131] The Soviet era mentality of acting for the sake of people without considering public opinion in policy deliberations was natural to these men who favoured a more totalitarian system. There was no consideration given to the effects of what Glasnost and democratization had on the people. The Soviet masses were better informed and more active in political affairs than at any time since the inception of the Soviet Union.[132] There was blatant disregard for the powerful effect the people now had on the political discourse by the Soviet hardliners, whose government was becoming

[130]A. D'Agostino, The Gorbachev Revolution (New York, NY, New York University Press, 1998).

[131] The BBC, '1991: Hardliners stage coup against Gorbachev', The BBC [web page] (2005) <http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/august/19/newsid_2499000/2499453.stm>, accessed Feb. 13 2013

[132] Ibid.

increasingly beholden to its constituents. Powerful protest movements against the coup leaders composed of Soviet denizens motivated by their political views began the new era started by Gorbachev, which pointed to vibrant and overwhelming support of democratic leadership.[133] Public opinion was against any attempt to derail the empowerment of the people by Gorbachev's reforms, and at this point there was little likelihood for the coup's survival because of the government's decentralization and democratization, which created a new dynamic between the Soviet government and its people. Legitimacy by popular consent was the major enabling factor in the new political culture and the overwhelming protests against the coup that ensued in the days after the hardliners announced their removal of Gorbachev is a testament to the new democratic forces shaping the lives of the protestors and policy-makers.

The coup happened after several years of unprecedented weakening of the Soviet government. Few scholars or statesmen in the world would ever have predicted that Gorbachev would become revolutionary in the sense that the Soviet system would be radically changed to the point that it would become compatible with the Western democratic model of government.[134] Soviet government officials no longer possessed the unlimited and secretive roles in operating the policy-making apparatus. The people's opinions became a major factor in the minds of policy-makers. According to Ron Hill:

> Gorbachev also shocked and alienated the apparatchik!? The party and state bureaucrats who really ran the system by referring to the Communist Party's "infallibility complex," and engaged in a drive against corruption in the system. In this his weapon was "Glasnost", "openness" or "publicity", which allowed the press to unmask abuse by officials at all levels in the system.[135]

[133] Ron Hill , 'The Collapse of the Soviet Union.', History Ireland [online journal] , 13/ 2 (2005), 37-42
< http://www.jstor.org/stable/27725240>, accessed July 3 2012.
[134]Ibid.
[135] Ibid, 39.

The eight-man committee, which sought control over a country that was increasingly drifting away from its grasp, could not escape the invasive free news media. Every action the hardliners took was reported to the people during the coup and this freedom of information was a necessary tool for the organization of protests. The government now had to act accordingly with an informed population that chose whether to support it; the planners of the coup were simply out of touch with what the people wanted, which was further democratization. No regard for the wishes of the governed was given and this was a crucial mistake. There was no possible reversal of the empowerment of the individual, which was Gorbachev's lasting legacy, and the hardliners were oblivious to this new status quo.

The junta, which was composed of Soviet officials opposed to any democratic reform, seemed not to have an inkling of how the last several years had transformed the masses. It must have been an extraordinary and shocking moment when the military operating under its orders was confronted with an estimated 100,000 citizens led by liberal leader Boris Yeltsin.[136] The elections in previous years had seen the people vote against the staunch Communists and this was a telling sign that public support was eroding for the Soviet hardliners, such as Ligachev and like-minded individuals. The national question, which was catapulted to importance by Gorbachev's democratization, was eroding the cohesion of the Soviet Union.[137] The junta staged the coup as a resistance to these forces that were well into fruition by 1991. As a result of Perestroika, the Soviet government no longer controlled the economy. Glasnost and democratization gave citizens a vastly superior position in society to choose their path when compared with the Stalin or Brezhnev years. The fundamental shift in power occurred from the central government to its citizens.

[136] Michael Mandelbaum, 'Coup de Grace: The End of the Soviet Union.', Foreign Affairs [online journal], 71/1 (1991), 164-183 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20045116>, accessed 30 July 2012.

[137] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).

The individual was now the core of policy-making. According to Michael Mandelbaum, 'Democratization was to be a political weapon in his battle against the Communist Party apparatus.'[138] Gorbachev's aims were to rehabilitate the union by providing freedom to its citizens to engage and facilitate the change they desired.

The final outcome of the coup was as Michael Mandelbaum describes: 'a coup d'état that became a coup de grace' for the Soviet Union.[139] Public support swung to Boris Yeltsin and his advocacy of liberal principles, and citizens attended protests in large numbers to confront the Soviet military. Individual, unarmed citizens coalesced to form an opposition to Communist totalitarianism and the people emerged victorious over the junta, which lost the most important tool for political survival – legitimacy from the governed. Gorbachev's reforms made policy-makers beholden to well-informed and empowered citizens who now demanded and had the opportunity to choose their own fate. This was Gorbachev's most powerful impact on governmental decisions and remains his lasting legacy.

One of the major decisions inspired by the new democratization of foreign policy decisions during the tenure of the first President of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin, involved the shift in foreign policy schools of thought from Westernism to Statism.[140] Boris Yeltsin's first Minister of Foreign Affairs, Andrei Kozyrev, served in this capacity from the inception of the Russian Federation until early 1996.[141] Kozyrev was a fervent believer in Western liberal democratic principles and made no compromise in his belief that complete cooperation with the West was necessary in the post-Cold War era.[142] Kozyrev and Yeltsin

[138] Ibid, 170.
[139] Ibid.
[140]Tsygankov, A. Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006).
[141]Ibid.
[142] Ibid.

were both liberal-minded Russians who sought a new chapter of harmonious relations with previous adversaries to the point of what may be perceived as capitulation by the Russian public. Kozyrev was the advocate of this new approach to international affairs, which can be described as the Westernist school of thought. [143]

Gone were the days when policy formulation was confined to the debates of government elites with no regard for the masses they governed. Glasnost and democratization made it impossible for the Russian government to make decisions without being beholden to the people, who were well-informed of international developments and maintained the right to use their power in the voting booth. Boris Yeltsin made a major miscalculation in his approach to the new foreign policy during his first term. Namely, he never took into account the possible reaction of his constituents. The question of whether rapprochement with the West to the point of publicly perceived capitulation would unnerve his people was not an important facet in Yeltsin's foreign policy formulation, and this blatant disregard for the new forces that have transformed the Russian Federation cost him a great deal of political capital. Russia was in search of its new identity on the world stage and Boris Yeltsin attempted to forge one that was naturally and characteristically adverse to the perceived Russian role in world affairs by the citizens he governed.

After spending several years pursuing peaceful and conducive integration with the West, Yeltsin and Andrei Kozyrev were reluctant and ill-advised to acknowledge the importance of public opinion. Two reasons may be attributed to this. The first is that both men schooled in Soviet politics were still totalitarian in character and were riding on the institutional momentum of the historical era that ended in 1985, notwithstanding their devotion to liberal principles of Western influence. The second is that this was, above all

[143] Ibid.

else, the first democratic presidency in Russia and the relationship between the public and office of the Russian President was ill-defined and not clearly understood by its occupant and his advisors. The disconnection was apparent throughout Yeltsin's presidency by the authoritarian tendencies he maintained during his tenure and the abysmally low approval ratings he had. According to *The New York Times* article detailing the election results in 1995, it makes specific mention that Vladimir Zhirinovsky, the ultranationalist who opposes any cooperation with the West, and his party gained significantly in the Duma, as well as the Communist party led by Gennady Zyuganov who similarly opposed the engagement with the West advocated by Kozyrev.[144] According to election results published by *The New York Times*, both parties won heavily in the Duma and were energized to begin a political coalition that could successfully combat the presidency of Boris Yeltsin.[145] The Russian people voted in significant numbers and elected members to the Duma who advocated Eurasianism as opposed to Atlanticism or the Westernist school of thought. The Kozyrev course was conclusively and undeniably rejected by the Russian people. Yeltsin's authoritarian disregard for the wishes of the masses damaged him politically and he was in crisis mode until the end of his presidency.

The true essence of democracy is when governments are genuinely fearful of their people.[146] In Boris Yeltsin's case this took the form of Kozyrev's dismissal after the disastrous 1995 parliamentary elections and the appointment of Yevgeni Primakov, who advocated a Statist approach to international affairs, which balanced East and West and

[144]Michael Specter, 'Opposition Gains As Russians Elect New Parliament', The New York Times,18 Dec. 1995, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 11 Feb. 2012.

[145] Ibid.

[146] The Thomas Jefferson Encyclopaedia, 'Spurious Quotations', The Thomas Jefferson Foundation [web page] (1996), < http://www.monticello.org/site/jefferson/when-governments-fear-people-there-libertyquotation>, accessed 2 Mar. 2013.

sought to leverage the great powers for Russia's benefit.[147] Boris Yeltsin's new chief foreign policy minister and foreign affairs path were chosen to be in sync with what the voters wanted. The forces of democratization guaranteed that any elected chief executive of the Russian Federation needed to maintain a political course compatible with a well-informed and empowered public or risk the end of his or her political career, which is exactly what Gorbachev's reforms desired and accomplished.

Ultimately, the Russian people were unhappy because of their perception of Yeltsin's capitulation to the West and NATO, its military alliance.[148] NATO was seen as being an intrusive force invading the post-Soviet space and Eastern Europe. The benefits for the Russian Federation were difficult to discern and the people perceived Yeltsin and Kozyrev as puppets of the United States that compromised Russian security for integration with the West. Professor Michael McFaul argues that Russia was successful in defending its traditional sphere of influence under Kozyrev and criticism of integration with the West was not fair.[149] Any examination of Kozyrev's diplomacy will show that NATO expansion was stalled to a substantial degree and Primakov continued this trend.[150] Regardless, this is not how voters perceived Russia's rapprochement with the West, and they voted overwhelmingly for a new course. Allen Lynch asserts, 'Why then was Kozyrev sacked in favour of Primakov? Already before 1993 was out, Kozyrev was becoming a growing liability for President Yeltsin in terms of the domestic politics of Russian foreign policy.'[151] Boris Yeltsin's re-election campaign was to start the following year and he made a politically astute decision to begin a new foreign policy path under Primakov. This

[147] Tsygankov, A. Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006).
[148] Allen C. Lynch , 'The Realism of Russia's Foreign Policy.', Europe-Asia Studies [online journal] , 53/1 (2001), 7-31 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/826237>, accessed 17 Feb. 2012.
[149] Ibid.
[150] Ibid.
[151] Ibid, 21.

demonstrated to his constituents that he was listening and ready to make changes in order to acquiesce to their wishes. Legitimacy by popular support was now the most important force in the Russian Federation and this was an early instance of how powerful the average citizen became in the new Russia.

Boris Yeltsin's Legacy:

At the time of his death in 2007, Boris Yeltsin was erroneously considered the standard bearer of Russian democracy and the complete antithesis to his hand-picked successor, President Vladimir Putin. In 2007, Vladimir Putin was navigating on the world stage with deep pragmatism and calculated risk-taking. Putin's foreign policy was a cohesive and succinct expression of the Russian Federation's new role in world affairs. It would not kowtow to the West and would not become beholden to the East. It was an independent arsenal of tactics, policies, and strategies to start a new chapter in Russian foreign policy. No one would have even considered crediting Boris Yeltsin with Putin's fundamental exercise of an enhanced, powerful presidency granted by a constitution expressly empowering the office of the Russian chief executive. A major facet of Vladimir Putin's 'sovereign democracy' is a powerful presidency with powers to be the ultimate decision-maker and policy formulator.[152] Any examination of Yeltsin's presidency is incomplete without examining the transformation of the Russian presidency during his tenure.

It is true however that Yeltsin was the first democratically elected President, but Archie Brown unequivocally dismisses the notion that Yeltsin was a democratic stalwart

[152] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

and founder of the new Russian system of government.[153] 'Yeltsin came close to cancelling the 1996 presidential contest and only allowed it to go ahead when he knew that, with TV on his side and huge sums of money from the oligarchs, he could win. He overlooked vote-rigging in both Duma and presidential elections.'[154] Yeltsin was first and foremost a political agent of the liberal-minded intelligentsia, but that does not negate his grab for power and the willingness to do anything to maintain it. It is clear that the Yeltsin Administration sought unfair advantages during its tenure, and it would be a baseless assertion to claim that Yeltsin was the vanguard of the new democracy. The rule of law when it did not suit his needs or purposes was non-existent in Yeltsin's mind. His authoritarian tendencies did not simply vanish when the Soviet Union dissolved. A man, even as liberal-minded as he was, could not suddenly abandon the Soviet methods and tendencies that were definitive of the time period in which his early political experiences were formed. Free and fair elections, criticism from the news media, and accountability to the constituents were still revolutionary concepts in the new Russian Federation. Success in the new Russia required Yeltsin to engage in some political posturing and power grabbing reminiscent of the Soviet era.

A focal point for the analysis of this body of research is the 1993 coup against Yeltsin, which turned out to be a constitutional crisis in which the Russian President prevailed over the legislature and national judiciary. The presidency clashed with the legislature over what branch of government would occupy the higher position on the hierarchy.[155] Yeltsin felt that any democratic institutions that infringed or impeded his

[153] Archie Brown, 'The Real Yeltsin Legacy.', The Guardian, 26 April 2007, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 23 May 2012.
[154] Ibid.
[155] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

ability to exercise complete authority over the affairs of the state were to be weakened or neutralized. It was this imperial view of his power and the mechanisms that were transformed by this that were inherited by his successors, which is now a major facet of the Russian political arena. According to Archie Brown:

> Yeltsin's main merit as President of post-Soviet Russia was that he preserved many of the freedoms introduced by Gorbachev. His principal fault was that he helped discredit the very ideas of democracy which had evoked real enthusiasm in the last three years of the Soviet Union. This was partly a result of his lack of interest in democratic institution-building. He was disdainful of political parties, and refused to join one. He was scarcely less dismissive of legislatures, most literally in 1993 when he ordered the bombardment of the parliament building. He had little understanding of the significance of the rule of law.[156]

The constitutional period that ended when the 1993 constitution was adopted was a short period in the new Russian Federation when the Russian presidency operated under the rule of law, cooperation of the legislature, and consent of the judiciary. It was for a short time a legitimate democracy in the sense that no organ of government possessed nearly unlimited power. Boris Yeltsin's lasting legacy was not the preservation of democracy, but rather the empowerment of the Russian presidency, a central theme in this thesis.

Relations between the Russian legislature and Yeltsin were tense and adversarial from the beginning. Boris Yeltsin never felt that it was proper for the Russian President to be beholden to any legislator representing a small fraction of the Russian constituents. There was never a doubt in the mind of Yeltsin that the Russian presidency was a position of dominance and superiority over the other branches of government. The judiciary and legislature were inferior in status and power according to Yeltsin's imperial view of presidential power. There were mechanisms of power that were to be out of the scope of the

[156] Archie Brown, 'The Real Yeltsin Legacy.', The Guardian, 26 April 2007, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 23 May 2012.

other branches of government, and Yeltsin sought to solidify this by constitutional means in order to ensure his success.

Yeltsin was a liberal by instinct. He regarded the Communist years with dread and the collective leadership of Khrushchev and Brezhnev were feeble attempts to manoeuvre the organs of power at the apex of the governmental apparatus. The power struggles and political gridlock between Alexei Kosygin and Leonid Brezhnev during the formative years of Yeltsin's career must have contributed to this view of presidential entitlement according to a 'Goldgeieran' analysis. The need to solidify power by means of either coalescing powerful bureaucrats to your pursuit or neutralizing them to clear the path was the scourge of Communist times. Such chaos within the powerful ranks of policy-makers left Yeltsin with the belief that the chief executive must be an unquestionable and superior figure in the Russian government. It is with this defining experience of his formative years that he fought attempts to force him out of power after his dictatorial tendencies ingrained themselves in the office of the presidency.

The new Russian Federation was governed by a poorly defined 'peaceful coexistence' between a parliamentary system and presidential executive office. The President and the legislature operated with different impulses; the Russian legislative body believed it was the sole lawmaking authority. The President believed his office's primary responsibility was to formulate the country's policy decisions to his liking. Both believed that legitimacy granted to them by voters entitled them to free rein over the affairs of government. A battle of wills ensued over which branch of government was the primary policy-maker. This early battle in the new country's history established the status quo for intergovernmental interaction, which defined the Russian presidency as being a more powerful and pervasive force over all elements of the government. The new constitution

adopted in 1993, which was authored by Boris Yeltsin, set the tone for a dynamic that precluded outright challenges to the Russian presidency's dominance in governing and lawmaking. This was a direct reflection of Yeltsin's vision of the Russian presidency. The trauma of the October 1993 crisis left both sides unwilling to engage in governmental infighting and constitutional jousting in future disagreements.[157] This event was a cataclysmic event that shaped the future of presidential-parliamentary relations. Therefore, the constitution adopted as a result of this crisis has remained nearly unchanged, except for a few minor revisions regarding the term limits of the Russian presidency. No significant alteration of presidential power granted by the constitution was ever enacted after 1993.

The President of the Russian Federation became the official leader on top of the power hierarchy within the government. Presidential decrees and national referendums are the ultimate weapons of the presidency. Ultimately, the legislature can be overruled when clashing with the wishes of the Russian President. Thomas Remington states:

> The constitution gives the President the power to enact decrees (ukazy) without requiring any special delegation of power; this is "constitutional decree power." The President does not even face the constraint that existed under the previous constitution, when parliament delegated him emergency decree power but reserved for itself the right to block his decrees by countermanding them.[158]

Therefore, Boris Yeltsin ensured that the will of the Russian President be the overwhelming force in government. The 1993 constitution allowed the Russian President to be the ultimate policy-maker and this reduced the legislature to a secondary body of minor importance that was left neutralized in the event of conflict with the office of the presidency. The Russian Duma's main mode of inquiry into the affairs of the presidency was 'government hour,' which entailed a non-invasive and voluntary hearing for legislators

[157] Thomas F. Remington, 'The Evolution of Executive-Legislative Relations in Russia since 1993.', Slavic Review [online journal] , 59/3 (2000), 499-520 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2697343>, accessed 30 Mar. 2012.
[158] Ibid., 505.

to seek information from the executive branch.[159] This was hardly ideologically compatible with an 'equal branches' model of government. Yeltsin sought to curtail the power of others in his pursuit to consolidate his own power to govern imperiously in opposition to proposed transparency and forced cooperation with the other branches of government.

Yeltsin left the Russian presidency a powerful position, which contrasted sharply with the multiple limitations and hindrances of wielding power when he entered it. The Soviet Constitution of 1978 had been designed for collective leadership, and there was an inherent aversion to the Soviet model of government in Yeltsin's new life as the first democratic President of Russia. Any federal ambiguities ceased to exist in the new Russian government when Yeltsin sought not only to be head of state but also de facto head of the government with the President's constitutional right to appoint the Prime Minister and constitutionally granted ability to dissolve the legislature in the event that his nominee is rejected three times.[160] This effectively means that the Russian Duma has no choice but to accept the President's nominee to control the reins of the government under threat of being dissolved and repeating the 1993 constitutional crisis in which the government nearly imploded. The 1993 constitution essentially demoted the Russian legislative body to an inferior status.

Yeltsin's place in history will be one of some contradiction. He was both democratic and authoritarian; this hybrid of political persuasions has ingrained itself in the office he occupied. Without explicitly outlining the relationship between the judiciary, legislature, and presidency, Boris Yeltsin leapt forward in promoting economic reform. The dismal economy, which had been a constant malady in Russia for several decades, needed to be rehabilitated and reformed. Yeltsin sought to reform the economy first and placed

[159] Ibid.
[160] Ibid.

political matters, such as the grievances of his political opposition, to a lower priority category. The adoption of market capitalism and its inherent problematic adjustments stymied progress for the duration of Yeltsin's tenure. This preoccupation with the economy left relations between the legislature and presidency to be defined and resolved on an ad hoc basis using informal mechanisms with the cooperation of both branches.

Yeltsin's opponents felt he was abusing his power and not allowing the other branches of government to function properly, while Yeltsin claimed his actions were justified within the scope of his office. The needed economic reforms required political leeway and the Soviet Constitution of 1978 was a relic of history and obsolete for modern times. Yeltsin sought to redefine the Russian presidency to suit his needs and ensure the success of future successors to act without the impediments of governmental oversight or obstruction. The constitution of 1993 is Boris Yeltsin's gift to any successor who wishes to exercise vastly superior powers when compared with the other branches of government.

In order to fully understand Boris Yeltsin's legacy in foreign policy-making during the Medvedev presidency, it is of central importance to examine relevant articles of the Russian Constitution in 1993 that detail the enhanced role of the presidency. These articles in the 1993 constitution were Yeltsin's lasting legacy in the institution he occupied first in the Russian Federation's history.

An examination of pertinent excerpts of the 1993 Constitution:

Let us start with an examination of Chapter 4 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation.

CHAPTER 4. THE PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION
Article 80[161]

1. The President of the Russian Federation shall be the Head of State.

[161] Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010), < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.

2. The President of the Russian Federation shall be the guarantor of the Constitution of the Russian Federation and of human and civil rights and freedoms. In accordance with the procedure established by the Constitution of the Russian Federation, he (she) shall adopt measures to protect the sovereignty of the Russian Federation, its independence and State integrity, and shall ensure the coordinated functioning and interaction of State government bodies.

3. The President of the Russian Federation shall, in accordance with the Constitution of the Russian Federation and federal laws, determine the basic objectives of the internal and foreign policy of the State.

4. The President of the Russian Federation, as the Head of State, shall represent the Russian Federation within the country and in international relations.

The Russian presidency is given its new role beginning in Article 80 of the 1993 Russian Constitution. Provision 2 stipulates that the President is responsible for ensuring 'coordinated functioning and interaction of state government bodies.'[162] This precludes the judiciary or legislature from engaging in constitutional or ad hoc mechanisms to resolve bureaucratic or intergovernmental squabbles and conflicts when the President chooses to take the matter into his or her own hands. The President is the sole guarantor that the government will work effectively and cohesively, which can give the Russian presidency legal and constitutional leeway to act in what the office believes the best interests of the constituents. Furthermore, provisions 3 and 4 magnify the President's role by explicitly mentioning that the office is responsible for determining 'the basic objectives of the internal and foreign policy of the State.'[163] This means that the President initiates and implements policies with regards to national legislation and foreign affairs. The fourth

[162] Ibid.

[163] Ibid.

provision emphasizes this as designating the President as chief representative of the Russian constituents nationally and abroad. Yeltsin authored this in order to maintain complete authority over foreign affairs and to limit the legislature's role in domestic matters. Yeltsin envisioned the presidency as being threefold: chief representative abroad, most influential in terms of legislation, and the most important advocate for the Russian citizens. Therefore, this confluence of responsibilities blurred the lines between the executive and legislative branches, while relegating the judiciary from attempting to intervene in the event of intergovernmental gridlock.

Article 83 further demonstrates the enlargement of presidential authority and constitutional entitlements.

Article 83[164]

g) shall form and head the Security Council of the Russian Federation, the status of which shall be determined by federal law;

h) shall approve the military doctrine of the Russian Federation;

i) shall form the Administration of the President of the Russian Federation;

j) shall appoint and dismiss plenipotentiary representatives of the President of the Russian Federation;

k) shall appoint and dismiss supreme commanders of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation;

l) shall appoint and recall after consultations with appropriate committees and commissions of the chambers of the Federal Assembly diplomatic representatives of the Russian Federation in foreign States and international organisations.

[164] Ibid.

Article 83 gives the Russian President superior constitutional authority and presidential prerogatives in order to not repeat the 1993 clash in which the executive and legislative bodies of the government sought to clarify the governmental hierarchy. Boris Yeltsin's bureaucratic legacy, which has greatly defined the foreign policy-making process in the Russian Federation, is his adoption and instalment of the Russian National Security Council. The relevant details for this decision-making mechanism are discussed later in this chapter. For constitutional purposes, the consultative body, which included a wide range of diplomatic, defence, and political members, was to remain out of the Duma's jurisdiction and intentionally lack transparency. This deliberative body became the Russian presidency's chief avenue to formulate foreign policies and decisions to looming crises. The implementation of foreign policy however stemmed from the President's ability to control the presidential administration, Ministry of Defence and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In essence, Boris Yeltsin constitutionally obstructed any other branch of government to impede or infringe on his selection of diplomats, military commanders, and presidential appointees. The legislative body had no influence or authority to intervene in presidential affairs, which is what Yeltsin sought. Article 83 enlarges the Russian President's authority to establish military doctrine as he or she wishes and formulate diplomatic relations on the world stage, as well as implement these presidential prerogatives. Lastly, there is the last provision that calls for 'consultations with appropriate committees and commissions of the chambers of the Federal Assembly.'[165] This last provision is essentially meaningless as there is no mechanism to accept or reject the President's appointees.

[165] Ibid.

Article 84[166]

The President of the Russian Federation:

a) shall announce elections to the State Duma in accordance with the Constitution of the Russian Federation and federal law;

b) shall dissolve the State Duma in the cases and in accordance with the procedure provided for by the Constitution of the Russian Federation;

c) shall announce referendums in accordance with the procedure established by federal constitutional law;

d) shall submit draft laws to the State Duma;

e) shall sign and promulgate federal laws;

f) shall address the Federal Assembly with annual messages on the situation in the country and on the basic objectives of the internal and foreign policy of the State.

Article 84 reflects Boris Yeltsin's battles with the Russian legislature from 1991 to December 1993 that left a lasting impact on his philosophical view of the presidential role in government. Not only did he seek to empower the presidency in relation to its control of the executive branch, but he also sought to neutralize the legislative body by expanding the role of the President in legislative affairs. Therefore, the powerful presidential system allows the Russian President to be the chief executive and most powerful legislator. The President has the option of submitting draft laws and signing them into federal law. This vast and encompassing role in Russian affairs places the presidency on the top of the power hierarchy. There is no doubt that any future occupant of the Russian presidency will be opposed to any diminished role by constitutional amendment. Yeltsin's constitution is a gift

[166] Ibid.

to any President who seeks to impose his or her will in opposition to the legislative body or political opponents in general.

Article 85[167]

1. The President of the Russian Federation may use conciliatory procedures to resolve disputes between State government bodies of the Russian Federation and State government bodies of constituent entities of the Russian Federation, and disputes between State government bodies of constituent entities of the Russian Federation. In the event that no agreed decision is reached, he (she) shall have the right to refer the dispute to the appropriate court.

2. The President of the Russian Federation shall have the right to suspend acts of executive government bodies of constituent entities of the Russian Federation in the event that these acts conflict with the Constitution of the Russian Federation and federal laws or with international commitments of the Russian Federation, or violate human and civil rights and freedoms until the issue is resolved by an appropriate court.

The first provision of Article 85 assigns the President as the chief mediator and primary official to maintain cohesion in the government. In the event that the governmental gridlock is not resolved by the President, the judiciary is to settle the matter. However, Boris Yeltsin neutralized the judiciary by expanding the membership of the Russian Supreme Court and appointing pro-government judges.[168] This trend has continued under Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev. Therefore, the judiciary has been altered to become compatible with the wishes of the Russian presidency. It is theoretically and practically impossible to challenge the actions of the Russian President.

[167] Ibid.

[168] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).

Article 86[169]

The President of the Russian Federation:

a) shall direct the foreign policy of the Russian Federation;

b) shall hold negotiations and sign international treaties of the Russian Federation;

c) shall sign instruments of ratification;

d) shall receive letters of credence and letters of recall of diplomatic representatives accredited to his (her) office.

The 1993 Russian Constitution specifically emphasized that the Russian presidency is the sole foreign policy-maker and is not beholden to any branch of government in this regard. The Russian President's role is to direct foreign policy, participate in mediation of international conflicts, sign any interstate ratification, and be the sole interlocutor for foreign diplomats and ambassadors. The legislature and judiciary have no role in any of these categories and are to allow the President full mobility to operate with the presidential mechanisms granted to him or her by the constitution.

Article 87[170]

1. The President of the Russian Federation shall be the Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation.

2. In the event of aggression against the Russian Federation or of a direct threat of aggression, the President of the Russian Federation shall introduce martial law on the territory of the Russian Federation or on certain parts thereof and shall immediately inform the Council of Federation and the State Duma of this.

3. The regime of martial law shall be defined by federal constitutional law.

---

[169] Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010), < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.

[170] Ibid.

Article 87 reflects Yeltsin's desire to always keep the defence apparatus solely under the President's authority. The coup against Yeltsin failed abysmally because the plotters failed to take into account the allegiance and importance of the armed forces. The military commanders claimed to be neutral but ultimately sided with Boris Yeltsin and cooperated with orders to attack the Russian White House.[171] The military was not a political organ, but it did respect authority, which it felt the democratically elected President had over quarrelsome legislators who felt Yeltsin was being authoritarian. The generals felt that the chain of command must be preserved and the chain led to the Russian President. Yeltsin learned from his successful battle against the attempted coup and specifically authored an article that in no uncertain terms made the military beholden to the President and no one else. In the event of an attack deemed by the Russian presidency to be a threat to national security, the President is constitutionally empowered to declare martial law. This gives the President the ability to militarily impose his will on any breakaway region or neighbour that engages in what can be construed as dangerous activity.

Article 88[172]

The President of the Russian Federation, in the circumstances and in accordance with the procedure envisaged by federal constitutional law, shall introduce a state of emergency on the territory of the Russian Federation or on certain parts thereof and shall immediately inform the Council of Federation and the State Duma of this.

Article 88 complements article 87. Yeltsin's motives for this article were not as noble as one might assume. The President is required to 'inform the Council of Federation and the State Duma' in the event of a state of emergency.[173] In practical terms, this means

[171] The BBC, 'Boris Yeltsin: President of Russia 1991 - 1999', BBC [web page] (2013), <http://www.bbc.co.uk/wales/ps/sites/politicsguide/hall_of_fame/pages/boris_yeltsin.shtml>, accessed 3 Feb. 2013.
[172] Ibid.
[173] Ibid.

that the President will convey his reasons for taking such actions, but this is the extent that these two organs of government are to be involved. In essence, the Council of Federation and State Duma have no role in this process. The Russian President is free to act decisively and quickly as he or she wishes without any intergovernmental hindrances. In the next article, this newfound presidential superiority is given legal luxuries that continue the constitutional trend of empowering the Russian presidency.

Article 91[174]

The President of the Russian Federation shall have immunity.

Yeltsin sought an imperial presidency, which made the rule-of-law inapplicable to his office. According to his philosophical view of the presidency's role in the Russian government, the President must be free of any legal hindrances and not subject to the threat of imprisonment. In history, democratically elected leaders have been subjected to legal penalties in the event that the national judiciary believed that an abuse of power was committed.[175] Richard Nixon, for example, resigned as a result of using his office to obstruct a criminal investigation of the American White House during his tenure.[176] This coup against Yeltsin sought to remove him because of his purported abuse of power in the same vein. Therefore, Yeltsin believed that the Russian presidency must not be legally liable to regard the rule-of-law and must be immune to any criminal or civil investigation. This entitled the President to exercise his or her power to a maximum degree by the absence of judicial oversight as stated in the 1993 constitution. Boris Yeltsin envisioned a presidency free of legal hindrances to conducting presidential duties, and his successors have benefited greatly from this enhanced office they inherited from him.

---

[174] Ibid.

[175] A. Schlesinger Jr., The Imperial Presidency (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2004).

[176] Ibid.

Article 93[177]

1. The President of the Russian Federation may be impeached by the Council of Federation only on the basis of charges of high treason or of another grave crime brought by the State Duma and confirmed by a resolution of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation on the existence of indications of a crime in the actions of the President of the Russian Federation and by a resolution of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation confirming that the established procedure for bringing charges has been observed.

2. The decision of the State Duma to bring charges and the decision of the Council of Federation to impeach the President must be adopted by two-thirds of votes of the total number of members of each chamber on the initiative of not less than one third of deputies of the State Duma and on the basis of a resolution of a special commission set up by the State Duma.

3. The decision of the Council of Federation to impeach the President of the Russian Federation must be adopted not later than three months after the State Duma brings charges against the President. If a decision of the Council of Federation is not adopted within this time the charges against the President shall be regarded as having been declined.

Regardless of Yeltsin's authoritarian tendencies and imperial philosophy of the presidential role in government, he still believed that the presidency was not an absolute monarchy. There were to be rare circumstances in which the President may be impeached. As the Yeltsonian model of the presidency envisioned, a terrible act against the state justified impeachment. However, the wording of this constitution is vague and poorly-defined. 'Charges of high treason or another grave crime' has no actual meaning or

[177] Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010), < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.

relevance.[178] In theory, the State Duma, which is comprised of legislators of different political and philosophical leanings, would never be able to unify against the President by agreeing that certain actions fit this vague wording. An attempt to impeach the President would fail because legislators could never agree on whether the actions justified impeachment. Furthermore, the Council of Federation is not elected by the people but by the State Duma, who are legislators advised by their party bosses and channels from the Kremlin on whom to select. This makes the impeachment process difficult to separate from the influence of the Kremlin. Lastly, the State Duma has ninety days to decide on this matter from the day charges were brought against the President. This stipulation makes it nearly impossible for impeachment to occur. Legal and political proceedings are rarely as fast as this constitution requires and this was another hindrance to presidential impeachment authored by Boris Yeltsin in order not to repeat the coup against him in 1993. In essence, impeaching the Russian President is highly improbable because of the constitutional constraints. With the presidency being an enormously powerful institution, the next chapter of the constitution emphasizes that the Russian President controls all the levers of power in the government.

CHAPTER 6. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Article 110[179]

1. Executive power in the Russian Federation shall be exercised by the Government of the Russian Federation.

2. The Government of the Russian Federation shall consist of the Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation, deputy chairmen of the Government of the Russian Federation and federal ministers.

[178]Ibid.

[179] Ibid.

Article 111[180]

1. The Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation shall be appointed by the President of the Russian Federation with the consent of the State Duma.

2. Nominations for the Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation shall be submitted not later than two weeks after a newly-elected President of the Russian Federation assumes office or after the resignation of the Government of the Russian Federation or within one week after the State Duma has rejected a nomination.

3. The State Duma shall consider the candidate nominated by the President of the Russian Federation for the post of Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation within one week after the submission of the nomination.

4. In the event that the State Duma rejects the candidates for the post of Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation three times, the President of the Russian Federation shall appoint the Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation, dissolve the State Duma and announce new elections.

Article 110 lays out that the Chairman of Government (Prime Minister) is responsible for maintaining bureaucratic, constitutional, and fiscal issues pertaining to the operating mechanisms of the Russian government. Therefore, the Prime Minister is a highly important officeholder who is second in power only to the President. The role of Prime Minister was envisioned to successfully manage the government, while the President was the ultimate decision-maker and policy formulator in domestic and foreign affairs. Article 111 gives the power to appoint the Prime Minister to the President, and his or her choice is to be submitted to the legislature. If the State Duma rejects the nominee three times, under

[180] Ibid.

the law of decree the President may dissolve parliament and call for new elections.[181] This effectively limits the Duma's role in choosing the Prime Minister and it must either consent or risk being dissolved. The President is not only the head of state because of this, but he or she by virtue of being the selector for Prime Minister is the de facto head of government as well. This ensures the President that he or she controls virtually all of the levers of power. Yeltsin's goal of empowering the presidency was achieved by constitutional means.

Reflections:

The office of the Russian presidency was inherited by Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev, who had free rein to control foreign policy decisions to an unusual degree. No major foreign policy decision was made without the Russian President's express approval. Boris Yeltsin established this over-arching ability to allow the President to calibrate foreign policy with a high level of foresight, policy input, and mobility. No legislator or jurist will ever successfully obstruct the policies on the world stage initiated by the chief executive of the Russian Federation. This inherent facet of Russian foreign policy decision-making maintains its relevance to the present day. The Yeltsonian model of an empowered executive branch of government has survived two decades without the opposition ever being remotely close to amending the constitutional powers of the presidency in the 1993 constitution. This is Boris Yeltsin's lasting legacy and the Yeltsonian forces of presidential policy-making persist in every decision made by the Putin-Medvedev regime. As was outlined in the introduction, the Governmental Politics Model is used in this body of research to examine the key players in government and how they coexist with the powerful political forces of the Russian Federation.

[181] Ibid.

The Governmental Politics Model:

Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow's seminal book, *Essence of Decision*, is utilized for the purpose of analysing Russian foreign policy decision-making in this thesis.[182] Allison sets forth two analytical frameworks, which jointly are known as 'the Bureaucratic Politics Model.'[183] In his work, he aimed to analyze the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 using the Rational Actor Model, Organizational Politics Model, and Governmental Politics Model.[184] Allison acknowledges the importance of the rational actor theory, but concludes that it alone is lacking a comprehensive approach to understanding the internal dynamics of decision-making. [185] Therefore, *Essence of Decision* advocates the two models of analysis that fill the void left by the Rational Actor Model.[186]

The Governmental Politics Model, which will be used for the purpose of this thesis, involves the primary actors in the decision-making process of the Russian Federation. The Organizational Politics Model posits that a better explanation of foreign policy decisions can be deduced by investigating the various agencies and ministries involved in the decision-making process.[187] Namely, each organization within the decision-making apparatus has its own institutional preferences, methods, and mechanisms to contribute to the policy formulation.[188] Furthermore, the synergy between the intergovernmental organizations and whether they unify or clash are important factors that must be addressed and investigated in order to achieve a better understanding of the decisions and policies borne from this process. While this certainly will be a consideration, organizations are ultimately guided by individuals at the apex of power. It is for this primary reason that an

[182] Graham T. Allison and Philip D. Zelikow, Essence of Decision, (Boston, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publisher Inc., 1999).
[183] Ibid.
[184] Ibid.
[185] Ibid.
[186] Ibid.
[187] Ibid.
[188] Ibid.

analysis of the key players accounts for the majority of research for this thesis. Secondly, the Governmental Politics Model complements the ultimate gap between policy and policy-making by examining the motives, ideologies, and other contributory factors of the highest officials within a governmental ministry or agency involved in the decision-making process. There must be a personal analysis of decision-making figures in order to fully understand the complexity of the policy formulation. For example, the decisions made by the Russian President are to be understood by examining the office of the Russian presidency by analyzing the occupant of the office and how he or she approaches the challenges of formulating decisions.

Graham Allison's Bureaucratic Politics Model has received its fair share of criticism.[189] Three reasons for this exist. First, the Bureaucratic Politics Model is intellectually neglectful of socially and historically contingent factors on the word stage.[190] The internal dynamics of decision-making according to Graham Allison's model takes into account consequential factors on the world stage but does not acknowledge these as fundamental when compared with the departments and officeholders of those involved in the policy formulation apparatus.[191] Second, the model of analysis is not fully cognizant of the impact of global interdependence and liberal institutionalism, which are two hallmarks of the 21th century.[192] The integration of the global economy and world institutions governing international economic and political affairs are powerful forces shaping the world stage. The Bureaucratic Politics Model is an internal examination of the decision-making and therefore it remains limited in its cognizance of these external forces.[193]

---

[189] Jonathan Bendor and Thomas H. Hammond, 'Rethinking Allison's Models.' The American Political Science Review, 86/2 (1992), 301-322 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1964222>, accessed 1 Dec.2011.

[190] Ibid.

[191] Ibid.

[192] Ibid.

[193] Ibid.

Thirdly, critics contend that Allison's model is systematically designed for the American government and is not applicable to foreign governments.[194] The book's analysis focuses solely on the Kennedy Administration in 1962, and the author does not elucidate on how this system of analysis may be applied to different governments.[195]

On this last point, *Essence of Decision* would have been difficult to regard as applicable to the Soviet government. First, the Secretary General of the Soviet Union was not the chief executive, but rather a leader among bureaucratic elites who were constantly engaged in power struggles. The Secretary General position was at times and depending on the individual more akin to a 'secretary' than a 'general.' There was no National Security Council in the Soviet Union until 1990 and its use was nominal at best. Allison's book was written about a democratic government granted legitimacy by its constituents. The Soviet Union could not have been analyzed using the Bureaucratic Politics Model. A Communist totalitarian government led by cabals of bureaucratic elites and its inherent power struggles affecting the decisions of the Secretary General had no relevance or place in Allison's literature.

The Russian Federation, however, is an entirely different proposition, and it is suited to Graham Allison's literature. First, as Yeltsin desired, the Russian presidency is the supreme decision-making body of the state. There is no doubt that within the government as granted by the 1993 constitution the President is the sole occupant of the highest position on the policy formulation hierarchy. With Gorbachev's reforms and empowerment of the constituents, regardless of who the occupant of the Russian President's office is, he or she must take public opinion into account. There is no Russian President who can disregard the wishes of the governed, unless he or she wishes to lose the necessary legitimacy to govern,

[194] Ibid.

[195] Graham T. Allison and Philip D. Zelikow, Essence of Decision, (Boston, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publisher Inc., 1999).

which may create the viability for an ouster by the people or a lost election. These important changes from Soviet times have made the Russian government compatible with Graham Allison's model of analysis.[196] The Russian Federation is governed primarily by a chief executive with superior constitutional entitlements at the behest of the governed. This fits 'the Allisonian model' perfectly.

From an organizational standpoint, Yeltsin's adoption of a National Security Council further integrates it with Allison's literature. The structure of Russia's foreign policy apparatus is similar to the United States. The structure maintains the Russian President's superiority in the process, while utilizing the National Security Council to include a wide array of advisors from the presidential administration, Ministry of Defence, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This systematic approach to responding and initiating reactions to world affairs is highly compatible with Allison's model and serves the purpose of this thesis. The agencies and ministries, as well as key figures of these units, are a source of analysis for understanding the path the Russian Federation has taken during the Medvedev presidency from 2008 to 2012.

Structure of analysis of key players in the current Russian government:

The Russian Constitution of 1993 makes the State Duma a virtual non-entity in the grand scheme of policy formulation with regards to foreign affairs. Foreign policy is firmly in the hands of the President, and this powerful presidential system limits the relevance of various governmental bodies in policy deliberations. The decision-making by the Russian presidency is not beholden to any agency or ministry whether in the executive branch or a non-executive branch. The presidency maintains supremacy over the Russian government, but it is entirely beholden to the constituents from which it gains its legitimacy. These

[196] Jonathan Bendor and Thomas H. Hammond, 'Rethinking Allison's Models.' The American Political Science Review, 86/2 (1992), 301-322 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1964222>, accessed 1 Dec.2011.

clashing forces of democratization and imperial presidential powers are emblematic of the vastly different area of research that Kremlinology is compared with Sovietology.

This body of research in essence with the Governmental Politics Model examines key officeholders in the Russian Federation's foreign policy apparatus. As the author of this thesis has decided, the chief bureaucrats of the foreign policy apparatus as determined by involvement in formulation and implementation of decisions have been examined as opposed to examining departments and bureaucrats with a marginal participation in decision-making. The Governmental Politics Model is a mode of analysis with an inherent focus on the chief decision-makers.[197] Therefore, the author excluded bureaucrats who because of the agency or role in government did not affect decision-making or remained steadfastly in the background to assist and prop up the vital members of the Kremlin. Dmitry Medvedev and Anatoly Serdyukov's connections to Technocrats serving in the presidential administration and Vladimir Putin and Nikolai Patrushev's links to their former KGB operatives now serving in the Russian Federation's FSB are foregone conclusions. The links to like-minded individuals who support the decision-makers is a well understood fact, but the thesis relies on the actions of the chief policy formulators, not the bureaucrats who serve them. The chief bureaucrats leading the offices of the Russian presidency, Head of Government (Prime Minister), Russian Security Council, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Ministry of Defence outweigh the importance of the other facets of the foreign policy apparatus because the Russian Federation's decisions are primarily formulated and implemented in these organs of government.

President-Prime Minister:

The Russian presidency is examined in a two-fold process. First, the individual occupying the office will be understood by utilizing Graham Allison's mode of analysis of

[197] Graham T. Allison and Philip D. Zelikow, Essence of Decision, (Boston, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publisher Inc., 1999).

his or her formative years. Secondly the Gorbachovian and Yeltsonian forces affecting and ultimately defining the Russian presidency are investigated and synthesized in order to contribute to the overall goals of research.

Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev are the faces of modern Russian leadership. Their place in history will be cemented with the positive transformation of the Russian Federation after the Yeltsin years. Dmitry Medvedev's tenure as President saw a man schooled in the Soviet era engage in political posturing completely different from the age of his formative years. There is no doubt that the foreign policy decisions he made were formulated with the distinct possibility that voters would reject his policies and vote him out of office. Therefore, the Russian presidency and Russian popular opinion are interconnected. No man or woman in the office of the presidency will make decisions that will either harm themselves or their party irreversibly. Political expediency and kowtowing to the wishes of the governed are therefore inherent with the decisions made by the Putin-Medvedev regime. The Gorbachovian forces of democratization have empowered the people to an unusual degree in which their voices cannot be ignored.[198] This aspect maintains a high priority in this thesis.

The 1993 constitution as previously discussed has contributed the Yeltsonian forces that created an imperial presidency. The President of Russia has full authority to control the Russian Security Council, Chair of Government, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Ministry of Defence. In no uncertain terms, does the judiciary or legislature have significant means or influence to alter the chosen path by the office of the presidency. This important empowerment of the Russian presidency has made the Secretary General position of the Soviet Union and President of the Russian Federation before the 1993 constitution pale in

[198] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).

comparison with the enormous differences in scope of unquestionable power. These fundamental changes in the chief executive position exert a powerful measure of control on the mechanisms of establishing and conducting diplomatic relations and responding to crises on the world stage. Constitutionally, the President may appoint anyone without governmental oversight of any nature. The President is not beholden to any other government branch or mechanism.

From May 2008 to May 2012 Vladimir Putin was constitutionally required to step down and appointed to the position of Prime Minister. This position, while certainly powerful, precluded him from being the official top decision-maker. The Russian Constitution was amended and has now allowed him to be President until 2024 under foreseeable circumstances. This 'lying in wait' certainly did not lessen his influence. The Prime Minister still maintained a grip on the reins of government, and for the purposes of examining Russian foreign policy still summons and maintains an unusual degree of influence over the mechanisms of the foreign policy apparatus. Putin was appointed by his protégé who became President, and it is apparent that Dmitry Medvedev had no moral or political qualms about this 'tandem arrangement.'[199] Speaking about his close partnership with Putin in the final days of his presidency, Medvedev emphasized that this arrangement is beneficial and will continue.[200] Medvedev stated:

> It's not bad when the country's future and political life depend not only on the whims of one man, but when all decisions are taken after a discussion, when there are several people in the country who can influence the political process. This is normal. This is movement toward democracy. Everybody should relax. This is for a long time.[201]

[199] Andrew Osborn, 'Dmitry Medvedev's Russia still feels the cold hand of Vladimir Putin', The London Telegraph, 7 Mar. 2010, in Google News Archive, accessed 1 Mar. 2012.
[200] Nataliya Vasileya, 'Medvedev Predicts Long Life for Tandem with Putin', Salon, 26 Apr. 2012, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 May 2012.
[201] Ibid.

For the purpose of this thesis' analysis, the presidency will therefore be examined as Putin-Medvedev. A hybrid of interests, which as seen by Putin's return to the presidency in 2012, as being guided by the Prime Minister more so than the hand-picked President who wilfully and happily demoted himself to allow his predecessor and mentor to return to power. *The London Telegraph* noted in 2010 that the Putin-Medvedev relationship was not an equal partnership and that this was most evident by President Medvedev addressing his Prime Minister as 'vy' as one would address a superior, while Prime Minister Putin addresses President Medvedev by the casual 'ty' as one would address a junior colleague.[202] This stark example speaks volumes about the power dynamic between the two, and it is not surprising that Vladimir Putin exerted unrelenting influence on Medvedev's decision-making process. This was evident during the Medvedev years and the looming 2012 election in which Putin was re-elected; this election was surely on the minds of the Putin-Medvedev duo. This political marriage between a Silovik, who is characterized by the hawkish worldview that is inherent with his KGB background, and a Technocrat, who is characterized by a liberal temperament and methodical style that are inherent with his background as a legal professional, maintained its relevance and prevalence throughout every foreign policy decision. Dr. Graham Allison, author of the Governmental Politics Model and director of the Belfer Centre at Harvard University, stated during an interview with the author: 'You have a nominal man on the throne and a power behind the throne as far as the Governmental Politics Model is concerned.'[203] As *The Moscow Times* noted a few months before Medvedev's ascension to the presidency, an overwhelming percentage of citizens polled trust Medvedev because of his closeness with Putin, who remains the

[202] Andrew Osborn, 'Dmitry Medvedev's Russia still feels the cold hand of Vladimir Putin', The London Telegraph, 7 Mar. 2010, in Google News Archive, accessed 1 Mar. 2012.

[203] G. Allison, 'The Governmental Politics Model in Perspective' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 19 December 2012, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

most popular living politician in the Russian Federation, notwithstanding the occasional protests from opposition groups.[204] This is a testament to the Gorbachovian forces of democratization. Namely, this 'tandem democracy' was only possible because popular support did not erode for Putin, and therefore his successor was able to come to power with ease.

The President of the Russian Federation leads a bloated bureaucracy full of conflicting ideologies, interests, and personalities. The Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Russian Security Council are fundamental organs for the formulation of foreign policy. The three groups in government are the Siloviki, the Technocrats, and the Yeltsin Liberals. These organs are therefore full of individuals who fall within one of these groups and it will be the purpose of this research to examine and ascertain what results from policy debates within the Kremlin. The Security Council of the Russian Federation is a prudent tool to not only communicate decisions, but to bring defence and foreign affairs interests within the President's grasp while allowing the three groups that maintain a powerful presence in the Russian government to come together in a formal setting and formulate policy by virtue of face-to-face discussion. This mechanism and the inherent groups within the formal sessions of deliberation will be examined to understand Russia's new pragmatism under the Putin-Medvedev regime.

The Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation, as evident during the 1993 coup, has maintained an affinity and compatibility with the Russian Federation's executive leadership. The Russian military and its generals have shown, particularly during the 1993 coup, a predisposition is to be guided by an unquestionable executive office, which incidentally follows the 'chain of command' mentality by military personnel. Therefore, the

[204] 'Medvedev's Strength Is Putin: Poll', The Moscow Times, 16 Jan. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 20 May 2012.

military and defence officials in the Russian Federation maintain their loyalty to the chief executive and seek to influence his or her decisions according to their own sense of international security, which can be characterized as a hawkish vision of Russian dominance in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, as well as containing NATO.[205] Russian defence has been historically opposed to NATO enlargement and remains a prevalent factor in its policy views.[206] The Minister of Defence Anatoliy Serdyukov is an important bureaucrat for the analysis of Russian foreign policy decisions during the Medvedev presidency.

Minister of Defence Anatoliy Serdyukov:

The Russian Ministry of Defence was headed by Anatoliy Serdyukov, a St. Petersburg Technocrat, brought in with Putin's Siloviki as a counterweight to the Yeltsin Liberals who still occupied many positions within the government. After six years of being under the leadership of Silovik Sergei Ivanov, the Ministry of Defence was now guided by a Technocrat who has made little effort to disguise his role as a reformer during the Medvedev presidency. His reforms were centred on ending corruption, accelerating progress, and revitalizing defence capabilities by adjusting the apparatus to fit the times. Serdyukov commented, 'No mobilisation, no large-scale war, no threats from Nato. Why was the threat of Nato so popular with the military? Because it allowed them to maintain the old system and consider themselves useful, even though the officers of those divisions had been doing nothing for the last 15 years.'[207] The Cold War mentality was seen as a faux pas in some Russian political circles and updating the defence apparatus was long overdue.

---

[205] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[206] Ibid.

[207] Andrei Zolotov Jr, 'Less is more for Modern Military', The London Telegraph, 22 Sep. 2009, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 20 May 2012.

The Russian Federation has been well-acquainted and maintained a working relationship with NATO since the early Yeltsin years and the Partnership for Peace. NATO was no longer the most serious security threat in the perceptions of the less hawkish bureaucrats in the Russian government.

Serdyukov has been unpopular to date because of his reforms, which are not seen by all to be advantageous for Russian defence capabilities. General Yuri Baluyevsky's conflict with his superior, the Minister of Defence, is a microcosm of the inner departmental turmoil Serdyukov has had to deal with. Namely, the military traditionalists hardly view NATO and the West as non-threats and for them the Cold War never ended. General Baluyevsky in his position as Chief of General Staff had been a vocal opponent of the Serdyukov reforms, which he believed encroached on the military generals' ability to maintain the Cold War defence apparatus and its capabilities. In addition to this, General Baluyevsky opposed the Ministry of Defence's growing power over the generals and this was seen as a major reason for his transfer to the Russian Security Council.

Ultimately, Serdyukov's tenure as Minister of Defence had brought in a pragmatic, reform-minded leadership with a starkly different worldview from his predecessor, Sergei Ivanov. Serdyukov's background was not in Soviet espionage or intelligence, but rather in accounting. His approach to defence issues were methodical, systematic, and balanced from a policy standpoint. Namely, the accountant from St. Petersburg possesses none of the jingoistic or security impulses as Putin and the Siloviki. The Ministry of Defence was led by a minister during the Medvedev presidency that was intent on accelerating modernization and efficiency. In addition to this, the reforms facilitated an inherent empowerment of the Minister of Defence's position over the generals. This fact contributes

to the thesis and its structural framework of analyzing Serdyukov's input in foreign policy decisions. The Minister of Defence is now a major force in the decision-making process.

Russian Security Council Secretary Nikolai Patrushev:

The Russian Security Council is an advisory board with the unique task of bridging the gap between the diplomats and generals and unifying the different wings of government in order to advise the President. The Russian Security Council has no direct effect on the mechanisms of foreign policy except for being a forum for deliberation. The Russian Security Council is open to all members as desired by the President, so the advisory board is not limited to the same individuals. What is certain is that the Russian Security Council is controlled by Nikolai Patrushev, whose long career in the KGB and Silovik mentality are well known. A stark example of Patrushev's worldview is illustrated by the selection of his deputy, General Baluyevsky, who maintains the 'Cold War warrior' mentality and hardline Soviet worldview. Namely, this can be described as a mistrust of the West and NATO. These two men were responsible for drawing up the 2010 military doctrine and 2009 National Security Strategy.[208] Both men are ardent advocates of increasing Russia's international prestige and power and this was greatly infused into the writing of crucial documents for Russian foreign policy.[209] Nikolai Patrushev, Russian Security Council Secretary said:

> Today, on February 5, President Medvedev approved the Military Doctrine. First of all, I would like to say that in May of last year the President adopted the national security strategy up to 2020, where the national defence is determined as one of the strategic national priorities. We should continue to work on the strategy, and the Military Doctrine is one of the results of this work.[210]

---

[208] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[209] Ibid.

[210] Russia Today, 'Russia's New Military Doctrine Approved', Russia Today [web page] (2010) <http://rt.com/usa/russia-military-doctrine-approved/>, accessed 31 Jan. 2012.

The Silovik worldview is a powerful influence in the decision-making process. The Russian Security Council maintains this position and maintains the ability to tilt foreign policy decisions in this manner. The Russian Security Council may posses a wide variety of opinions, ideologies, and biases, but the chief Russian Security Council agent possesses the ability to influence doctrines and decisions according to his or her liking by virtue of acquiring the Russian Security Council Secretary position. There can be little doubt that the Russian Security Council possesses an affinity for Vladimir Putin and like-minded individuals who are schooled in the KGB and are primarily concerned with Russia's power status on the world stage. *RIA Novosti* reported Nikolai Patrushev as saying:

> In an interview with the *Izvestia* daily, Security Council head Nikolai Patrushev said Russia's national security can be ensured by "achieving an array of strategic national priorities," including the country's sustained development and its evolution as "a competitive state" with a hi-tech industry, a modern defence capability, and "decent living standards." In this context, he said Russia rejects NATO military expansion plans and attempts to grant the military alliance a global role. Russia is ready to build relations with NATO and the United States on the basis of equality and respect for international law.[211]

A major point of contention by the Russian Security Council Secretary is that the world's security architecture is tilted in the West's favour.[212] This is a common grievance among Siloviki and military traditionalists that the OSCE, NATO, and most security arrangements are adversarial toward the Russian Federation and pose a significant threat to Russian security. Rarely do trade agreements, human rights, territorial issues, or any other aspect of international politics create 'political waves' among Russian policy-makers. Security is an issue that takes precedence among the Russian political intelligentsia and Kremlin leaders. Military reforms have changed the composition of the Russian armed forces, but nuclear capabilities have been reinforced by doctrine and a proactive approach

[211] RIA Novosti, 'Russian President Approves National Security Strategy until 2020', RIA Novosti [web page] (2009) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20090513/121575657.html>, accessed 20 May 2012.
[212] Ibid.

to ensure that Russia is not lagging behind. While treaties and executive agreements have been dovish in the sense that a sensible approach to nuclear weapon issues by virtue of The ABM Treaty and New START Treaty has been pursued on the part of the Russian Federation, its nuclear apparatus has remained robust. As the Russian Security Council document states:

> The main challenge of strengthening national defence in the medium term is the transition toward a qualitatively new profile for the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation, while maintaining the potential of the strategic nuclear forces, by improving the organizational staff structure and system of territorially-based troops and forces, increasing the number of divisions at constant readiness, and likewise improving operations and combat training, as well as improving the organization of interaction among different troops and forces.[213]

The Russian Security Council was Boris Yeltsin's initiative to create an efficient tool to provide a cohesive forum to formulate policies and assemble the important players in the foreign policy apparatus. Both Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev have used this forum to deliberate policies and convey decisions within the upper echelons of government. It has served both as a tool for communication and policy discourse. The thesis will examine how exactly the Silovik controlled Russian Security Council affects the dynamics of three distinct groups competing for influence in this advisory forum.

The Silovik worldview is understood best as an array of tactics on the world stage ensuring Russian security and prosperity in addition to an aversion toward Western security architecture and influence in the Eastern hemisphere, especially in Europe and the post-Soviet space. The Silovik worldview consists of the hawkish truculence and Cold War mentality of the former KGB operatives who insist that Russian power on the world stage and the international security sphere not remain infringed, entangled, or inhibited in any manner. Vladimir Putin's first presidency from 2000 to 2008 has shown an affinity for this

[213]Rustrans, 'Russia's National Security Strategy to 2020', Rustrans [web page] (2009) <http://rustrans.wikidot.com/russia-s-national-security-strategy-to-2020>, accessed Jan 31 2012.

vision of Russia's role on the world stage, but Russian foreign policy during this period has shown him to oscillate between cautious cooperation with the West and hawkish insistence that the United States and the West do not overextend their tentacles in the Eastern hemisphere. For example, Vladimir Putin assisted the Bush Administration's invasion of Afghanistan to the chagrin of the supremely hawkish bureaucrats, such as then Minister of Defence Sergei Ivanov, but wholeheartedly opposed the Iraq War and the Missile Defence Shield in the Czech Republic. Putin opposed both efforts by the United States to prevent the possibility of a nuclear arms race and regional instability in the Middle East. The Silovik worldview bends from outright anti-Western posturing to conciliatory, but cautious engagement.

Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergei Lavrov:

Sergei Lavrov has been Minister of Foreign Affairs since 2004 after 10 years of being the Russian Ambassador to the United Nations. Throughout his career, which began during the Soviet era, Lavrov has remained a diplomat working in the world's multilateral status quo. His years at the United Nations are a testament to his experience navigating among the world's representatives and conducting multilateral negotiations. Being a 'Yeltsin Liberal' who established his career during the 1990's has precluded him from exerting influence comparable to the Siloviki and the Technocrats. His ascension to the position of Minister of Foreign Affairs remains a powerful position to exercise his control in foreign policy formulation, but the inner sanctum of former KGB agents and educated professionals who once worked in Putin's political circle in St. Petersburg remain and have been a powerful barrier between Lavrov and the ear of the Russian President.

From a logistical standpoint, the Minister of Foreign Affairs requires frequent travel to fulfil his duties and this is another obstacle for Lavrov in terms of penetrating the inner

sanctum. Russia's foreign policy since the inauguration of Putin has been more assertive, principled, and independent. This is a complete reversal of the Yeltsin liberal foreign policy, which made Russia beholden to the West out of respect for Western civilization and a cognizance of the loss of the Cold War. Lavrov's foreign policy liberalism will be assessed as to whether it evolved or remains the same. In addition to this, Lavrov's role in the policy equation will be ascertained and compared with the powerful heads of the Russian Federation's government. Lavrov's role as travelling Minister of Foreign Affairs and foreign policy advisor will be a focal point of the decisions made during the Medvedev years.

Lavrov's bona fides as a skilled diplomat are beyond reproach. His intellect, experience, and versatility make him a formidable negotiator and advocate. His ten years on the United Nations Security Council are viewed by the general public as being highly successful. According to Patrick Jackson's article: '"I think everybody viewed him as the most powerful personality on the Security Council during his time there, with a rapid mind, with comprehensive and accurate knowledge and awareness of what was going on, and with a capacity for articulate intervention which could easily change the tenor of the debate," one UN insider told the BBC News website.'[214] Lavrov, even though a major player in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the Yeltsin years, was not viewed by anyone as a capitulator to the West or formidable powers on the world stage.[215] The Kremlin has kept him in powerful positions from the inception of the Russian Federation. His status as a visible player remains unchanged during the Putin-Medvedev years. Therefore, his importance in the policy debates deserves proper scrutiny.

[214] Patrick Jackson, 'Profile: Putin's Minister of Foreign Affairs Lavrov', The BBC [web document] (2007), < http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/6242774.stm>, accessed 18 June 2012.
[215] Ibid.

The Yeltsin years saw an emphasis on multilateral diplomacy as opposed to hawkish defence diplomacy. Kozyrev and Primakov were powerful advocates of their own respective foreign policy stances. Both men maintained powerful voices in the political and public debates during the 1990's. The Minister of Foreign Affairs was a powerful position in relation to President Yeltsin, but the Putin-Medvedev years have seen a different treatment of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The foreign affairs arm of the government has remained to a major extent unchanged with the same Yeltsin Liberals occupying powerful positions in diplomacy. For example, Vitaly Churkin, a diplomat who rose to prominence during the Yeltsin era, now occupies Lavrov's previous position as Russian Ambassador to the United Nations in New York City. The Kremlin maintains the predisposition of not appointing Siloviki or Technocrats to the foreign affairs arm of the government. This predisposition reflected an increasing trend of emphasizing defence and executive leadership over the diplomats in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Ultimately, Sergei Lavrov's role as policy formulator in Russia's affairs with other states has its barriers. The role of chief diplomat is not one that Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev feel that a member of the inner sanctum should occupy. '"The position of the head of *Mid* has been fairly marginalised over the last decade," says Sarah Mendelson from the Centre for Strategic and International Studies in Washington.'[216] 'I have the impression that the weight of foreign policy decisions is being decided in other parts of the government.'[217] The foreign policy decisions of the Russian Federation during the Medvedev years have certainly included Sergei Lavrov, but his role and by a larger extent the role of chief diplomat will be examined to alter and update the fundamental understanding of Russia's Minister of Foreign Affairs position.

[216] Ibid.
[217] Ibid.

Reflections:

The Kremlin today is shaped by democratic and constitutional forces. The Gorbachovian forces of democratization, which were facilitated by the reforms of the 1980's and early 1990's, have forever altered the relationship between the citizenry and government officials. There is very little doubt that legitimacy by virtue of the consent of the governed is a high priority for those occupying powerful positions in the Russian government. Regardless of political ideology, background, or motivation, every elected government official must now recognize that political survival requires acting compatibly with an empowered and informed citizenry. The Russian presidency however is at the apex of the Gorbachovian forces. Russian Presidents are careful in public not to disparage or discount the voices of the citizens, but Boris Yeltsin had little regard for those within the government who aimed to insert themselves in his path. The 1993 coup against Yeltsin, which turned out to be Yeltsin's greatest legacy, paved the way for the creation of an imperial presidency, the Yeltsonian forces. Boris Yeltsin was cognizant of the democratized and empowered masses he now governed, but the mechanics of the government were regarded as being nuisances. He therefore tailored the 1993 Russian Constitution to fit his needs and ensure that the presidency is unconfined by the judiciary or legislature. The Russian presidency was now unquestionably at the apex of power. This clash of forces on the ultimate decision-maker in the Russian government requires a comprehensive examination.

The decision-making by virtue of the vital bureaucrats and the offices they occupy within the constitutional framework of a powerful presidency that is ultimately subservient to the will of the constituents is a key aspect of this thesis. The Russian Constitution authored by Yeltsin in 1993 ultimately relegates all branches and departments in

government in relation to the superior presidency.[218] The Russian presidency exists in a political environment where it may act in any manner within the government but externally must maintain a public persona that appeases the Russian public.[219] The claims of a 'virtual politics' are not wholly applicable because any political party or president may be voted out of office.[220] Therefore, while the presidency may confine the organs of government because of constitutional entitlements, the Russian public still maintains its superiority over any and all elected officials.

The delicate balance between the ardent views of the public and the personal popularity of Vladimir Putin and his party's endorsement of actions when the public's views are lacklustre in either direction has been addressed in this thesis. As proven in the case studies, the Russian public's views of Georgian 'aggression' and President Bakiyev's mercurial pro-American posturing emboldened the Kremlin to make decisions in response to these issues. In the case of Western-labelled 'rogue regimes' when the Russian public had no discernible opinion, the Putin-Medvedev duo were emboldened by their popularity to shape Russian public opinion. The thesis assessed the Russian public's relationship with the Kremlin's leadership in terms of whether legitimacy was granted by the constituents. Political legitimacy was now the fundamental tool in the 'new Russian political environment' by virtue of the Gorbachovian effects of democratization.[221] However, in the case of the Yeltsonian forces, which were authored and implemented by the 1993 Russian Constitution, the Russian presidency is able to bypass popular opinion when formulating foreign policy decisions.[222] This poses the risk of political demise, but as seen in

[218] Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010), < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.
[219] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).
[220] A. D'Agostino, The Gorbachev Revolution (New York, NY, New York University Press, 1998).
[221] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).
[222] Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010), < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.

Medvedev's decision to disregard the Russian public's possible outrage over NATO intervention and the resulting crisis in legitimacy for the Putin-Medvedev duo during the Syrian crisis, the Gorbachovian and Yeltsonian forces coexist independently and simultaneously. Therefore, the 1993 Russian Constitution expanded the powers of the presidency and the effects of Gorbachev's democratization that empowered the people are powerful contributory factors in which the Kremlin has had to have a populist approach in a country where the government is a quasi-democratic apparatus, especially when public opinion is vigorous in regards to a certain issue. Therefore, when the Russian public is unengaged regarding a certain issue or the President chooses to ignore the citizenry, any decision may be made as stated in the Russian Constitution. This, the Yeltsonian constitutional powers, is a conflicting force against the Gorbachovian democratization. The main players of the Kremlin will be examined considering these themes.

The important players in the policy formulation are the President, Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister of Defence, and Russian Security Council Secretary. The confluence and cohesion in the debates of these individuals in response to important foreign policy events will be examined to understand how the Russian Federation acts on the world stage. Graham Allison's Governmental Politics Model is best suited for the needs of this research; it posits that a government's decisions are best understood when examining the main policy-makers.[223] The synergy, friction, and clashes of those important individuals result in the product of decisions made in response to challenges on the world stage. This synthesis of examining the major players and the clashing forces of the system they have inherited from Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin are important facets in understanding Russian foreign policy during the Medvedev presidency.

[223] Graham T. Allison and Philip D. Zelikow, Essence of Decision, (Boston, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publisher Inc., 1999).

Chapter 2: Russia's War

Introduction:

Dmitry Medvedev's first major foreign policy challenge was not with the West or the United States, but rather a neighbouring country within the post-Soviet space. A new age with a vastly different world stage brought the Kremlin into a war that signified an assertive Russia much different from the Yeltsin era when Russian participation in world events was marginal at best. The United States during 2008 was already involved in two costly and extensive wars. The American efforts in Afghanistan's reconstruction demanded Washington's attention in light of severe structural and societal problems, and the military surge in Iraq, while providing a measure of ample success, created a limitation on American military resources. The West was simultaneously dealing with a financial crisis that complicated its involvement in world affairs. The trans-Atlantic alliance was problematic for these two primary reasons. The West was financially and military unable to extricate itself from the looming problems it was facing. Russia was free to assert itself in its former sphere of influence and made two vital foreign policy decisions with respect to Georgia. It responded to Saakashvili's military in Georgia's breakaway regions with disproportionate force and the Russian Federation ceased hostilities after five days. Dr. Lincoln Mitchell, Georgia scholar and professor at Columbia University, noted: 'Russia stopped because Russia wanted to stop. They didn't have to stop there and could have escalated further. Russia stopped Russia.'[224] This foreign policy issue will be analyzed in this chapter as the Medvedev era's first major foreign policy episode.

Mikhail Saakashvili's tenure was troublesome for the Kremlin from the very beginning. The Rose Revolution in Georgia ousted President Eduard Shevardnadze for

[224] L. Mitchell, 'Russia's war with Georgia' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 12 December 2012, School of International & Public Affairs, Columbia University, New York, New York

corruption, a former Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs who maintained close relations with his former underlings who were now integral members of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Throughout Shevardnadze's tenure, he sought to strengthen Russian-Georgian ties. Saakashvili's first few months saw a complete reversal of Georgian foreign policy. Namely, at Saakashvili's inaugural European Union flags were raised and the new President announced that Georgia will integrate with Europe and the West.[225] Saakashvili visited NATO headquarters on many occasions with his Minister of Defence and Minister of Foreign Affairs in order to seek NATO's support for implementing defence goals and integrating Georgia with NATO's security architecture.[226] Russian foreign policy-makers were beginning to see a newly assertive Georgia increasingly exercise a pro-West, pro-NATO alignment under its new leadership. Georgia's ties with the Russian Federation were reprioritized to minor importance. Saakashvili possessed little desire to continue Georgia's existence as a capitulator to Russia. These actions were adverse to Russia's interests and security concerns developed as a result. The Russian Federation's main goal was to maintain a strong defence against NATO enlargement, which in the first decade of the 2000's seemed unstoppable. This clash of interests and divergent foreign policies created fertile ground for a tense relationship unseen in the history of Russian-Georgian relations.

Saakashvili maintained no ties to Putin's inner sanctum or anyone from the Soviet regime. Therefore, the Kremlin was distrustful and suspicious of the new Georgian leader from his inauguration. Hence, Dr. Lincoln Mitchell states: 'Georgian foreign policy was to become a client of the West. That was his (Saakashvili's) policy and his ultimate goal. That

[225] Times Topics, 'Mikheil Saakashvili', The New York Times [web page] (2013) < http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/mikheil_saakashvili/index.html>, accessed 25 May 2012.

[226] NATO Update, 'Press Releases', NATO [web page] (2012) <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_38988.htm>, accessed 3 May 2012.

framed the relationship with Russia.'[227] The new Georgian foreign policy only added fuel to an increasingly tense relationship. Prior to Russia's decision to respond to Georgian forces militarily, *The Economist* noted that Vladimir Putin's dislike for the 'maverick President' is a direct reason for the Russian Prime Minister stating that the Russian Federation would retaliate militarily if the Georgian military involvement in the breakaway regions continued.[228] 'Misha (Saakashvili) and Putin, there was personalized rancour. They just didn't like one another. Putin could not stand how Misha would not play along. Misha personally insulted him by calling him "Liliputin" (midget Putin), and Putin responded by saying he would hang Saakashvili by his testicles.'[229]

The Russian Prime Minister made a forceful warning of an impending military response, while the technocratic President remained visible but not as vocal.[230] *The Economist* noted that despite Medvedev's presidency and technocratic leanings, the security-minded officials and hardliners in the Kremlin's foreign policy apparatus, the Siloviki and military traditionalists, may sway the new Russian President's decision into starting a war with Georgia.[231] The new President inherited a government with a strong presence of Putin's like-minded former KGB agents and hardline military personnel. Medvedev was now at the apex of the decision-making power structure with the same rivalries that plagued his predecessor's tenure. Ian Bremmer and Samuel Charap's analysis of the dynamics of these rivalries in the Kremlin was relatively similar to 2008 when Medvedev's term began, except for the notable difference that a new President with a

[227] L Mitchell, 'Russia's war with Georgia' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 12 December 2012, School of International & Public Affairs, Columbia University, New York, New York

[228] 'War Erupts in Georgia', The Economist, 8 Aug. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 May 2012.

[229] Ibid.

[230] Ibid.

[231] Ibid.

different background and temperament compared with his predecessor was now in charge.[232]

'The Five Day War,' as it now known, was Russia's reminder to the world that it was a formidable force with a modernized, competent military. Russia's exercise of military strength was intended to reflect a changing momentum, where Russia may intervene unilaterally on the world stage without any hesitation or cognizance of the West, which the latter had seen its influence over world affairs increase exponentially since the end of the Cold War. The decision regarding this military response to Georgia was made by the collusion of Putin's Siloviki, Medvedev's Technocrats, and the Yeltsin Liberals in a war-oriented policy. The war provided the Medvedev era with its first opportunity to shift the balance of power in the post-Soviet space in the Russian Federation's favour. This momentous episode produced an important decision that had a powerful impact on Russia's standing in the court of world opinion and symbolized its new assertiveness unseen since Soviet times.

On the third anniversary of the war in 2011, President Medvedev reflected on Russia's successful attempt of stripping Georgian control of the breakaway regions.[233] Medvedev made no effort to hide his antipathy toward the Georgian President.[234] In a *New York Times* interview, Medvedev stated that he would 'never shake hands' with the Georgian President and that Saakashvili should be tried for war crimes.[235] Furthermore, Medvedev blames the conflict on Western interference in Georgia's government, and he claims had the Russian Federation continued the conflict all the way to Tbilisi it would

[232] Ian Bremmer and Samuel Charap, 'The Siloviki in Putin's Russia: Who They Are and What They Want', The Washington Quarterly [online journal], 30/1 (2006), 83–92 <http://www.units.muohio.edu/havighurstcenter/russianstudies/documents/siloviki.pdf>, accessed 18 July 2012.

[233] Ellen Barry, 'Russian President Says U.S. Had Role in Georgian Conflict', The New York Times, 5 Aug. 2011, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 1 May 2012.

[234] Ibid.

[235] Ibid.

have seen the ouster of Saakashvili.[236] The Russian President's assertiveness was a microcosm of the new Russian foreign policy, which differed significantly from the early years of the Russian Federation. 'The Five Day War' was a signal to the world that the 'new Russia' would be a powerful force in world affairs and should not be discounted.

The Decision:

The decision to respond militarily was Medvedev's ultimatum after years of tension and intervention in the Georgian separatist conflict. Because of Georgia's geographic proximity, such an issue could not be ignored by the Kremlin. Territorial issues threatening a country always take precedence, and it is for these primary reasons that the Russian Federation sent peacekeepers and military personnel to observe the situation. While Saakashvili claims that the Russian military had been preparing and bolstering its forces for an imminent war, neither NATO, nor US Defence officials acknowledge this.[237] On the contrary, NATO and the US Defence Department have admitted that the Russian military was far below levels of any tangible build up and the Georgian claim is baseless.[238] As a world summit and Olympic Games had commenced in Beijing, so had an intense bilateral dialogue between Vladimir Putin and George W. Bush.[239] The dialogue was further substantiated by Prime Minister Kevin Rudd's proximity to the two men as they had this discussion and it seemed that the two were enveloped in what was happening between Russia and Georgia, rather than the sports they had come to watch.[240] While President Medvedev was officially the chief executive, it was his official underling who attended the

---

[236]Ibid.

[237] Nicolai N. Petro, 'The Russia–Georgia War: Causes and Consequences.' Global Dialogue [online journal], Vol. 11 (2009), <http://www.worlddialogue.org/content.php?id=439>, accessed 17 May 2012.

[238]Ibid.

[239] Reuters, 'Bush and Putin Discuss Georgia Fighting', Reuters [web page] (2008) < http://uk.reuters.com/article/2008/08/08/us-georgia-ossetia-bush-idUKWAT00988620080808>, accessed 29 May 2012.

[240] Luke Mkilveen, 'Kevin Rudd reveals Bush-Putin argument at Opening Ceremony', The Australian, 10 Aug. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 May 2012.

games and spoke directly with the American President. Putin's influence seemed to have not waned with his demotion to Prime Minister. For example, rarely did Georgia's Prime Minister have such a public and vocal position with regards to the conduct of this war when compared with Saakashvili.

When asked about the impromptu diplomatic discussions, George W. Bush responded to NBC News: 'I was very firm with Vladimir Putin -- he and I have got a good relationship -- just like I was firm with the Russian President, Dmitry Medvedev.'[241] Bush in this statement inadvertently admitted that Putin was the primary interlocutor with whom to discuss this issue. As *The Economist* noted, Putin had no qualms about issuing a direct warning to Georgia that a military strike will occur if it continues its anti-separatist efforts.[242] The Yeltsonian forces of a superior presidential system as granted by the 1993 Russian Constitution have made it viable for any Prime Minister to exert such influence according to the constitutional framework and the Russian President's behest. The new Putin-Medvedev leadership seemed to be inextricable from one another and the 1993 Russian Constitution, while giving the President unquestionable authority over his underlings and other branches of government, now accommodated the Silovik power base that had been in the Kremlin since Putin's ascension to the presidency in 2000. Putin's Siloviki never left the government despite having their faction's leader demoted to Prime Minister, and the Putinist rhetoric continued even though Putin was the second most powerful official in the Russian Federation.

Yeltsin's legacy of empowering the Russian presidency remains relative in this new political arrangement of the President and Prime Minister acting as a two-man executive authority. Article 80 of the Russian Constitution clearly outlines that the Russian President

[241] Elaine Quijano, 'Bush Mixes Diplomacy, Sports in Beijing', CNN, 11 Aug. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 May 2012.

[242] 'War Erupts in Georgia', The Economist, 8 Aug. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 May 2012.

is the chief interlocutor and policy-maker for foreign affairs.[243] Boris Yeltsin envisioned a presidency that was unencumbered by any non-executive branches of government or any of his underlings. There was to be no obstacle by policy mechanisms or rule of law. The President maintained absolute authority in foreign affairs and the constitution reflected this Yeltsonian legacy. The issue of the Putin-Medvedev governing arrangement is possible because of the Yeltsonian forces that empower the President to have the constitutional right and luxury to appoint his underlings without effective legislative or judicial oversight. Chapter 6 of the Russian Constitution as authored by Yeltsin allows the Russian President to be the sole official to select a Prime Minister of his or her choosing without any actual mechanisms to block such an appointment.[244] When Dmitry Medvedev became President, the decision to appoint Putin was wholly his and no member of his presidential administration or any other departmental sector of government could have successfully objected to this. The President was empowered to appoint whomever he desired according to Article 111.[245] The State Duma has no alternative but to confirm the President's appointment or risk being dissolved.[246] The Yeltsonian forces of the presidency allow the chief executive to enforce his or her will constitutionally and according to his or her own preferences. It is for these primary reasons that the State Duma had no choice but to confirm Vladimir Putin as the new Prime Minister.

The system of the Russian Federation can be described as a 'superior presidential mode of governing,' and a necessity of maintaining this system is being able to appoint anyone at the President's behest. Boris Yeltsin understood that a successful presidency must be ingrained with tremendous and unquestionable authority to exert control over

[243] Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010), < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.
[244] Ibid.
[245] Ibid.
[246] Ibid.

matters of national and international interests to the Russian Federation. Boris Yeltsin was known to appoint an inner circle of his own full of loyal Yeltsin Liberals and family members rather than government officials based on merit, so too can future Presidents appoint their own inner circle for top tier positions. In this case, Vladimir Putin had appointed a St. Petersburg legal professional to serve as Prime Minister during his presidency, and now President Dmitry Medvedev was able to do the same only in reverse because of the Yeltsonian constitutional legacy. Yeltsin's inherent practice of choosing government officials from his own preferred list of confidantes has continued to this present day in the Kremlin. The 'tandem democracy' as the Kremlin called it was essentially a constitutionally and legally sound arrangement, which allowed Vladimir Putin to maintain a powerful presence in government. The former President of the Russian Federation was now part of a governing duo that essentially led the government into its first major war since the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. The Technocrats as led by Medvedev and Siloviki as led by Putin were now at the apex of the foreign policy decision-making apparatus. This political union and hybrid of interests were now set to converge or diverge in policy debates with respect to foreign affairs.

Dmitry Medvedev's decision to order a military response to Georgian forces and therefore start a war was carried out in the context of the Yeltsonian constitutional forces that emboldened him to make such a pronounced statement on the world stage. The decision to go to war carries with it a great deal of unintended consequences for a President in a democratic government. According to Graham Allison's Governmental Politics Model, the examination of this decision would require to delve into the mindset of the chief executive and what options that mental process drove Medvedev to consider.[247] As Robert

[247] Graham T. Allison and Philip D. Zelikow, Essence of Decision, (Boston, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publisher Inc., 1999).

Kennedy's account of the Cuban Missile Crisis gave a stark insider's view of the events leading up to the successful avoidance of a nuclear confrontation in 1962, he mentions that President Kennedy was cognizant of the possibility that he may be impeached if his response were deemed foolish, illegal, or disproportionate.[248] The 1993 Russian Constitution contains two articles that are relevant to the Russian President's decision to go to war. Namely, Articles 91 and 93 empower the President to be virtually unimpeachable and shielded from the rule of law and legislative oversight.[249]

During Dmitry Medvedev's speech announcing his decision he said: **'**In accordance with the Constitution and the federal laws, as President of the Russian Federation it is my duty to protect the lives and dignity of Russian citizens wherever they may be.'[250] This statement was spoken with the confidence of knowing that the Yeltsonian constitutional forces protected him to an unusually high degree, specifically the articles dealing with the legality of the Russian President's actions. 'Article 91: The President of the Russian Federation shall have immunity' is the single most important constitutional entitlement allocated to the President.[251] It is a powerful article that allows the Russian chief executive to make decisions with constitutional protection from accusations that a policy or policies may be illegal. The Russian Constitution expressly protects the President from any such accusation of malfeasance or legal challenge.[252] Furthermore, Article 93 complements Article 91 by making the process of legally challenging a President virtually impossible.[253] The 1993 Russian Constitution vaguely defines what exactly qualifies as 'treason or grave

[248] R. Kennedy, Thirteen Days (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, 1969).
[249] Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010),
< http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.
[250] The President of The Russian Federation, 'Statement on the Situation in South Ossetia', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008)
<http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2008/08/08/1553_type82912type82913_205032.shtml >, accessed 29 May 2012.
[251]Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010),
< http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.
[252] Ibid.
[253] Ibid.

crimes' and requires a resolution from the Russian Supreme Court, which was neutralized during the Yeltsin presidency by expanding membership and appointing pro-government judges to life-terms. The judiciary has never posed as an obstacle to the Russian President since the inception of the Russian Federation. Furthermore, the process of convincing two-thirds of members of the State Duma and bringing the charges, which have no constitutional definition or precedence as what qualifies as 'treason or grave crimes', to the Council of the Federation that is legally obligated to adopt the measure to impeach the President within 90 days of the charges having been brought forth is cumbersome and nearly impossible to accomplish. The wheels of the legal system do not turn so quickly and efficiently. Dmitry Medvedev's decision therefore was made with no concern for his legal survival and this created a powerful accelerant for the decision to respond to Georgian military operations against Russia.

Dmitry Medvedev's perceptions and priorities were inspired because of his legal background. His four years as President saw an unprecedented battle against governmental corruption directed by the office of the Russian presidency.[254] According to Graham Allison and James Goldgeier's respective modes of analysis, Medvedev's legal profession most certainly influenced his decisions, agendas, and policies. It would be difficult to separate his legal upbringing and tenure at the apex of the decision-making apparatus. As a legal professional now firmly holding the reins of power, Medvedev's inaugural speech in 2008 specifically emphasized the need for the strengthening of the rule of law and ending corruption in government and society:

> A mature and effective legal system is an essential condition for economic and social development, supporting entrepreneurship and fighting corruption. But it is no less important for increasing Russia's influence in the international community, making

[254] RIA Novosti, 'Medvedev Signs Landmark Anti-Corruption Law', RIA Novosti [web page] (2011) < http://en.rian.ru/russia/20110504/163854280.html>, accessed 25 May 2012.

> our country more open to the world and facilitating dialogue as equals with other peoples. Finally, true supremacy of the law is only possible if people feel safe in their lives. I will do everything I can to ensure that the safety of our citizens is not just enshrined in the law but is genuinely guaranteed by the state.[255]

Medvedev's stance was, purely in constitutional terms, that the Russian military responded to Georgian 'aggression' that was threatening the Russian Federation, and this gave the Russian President the moral and constitutional duties to order the Russian military to respond with force. All statements in the aftermath of Medvedev's order were centred on the legal righteousness that the Russian Federation possessed according to the Russian President. Medvedev's legal training enhanced his justification that his decision was the proper course and maintained full legal authority to execute and implement the decision. Dr. Mark Galeotti, Russia expert and professor at New York University, opined: 'Putin was trained as a lawyer, but he didn't internalize the training, whilst Medvedev certainly did.'[256] The Kremlin was now being led by a man who understood Russian constitutional law better than anyone in the top tier of the Russian government. The decision was made with full legal cognizance by Medvedev. The claims that genocide, which if true violated every international norm, was being committed by the Georgian government were used to justify the Russian response. Medvedev saw a major opportunity to assert Russian foreign policy at a time the Russian defence forces were a non-factor in world affairs.[257] The Russian President did this with the theoretical and practical knowledge that no impeachable offence was being committed and that constitutional law justified the Russian response. Medvedev's decision was constitutionally sound and internationally plausible according to the Russian President.

---

[255] The President of The Russian Federation, 'Speech at Inauguration Ceremony as President of Russia', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008) <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2008/05/07/1521_type82912type127286_200295.shtml>, accessed 29 May 2012.

[256] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

[257] George Friedman, 'The Russo-Georgian War and the Balance of Power', Stratfor [web document] (2008), <http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/russo_georgian_war_and_balance_power>, accessed 11 May 2012.

Medvedev's speech on August 8, 2008, after the order to attack Georgia militarily was given, bares all the qualities of a prudent, pragmatic lawyer.[258] None of Putin's speeches ever contained so much legal justification for foreign policy decisions. The speech was clearly tailored to suit the preferences of a President with a long and distinguished legal upbringing. Medvedev begins his speech with the claim that Russian military presence in the breakaway regions was 'absolutely lawful' and Georgian 'aggression' was tantamount to 'a gross violation of international law and of the mandates that the international community gave Russia as a partner in the peace process.'[259] Being the clever legal professional that Medvedev is, he outlined that the breach of Russian security by Georgia required his response.[260] Medvedev is subtly assuring his country and the world that his actions were executed within the scope of the rule of law; lastly, he concludes that according to the Russian Constitution he is free to pursue this conflict in the manner he has chosen.[261] This legal manoeuvring is a stark glimpse into a major facet of Medvedev's decision-making mental process. The legality and scope of rule of law were important theoretical and practical considerations for the decision.

With the legal and constitutional requirements seemingly satisfied, the Kremlin's foreign policy apparatus is beholden to the democratically-linked constituents it needs to serve. The Gorbachovian forces of democratization were well into fruition by 2008. Twenty years of the Gorbachovian reforms have seeped into every facet of the Russian Federation. Dmitry Medvedev, the new President, was now the de jure chief interlocutor in conducting foreign affairs. A few months into his young presidency he is faced with a territorial

[258]The President of The Russian Federation, 'Statement on the Situation in South Ossetia', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008) <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2008/08/08/1553_type82912type82913_205032.shtml >, accessed 29 May 2012.

[259] Ibid.

[260] Ibid.

[261] Ibid.

dilemma that poses a risk to Russian-speaking South Ossetians and Abkhazians as well as Russian citizens living near the Georgian border. The decision to respond to Georgian forces was made in the context of accommodating the political climate of the Russian Federation with respect to this issue. The Putin-Medvedev duo was on precarious ground in political terms. Medvedev's tenure did not distance Putin from the Kremlin, while United Russia still controlled the government by virtue of a majority in the State Duma. Medvedev's first major foreign policy decision was as vital to his presidency as any major piece of legislation or domestic program in relation to State Duma elections and the 2012 presidential election. This was Russia's 'first war' and whether the Kremlin was emboldened to make this decision stems directly from the empowered people whose voices could not be ignored.[262] Gorbachev's legacy of requiring public legitimacy from constituents is a product of his reforms and bares a powerful impact on those who occupy the office of the Russian presidency.

An opinion editorial by John Helmer in *The Asia Times* succinctly states that for Russia, Georgian military operations were tantamount to genocide in the same vein as Slobodan Milosevic's actions in the Balkans.[263] John Helmer opined:

> For all Russians, not only those with relatives in Ossetia, the near-total destruction by Georgian guns of Tskhinvali is a war crime. The deaths of about 2,000 civilians in the Georgian attack, and the forced flight of about 35,000 survivors from the town - the last census of Tskhinvali's population reported 30,000 - has been described by Russian leaders, and is understood by Russian public opinion, as a form of genocide. Ninety percent of the town's population are Russian citizens.[264]

The Russian public was fearful and disdainful of Georgia's military escalation in the breakaway regions prior to the war. Saakashvili was compared to Milosevic and

[262] A. Brown, The Gorbachev Factor, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[263] John Helmer, 'Russia Bids to Rid Georgia of Its Folly', The Asia Times,12 Aug. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 May 2012.

[264] Ibid.

characterized this way in order to dismiss any moral ambiguity over his actions.[265] John Helmer's opinion editorial is written from the Russian vantage point and he asserts that Georgia's increasingly aggressive stances and efforts to join NATO have contributed to the Russian opinion that he was a dangerous leader fixated on 'destabilizing the region' and adversely affecting Russia's grip on the post-Soviet space that Moscow once controlled.[266] Medvedev has persisted in characterizing the event as 'Russia's 9-11 moment' and that the safety of Russia was at stake.[267] The question over legitimacy from constituents was an important one for the express reasons that the new President needed firm public support to conduct the next four years of his presidency and maintain the Putin-Medvedev regime's grasp on the Kremlin, State Duma, and presidential election in 2012. Political capital was needed to maintain control of the government and the Gorbachovian forces of democratization affected every major foreign policy decision. No major decision in foreign policy could be made by discounting Russian public opinion. The political survival of United Russia and the Putin-Medvedev regime were at stake.

Opinion polls related to the conflict with Georgia were published by the independent Levada Centre and *Russian Analytical Digest*. The previously mentioned publications are from the few public opinion organizations in the Russian Federation that are neither funded by nor associated with the Russian government. *Russian Analytical Digest's* comprehensive questionnaire and statistical data confirm that the decision to attack Georgia was implemented in concert with Russian public opinion.[268] The war with Georgia in the Levada publication suggests that Russian public opinion of Georgia has been in

---

[265] Ibid

[266] Ibid.

[267] Jonathan Steele, 'Medvedev Describes Georgia Attack as Russia's 9/11', The Guardian, 13 Sep. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 23 May 2012.

[268] Russian Analytical Digest, 'Russia-Georgia Relations', Jstor [web document] (2009), <http://home.gwu.edu/~cwelt/Russian_Analytical_Digest_68.pdf>, accessed 19 May 2012.

freefall ever since Shevardnadze's ouster and was abysmally low immediately prior and during the 2008 conflict.[269] The poll result shows that 70% of Russian respondents feel that Russian authorities did everything to avoid this escalating conflict and the result stemmed from Georgia's 'wanton acts.'[270]

Levada's polling asked Russians to assess Georgian motives for this war.[271] Most Russians attribute this to personal motives for power on the part of the Georgian President and a large percentage attributes it to NATO, which is loathed throughout Russia.[272] When asked whether 'M. Saakashvili launched this campaign to boost his authority in Georgia and keep Presidential seat,' 38% responded affirmatively, which was the highest percentage of respondents for this question.[273] Furthermore, Levada asked whether Georgian 'aggression' was ordered for NATO membership.[274] 'Georgia should fix its territorial issues in order to be admitted as NATO member?'[275] 43% answered affirmatively, the highest percentage among respondents.[276] The majority of the Russian public did not attribute Georgia's 'aggression' to any noble causes, but rather saw this as an effort for personal gain by Saakashvili and NATO membership to threaten Russia's security.

The decision to respond militarily to Georgian 'aggression' was carried out with the political instinct to assess that the Russian public would support such measures. The Kremlin made this decision with the knowledge and certainty that the Russian constituents are supportive and patriotic against the Georgian leadership. Public opinion polls certainly confirm this. When asked to judge whether Medvedev's order was the proper course,

---

[269] Levada Analytical Center, 'Russian Public Opinion March 2008 – March 2009', Jstor [web document] (2009), <http://www.levada.ru/sites/default/files/levada_2008_eng.pdf >, accessed 19 May 2012.
[270] Ibid.
[271] Ibid.
[272] Ibid.
[273] Ibid.
[274] Ibid.
[275] Ibid.
[276] Ibid.

Russian respondents strongly supported this decision.[277] One poll question asked, 'Do You Approve or Disapprove of the Decision of the Russian Leadership to Send Troops to South Ossetia to Conduct a Military Operation?'[278] According to the Levada poll, 78% enthusiastically supported the military action on Russia's part.[279] The respondents were asked whether Georgia's actions required a military response because of the Kremlin's accusation that Saakashvili was guilty of genocide.[280] 'Do You Think that the Actions of the Georgian Army Can Be Described as Genocide?'[281] 72% of Russian respondents believed genocide was committed in the breakaway regions.[282] Public legitimacy was another powerful factor in enabling the Kremlin to commit to a five day military offensive against Georgia.

As *The Economist* noted in 2008 prior to Russia's retaliatory attack on Georgia, Putin warned that if Georgia's treatment of the breakaway regions continued, military action will be taken by the Russians.[283] It would be difficult to separate the Silovik impulses of the former President and current Prime Minister Putin from the new President Medvedev who was a handpicked successor and appointed Putin to his position. The partnership between these two men was personally and professionally close. In Medvedev's inaugural speech in 2008, he singled out Putin for praise and insisted that he would maintain a powerful position in the Kremlin.[284] 'I give my sincere thanks to President Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin for the unfailing personal support I have always received

[277] Ibid.
[278] Ibid.
[279] Ibid.
[280] Ibid.
[281] Ibid.
[282] Ibid.
[283] 'War Erupts in Georgia', The Economist, 8 Aug. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 May 2012.
[284] The President of The Russian Federation, 'Speech at Inauguration Ceremony as President of Russia', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008) <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2008/05/07/1521_type82912type127286_200295.shtml>, accessed 29 May 2012.

from him. I am sure that this will not change.'[285] It is a safe assumption that Putin and Medvedev discussed the grave military situation in South Ossetia and Abkhazia. It was a security issue that Silovik-minded Putin would be quick to assess and seek to ameliorate. Security and stability are a Silovik's philosophical underpinnings and the dutiful, handpicked President would not hastily dismiss his mentor's concerns. Furthermore, the other Siloviki and military traditionalists whose Cold War impulses remained would not ignore 'aggression' by a country moving increasingly closer to NATO and the European Union. Putin's vocal warning to Georgia and the world in 2008 prior to Medvedev's order confirms that the Silovik power base and military traditionalists had swayed the Kremlin decision-making apparatus prior to the war in favour of ordering military action if the Georgian military operations against Russia and the separatists continued.

The Russian Security Council met on August 1, 2008.[286] Dmitry Medvedev chaired a meeting that included Vladimir Putin and Nikolai Patrushev.[287] Both men are considered Siloviki with powerful roles in the foreign policy apparatus. Prime Minister Putin is an influential former President, while Russian Security Council Secretary Patrushev heads an advisory council that provides a forum for deliberation, as well as communication. The Silovik faction is focused on international prestige. It would be unimaginable that NATO enlargement and Georgia's active efforts for membership were not discussed and that this did not place Georgian activity in the breakaway regions high on the priority list. Patrushev guided the council and Putin was the former President who once controlled it; their

[285] Ibid.

[286] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'Operational Meeting of The Permanent Members of The Security Council of The Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008) <http://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/339.html>, accessed May 29, 2012.

[287] Ibid.

opinions would be ingrained in the discussion and direction of the proceedings. Siloviki by definition would be fixated on this looming security problem.

Georgia's theoretical attempt to normalize relations with its breakaway regions or in the practical reality subjugating the regions to its military might was implemented in the grand scheme of becoming a member of NATO.[288] The Russian Siloviki and military traditionalists must have been outraged over the prospect of this post-Soviet country falling to NATO. Ever since 1991, NATO enlargement has enveloped most of what was once considered 'the Soviet sphere of influence.' The security instincts of the Silovik power base and Cold War era military personnel operating within the new Russian Federation were alarmed to find that Russia's grasp on its region was slipping. As previously mentioned, a large percentage of Russians believes Saakashvili committed genocide to bring the breakaway regions under his control in order to accelerate membership into NATO.[289] Russia's relations with NATO have been adversarial and troublesome throughout the history of the relationship; NATO was a toxic element for the security of the Russian Federation according to the Putin-minded individuals now occupying important positions in the Kremlin. Putin's forewarning of Russia's imminent retaliation was a testament to the Silovik controlled Russian Security Council deliberation that swayed in the direction of making the military response the most viable option. Putin's confident and vocal warning was a direct result of prior formulation of the Russian response to the Georgian issue.

Dmitry Medvedev has claimed several times that he did not consult Vladimir Putin about ordering a Russian military response to Georgia and only spoke to him twenty-four

[288] Times Topics, 'Mikheil Saakashvili', The New York Times [web page] (2013)
< http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/mikheil_saakashvili/index.html>, accessed 25 May 2012.
[289] Levada Analytical Center, 'RUSSIAN PUBLIC OPINION March 2008 – March 2009', Jstor [web document] (2009), <http://www.levada.ru/sites/default/files/levada_2008_eng.pdf >, accessed 19 May 2012.

hours after military operations had begun.[290] There is official proof from the Russian Security Council that he did meet with Vladimir Putin in the days before the war started.[291] Furthermore, the likelihood of the order to commence military operations is illustrated by the trend of anti-Georgian statements by Medvedev. On June 18, 2008, Medvedev informed Saakashvili during a telephone conversation that Georgian attacks on Russian peacekeepers were unacceptable.[292] This blunt remark made to the Georgian President demonstrated a readiness to defend Russia's interests. On July 7, 2008, Medvedev met with George W. Bush in Japan and when Bush mentioned Georgia, Medvedev insisted that Russian plans for 'defusing tension' in Georgia were already formulated.[293] Medvedev was vague, but on July 18 while meeting with a German official in Moscow, he outlined that the only solution to this issue would be Georgia withdrawing its military from the breakaway regions and giving up control.[294] Evidently, the Russian response to Georgian 'aggression' was not formulated in the wake of the Georgian attack that started 'The Five Day War.' Medvedev's claim that no consultation or planning was involved in his decision is baseless. Vladimir Putin's role in the decision-making process is evident by his attendance of the Russian Security Council meeting and forewarning immediately prior to the war. Furthermore, Medvedev's decision may have been a quick reaction to Georgian military

---

[290] Shaun Walker, 'Medvedev Reignites War of Words over Blame for Georgia Conflict', The Independent, 8 Aug. 2011, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 30 May 2012.

[291] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'Operational Meeting of The Permanent Members of The Security Council of The Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008) <http://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/339.html>, accessed May 29 2012.

[292] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'Dmitry Medvedev had a telephone conversation with President of Georgia Mikhail Saakashvili', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008) <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/text/news/2008/06/202706.shtml>, accessed May 29 2012.

[293] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'President Dmitry Medvedev met with US President George W. Bush', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008) < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/text/news/2008/07/203730.shtml>, accessed May 29 2012.

[294] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'The President of Russia met with German Vice-Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs Frank-Walter Steinmeier', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008) <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/text/news/2008/07/204320.shtml>, accessed May 29 2012.

operations, but it clearly accommodated the Silovik affinity for security against NATO enlargement. Dr. Lincoln Mitchell noted, 'Georgia needed to take control of its territories to be considered for NATO membership.'[295] By stripping Georgia of its control of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, Tbilisi's future membership to NATO was in jeopardy.

Medvedev and Putin certainly shared an informal power network. The duo comprised a dutiful Technocrat and staunch Silovik who enjoyed a relationship comparable to a junior colleague and senior mentor.[296] There would be few who distinguished the two as separate entities. 'The 42-year-old President said George Bush had phoned him shortly after he had ordered Russian forces to drive the Georgians back. "You're a young President with a liberal background. Why do you need this?" Medvedev quoted Bush as saying. I told him we had no choice, he said.'[297] Bush in this conversation implies that Medvedev's actions do not reflect his 'liberal background' and reflect those of his predecessor. Medvedev's use of the term 'we' instead of 'I' alludes to the fact that Medvedev's decision did not involve his sole input, but rather was the result of a consensus. In addition to Putin's forewarning and Bush's informal negotiation with Putin, it would be baseless to assert that the Prime Minister's role in this decision was minor. The Putin-Medvedev duo was inextricable from one another. The Yeltsonian constitutional forces allowed this to happen by virtue of the clause allowing the President to dissolve the State Duma in the event his nominee for Prime Minister is rejected three times. Putin's role is guaranteed by the superior presidential powers granted by the 1993 Russian Constitution. Furthermore, Putin's popularity among the Russian people was extremely high and the new President

[295] L. Mitchell, 'Russia's war with Georgia' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 12 December 2012, School of International & Public Affairs, Columbia University, New York, New York.

[296] Andrew Osborn, 'Dmitry Medvedev's Russia still feels the cold hand of Vladimir Putin', The London Telegraph, 7 Mar. 2010, in Google News Archive, accessed 1 Mar. 2012.

[297] Jonathan Steele, 'Medvedev Describes Georgia Attack as Russia's 9/11', The Guardian, 13 Sep. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 23 May 2012.

was further enabled to give the order to attack Georgia. 'The poll showed Putin's popularity peaking at 58 percent in August 2008 in the heat of Russia's five-day war against its much smaller neighbour Georgia.'[298] Medvedev's public legitimacy hinged on his popular Prime Minister and former President who was credited with Russia's recovery after the Yeltsin years. Putin's forewarning, which also served as a tacit endorsement, of what eventually happened and Russian antipathy toward the Georgian leadership bolstered Medvedev by virtue of the Gorbachovian forces that now shaped the political climate. The Gorbachovian democratization and Yeltsonian Constitution were now forces that either enabled or deterred actions by elected officials. In this case, Russia's response to Georgia was a viable action because of the enabling forces.

An important issue has arisen in the years after the war; namely, why did Medvedev respond to Georgian forces on August 8 when Saakashvili ordered military action against Russia on August 6? Medvedev has been criticized by military traditionalists for delaying inevitable orders.[299] General Baluyevsky, who was removed from the Chief of General Staff position and appointed to the Russian Security Council's deputy position, has been the most vocal critic of the delay in responding to the Georgian military. 'I am convinced, until there was a kick from Vladimir Vladimirovich (Putin) in Beijing, everyone here, speaking politely, was afraid of something,' General Baluyevsky stated.[300] Medvedev's hesitance implies that his technocratic leanings precluded him from striking disproportionately, savagely, and expediently. The thoughtful and dutiful legal professional was not hasty in his decision and by virtue of his technocratic qualities did not retaliate in the manner a Silovik or Cold War military traditionalist would in the same case. In addition

[298]Tengri News, 'Putin's Election Rating Down 20% Since '08: Poll', Tengri News [web page] (2011)
< http://en.tengrinews.kz/politics_sub/Putins-election-rating-down-20-since-08-poll--4102/>, accessed 30 May 2012.
[299] Gleb Bryanski, 'Russian Generals Attack Medvedev over Georgia War,' Reuters, 9 Aug. 2012, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 Sep. 2012.
[300] Ibid.

to this, the two day interim provided plenty of time for Medvedev to communicate with Putin in relation to the conflict while he was in Beijing. Putin was well aware of the conflict and his personal dialogue with George W. Bush showed no signs of being less than fully-briefed with what was occurring despite his geographic location and theoretically secondary position to the Russian President in terms of power and influence.

In the early days of Medvedev's return to the position of Prime Minister in 2012 and the fourth anniversary of the war, a barrage of scathing criticism erupted against former President Medvedev. A documentary entitled 'The Lost Day' casts blame on Medvedev's hesitance in ordering the response to Georgian forces, which his critics claim would have prevented casualties.[301] In 2012, Putin did admit to three fundamental facts about the war. The first was that despite what former President Medvedev claims, Putin did communicate with the Kremlin during those crucial days when he was in Beijing before the Russian forces responded to Georgian actions against Russia.[302] Second, the plans to retaliate in the event of Georgian hostility were drawn up one to two years prior to the war.[303] Putin firmly stated that the Russian response was pre-planned before the Medvedev presidency.[304] Third, the South Ossetian separatists did act as an integral unit of the Russian military, which undermined the Russian claim of 'genocide' by the Georgian government.[305] There seems to be a strong concurrence that the Russian decision to respond to Georgian hostility was preordained by the Putin presidency, received considerable input from former President Putin during August 2008, and was aimed not to stop 'genocide' but rather strip

[301] Ekaterina Shtukina, 'Medvedev Defends His Georgia Attack Decision in 2008', RIA Novosti, 8 Aug. 2012, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 Sep. 2012.
[302] Pavel Felgenhaur, 'Putin Confirms the Invasion of Georgia Was Preplanned', Google Search [web document] (2012), <http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=39746&cHash=177fd31d57370a96ac7da644dc280014>, accessed 1 October 2012.
[303] Ibid.
[304] Ibid.
[305] Ibid.

Georgia's control over the breakaway regions to thwart its NATO membership and alignment with the West.

It would be uncharacteristic for Medvedev, a dutiful Technocrat and legal professional, who refers to Putin as one would a senior mentor and in turn Putin refers to Medvedev as a junior colleague even during the Medvedev presidency, to disregard Putin's input in this decision.[306] Medvedev's hesitation and General Baluyevsky's observation that Medvedev waited for Putin's approval, as well as Putin's admission that the two did communicate prior to the order given on August 8, illustrate that Vladimir Putin's role in Medvedev's order was important and may have been the overriding element in the fashion Medvedev responded to Georgian forces. Furthermore, the formulation for the Russian response was developed as Putin admitted during his own presidency.[307] Dr. Sergei Khrushchev, Cold War historian and son of late Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, stated: 'There were plans for war against Georgia for years beforehand and it was clear it was going to happen.'[308] Therefore, Medvedev's constant assertions that the order he gave was his own without any consultation is not supported by any conclusive evidence. Even at the urging of the hawkish wing of Kremlin occupants such as General Baluyevsky, Medvedev's technocratic pragmatism, patience, and dutifulness precluded him from ordering the Russian response prematurely or without the input of Vladimir Putin, the head of the Silovik faction who was fully supportive of the war and any effort to deter NATO enlargement.

---

[306] Andrew Osborn, 'Dmitry Medvedev's Russia still feels the cold hand of Vladimir Putin', The London Telegraph, 7 Mar. 2010, in Google News Archive, accessed 1 Mar. 2012.

[307] Pavel Felgenhaur, 'Putin Confirms the Invasion of Georgia Was Preplanned', Google Search [web document] (2012), <http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=39746&cHash=177fd31d57370a96ac7da644dc280014>, accessed 1 October 2012.

[308] S. Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.

The order to respond to Georgian forces on August 8 was implemented by communication between Medvedev and his Minister of Defence Anatoliy Serdyukov.[309] Serdyukov's temperament and defence reforms were powerful factors in the conduct of the war. First, Serdyukov was appointed Minister of Defence to replace Sergei Ivanov who was an influential Silovik to say the least. Sergei Ivanov, a former KGB official and contemporary of Putin, is known for being fanatically anti-NATO and hawkish. He was the sole dissenting voice challenging Putin over his assistance of NATO and US forces for the invasion of Afghanistan in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks.[310] Sergei Ivanov was not a mere official who dutifully served the Kremlin; he was a powerful voice in the foreign policy discourse. Many political observers within and outside of Russia asserted that his credentials, qualifications, and vociferousness designated him as a viable presidential successor to Putin. Medvedev, the dutiful Technocrat whom Putin personally elevated to a public platform to attain the presidency, was designated as the next presidential successor. Sergei Ivanov was demoted to Security Council Secretary and Deputy Prime Minister afterward and never maintained the powerful pulpit he had during his tenure as Minister of Defence. Serdyukov was a polar opposite of his predecessor; he was a Technocrat from St. Petersburg whose previous post was leading the Russian taxation bureau. Serdyukov was not a hawkish Silovik and has never been vocal in the foreign policy discourse. Serdyukov was a dutiful Technocrat in the same vein as Medvedev. Loyalty and a sense of duty to serve the President were Serdyukov's primary attributes.

Serdyukov's reforms of the defence apparatus were unprecedented in terms of evolving the relationship between the Russian President and the military personnel, which

[309] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[310] Michael Wines, 'After The Attacks: In Moscow; Russia Takes Stand Against Terrorism, but the Stance Wavers Quickly', The New York Times, 16 Sep. 2001, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 29 May 2012.

is the primary reason for the antipathy between Medvedev and the generals.[311] During 2007 to 2008, Serdyukov's reforms demoted the Chief of General Staff position and enforced a new military protocol that created the Minister of Defence position as the sole and unquestionable commander of the military second only to the President.[312] General Baluyevsky, a staunch military traditionalist whose upbringing was mired in the Cold War, criticized the new 'shake up' and proceeded to advocate the hawkish Cold War stances he believed were essential to Russian security and prosperity. Medvedev personally removed Baluyevsky and appointed him to the Russian Security Council that was led by Nikolai Patrushev, an ideological soulmate to Baluyevsky.[313] This appointment only reinforced the Russian Security Council's Silovik and hardliner led control of Medvedev's advisory committee. Sergei Ivanov was also demoted and appointed to the Russian Security Council, which may be an effective tool for blunting the overly zealous rhetoric of the hawkish officials who oppose the occupant of the Russian presidency. Regardless of Baluyevsky's replacement, Serdyukov was Medvedev's main contact in terms of initiating Russia's response to Georgian forces; no defence subordinate held this distinction. Dr. Mark Galeotti commented, 'The Minister of Defence is in charge of the generals. That is the key aspect of the military reforms.'[314]

Vladimir Putin had admitted to being in direct contact with the Kremlin during the escalating conflict.[315] 'As far as telephone calls are concerned, yes, I called Dmitry Medvedev twice, on August 7 and August 8 [2008], as well as the defence minister, and we

---

[311] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[312] Ibid.

[313] Ibid.

[314] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

[315] Fred Weir, 'Was Putin in charge during Georgia war? Medvedev begs to differ', CS Monitor, 10 Aug. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 12 Aug. 2012.

talked about the problem,' Putin said.[316] Medvedev has in the years since claimed that the decision was his alone and that his Minister of Defence was the only person with whom he discussed ordering a military assault.[317] As both sides of the story are told, the singular point of convergence is that Anatoliy Serdyukov, not any general or subordinate defence official, was the essential link to ordering the military operations that started the war with Georgia. As Dr. Sergei Khrushchev noted that while the relationship between Medvedev and Putin is close and the former did not challenge the latter, the resulting response to Georgia would have been the same regardless.[318] Therefore, there is a simmering conflict between the methodical Technocrats and hawkish Siloviki who now bicker over who is responsible for the successes or failures of the war. Dr. Sergei Khrushchev notes, 'Medvedev gave the order because Putin was too far. It would not have been different from Putin's order. There were plans and it was clear it was going to happen.'[319] Dr. Sergei Khrushchev characterized the relationship between the Siloviki and Technocrats as follows: 'They are like cats and dogs.'[320] This dispute between Medvedev and Putin over who gave the order to whom and who consulted on the matter is simply an extension of the rivalries that plague the decision-making apparatus in relation to foreign policy.

Centralization of power in the defence apparatus was not a Medvedev initiative but rather a joint reformist agenda by both Putin and Medvedev, which started in 2007 and was implemented in advance of the war with Georgia in terms of the defence hierarchy in

[316] Ibid.
[317] Ibid.
[318] S. Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.
[319] Ibid.
[320] Ibid.

relation to the Russian President.[321] The Yeltsonian and Gorbachovian forces enabled Kremlin leaders to pursue such reform as a direct result of the 1993 Russian Constitution, which limited legislative oversight of these reforms and publicly claiming that Serdyukov and the Russian President were implementing these changes as an 'anti-corruption campaign.'[322] By utilizing the constitutional empowerment established by Yeltsin and manipulating the public image of the reforms to sway the public that it was implemented to eradicate corruption to gain public legitimacy, Putin and Medvedev successfully centralized defence authority in the one official they controlled directly by virtue of the Russian presidency. The conduct of the war revealed that the Minister of Defence position was where the power lay to implement a decision to use military force. The Russian Security Council was consulted after Medvedev had given Serdyukov the order and military operations had already begun before the meeting of the Russian Security Council was convened.[323] The Serdyukov defence reforms created a centre of power for decision-making that effectively stripped the Russian Security Council, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and any advisors to have an official role in the decision to use military force. The Minister of Defence was the most important and sole actor in pre-war deliberations other than the President; Serdyukov's technocratic background and methodical temperament enabled Medvedev to easily utilize his Minister of Defence as a dutiful government official as Medvedev had been to Putin during the latter's presidency. Serdyukov did not make any notable statements prior to the war and his willingness to implement orders at the top of the power structure has never been questioned.

---

[321] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[322] Ibid.

[323] Ibid.

The Russian Security Council was summoned on August 8, 2008.[324] The meeting was entitled: 'Emergency operative meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation.'[325] A startling piece of information is missing from this official posting; while other Russian Security Council meetings are noted with the members in attendance, this meeting is recorded with only the speech announcing the order to respond to Georgian forces by Medvedev. It does not note any deliberations or discussions that took place, and the only possible inference is that the Russian Security Council was summoned to communicate what had already been decided. The Russian Security Council was summoned by Medvedev only after he had given the order to Serdyukov to begin military operations that commenced 'The Five Day War.'[326] Medvedev's delay and intentional non-usage of the Russian Security Council to consult him on the issue of how to respond to Georgian forces beg the question of why he would do this when members of the Kremlin elite would have provided their insights to the President at a grave time.

Nikolai Patrushev's background is virtually similar to Vladimir Putin; he is a like-minded bureaucrat with an extensive KGB background. In addition to this, he is a member of the hawkish Silovik faction that emphasizes increasing Russia's global power and prestige.[327] Medvedev and Patrushev are in different factions, and it would be likely that their opinions clash more than they converge. Patrushev's control of the Russian Security Council would tilt in the Silovik-minded faction's favour. Namely, the consultative body is

---

[324] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[325]Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'Emergency operative meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation.', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008) <http://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/340.html>, accessed 29 May2012.

[326] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[327]Ibid.

directed by a man who believes in hawkish policy and diplomacy. Furthermore, Medvedev personally removed General Baluyevsky and appointed him to the Russian Security Council. Baluyevsky's military traditionalist views borne of the Cold War did not accommodate Medvedev's methodical, systematic Technocrat style. As seen in the early days of Medvedev's post-presidency, several generals and Baluyevsky have criticized Medvedev for being hesitant and not giving the order to attack Georgia earlier. The Russian Security Council was guided and controlled by individuals who were adverse to Medvedev's style, temperament, and methodical leadership in addition to not having a rapport with their new President.

Medvedev's hesitation stemmed from three primary reasons. The first is that he did not possess the hawkish truculence displayed by the Siloviki and military traditionalists as Patrushev and Baluyevsky are known for as reported by media outlets.[328] Medvedev's intentional non-usage of the Russian Security Council was a method to delay the inevitable hawkish urging of the Silovik faction to strike quickly and savagely. Second, Medvedev desired to have free and unimpeded dialogue with his Minister of Defence without the interference of others in the Kremlin who would have been vocal advocates to give the order expeditiously, especially Baluyevsky, who is known to have a Cold War warrior mentality.[329] Third, Vladimir Putin has admitted that he did communicate with the Kremlin prior to the order being given while he was in Beijing.[330] The relationship between

[328]Gleb Bryanski, 'Russian Generals Attack Medvedev over Georgia War,' Reuters, 9 Aug. 2012, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 Sep. 2012.

[329] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[330]Pavel Felgenhaur, 'Putin Confirms the Invasion of Georgia Was Preplanned', Google Search [web document] (2012), <http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=39746&cHash=177fd31d57370a96ac7da644dc280014>, accessed 1 October 2012.

Medvedev and Putin has always been one of a junior colleague and senior mentor.[331] Medvedev's hesitation accommodated Putin by allowing his input to be heard during the presidential decision-making before the order was given.

Sergei Lavrov was not present during the Russian Security Council meeting prior to the war with Georgia.[332] The Minister of Foreign Affairs was not consulted by Medvedev or Putin by all accounts prior to the war with Georgia. Lavrov has been a stalwart appointee of the Putin-Medvedev years. There has never been a serious disagreement between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Kremlin. Lavrov's tenure as Minister of Foreign Affairs started in 2004 and he continues to be in this role without any hindrance from the Kremlin. Lavrov is a Yeltsin Liberal who continues his role as the Kremlin's assertive chief diplomat, and he was appointed to replace Igor Ivanov, another Yeltsin Liberal. Both men were well associated with Yeltsin and Kozyrev's dovish approach to relations with the West, but neither has been demoted for these reasons. Igor Ivanov left his post and continued with many high-ranking positions for the Kremlin. Lavrov's role continues uninterrupted by any Siloviki or Technocrats replacing him. Putin and his inner circle have not placed Lavrov to a powerful position in terms of influencing decision-making as evident by the episode with Georgia, but they have not reacted in a manner that would suggest that they disapprove of his tenure. The Putin-Medvedev regime clearly shows a predisposition to control the Kremlin, Russian Security Council, and Ministry of Defence by appointing Siloviki and Technocrats, but not producing any effort to appoint like-

[331] Andrew Osborn, 'Dmitry Medvedev's Russia still feels the cold hand of Vladimir Putin', The London Telegraph, 7 Mar. 2010, in Google News Archive, accessed 1 Mar. 2012.

[332] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'Operational Meeting of The Permanent Members of The Security Council of The Russian Federation August 1, 2008', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008) <http://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/339.html>, accessed May 29 2012.

minded individuals to powerful positions in Russian diplomacy. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the Russian Federation is the last bastion of Yeltsin Liberals still in power today.

Lavrov made a few notable contributions to the episode with Georgia and only in its aftermath. Lavrov's assertiveness was channelled by two public pronouncements in the immediate weeks and months after the war. Lavrov wrote an opinion editorial published in several newspapers detailing Russia's reasons for reacting to 'the murder of civilians.'[333] Lavrov portrayed Russian peacekeepers as protectors of the civilians and that the Georgian military's actions were tantamount to genocide.[334] The opinion editorial regurgitated Medvedev's opening speech that announced Russian military operations against Georgian forces. Furthermore, Lavrov continued to discredit Saakashvili and bolster his claim by claiming Russian security was breached.[335] In essence, Lavrov's opinion editorial was a repetition of what the Kremlin leadership had said. Lavrov has been the international spokesman for the sentiment among Kremlin elites; for example, Lavrov warned NATO against 'pushing the current Georgian regime toward a repetition of their August 2008 gamble.'[336] Lavrov's role in the episode with Georgia under the Putin-Medvedev regime has been chief spokesman, not chief diplomat or negotiator. His role in the war with Georgia and its aftermath was merely to convey what the leadership believed and he advocated these beliefs by virtue of public pronouncements. The Siloviki and Technocrats may differ on many issues, but their peripheral usage of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and resistance to appointing a member of the inner sanctum to this position have continued unchanged from the ascension of Putin to the presidency in 2000.

---

[333]Sergei Lavrov, 'America Must Choose Between Georgia and Russia ', The Wall Street Journal, 20 Aug. 2008, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 20 May 2012.

[334] Ibid.

[335] Ibid.

[336] RIA Novosti, 'Russia says Georgia's entry to NATO could lead to war', RIA Novosti [web page] (2011) < http://en.rian.ru/world/20111208/169485481.html >, accessed 30 May 2012.

Lavrov's role in the weeks and months after the war was that of a perennial interviewee acting as a spokesman for the Kremlin and not a negotiator or diplomatic agent who sought to independently conduct interstate relations. Despite his role of a spokesman and not a chief diplomat, he did attend the two subsequent Russian Security Council meetings after the war was announced on August 8 during a meeting in which he was not present.[337] Both meetings were held after the war concluded and the Russian Security Council did not meet during the five days of warfare, except for the meeting when Medvedev announced that his order had been given before the Russian Security Council convened. Lavrov did not have a chance to offer his consultation in a formal setting and Medvedev and Putin have never singled out any contribution to the decision to go to war by Lavrov. Medvedev's preference to leave the Russian Security Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs out of his decision to go to war shows a preference to tame the Silovik faction by virtue of delaying the formal mechanism it controls and exclude the Yeltsin Liberals by continuing Putin's marginalization of the Yeltsin holdovers from exerting influence. Medvedev consulted his Technocrat Minister of Defence and by most accounts Prime Minister Putin, who was also his mentor. Lavrov did not belong to the inner sanctum and his role on the Russian Security Council was further marginalized by the hardliners who controlled it such as Patrushev and Baluyevsky, who are inclined to distance the Yeltsin Liberals responsible for facilitating Russia's poor state of affairs during the 1990's when it remained a problematic and inconsequential member on the world stage. Lavrov's obstacles to exerting his influence are therefore numerous and effective.

The Russian Security Council was convened twice after the decision was announced, and it convened after Putin's return with him present at both of these

[337] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'Activities' The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2008) < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/text/news/2008/07/204320.shtml>, accessed May 29 2012.

subsequent meetings on the matter.[338] His role as Medvedev's most important advisor is clear by his willingness to accommodate convening Russian Security Council meetings to Putin's presence. The Russian Security Council meeting announcing the decision while Putin was in Beijing was merely a formality with no deliberation after the fact.[339] The delay was meant to provide time for Putin and Medvedev to communicate and formulate a decision while delaying the inevitable push toward war that the Russian Security Council would recommend. Medvedev's methodical approach to decision-making precluded a sudden response to Georgian forces, and while he did not feel it was necessary to appease the Silovik faction by convening a Russian Security Council meeting, he did feel it was appropriate to accommodate his Prime Minister whom he considers his senior mentor. Dr. Sergei Khrushchev's assertion that the relationship between Putin and Medvedev is cohesive, but the same does not apply to their respective factions is well-founded.[340] Medvedev left the Siloviki out of the policy equation.

Serdyukov and Medvedev are both members of the same faction, and the military reforms elevated the Minister of Defence to a position of tremendous military control, which did overshadow the generals and particularly the occupant of the Chief of General Staff position. The generals and their inherent biases were no longer an impediment or accelerant for the decision to go to war. Serdyukov was now the sole agent in conducting military affairs at the behest of the Russian President. By virtue of the powerful 1993 Russian Constitution that shielded the Russian President from legislative or judicial scrutiny in relation to military reforms and publicly bolstering the reforms by claiming it

---

[338] Ibid.

[339] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[340] S. Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.

was integral to an 'anti-corruption campaign,' Putin and Medvedev were able to effectively reshape the President's grasp on the defence apparatus. The Yeltsonian constitutional powers of an empowered office of the presidency and the Gorbachovian democratization that required the Russian President to have public legitimacy were now enhancing the relations between the Russian President and Minister of Defence. In this case of a looming defence issue, the Russian President was empowered to implement his decision with a mere vocal communication to his powerful Minister of Defence. The trend of continuing a superior presidency that is emboldened by public legitimacy has been unimpeded since Yeltsin's coup in 1993 in terms of foreign policy decisions.

The constitutional power allowing the President to restructure the defence apparatus is beyond reproach. There is no legal obstruction or legislative remedy that can be established in deterring the Russian presidency to empower the Minister of Defence in enhancing the Russian President's control of the military.[341] Ruslan Pukhov noted:

> What is particularly interesting is how Russia's leadership has reacted to these military reforms. The Kremlin and White House, which are usually careful to avoid any action that could spark social unrest or upset the status quo bureaucracy, have given strong support to Serdyukov despite widespread criticism and hysterical opposition from members of the military establishment.[342]

The Kremlin portrayed these reforms as an effort to eradicate corruption and accelerate modernity. Opinions of Serdyukov vary among Russians; his non-military background and reticent technocratic public persona do not convince the public that he was an effective Minister of Defence when compared with his Silovik predecessor, Sergei Ivanov, who was widely assumed to be Putin's natural successor. Regardless of this, the Russian public has been indifferent to the military reform. There have never been any

[341]O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[342] Ruslan Pukhov, 'Serdyukov 4 Years On', The Moscow Times, 3 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 Aug. 2012.

protests or opposition to the reforms by the constituents. Military reform and the technical nuances of the defence apparatus structure do not invigorate the masses with the exception of Cold War warriors in the military or Ministry of Defence criticizing these reforms; the Russian media did not make the reforms a focal point of its coverage because of lack of interest among the public. The Putin-Medvedev leadership has made the defence apparatus wholly within the control of the relationship between the President and Minister of Defence. This empowerment of the Minister of Defence directly by the Russian presidency has never been initiated in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or Russian Security Council with the respective chiefs of these units of the Russian government. Regardless of the rivalries that plague the decision-making apparatus, the Russian President has made the Minister of Defence his undisputed arm to engage in military operations by strengthening the power structure of the Minister of Defence's office, and as a result this severely deters the Russian Security Council and Ministry of Foreign Affairs from having a formal role in the decision to commence military operations.

Reflections:

The external forces affecting the Kremlin by virtue of the Gorbachovian democratization, which empowered the people, and the Yeltsonian constitutional powers, which established a powerful presidency, were enabling factors in conducting the military operations against Georgia. Public opinion against Georgia and Prime Minister Putin's tacit endorsement of Russia's eventual response served to solidify Medvedev's standing among the empowered Russian citizens. The Kremlin was given legitimacy by its constituents that overwhelmingly supported the measures taken against Saakashvili. In addition to this, Medvedev's speech and rationale for giving the order stemmed directly from the powerful constitutional clauses making him responsible for Russian security and not requiring

legislative or judicial approval to take such action. The military action against Georgia was taken by utilizing public and constitutional legitimacy that are required in the Russian Federation. The legacies of Boris Yeltsin and Mikhail Gorbachev were fully ingrained in the Kremlin's foreign policy decision with respect to Georgia.

The relationship between Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev was synthesized through a Governmental Politics Model that examined the personal ideologies and relationship between the two men. In the years after the war, it is apparent that such actions were pre-planned during the Putin presidency and that Medvedev's hesitation accommodated Putin's logistical predicament while he was in Beijing. There was communication between Putin and the Kremlin before the order was given, and Medvedev's cognizance that his popular Prime Minister and senior mentor was integral to the foreign policy decision-making is clearly illustrated by his refusal to order military action before Putin had a chance to offer his input. The relationship between the two men is a close one as evident during the episode with Georgia, but their respective camps do not share the same affinity for one another. Namely, Medvedev's intentional delay of the Silovik controlled Russian Security Council is a case in point. The Russian Security Council controlled by hawkish Silovik Patrushev and truculent General Baluyevsky, whom Medvedev personally removed from the Ministry of Defence, would have certainly recommended immediate and sudden military operations against Georgia. The relationship between Medvedev and Patrushev is not a particularly close one and the Russian President's relationship with Baluyevsky is intensely adversarial. Medvedev's patient technocratic temperament precluded such a hasty response that the Siloviki would have urged. The delay was a method for Technocrat Medvedev to lessen the Silovik faction's jingoistic calls for immediate action. Medvedev did not rush to give the order and this was

heavily criticized by military traditionalists and former KGB operatives currently working in the Russian government. Medvedev was not personally concerned with the input of the Silovik base, but did take efforts to allow time for Putin to offer his input. The relationship between the two is fundamentally strong during this foreign policy episode, but the clashing factions are as seen during this event to be competing against each other for influence in the decision-making process.

Russia's war with Georgia is arguably Medvedev's most important foreign policy decision. The Russian Federation reasserted itself in the post-Soviet sphere and this was Russia's first unilateral military conflict against another country since the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. The weight of this decision would surely affect the world stage and international diplomacy in the future. It was carried out by virtue of communication with one individual: the Minister of Defence Anatoliy Serdyukov. The military reforms empowered the Minister of Defence and centralized defence capabilities in this position, while weakening the generals and Chief of General Staff. Putin and Medvedev differ on who was involved in the deliberations, but both admit that the Minister of Defence was the ultimate contact point in commencing military operations. This was achieved and enabled directly by the Yeltsonian constitutional forces that gave the Russian President the power to restructure the defence apparatus to his preferences without legislative or judicial oversight. It was advocated as an 'anti-corruption campaign' to appease the Gorbachovian forces so that the Kremlin did not have to contend with the empowered masses who would have risen to protest if they deemed the reforms adverse to the needs of the constituents. The defence apparatus in this episode overshadowed the Russian Security Council and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Serdyukov, a Technocrat and colleague of Medvedev's as well as member of Putin's inner sanctum, dutifully and obediently conducted military operations as he was

instructed by the Putin-Medvedev leadership. The Russian Security Council was summoned after military operations commenced to communicate the decision and Lavrov's role in the days and weeks after was simply that of a spokesman. Medvedev chose to alienate the Silovik faction due to a difference in philosophy and temperament, and the Putin-Medvedev regime continued to marginalize the Yeltsin Liberals and their last bastion, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Ultimately, President Medvedev was enabled by the Yeltsonian and Gorbachovian forces to give the order, but his implementation reflected his personal preferences with which he consulted or did not consult certain high-ranking officials in government. Furthermore, Medvedev's personal preferences are reflected by his alienation of key figures in the foreign policy apparatus because of his disdain for the hawkish truculence of the Silovik faction and jingoistic military personnel he consented to weakening and transferring power from to empower the Minister of Defence. The internal dynamics of Medvedev's decision do reflect an affinity for his mentor and predecessor, but the ideological divide between Technocrats and Siloviki could not be more apparent by the intentional non-usage of the Russian Security Council. Medvedev's decision, which solidified Putin's forewarning, was made and implemented by virtue of public support and constitutional entitlements that gave the Russian President the ability to conduct the war without any impediments or barriers from other branches of government. While Medvedev's lack of utilizing the Minister of Foreign Affairs continues the trend started by Putin, his intentional alienation and non-usage of the Silovik controlled foreign policy mechanism is a powerful reminder that his technocratic upbringing influenced his use of the levers of power and consultation at his disposal. 'The Five Day War' was Russia's first unilateral military conflict against another country in its short history and the chief executive was fully

empowered by the office of the Russian presidency to make this decision and further enabled by support from his constituents that were responsible for his and United Russia's political survival. The war of words over who was ultimately responsible for Russia's victory continues until the present day and this is an extension of the two warring camps that continue to battle for influence in the Russian President's decision-making apparatus. The Russian Security Council met twice subsequently to discuss Russian-Georgian relations with Putin present at both meetings, but the deliberations to commence the war were far more important than any pronouncements after the military order was given. The external forces enabled the decision and the internal rivalries and personal dynamics determined how the order was formulated and implemented.

Chapter 3: Russia's Response to East Asia's Rogue Regime

Introduction:

May 2009 was one of the most important periods in Russian history in terms of foreign policy; the trends of the Cold War continued in a new complex external environment. The North Korean regime still acted in opposition to the world and maintained its post-Korean War attitude that the world stage is still mired in a Cold War entanglement of Western and Communist rivalries. Modern day Russia reacted to the North Korean nuclear confrontation in 2009 with no concern for Kim Jung Il's Communist or Soviet connections. The Russian Federation passed an unprecedented National Security Concept document that strengthened the role of the Russian Security Council while simultaneously responding to nuclear armament testing by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea under the orders of Kim Jung Il. The world stage is a stable environment in modern times, except for the unexpected behaviour of rogue regimes and terrorist groups. North Korea has been a perennial source of international conflict since the end of the Korean War in 1953. The Medvedev Administration was faced with three United Nations-sponsored resolutions against North Korean nuclear activity. The North Korean issue was an important point in understanding Russian foreign policy during the Putin-Medvedev years and this chapter examines this in the context of the National Security Concept document passed in May 2009 immediately prior to illegal North Korean activity in the form of nuclear development testing.

The Russian Federation's history with North Korea reaches back to the inception of the latter country during Soviet times.[343] Namely, the Soviet Union had always been an ally of the North Korean regime. This trend continued as Russia participated in the Six-Party

[343]Harry Gelman & Norman D. Levin, 'The Furture of Soviet-North Korean Relations', The Rand Air Force Project Report [online journal], (1984), 1-71 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/reports/2009/R3159.pdf>, accessed 20 May 2012.

Talks acting as a counterweight to the United States, Japan, and South Korea. The Russian Federation's relationship with China is a close one and China's 'younger brother,' North Korea, has sought closer ties with the Russian Federation because of its strong relationship with China. The Russian Federation has consistently defended its neighbour that it shares a small border with and maintained its support for the country to the chagrin of the West, which deems North Korea a 'police state' that denies its citizens human rights and is a threat to the international community. One of Vladimir Putin's first acts when he was sworn in as President of the Russian Federation in 2012 was to cancel his plans to attend a summit in the United States of the G8.[344] This was a powerful message to the world that Russian interests lie in the Eastern hemisphere and anywhere within the post-Soviet sphere and by default its inherent issues such as North Korea take precedence over what happens in the Western hemisphere.

Russia's war with Georgia demonstrated that the Security Council of the Russian Federation was an advisory board with little role in the decision-making apparatus. The President is the sole authority in allowing the Russian Security Council to participate in foreign policy deliberations. A technocratic President and the Silovik controlled Security Council of the Russian Federation did not act in unison when formulating a response to Georgian military operations. The National Security Concept document was Silovik Nikolai Patrushev and military traditionalist General Baluyevsky's retaliatory move to counter the powerful presidency, which established by the 1993 constitution is constitutionally and legally enabled to delay any mechanisms in the foreign policy apparatus.[345] The recalibration of the Russian Security Council has theoretically

[344] 'Vladimir Putin Calls off US Trip', The Guardian, May 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 10 May 2012.

[345] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

strengthened its role and was intended to be a Silovik tool to exert more influence in Dmitry Medvedev's decisions, especially in regard to foreign policy.

In May 2009, Russia consented to sanctions against North Korea for violating international norms in the form of its nuclear testing.[346] Two subsequent sanctions by the United Nations against North Korea were passed to extend the original resolution to enforce sanctions.[347] United Nations Resolution 1874 against North Korea and the strengthening of the Russian Security Council are primary issues in this chapter and are explored to better understand the evolution of the internal dynamics of the Kremlin. Also under scrutiny is what effect the external forces had on decision-making. The May 2009 National Security Concept document is also examined to ascertain the extent to which it has evolved the Kremlin's inner workings.

The North Korean issue is a multi-faceted foreign policy dilemma that encompasses nuclear politics, international security, and liberal institutionalism. The Putin-Medvedev regime has exhibited a cognizance to international security by virtue of its nearly constant attendance in United Nations Security Council deliberations, as well as its vocal involvement in pressing security issues on the world stage. The issue carries with it a concern over Sino-Russo relations, which is highly important; this cannot be discounted. As noted earlier, the Russian Federation acts as a counterweight to the United States and its allies in the Six-Party Talks, but it also bolsters the Chinese delegation, which chairs the negotiations and provides a forum.

The West has advocated measures against North Korea because according to Western governments it is a country governed by a nefarious regime that is adverse to

[346] The United Nations Security Council, 'Security Council, Acting Unanimously, Condemns In Strongest Terms Democratic People's Republic Of Korea Nuclear Test, Resolution 1874' The United Nations [Web Page] (2009) <http://www.un.org/news/press/docs//2009/sc9679.doc.htm>, accessed 20 June 2012.

[347] The United Nations Security Council, 'Press Releases', The United Nations [web page] (2009) <www.un.org/en/unpress/>, accessed 20 June 2012.

modern day norms. It is important to acknowledge that the Russian Federation, which seeks independence from the West and to further distance its role as a capitulator to the United States during the Yeltsin years, consented to the resolutions that enforced sanctions against North Korea during the post-Yeltsin years. The Russian Federation's first supported United Nations resolution for sanctions against North Korea was in 2006 during Putin's presidency.[348] Therefore, there are continuing factors in the decision to support a concerted effort to deter North Korean nuclear activity. An examination of the foreign policy stance toward North Korea illuminates how the Russian Federation responds to looming nuclear threats and how it deals with Western advocacy against rogue regimes.

The role of the Silovik controlled Russian Security Council and the security document that strengthens its role is of high priority. The fundamentals of the foreign policy apparatus have now shifted to make the advisory board an important tool in the deliberations of foreign policy and the methods to respond to North Korean nuclear activity have been enhanced to rectify its non-involvement during the war against Georgia. The central investigation in this chapter examines the 'key players' to derive evidence on how the levers of power and mechanisms of deliberation were used to arrive to the decision that was formulated and then implemented.

National Security Concept:

The Silovik faction was a driving force behind the new security document that strengthened the role of the Russian Security Council after its non-usage during the war with Georgia and accusations that it was merely a sinecure.[349] The intended consequence of the drive was that the Russian Security Council, a stronghold of the hawkish advisors in the

[348] Ibid.

[349] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

Kremlin who are like-minded Putin associates and Cold War era military officials with the same impulses they had before the Berlin Wall fell, should be a necessary component in foreign policy matters. Medvedev's delay in convening the forum was an evasive technique to blunt the Silovik faction's influence in his decisions. The hardliners in the Kremlin's inner circle would have surely attempted to accelerate his decision, but the Russian Security Council's usage was poorly defined in previous years. It was a consultative body with no specific role. This changed after the Russian Security Council document was authorized and put into effect by Dmitry Medvedev. The hardliners on the Russian Security Council were eager to enforce their roles by virtue of assigning the council an expanded role in the foreign policy-making apparatus. Nowhere in Russian foreign policy is this more apparent than in the attitude of the hardliners toward NATO.

The Russian Security Council had become a beacon of anti-NATO enlargement, which is a fundamental concern among hardline elements of the Russian government. This indelible aspect of the Siloviki was a major ideology within the Russian Security Council deliberations as guided by Silovik Patrushev and his deputy General Baluyevsky whose quarrel with liberal-minded Medvedev resulted in his demotion. Patrushev reasserted that NATO military expansion was unacceptable and Russia would no longer be a capitulator in the arena of international security.[350] This major security document enables Patrushev and like-minded individuals to steer the discourse in the direction that accommodates an anti-NATO, hawkish sentiment to which the Russian President is not predisposed. Patrushev and Baluyevsky were given a powerful opportunity to enhance their ability to convey the

[350] Rustrans, 'Russia's National Security Strategy to 2020', Rustrans [web page] (2009) <http://rustrans.wikidot.com/russia-s-national-security-strategy-to-2020>, accessed Jan 31 2012.

desire to increase Russian prestige on the world stage according to the Rand report in 2009.[351]

The Russian Security Council was given specific guidelines by Patrushev and Baluyevsky in terms of what role it would have in an organizational and foundational sense.[352] The Russian Security Concept document stated:

> V. Organisational, legal-normative and informational foundations of the realisation for the given strategy.
> 97. The state policy of the Russian Federation in the area of national security is the result of the concerted effort of all elements of the system providing national security, with a coordinating role being played by the Security Council of the Russian Federation with respect to the realisation of a range of measures of an organisational, legal-normative and informational nature.
> 102. By resolution of the President of the Russian Federation, documents regarding issues of domestic and foreign policy can be brought up for review before the Security Council of the Russian Federation.[353]

'97' specifically states that state policy 'is the result of the concerted effort of all elements of the system,' which in subtle nuances means that the Russian Security Council must have a vital role as opposed to previous years.[354] 'With a coordinating role' was included in the document to enhance the organizational role of the consultative body from the inception of foreign policy deliberation and throughout the implementation.[355] As seen with the Georgian episode, the Russian Security Council was a meaningless tool used to communicate the decision and the implementation was seen through the Ministry of Defence. The Russian Security Council's marginalization was theoretically no longer a viable option and the Russian Security Council Secretary now had the conceptual and legal means to insert the advisory forum into the Kremlin's decision-making with respect to foreign policy. '102' continues the trend of a powerful presidency by assuring the foreign

[351] Ibid.
[352] Ibid.
[353] Ibid.
[354] Ibid.
[355] Ibid.

policy apparatus that the President is the principal agent for its use and by implication no other element of the government can include or exclude its usage.[356]

A bureaucratic rebellion against Medvedev's preference to blunt the effectiveness of the Russian Security Council, which was controlled by individuals who shared no ideological or temperamental compatibility with the Russian President, was resulting in a proposed enlargement of the advisory board's role in policy formulation. Patrushev was the key player in the formulation of this document and was responsible for revising it to accommodate President Medvedev's wishes.[357] The Russian Security Council was not an independent body and as illustrated by Patrushev's willingness to revise the document according to Medvedev's orders that the sole authority for this consultative body falls fully within the scope of the Russian presidency. While the Ministry of Defence and Ministry of Foreign Affairs have large, complex bureaucracies with a myriad of acting agents independent of the Kremlin's oversight, the Russian Security Council is a forum for the formulation of policy and can only exert its influence at the behest of the President while not being able to interact independently with the world stage. Only the Russian Security Council Secretary meets with officials from different countries and institutions, but the Council itself has no independent role in international affairs. Dr. Mark Galeotti notes, 'The Russian Security Council was never regarded as an executive body. It was always essentially a combination of a consultative committee and a monitoring mechanism.'[358] This is an inherent weakness of the Russian Security Council and the document strengthens its role in terms of the official obligations it has to advise the Kremlin's decision-makers. The document as provision '97'outlines is also obligated to participate in multi-faceted

[356] Ibid.

[357] Roger McDermott, 'Russia Prepares a New Draft Security Strategy Through 2020.', The Jamestown Foundation [online journal}, 6/2 (2009), < http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=34307>, accessed 1 June 2012.

[358]M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

deliberations not centred on foreign policy.[359] The Russian Security Council is privy to domestic policy deliberations and this entitlement can be interpreted in a number of ways all meant to enhance the body's ability to insert itself in the dialogue whether it is regarding military reform, living standards, or anything else considered to be 'strategic national priorities' as Patrushev authored.[360] The Russian Security Council is enabled to insert itself into any issue that involves bolstering the Russian Federation to become a 'competitive state' and this is a direct result of Patrushev and Baluyevsky's ideological and practical preoccupation with Russia's position in the world.[361]

In March of 2009 the Russian Security Council had quickly utilized the new security document to bolster its position in the Kremlin's policy debates by virtue of being a key element in prolonging Russian military presence in the Arctic.[362] The Russian Security Council became an influential voice in insisting the Russian military maintain its strategic lock on the region in order to protect its vital interests.[363] This was a drastic difference from the Russian Security Council's marginalization during Russia's war with Georgia. The Russian Security Council became a forceful institution in the policy debate, which it had not been prior to the security document that was authorized earlier that year. A major first step in asserting its bureaucratic tentacles was taken. The Russian Security Council was no longer a forum for deliberation but rather a deliberative body concerned with defence, security, and national priorities. The Russian Security Council had the duty and mandate to assert itself in the face of different centres of power such as the Russian

[359]Rustrans, 'Russia's National Security Strategy to 2020', Rustrans [web page] (2009) <http://rustrans.wikidot.com/russia-s-national-security-strategy-to-2020>, accessed Jan 31 2012.

[360] Ibid.

[361] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[362] Ilya Kramnik, 'Russia's Security Council turns to Arctic ', Google News Archive [web document] (2009), <http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20090330/120824719.html>, accessed 2 June 2012.

[363] Ibid.

presidency, Ministry of Defence, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Russian Security Council Secretary possessed the platform to arguably be as vital to the Kremlin as the Minister of Defence, since military matters were now an integral component of the Russian Security Council's subject-matter hinterland. After the war with Georgia, the Russian Security Council came under attack for being effete, archaic, and a sinecure under the guise of an important centre of policy debate.[364] The following year in 2009 the new National Security Concept document reversed much of this discourse and elevated the Russian Security Council to an unusually high degree unseen in the history of the Russian Federation. Patrushev was an inherently powerful figure with the acceptance of the document and this would theoretically be a major obstacle if Medvedev tried to muffle the voices of the Siloviki or military traditionalists on the Russian Security Council as evident during the episode with Georgia in 2008.

The catalyst for the new National Security Concept document clearly stems from the Kremlin's military order during the summer of 2008 against Georgia, and the war was certainly a powerful reminder that the Russian Security Council protocol needed to be updated because of Russia's radical transformation since Putin took the reins of power.[365] The authorship of the document is difficult to pinpoint, but it was seen to have been supervised solely by Nikolai Patrushev.[366] Throughout its history the Russian Security Council has been criticized as a meaningless mechanism, but the new National Security Concept document has seemingly made all these claims baseless because it gives the Russian Security Council unlimited duties and guidelines that enable it to assert itself in

[364] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[365] Keir Giles, 'Russia's National Security Strategy to 2020', NATO Defense College [web document] (2009), <http://conflictstudies.co.uk/files/RusNatSecStrategyto2020.pdf>, accessed 2 June 2012.

[366] Ibid.

virtually every aspect of national and international issues, including those pertaining to Russia's prosperity and development. Patrushev, a diehard Silovik firmly within Putin's inner circle, is now responsible for the new 'coordinating role' with all mechanisms and bodies of the government. The empowerment of the Russian Security Council is a drastic theoretical transformation from its meaningless existence prior to 2009.

Immediately after May 2009 the Russian Security Council began asserting itself in the formulation of the new Russian military doctrine guided by the council's lead military traditionalist, General Baluyevsky.[367] The hawkish elements of the Russian government now firmly hold the reins of influence and an assertive foreign policy is an entirely viable product after this transformation of the Russian Security Council. Even the tone of the National Security Concept document in 2009 compared with the one adopted in 2000 is vastly different in character and confidence.[368] The 2009 document reflects a confident, vibrant country that rose from the economic and military quagmire that characterized it during the Yeltsin years. There was no sense of doom or catastrophe as Keir Giles, an eminent defence and security expert, describes it. [369]

As noted earlier, Baluyevsky is Medvedev's harshest critic regarding the delay of using force against Georgia and the relationship between the two men is a strained and cantankerous one. The Russian Security Council has bolstered the hardline elements of the Kremlin against the liberal-minded President who did not share an affinity for jingoistic truculence. Clashing temperaments and ideological predispositions have formalized into a shift of power within the inner workings of the Kremlin. The Russian Security Council has a powerful role in voicing its opposition or support for the President's orders and agendas. Patrushev further cements the Russian Security Council's role by supervising a document

[367] Ibid.
[368] Ibid.
[369] Ibid.

that entitles it with a duty to intervene in security matters, which can relate to virtually any issue or agenda. The encompassing role of this institution has experienced a powerful elevation from its former status prior to 2009.

The powerful Russian presidency, which is wholly dependent on its superior presidential system that was granted by the Yeltsin-authored constitution in 1993, must control a mechanism that has an altered institutional protocol that gives it the viability to assert itself in every aspect of domestic and foreign affairs. Regardless of how powerful the Russian Security Council is now, the 1993 Russian Constitution firmly denies any mechanism of government to supersede or compete with the ultimate authority of the presidential officeholder.[370] The Russian Security Council is shielded from the Gorbachovian forces of public legitimacy because none of its members require an electoral victory to stay in that position, but the Yeltsonian constitutional forces are firmly the reason Patrushev needed to revise the role of the advisory mechanism to satisfy Medvedev's wishes. Even the language of the document makes it clear that the Russian Security Council is wholly dependent on the President it serves. Its mandate extends to a variety of issues, but its role is determined by the President. The Russian Security Council document states: 'By resolution of the President of the Russian Federation, documents regarding issues of domestic and foreign policy can be brought up for review before the Security Council of the Russian Federation.'[371] The Security Council of the Russian Federation can only participate at the behest of the President and the Council's document that strengthened its role was only possible by the decree of President Medvedev. Without the President's express approval and consent, the Russian Security Council cannot be an integral

[370] Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010), < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.

[371] Rustrans, 'Russia's National Security Strategy to 2020', Rustrans [web page] (2009) <http://rustrans.wikidot.com/russia-s-national-security-strategy-to-2020>, accessed Jan 31 2012.

mechanism of the foreign policy decision-making process. While the Ministry of Defence and Ministry of Foreign Affairs act independently by virtue of the large, complex bureaucracies and key players out of the Kremlin's grasp, the Russian Security Council still remains an arm of the Russian President. The President may act without the Russian Security Council, even though the document gives it a more important role. The Russian Security Council depends solely on the wishes of the President whose constitutional powers grant the ultimate authority to formulate foreign policy wishes according to chosen methods and usage of mechanisms. The 2009 United Nations Security Council Resolution against North Korea for its illegal nuclear armament testing was the first test for the Russian Security Council's 'new' role in the policy formulation of major decisions during the Medvedev presidency.

United Nations Resolution 1874:

The United Nations Security Council resolutions against North Korea have always included the Russian Federation. To assert that United Nations Resolution 1874 imposed in June 2009 was unprecedented would be categorically incorrect. Two resolutions were passed against North Korea with Russia's involvement during 2006. The same factors therefore exist during the Medvedev years as did during the Putin years. The common aggressive stance against Georgia and North Korea would indicate that territorial security is paramount to the Kremlin and supersedes any misgivings about intervening in foreign security dilemmas. The pattern of a new assertive foreign policy is evident and has continued unabated by the Medvedev presidency, even though the liberal-minded President claims to have his own guiding principles. However, United Nations Resolution 1874 was a severe set of diplomatic and economic sanctions against the rogue state. Therefore, the

internal and external forces affecting the Kremlin must be analyzed in order to ascertain what can be extrapolated from this decision by the Russian Federation.

The Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs made two relevant statements in relation to North Korean actions in 2009 that ultimately resulted in United Nations sanctions:

> We call on our DPRK partners to display a responsible attitude for the sake of regional stability, the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the respect for and observation of the UN Security Council resolutions. We still think that the nuclear problem of the Korean Peninsula may be resolved only at the six-nation negotiations.[372]

> The latest steps of the DPRK escalate tensions in Northeast Asia and endanger regional security and stability. We recognize the lawful concerns of the DPRK and do not see any real alternative in the provision of its security to political and diplomatic efforts and the formation of relevant regional institutions with the participation of all interested sides.[373]

Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergei Lavrov rarely revealed the inner workings of his own thought process or the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' deliberations over issues, but what is clear is that Lavrov spent the entire time leading up to the North Korean confrontation and several months afterwards staunchly chastising the nuclear activity. Lavrov was not a vocal proponent of United Nations sanctions; he instead was a proponent for the return to the Six-Party negotiations. These two official statements by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs directly reflect his stated views and are compatible with his temperament and diplomatic upbringing. Lavrov, a consummate diplomat who solidified his status in the Russian government during his years at the United Nations as an ambassador and continued as the chief minister of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, maintained his 'diplomatic but assertive posturing' as he had been known to do throughout his career.[374] The solution for Lavrov, as evident during his ten years as United Nations Ambassador, involved the diplomat's

---

[372] 'FM: Russia urges DPRK to demonstrate responsibility', People's Daily Online, 25 May 2009, in Google News Archive, accessed 12 June 2012.

[373] Ibid.

[374] Patrick Jackson, 'Profile: Putin's Ministor of Foreign Affairs Lavrov', The BBC [web document] (2007), < http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/6242774.stm>, accessed 18 June 2012.

method of sitting in one cohesive forum and communicating concerns and formulating solutions. Hence, 'We must avoid any hasty conclusions. Clearly this situation does not cause joy, it causes our concern. We would like to have a clear understanding of all details,' Lavrov was quoted as saying during a press conference.[375]

Lavrov's role as chief diplomat has been unchallenged since he was appointed in 2004, even though he was a holdover from the Yeltsin years. The emphasis on Russian diplomacy has been one of asserting Russian interests, but not reflecting a security-obsessed trend or jingoistic truculence as clearly shown by the Siloviki and the military traditionalists. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs continues to be a bastion for Lavrov and liberal-minded diplomatic operatives who do not possess the same qualities as those who now occupy the Kremlin. Putin's tenure did not significantly alter the institutional predisposition of the foreign affairs arm of the government in the same vein as the presidency and defence apparatus were utilized to impose a new era completely different from the Yeltsin years.

Lavrov's visit to North Korea during the escalating conflict was made for the sole reason of pleading with the North Korean leadership to return to the negotiating table.[376] Lavrov though was not met by any high-ranking members of the North Korean leadership, but his 'diplomatic but assertive' posturing is apparent throughout the entire 2009 ordeal.[377] He did not favour defence diplomacy or any harsh tactics as seen during the foreign policy episode with Georgia. Lavrov proceeded to advocate a return to the Six-Party Talks, even

[375] Conor Sweeney, 'Russia's Lavrov warns against haste over North Korea', Reuters, 7 Apr. 2009, Google News Archive [online datavase], accessed 11 June 2012.
[376] CNS Staff, 'North Korea's Nuclear Test and its Aftermath: Coping with the Fallout', Google [web document] (2009), <http://www.nti.org/analysis/articles/north-koreas-nuclear-test-aftermath/>, accessed 19 June 2012.
[377] Ibid.

after the resolution was passed. Lavrov's position remained unchanged. [378] He believed this conflict was the result of North Korea's refusal to engage in multilateral diplomacy.[379]

Vitaly Churkin, the Russian Ambassador to the United Nations and member of Lavrov's ideological brethren, reflected the Minister of Foreign Affairs' 'diplomatic but assertive' posturing. 'Although some new restrictions against North Korea cannot be avoided, these measures must be targeted, proportionate to the threat of nuclear proliferation and reversible,' Russia's Ambassador to the United Nations Vitaly Churkin stated.[380] Lavrov and Churkin communicated a desire that the sanctions should not be excessive or adverse to the needs of North Korean civilians who truly do not have a role in their government's decisions.[381] Hence, 'We also expect all the relevant parties to avoid any actions that might exacerbate tension,' the Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated.[382]

Lavrov, Churkin, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs acted in unison to thwart what could be perceived as an excessive punishment because of North Korea's illegal nuclear activity and chose to advocate multilateral negotiations to end this potentially catastrophic situation. They remained assertive, which reflects a major difference in overall philosophy established by the Yeltsin government, but remained diplomatic, which reflects that the institutional bias to remain open to negotiations and avoid violence has continued during the leadership of the Putin-Medvedev duo and the inner circle brought in to facilitate change in governance and foreign policy. Russian diplomacy has become more assertive in tone but fundamentally unchanged.

The other end of the apparatus spectrum, the Minister of Defence and his ministry, was not as visible during this nuclear crisis as had been Lavrov and the Ministry of Foreign

[378] Ibid.
[379] Ibid.
[380] Ibid.
[381] Ibid.
[382] Ibid.

Affairs. Serdyukov, a Technocrat with a methodical temperament, did not exhibit a predisposition to advocate against the nuclear situation, even though a small border between North Korea and Russia made the situation relevant to security interests. Serdyukov was not a security-obsessed Silovik or jingoistic military traditionalist. He was a career bureaucrat who was neither a dove, nor hawk, but rather a dutiful civil servant. Serdyukov's actions during the Georgian crisis illustrated that he was a loyal arm of the foreign policy apparatus and was directly influenced by presidential decision. Serdyukov has never challenged the leadership of the Kremlin openly similar to his predecessor, Sergei Ivanov. The defence branch was led by a man who was obedient and methodical. The North Korean crisis proved this further.

Throughout Serdyukov's tenure he has been criticized for being reticent and marginal in the foreign policy formulation process, even to the point of Medvedev having to constantly defend him in addresses to the country.[383] Serdyukov never visited Pyongyang like Lavrov, but did visit China to discuss the North Korean issue among others in the months prior to the nuclear confrontation on the Korean peninsula in 2009.[384] Only one brief statement on the issue was made to the media jointly by the Ministers of Defence from China and Russia: 'On the North Korea nuclear issue, the source noted that, "Both Russia and China are convinced that the North Korean nuclear problem can and should be solved solely by peaceful means, and that any kind of sanctions against Pyongyang would prove counter-productive at the moment."'[385] As this meeting was reported, the NATO Missile Defence Shield was of primary importance for Russia and the North Korean issue fell into the backdrop. The Ministry of Defence in the Russian Federation has been far more

[383] RIA Novosti, 'Medvedev Defends Ousted Defense Minister in TV Interview', RIA Novosti [web page] (2012) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20121207/177976558.html>, accessed 25 July 2012.

[384] RIA Novosti, 'Russian, Chinese Defence Ministers to Meet in Beijing', RIA Novosti [web page] (2012) <http://en.rian.ru/world/20081210/118777026.html>, accessed 25 July 2012.

[385] Ibid.

concerned with the NATO missile system in the Czech Republic. There are numerous statements and warnings from the Ministry of Defence about NATO defence issues, but scant references to the North Korean issue.[386] Serdyukov's primary concern during his tenure was that NATO not infringe upon Russian security, and this is clearly indicated by his preoccupation with the issue. The Silovik faction still maintain important positions in the Kremlin, and its leader Vladimir Putin 'rules in tandem' with Medvedev's express approval. The security-obsessed Silovik traits have seeped into Serdyukov's performance as Minister of Defence and this is reflected by his foremost attention drawn to the NATO Missile Defence Shield issue. Serdyukov's obedient nature and absence of ideology make him a prime tool for the security-obsessed ideologues to exert their influence for the sake of Russian security interests. Furthermore, the centralization of defence capability and authority in the Minister of Defence directly stemming from Serdyukov's reforms, has created a powerful tool in neutralizing any dissent among defence and military officials in the event they clashed with the Kremlin's wishes.[387] The presidential decision could not be challenged by anyone within the defence apparatus, except the Minister of Defence. In this case, the Minister of Defence was simply a reflection of the Kremlin's wishes and as evident by the Georgian and North Korean issues, Serdyukov did not challenge either decision.

Russian representation of its position in the lead up to the United Nations sanctions against North Korea in 2009 was wholly dominated by Sergei Lavrov. Russian foreign policy, whether consciously or not, treated this as a diplomatic issue more so than a threat to its own security. Serdyukov rarely spoke about this issue and the world media

[386] Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation, 'Home Page', Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation [web page] (2013) < http://eng.mil.ru/en/index.htm>, accessed 29 July 2012.

[387] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

communicated with Lavrov primarily. The pressing matter was to be decided at the United Nations and therefore this foreign policy decision was diplomatic in nature. Multilateral diplomacy was Lavrov's area of expertise. While Lavrov was concerned by this issue affecting multilateral diplomacy, Serdyukov's defence duties drew him to the NATO issue that affected Russian security in fundamental ways unlike the North Korean nuclear confrontation. Russia does not view the North Korean dilemma with the same apprehension as the West or the United States. Russia has consistently bolstered the Six-Party Talks and China's tenure as chair. Lavrov and Serdyukov have different perceptions of what is more important on the world stage and have different priorities that reflect their respective organizations. For the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, the United Nations Security Council and its actions were of foremost importance. The Ministry of Defence of Russia had little to no involvement in the multilateral diplomacy of the United Nations. Its primary concern was whether its military forces and post-Soviet sphere remained relatively safe to ensure Russian peace and prosperity. Serdyukov began his tenure as Minister of Defence with having to deal with NATO expansion viewed as a security intrusion by the Kremlin, while Lavrov spent his formative years at the United Nations and tenure as Minister of Foreign Affairs intricately involved with the ongoing debates and deliberations on the United Nations Security Council.

Serdyukov's relative nonchalance when compared with Lavrov can be attributed to different formative experiences, priorities, and personal qualities. Serdyukov, formerly the head of the taxation bureau, had no experience in multilateral diplomacy, and was mired in the Ministry of Defence's preoccupation with NATO and its security architecture. Serdyukov remained a dutiful and obedient individual of Putin's inner circle. His lack of ideology and fervent lack of enthusiasm over foreign policy issues as evident by his near

absence in communication with the news media have made him a viable arm for implementing the Kremlin's decisions without fearing an ideological debate or bureaucratic rebellion. Putin personally appointed him to his position in 2007 to further tighten his grasp over the different mechanisms of the foreign policy apparatus. The North Korean issue illustrated that the Russian Minister of Defence is a marginal figure in diplomatic issues and loyal appointee in reflecting the Kremlin's decisions when they are made. The United Nations Security Council decision directly involved the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs because the nature of the issue was treated by the Russian government as diplomatic rather than security-based by virtue of its handling of the crisis.

Six days prior to the North Korean nuclear test, Nikolai Patrushev was presented with a think tank report that concluded the NATO Missile Defence Shield system was useless and unnecessary to counter an improbable threat from Iran.[388] According to the report, Iranian nuclear development was rudimentary in the most optimistic of the report's assessments.[389] This clearly was compatible with the overall Russian argument that NATO missiles in Europe were not tantamount to achieving international security. Patrushev, the staunch Silovik who previously headed the Federal Security Bureau, undoubtedly found this report reassuring and it subsequently bolstered his Silovik instincts. The Silovik faction's chief grievance in recent years has been that NATO enlargement equates to encroachment of Russian security. North Korea and Iran were not primary concerns for security-obsessed individuals such as Patrushev, but rather NATO and its nuclear arsenal placed near Russia's sphere maintained relevance in the daily foreign policy deliberations.

It is important to re-acknowledge the fact that Patrushev was the chief influence of the National Security Concept document that theoretically strengthened the role of the

[388] RIA Novosti, 'Russian-U.S. panel says missile shield in Europe ineffective', RIA Novosti [web page] <http://www.rianovosti.com/world/20090519/155043876.html>, accessed 29 June 2012.
[389] Ibid.

Russian Security Council in the foreign policy apparatus.[390] This was executed in the aftermath of the Georgian crisis in which the Russian Security Council was not used for deliberating the decision to respond militarily but rather to communicate the decision made prior to the meeting.[391] The fundamental tactic to blunt the voices that may have disagreed with the presidential decision or wished to alter how the military order was implemented was achieved by a conscious marginalization of the Russian Security Council during what may be argued as Medvedev's most consequential decision during his presidency in terms of foreign policy.[392] Patrushev's Silovik instincts were virtually ignored by Medvedev's insistence on not using this advisory mechanism to deliberate his decision. The strengthening of the role of the Russian Security Council is a reaction to this neutralization of the mechanism's potency during the Georgian crisis. This motivated the basis for the new document.

In essence, Patrushev was now able to assert his Silovik views into an official status while increasing the importance of the Russian Security Council after Medvedev left him out of the deliberations for war with Georgia. The strengthening of Patrushev's advisory forum indicates an eagerness not to have the same marginalization repeated. Patrushev singled out two important facets of his document in the subsequent months of its formulation.[393] Patrushev outlined his perception of Russia's role in the world in its new energy doctrine.[394] As published by *The Jamestown Foundation*:

> The document also claims that Russia has overcome the "consequences of the systemic political and socioeconomic crisis of the late 20th century" and has restored

[390] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.
[391] Ibid.
[392] Ibid.
[393] Roger McDermott, 'Russia Prepares a New Draft Security Strategy Through 2020.', The Jamestown Foundation [online journal}, 6/2 (2009), < http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=34307>, accessed 1 June 2012.
[394] Ibid.

> its position in the world through "multi-polar international relations." In fact, this concept stands out as its cornerstone. After designating the United States as Russia's main rival, it turns to consider the ways in which Russia may maintain its position in the world in the future. Rivalry for controlling global energy resources is singled out as a long-term source of conflict.[395]

Patrushev and Baluyevsky are staunch advocates of increasing Russia's dominance on the world stage and returning it to 'great power status.'[396] This ideology has clearly influenced the Russian Security Council document and the two hardliners seek to effectuate this shift in the foreign policy against the grain of any liberal-minded capitulators or apologists for Russia's assertive role in world affairs. According to the document, the Russian Federation is now past its infancy and ready to return to the status of its predecessor, the Soviet Union.[397] Patrushev and Baluyevsky maintain the Cold War era worldview that incorporates a demonization of the United States and its Western allies, as well as a chagrin of American domination on the world stage. The hardline elements of the Russian foreign policy spectrum have now asserted themselves by virtue of this document and its authors hope to shift the fundamentals of Russian foreign policy in this direction.

The emphasis of protecting energy interests as the document painstakingly details is a direct result of its contentious relationships with Georgia and Ukraine.[398] The diplomatic impasses with Georgia and Ukraine severely restrain the supply routes and potential pipelines for energy supplies.[399] The Silovik instinct in this situation would dictate a more abundant array of strategies to counter the obstacles in order to allow freer access of energy markets. Blocked supply routes are adverse to the Russian economy, national productivity,

---

[395] Ibid.

[396] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[397] Ibid.

[398] Roger McDermott, 'Russia Prepares a New Draft Security Strategy Through 2020.', The Jamestown Foundation [online journal}, 6/2 (2009), < http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=34307>, accessed 1 June 2012.

[399] Ibid.

and quality of life among Russian citizens. These important facets are all intricately essential to Russia's standing on the world stage and Patrushev and Baluyevsky are cognizant of this as evident by the document they authored.

The foreign policy arms of the Kremlin are essentially neutralized. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is led by Lavrov, who is known to be a Yeltsin Liberal with no powerful role in foreign policy formulation.[400] The Ministry of Defence is led by a man who is a Technocrat that favours pragmatism over ideology and remains a dutiful public servant for the Kremlin's leadership. The Russian Security Council is a bastion for the hardline elements incorporated by the Siloviki and military traditionalists who advocate hawkish posturing and power politics in the ultimate hopes to return to great power status. The Kremlin's leadership has these three distinct branches of its foreign policy apparatus that circle around it to influence the decision-making process. The Russian Security Council does not have a vital role in the policy formulation process comparable with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or Ministry of Defence. The Georgian episode revealed that the Russian Security Council's existence as an advisory board was superfluous and essentially meaningless. Patrushev's effort to amend the situation and evolve the role of his advisory forum to elevate it to a more important role in the Kremlin's foreign policy apparatus was now theoretically achieved. This occurred simultaneously while attempting to give it a distinct ideology that was compatible with the Siloviki, who were advocates of policies and decisions that were not compatible with Medvedev's liberal temperament and dovish posturing. The North Korean crisis in 2009 was an important test for the Russian Security Council's new role.

[400] Patrick Jackson, 'Profile: Putin's Minister of Foreign Affairs Lavrov', The BBC [web document] (2007), < http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/6242774.stm>, accessed 18 June 2012.

On May 13, 2009, which was nearly two weeks before the North Korean nuclear issue ignited, the Kremlin posted a long statement that emphasized the new role of the Russian Security Council, specifically in relation to the other branches of government:

> In the document, its subsequent comprehensive assessment and coordination representative departments of the Presidential Administration and the Office of the Plenipotentiary of the President of the Russian Federation in the federal districts, the Government of the Russian Federation, of the federal executive authorities, the Russian Academy of Sciences, and other state academies and academic institutions.[401]

The posting emphasizes that the Russian Security Council is equivalent to the important agencies and branches of government that it lists.[402] This emphasis further cements that the Russian Security Council's marginalization in the past cannot be repeated because the National Security Concept document has emboldened the importance of the advisory board; the goal of the authors was for the Russian Security Council to no longer be accused of being a 'sinecure' or 'effete body.' This was signed into decree by Dmitry Medvedev on May 13 and on May 25 North Korea violated international norms by testing nuclear weapons and continuing its status as a 'rogue state.'

Even though the nuclear launch was on May 25, the Russian Security Council did not convene until May 29.[403] Medvedev still maintained the authority to summon the Russian Security Council at his behest and the National Security Concept document was certified by 'presidential decree.' Therefore, the mechanism of the Russian Security

---

[401] The Security Council of the Russian Federation, 'About the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation to 2020', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2009), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?depth=1&ei=wUzST_f0IIKL8gPN3ZCdAw&hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3Dsecurity%2Bcouncil%2Bof%2Brussian%2Bfederation%26hl%3Den%26safe%3Dactive%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvnsu&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/437.html&usg=ALkJrhh7ynhSmehB7SALhJYniUfvp9ZU0w>, accessed 29 July 2012.

[402] Ibid.

[403] The Security Council of the Russian Federation, 'Operational meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2009), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?depth=1&ei=wUzST_f0IIKL8gPN3ZCdAw&hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3Dsecurity%2Bcouncil%2Bof%2Brussian%2Bfederation%26hl%3Den%26safe%3Dactive%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvnsu&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/449.html&usg=ALkJrhjhOHY5vmGify3ZRtgHpimZNTxiHw >, accessed 29 July 2012.

Council, while strengthened in its role, does not act without the authority of the President. The presidential directive still maintains its overriding power as granted by the 1993 Russian Constitution. The Russian Security Council does not act like a Prime Minister's cabinet, but rather a committee of members who are dependent on whether the Russian President chooses to convene them in an official manner. This was Yeltsin's vision of the presidency and his successors have used these Yeltsonian constitutional powers to exercise nearly absolute power over all agencies and branches of the Russian government. The Russian Security Council's inability to counter the President's marginalization of it is a testament to Yeltsin's presidential empowerment that has allowed Medvedev to be the ultimate authority figure in the Kremlin's decision-making apparatus.

Instead of instantly and officially advising the President on this matter, Patrushev spent May 28 holding bilateral discussions with middle-level officials from India and China.[404] The importance of these meetings is debatable, but the Russian Security Council Secretary's new document did not give him the powerful access to heads of state such as Lavrov and Serdyukov were entitled to by practice and institution. The Russian Security Council did not elevate itself to the same level as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or Ministry of Defence as evident by the lack of access to important foreign leaders. Regardless of the new National Security Concept document, the institution still lacked the access and importance within the foreign policy apparatus to which the ministries were privy.

The official government posting of the meeting on May 29 of the Russian Security Council did not elaborate on what issues were discussed and it was described as an

[404] The Security Council of the Russian Federation, 'About News and Information', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2009), <http://translate.google.co.uk/translate?hl=en&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/&ei=wUzST_f0IIKL8gPN3ZCdAw&sa=X&oi=translate&ct=result&resnum=5&ved=0CHIQ7gEwBA&prev=/search%3Fq%3Dsecurity%2Bcouncil%2Bof%2Brussian%2Bfederation%26hl%3Den%26safe%3Dactive%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvnsu>, accessed 29 July 2012.

'operational meeting,' not an 'emergency meeting.'[405] Regardless of how it was classified, most of the important officials were present with one notable exception.[406] Medvedev, Putin, Lavrov, and Patrushev attended to discuss all pertinent matters, but Serdyukov was conspicuously absent.[407] Serdyukov, a dutiful Technocrat mired in the Ministry of Defence's battle against NATO from his inaugural day as Minister of Defence, did not attend this meeting. The three obvious reasons can be extrapolated by analyzing the situation and his respective position. First, Medvedev enjoyed a collegiate relationship with the like-minded Serdyukov who did not possess any jingoistic tendencies or hawkish notions of the world. They were compatible with one another and Serdyukov's amiable temperament would have made it easy for Medvedev to communicate his decision in relation to the North Korean issue. Second, Serdyukov's main role as Minister of Defence precluded him from having any issue other than NATO enlargement and its threat to Russian security as the fundamental, overriding issue of his tenure. Finally, the meeting was classified as 'operational' and not 'emergency' as the crisis with Georgia was labelled.[408] The defence apparatus was not inclined to involve itself with an issue that did not severely affect Russian security. The defence apparatus overall did not involve itself in the North Korean issue for the reasons previously stated.

On the same day, Patrushev attended a meeting with BRIC representatives by Russia's initiative to discuss diplomatic and economic issues.[409] The official statement had a veiled reference as to whether the North Korean issue would be open to discussion.[410] The Kremlin's website noted: 'Generally agreed that it is not directed against any dialogue

[405] Ibid.
[406] Ibid.
[407] Ibid.
[408] Ibid.
[409] Ibid.
[410] Ibid.

between Brazil, Russia, India and China is based on mutual respect and consideration for the interests of each other and to strengthen cooperation BRIC, peace, stability and development in the countries participating in the meeting and on the planet.'[411] The reference of the meeting 'not directed against any dialogue between Brazil, Russia, India, and China' would most certainly mean that the North Korean issue was precluded from being discussed. China has historically maintained the role of 'big brother' to its 'little brother,' North Korea.[412] It also chaired the Six-Party Talks and was a constant defender of North Korea, despite having its quarrels with its neighbour. The meeting was clearly convened to discuss BRIC trade issues, not political or diplomatic issues pertaining to individual states. Therefore, this was another missed opportunity for the Russian Security Council Secretary to intervene in this important nuclear dilemma facilitated by North Korean actions on the world stage. The Kremlin leadership, despite the National Security Concept document that Medvedev signed into law, did not allocate the North Korean issue to Patrushev and his Security Council. With the delay of consulting the Russian Security Council and the new security document now decreed, it is safe to conclude that the Russian Security Council's role remains on the sidelines.

The ultimate decision lay in the hands of Dmitry Medvedev and his non-usage of the Russian Security Council to react to North Korean provocation on the world stage further cements his hesitation to use this Silovik controlled institution to formulate decisions. As Dr. Sergei Khrushchev noted during an interview with the author, it was abundantly clear that while Medvedev and Putin maintain a close relationship, their respective factions do not share the same affinity for one another.[413] With the Siloviki not

[411] Ibid.

[412] Ibid.

[413] S. Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.

controlling the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or Ministry of Defence, the Russian Security Council is the last bastion of control for the security-obsessed hawks operating within the foreign policy apparatus. Medvedev did not summon the Russian Security Council in an emergency meeting, nor did he announce a decision after the first meeting in the aftermath of the North Korean launch. Medvedev's methodical style and liberal-minded inclinations are primary reasons for this marginalization of the Silovik dominated mechanism. The National Security Concept document has yet to provide the Russian Security Council with the leverage necessary to be a prominent factor in foreign policy decisions. With the defence apparatus being uninvolved in the crisis and foreign affairs apparatus led by an outsider of Putin's inner circle, the Putin-Medvedev duo had to make a decision, which was instructed to United Nations Ambassador Vitaly Churkin. Medvedev stated, 'We need to think about some measures to deter those programs that are being conducted. We hope the North Korean leadership will get back to the negotiating table, because there is no other solution to this problem.'[414]

Dmitry Medvedev's statement is clearly a product of the interpersonal bargaining between his liberal tendencies and his mentor's, Vladimir Putin, hawkish posturing. The bilateral discussions between these two resulted in a stance that is compatible with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' 'diplomatic but assertive' modus operandi since the inauguration of Putin in 2000. The compromise between the Technocrat President and Silovik Prime Minister led to Russian support of sanctions that were firm but not excessive. The sanctions did not destroy the North Korean economy or infrastructure. In addition to this, Russia never mentioned the possibility of military sanctions. Vitaly Churkin and Sergei Lavrov, Yeltsin Liberals who utilized assertive tones were ideologically and

[414] Maria Bartiromo, 'Medvedev's Strong Words for North Korea ', Bloomberg Businessweek, 3 June 2009, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 July 2012.

temperamentally compatible with United Nations Resolution 1874 passed on June 12, 2009. This was an instance when the Putin-Medvedev duo, which came to power to change the country after the Yeltsin Liberals mismanaged Russian politics, fell in sync with the Yeltsin Liberals who still maintained powerful positions in the diplomatic arm of the Russian government. The Russian Ambassador to the United Nations was noted as saying:

> "The additional measures are substantive and targeted in nature and clearly tied to ending the DPRK program to create nuclear missiles," Russian envoy Vitaly Churkin said after the vote. "The attempt by the DPRK to create nuclear missiles not only doesn't strengthen security but on the contrary ratchets up tension on the Korean peninsula."[415]

Also according to the United Nations Ambassador from the Russian Federation in another statement:

> Churkin said his country was "satisfied" by the unanimous adoption of the resolution against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, or DPRK. He said the Russians made sure that the provisions for checking ships on the high seas would not set a precedent, and that he hoped the resolution would steer North Korea back to six-party nuclear disarmament talks. [416]

As Churkin succinctly outlined, the sanctions were aimed at ending the nuclear development program and he did not attribute the resolution to any other motive.[417] The central focus of this effort as the Russian Ambassador to the United Nations said was to bring North Korea back to the negotiating table, which Medvedev has repeatedly urged. [418] Lavrov and Churkin's liberalism would have surely dictated a return to the Six-Party Talks and their affinity for liberal institutionalism would have been satisfied. As diplomats of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, this would be their institutional bias and their years of diplomatic service would surely influence them to support this effort. The Russian

---

[415] Bill Varner and Peter S. Green, 'UN Votes to Punish North Korea for Nuclear Test', Bloomberg, 12 June 2012, Google News Archive, accessed 28 June 2012.

[416] Ibid.

[417] Ibid.

[418] Maria Bartiromo, 'Medvedev's Strong Words for North Korea ', Bloomberg Businessweek, 3 June 2009, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 July 2012.

President and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs acted in unison without any discernible friction. Medvedev's closest bureaucrat in the Kremlin, Vladimir Putin, gave a strong view of the reasoning behind the decision to consent to sanctions by the Russian Federation.[419] Putin said:

> Yes, indeed. The situation is very worrisome and very acute. And we can't but be worried about that. Whatever happens there is happening in the very vicinity of our borders as it were. Having said that, we count a lot on the fact that the prudence will get the upper hand there. Emotions will be shelved. And the dialogue will be started. Without a dialogue, it is not possible to come to an agreement.[420]

Vladimir Putin's role in this decision is apparent by his constant meetings and admitted private conversations on all issues pertaining to the Russian Federation with the Russian President, who considers Putin to be his mentor. The 'tandem democracy' by definition means that both men are equally important in presidential decisions and Putin's input maintained a high priority in Medvedev's response to the North Korean confrontation. Putin described the situation as 'very worrisome' and this was a rare admission of apprehension by the stern former KGB operative.[421] The nuclear missiles would surely ignite his Silovik instincts and Putin's desire to protect Russian security interests is inherent with his intelligence upbringing and formative years. The border issue between North Korea and Russia is of central importance to Putin because of his shrewd cognizance that the missiles are within reach of Vladivostok and other targets within the eastern Russian sphere.

A striking nuance in Putin's response to the issue is that he fully supports the Six-Party Talks when a hardliner would have supported multilateral military sanctions or even unilateral military intervention to quell the North Korean threat to the Russian border. The

---

[419] Larry King, 'Interview With Russian Prime Minister Putin', CNN Archive [web document] (2010), .<http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1012/01/lkl.01.html>, accessed 29 July 2012.

[420] Ibid.

[421] Ibid.

discussions between Putin and the liberal-minded Medvedev, who technically outranked his mentor, made it clear that the Russian President supported a return to multilateral dialogue. Any of Putin's Cold War instincts or hawkish posturing that may have led to him advocating using force would have been vanquished by the new President who possessed no affinity for using military force, unless the security of Russia was directly and severely threatened. The Kremlin did not treat the North Korean issue with the same seriousness as the Georgian crisis. This was a diplomatic issue, not a defence issue in the eyes of the Russian leadership. Medvedev commented:

> Regarding North Korea, the situation there worries me more, because while Iran is still talking to the international community, North Korea has currently suspended almost all of its contacts. And the group engaged in the six-party talks concerning the problem of North Korea's nuclear programme is currently inactive. Meanwhile North Korea continues to carry out nuclear tests and launches of short-, medium- and higher than medium-range missiles. The missiles that North Korea is using have tremendous range. This has to be of concern for us. We are located in close proximity to this country.[422]

Medvedev's handling of this issue is a stark episode in exercising the powerful Yeltsonian forces that have empowered him to sway unusual control over the mechanisms of his foreign policy decision-making. Medvedev did not use the Russian Security Council for the purpose of formulating a decision in the immediate aftermath of the North Korean nuclear testing in May 2009 and he chose not to include his Minister of Defence in an official capacity. The Russian Constitution of 1993 firmly and unquestionably places all power within the office of the Russian presidency. There is no viable method for the members of the President's foreign policy apparatus to rebel against him and successfully challenge a presidential decision. As the 1993 Russian Constitution was authored to give the President every right and privilege to respond to crises affecting Russian security, the

[422] RAI and Corriere della Sera, 'President of Russia Interview', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2009), <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2009/07/05/1000_type82914type82916_219023.shtml>, accessed 29 July 2012.

North Korean issue is fully within the scope of the Yeltsonian constitutional forces. Neither the judiciary, nor legislative body of the Russian Federation can successfully obstruct or prosecute the President for any decision he has made in the event of foreign policy crises. Medvedev emphasizes that a shared border and nuclear activity on the Korean peninsula are of serious concern to his country and his citizens.[423] This gives the President the complete legal and constitutional authority to formulate and implement the decision however the occupant of the office of the Russian presidency wishes. The Minister of Defence's absence and the delay of convening the Russian Security Council are clear signs that the Russian Constitution has emboldened President Medvedev to orchestrate and conduct foreign affairs to accommodate his will. The handling of the crisis was enabled by the 1993 Yeltsin-authored constitution.

Public legitimacy for this issue was questionable and difficult to ascertain. Namely, the Russian public does not possess the same level of passion against North Korean nuclear activity as it does against NATO enlargement. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva noted, 'North Korea is not a concern of the Russian public. It's the West that the Russians worry about. North Korean and Russia are close.'[424] The NATO Missile Defence Shield and the increasing membership of NATO stir passion far more than any nuclear activity on the Korean peninsula among Russian constituents.[425] The Russian public was ambivalent and indifferent to the issue. The border shared with North Korea was small and the population is centred in Western Russia. The relevance to the majority of the Russian public was weak and the roots of Russian antipathy were not ignited. The Russian public linked Georgian

[423] Ibid.

[424] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

[425]O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

'aggression' to NATO enlargement and the Russian citizenry overwhelmingly supported military action against Georgia and Saakashvili.[426] When compared with this crisis, the Kremlin was faced with a general public that had no definite feelings regarding North Korea. This was not a NATO confrontation, which is evident by Serdyukov's absence in the aftermath of the North Korean nuclear test, and the Russian public was indifferent to all the options in the situation.

Medvedev took this opportunity of being constitutionally enabled and not facing any opposition from an indifferent public to vote in support of United Nations sanctions against North Korea. *The Moscow Times* noted that Medvedev's support from the Russian public is a direct result of his close relationship with Vladimir Putin, whom the Russian public trusts and respects in a majority sense.[427] The man seen as 'the saviour of Mother Russia' after the Yeltsin years is a constant presence around Medvedev and repeatedly voices his support for presidential decisions. Medvedev, empowered by his close association to Putin, was able to bypass an indifferent public in relation to the North Korean issue. This was done because the general public considered the Putin-Medvedev duo trustworthy as indicated by polls.[428] Dr. Nina Khrushcheva commented, 'At least 60% of Russia still supports Putin because Russians believe he is standing up for Russia and defending Russia's friends and interests.'[429] Medvedev's actions are bolstered by public support because his Prime Minister is a constant source of reassurance and continuity. It is for these reasons that Medvedev was able to use his authority, even though the Russian public did not particularly support or oppose sanctions against North Korea.

---

[426] Levada Analytical Center, 'Russian Public Opinion March 2008 – March 2009', Jstor [web document] (2009), <http://www.levada.ru/sites/default/files/levada_2008_eng.pdf >, accessed 19 May 2012.

[427] 'Medvedev's Strength Is Putin: Poll', The Moscow Times, 16 Jan. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 20 May 2012.

[428] Ibid.

[429] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

The confluence of constitutional entitlement and a lacklustre response by the general public to the North Korean crisis created a viable opportunity for Medvedev to support Western-led sanctions against a country that did not pose a significant threat to the Russian Federation. Medvedev's persistent closeness with Putin provided him with the legitimacy among constituents that satisfied the Gorbachovian forces of democratization. Putin's standing among the Russian people was so high during this period that his closeness to Medvedev was tantamount to achieving support and legitimacy from a Russian public that was indifferent to nuclear activity on the Korean peninsula.

In September of 2009, Putin congratulated North Korea on one of its public holidays and urged for cooperation and friendship between the two countries.[430] Putin did not view North Korea with the same animosity as he did NATO or Georgia; his views are important in terms of establishing Russian public opinion. His lack of antipathy toward North Korea was a prime reason the Russian public that holds him in such high regard did not exhibit the same passion it did in response to Georgian military operations, which was linked by Russian constituents to Saakashvili's warm relationship with NATO. The Gorbachovian forces empowered Medvedev, whose legitimacy stems from his relationship with his popular Prime Minister, to make this decision without any opposition from his constituents. It would be difficult to imagine Medvedev acting either diplomatically by sanctions or militarily by force if Putin publicly warned against the President's impending decision. Putin's standing among the people would have most certainly created an impediment for Medvedev had his Prime Minister publicly disagreed with the presidential decision before the order was given to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Putin remains a

[430] RIA Novosti, 'Putin congratulates North Korea on 61st anniversary ', RIA Novosti [web page] (2009) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20090909/156070761.html>, accessed 29 July 2012.

potent tool for Medvedev's efforts to satisfy the need for public legitimacy before any serious action is taken on the world stage by the Russian Federation.

Reflections:

The decision to support sanctions against North Korea was subsequently supported twice in two United Nations Resolutions that prolonged United Nations Resolution 1874. The Medvedev presidency continued the 'diplomatic but assertive' stance against North Korea that had been initiated by Putin's support in 2006 to force the rogue state to comply with international norms after detonating nuclear armaments. The overarching policy of the Russian Federation is to support measures that will curb the nuclear security dilemma on the Korean peninsula.

In the immediate aftermath of the nuclear confrontation, the Russian government now operated with the passage of the new National Security Concept document that theoretically strengthened the role of the institution controlled by the Siloviki and chaired by Nikolai Patrushev, a like-minded colleague of Vladimir Putin. Medvedev chose not to use this advisory board and allow it to exercise its new privileges and entitlements authorized by presidential decree. Medvedev is prone to delaying the usage of this advisory board because of the Silovik tendencies it would seek to insert in policy formulation. Medvedev's relationship with Silovik faction leader Vladimir Putin is close, but Medvedev does not possess an affinity for the military traditionalists or former KGB operatives who were brought into power by Putin. Medvedev's early foreign policy decisions illustrate that the Russian President is not keen on allowing the hawkish elements of the government to forcefully sway his decisions. The relationship with Putin is cordial, private, and integral in the early years of Medvedev's presidency. The Russian Security Council's document is ultimately able to empower the institution that authored it only at the behest of the

President. Medvedev's power stemming from his office is not infringed or blunted by this new document that gives Siloviki the opportunity to insert themselves to a greater extent into the foreign policy dialogue of the new liberal-minded President. Furthermore, the personal relationships between Medvedev and the two men controlling the advisory mechanism, Patrushev and Baluyevsky, the latter of whom Medvedev removed from the defence apparatus after ideological clashes, are not nearly as close as his relationships with Putin, Serdyukov, or even Lavrov. Medvedev's ideological differences and personal disdain for the Russian Security Council's chief leaders have led to the institution's marginalization. The National Security Concept document has yet to produce any empowerment for the institution that authored it.

The Putin-Medvedev duo responsible for the Russian government's foreign policy decisions differ in ideology and temperament, and the product of their deliberations ultimately results in a compromised decision that can be described as 'diplomatic but assertive.' The Ministry of Foreign Affairs under Lavrov has maintained a diplomatic agenda with an assertive tone in relation to Russian interests and prestige. This concurrence of the Putin-Medvedev duo and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its chief minister reacting to world events in the same manner has allowed for smooth relations between the Kremlin and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as the diplomatic arm of the government acting in unison with presidential decisions. While the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is not composed of insiders from Putin's inner circle, the Yeltsin Liberals have adopted the new tone established by Putin in 2000. The new predisposition for 'diplomatic but assertive' posturing by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs coincides with the policy predispositions of the ruling tandem composed of a staunch Silovik Prime Minister and a liberal-minded Technocrat President.

As with the Georgian episode, Medvedev resisted reacting to the 'aggression' on the Russian-Georgian border with a jingoistic truculence that would have made it necessary to act instantly, severely, and disproportionately. Action did follow by Medvedev ordering military operations against Georgia, but only after deliberating and choosing a suitable military course did the President give the order, even though the hardline elements of the government were urging a sudden and disproportionate response that would satisfy jingoistic, hawkish tendencies. The support for sanctions against North Korea resulted after the resolution was deemed to be effective, but not devastating to the civilians and their way of life. This support for moderately severe sanctions is the result of liberal-minded Medvedev and hawkish Putin reaching a consensus between their respective array of ideological tendencies and worldviews.

Serdyukov's absence from the Russian Security Council meeting in the aftermath of the nuclear confrontation reveals three important facets of the Kremlin's handling of the issue. First, Medvedev and like-minded Serdyukov were ideologically compatible and personally comfortable with each other. Similar to the Georgian episode, the communication between the Russian President and the Minister of Defence is healthy, amiable, and productive. Serdyukov's presence at the meeting was unnecessary because he was not an individual who would advocate his views or urge the President to take a course incompatible with a Technocrat's inclinations. Second, the Kremlin did not believe that this was an issue of serious importance that affected the security of the Russian Federation. This issue did not stir the same level of passion as NATO enlargement or Georgian involvement in its breakaway regions. This was treated as a diplomatic issue with relevance at the United Nations, not national importance. While support for Medvedev was strong because of his close association with Putin, the general public was indifferent to North Korea.

Therefore, the Kremlin did not face any public opposition to its support for sanctions against the rogue state. The Gorbachovian forces of democratization did not pose as an obstacle to the course chosen by the Kremlin, but instead allowed Medvedev the public legitimacy he needed because of his close association with popular Vladimir Putin. Furthermore, it also reveals a major point in relation to the President's powerful constitutional entitlements. Medvedev nullified the Russian Security Council's document by delaying the employment of the advisory board again and choosing to leave the defence arm of the government out of reach from it. This was a subtle, but important reminder that the President by virtue of the Yeltsonian constitutional entitlements controls all the levers of power regardless of any new document that theoretically strengthens mechanisms within the foreign policy apparatus. The Russian President does not need the consent or involvement of any of his ministers or advisors when deliberating and formulating a foreign policy decision. The 1993 Russian Constitution authored by Boris Yeltsin solidified Medvedev's control over his government's ministers and advisors; the handling of the North Korean issue exemplified this fact. The Putin-Medvedev regime's approach to its next major foreign policy episode in Kyrgyzstan in 2010 is examined in the following chapter by also utilizing the Governmental Politics Model and assessing the Yeltsonian and Gorbachovian forces in the decision-making process.

Chapter 4: A Confluence of Two Inconsequential Foreign Policy Issues and One Important Foreign Policy Event

Introduction:

The Russian Federation experienced a confluence of two foreign policy issues of secondary importance and one consequential event during the same time period. The confluence and resulting effects on the Kremlin must be examined in order to fully assess the impact on the foreign policy-making apparatus. After a serious conflict with Georgia, which was an extension of Russia's antipathy toward NATO enlargement, and the consent to sanctions against a rogue regime, North Korea, which saw the Kremlin sway in the direction of acting for the sake of international security as well as its own, the Russian Federation was emboldened as a protector of its territorial security with respect to borders shared with Georgia and North Korea. The Russian Federation now exercised its right to enact measures to obstruct any encroachment of its security, and the North Korean situation further solidified Russia's important role on the United Nations Security Council. Russia was a firm protector of its territorial boundaries, as well as a key player to ensure security in the international community. Despite the political implications of the Georgian conflict and Russia's consent to sanctions against its neighbour, North Korea, the foreign policy of the Russian Federation was independent and vital in the eyes of the world. The Russian Federation was acting in what it saw as a new age of multipolarity without the 'capitulation or sense of defeat to the West and the United States seen during the Yeltsin years.'[431] Russia was returning to the game of great power politics and the Putinist vision of an independent, powerful Russian Federation was coming to fruition during the Medvedev years. Dr. Alexander Cooley, renowned expert on Central Asia and professor at Columbia

[431] Tsygankov, A. Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006).

University, noted: 'Russia still believes the post-Soviet territory belongs to the Kremlin. That's what makes Russia a great power because it controls these parts and speaks for those countries.'[432] Even though a liberal-minded President now held the reins of power, the Putinist vision was not lost on the new international and geopolitical opportunities for the Russian Federation to increase its leverage in world affairs.

Early 2010 saw the Russian Federation experience two inconsequential foreign policy issues, and one vital foreign policy event in the post-Soviet territory. The first was an adoption of a new military doctrine in February 2010 that reflected a more confident and aggressive defence imperative as authored by those who occupied the Kremlin. The second was a conclusion to the long process of mediation between the Obama Administration in the United States and Medvedev Administration in the Russian Federation that resulted in The New START Treaty, which was ratified in the United States Congress and the Russian Duma by the end of the year. The third issue was not entirely dissimilar to the Georgian episode; Kyrgyzstan, an important country for allocating military bases, was in the midst of a civil war, which saw the ousting of President Bakiyev. Dr. Alexander Cooley notes, 'It's the only country in the world with both American and Russian military bases.'[433]This fact has placed Kyrgyzstan high on the priority list of the United States and the Kremlin for strategic purposes. The Russian Federation faced these three issues simultaneously and facilitated a response in the context of the complementing forces that resulted from the confluence of events. No serious transformation of the Russian Federation or its leadership occurred, but the series of changes occurring simultaneously must be analyzed in order to understand the subsequent foreign policy decisions during the Medvedev presidency.

[432] A. Cooley, 'The ouster of President Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 14 December 2012, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.
[433] Ibid.

The new Russian military doctrine authorized by President Medvedev and The New START Treaty, which took over a year to be ratified at the executive level and then several months to pass through respective legislative bodies, was facilitated in the context of a resurgent Russia asserting itself in world affairs simultaneously with a new American President whose rhetoric suggested he sought equitable bilateral relations with a former foe of the United States. The new military doctrine and treaty coincided with a Russia that sought equal, strategic partnership with the United States and leverage with regards to NATO's increasing membership, which was a security concern among Kremlin policy-makers. The factors provided by the new military doctrine and rapprochement with the United States must be considered in relation to the Russian response to the civil war of a strategically important country in Central Asia.

All three issues were susceptible to the Yeltsonian and Gorbachovian forces in which the Kremlin operates. The presidential prerogative was exercised within the constitutional forces that allow the office of the presidency to make such decisions. The modus operandi of President Medvedev and his decisions were executed by virtue of the 1993 Russian Constitution, and each decision was watched and analyzed by the constituents over whom he held authority. Legitimacy from the governed and the presidential powers involved in decision-making will maintain an important priority in this analysis. The confluence of events provided a gripping period that illuminates the personal dynamics within the Kremlin, as well as the forces that shape it externally.

The first two events, specifically the authorization of the new military doctrine and The New START Treaty, provided the Medvedev presidency with its first major opportunity to recalibrate the military to the new assertive era after the dismal Yeltsin years. It provided a new encompassing treaty with its former Cold War adversary that gave

Medvedev the opportunity to shape new security architecture with the United States based on mutual respect and equality. This recognition further ingrained the importance of the Russian Federation in world affairs. The American hegemon recognized its former adversary as an equal. This emboldened the Russian Federation in terms of sense of pride, resurgence, and self-worth.[434] Hence, 'The principles of equality, parity, equal and undivided security lay a solid foundation for the modern Russian-American cooperation in various spheres,' Lavrov said when asked about The New START Treaty.[435] Dmitry Medvedev ultimately made these decisions within the system he inherited that was transformed by the lasting legacies of Boris Yeltsin's superior presidential powers and the Gorbachovian democratization that emboldened the constituents who had once been a non-factor in the foreign policy decision-making equation. Even though the external forces affected the chief executive in his decision-making, the key players under scrutiny in this body of research are completely impervious to the public legitimacy requirement. Therefore, the Gorbachovian forces directly and solely affect the President, while the Yeltsonian forces shape the methods with which the President manages and convenes his key players.

The Russian Military Doctrine of 2010:

A new military doctrine during a post-Putin presidency may have been viewed as an important event, but the fundamentals of the internal dynamics of the Kremlin precluded this 'important' document to alter the substance and protocol of the Russian Federation's military in relation to the office of the President or any other agency within the executive branch of government. As the Kremlin officially stated: '"The President informed the members of Russia's Security Council on Friday that he has approved two documents - the

[434] RIA Novosti, 'New START treaty "lays foundation"for Russia-U.S. cooperation - Lavrov', RIA Novosti [web page] (2011) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20110205/162466422.html>, accessed 1 June 2012.
[435] Ibid.

military doctrine and the Fundamentals of the state policy on nuclear deterrence until 2020," said presidential press secretary Natalia Timakova.'[436] Dmitry Medvedev's consent has fully authorized the new military doctrine, but the new principles are translated into practice by individuals with certain impulses and bureaucratic arrangements that make it virtually impossible for the Russian Ministry of Defence to have a transformational role in the foreign policy-making apparatus. Serdyukov's reforms and temperament fully empower the Russian President to control the defence apparatus and neutralize it in a manner that creates a solid connection between these two mechanisms of power. Serdyukov's reforms have effectively centralized all defence power within his office and created a buffer between the Russian generals and Medvedev.

Medvedev's feud with General Baluyevsky is a testament to this alienation and marginalization of the Russian generals. General Baluyevsky has remained an ardent critic of these reforms and Medvedev's tenure since the demotion of the Chief of General Staff position that was formerly much more independent and vital within the defence apparatus, but now is a relatively nominal position when compared with the Minister of Defence who is privy to undeniable and close access to the office of the Russian President. In addition to this, Serdyukov, the pragmatic and dutiful Technocrat with no discernible ideology, maintains his loyal and non-controversial tenure without ever openly defying or questioning Russian foreign policy. As the foreign policy episode with Georgia had made clear, the Minister of Defence was the ultimate contact point with which Medvedev engaged to commence military operations. Regardless of the issue, the Minister of Defence's powerful position and personal relationship with the President has enabled Medvedev to depend on Serdyukov to implement orders without fear of ideological reprisal

[436] RIA Novosti, 'Russian president approves new military doctrine', RIA Novosti [web page] (2010) <http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20100205/157785368.html >, accessed 1 June 2012.

or sabotage.[437] In spite of what the military doctrine entails, Medvedev's use of the defence mechanism will be accessible and free of obstruction because of the reforms, unchallenged by his fellow Technocrat, and bureaucratically compatible because of the power structure between the respective positions.

The Russian Security Council still maintains an advisory role within the Kremlin and this was solidified by the adoption of the National Security Concept document in 2009. The new role of the Russian Security Council was theoretically wider in scope. The Georgian conflict and the North Korean confrontation illuminated the role of the advisory forum and evidently it was not used as an emergency mechanism to respond to foreign policy events as the primary players on the council had hoped. The National Security Concept document had proposed an important role in terms of the formulation of policy by the Russian Security Council advising the various mechanisms within the foreign policy apparatus. Nikolai Patrushev, Russian Security Council Secretary said:

> Today, on February 5, President Medvedev approved the Military Doctrine. First of all, I would like to say that in May of last year the President adopted the national security strategy up to 2020, where the national defence is determined as one of the strategic national priorities. We should continue to work on the strategy, and the Military Doctrine is one of the results of this work.[438]

Patrushev's persistent marginalization in the policy debates as evident by the Georgian conflict and North Korean confrontation is now at a point where his advisory mechanism has the full authority to insert itself into the policy formulation. The National Security Concept document in 2009 was decreed by the President and gives Patrushev the opportunity to recalibrate or revise military doctrine, an important facet in decision-making. While the Russian Security Council's role in emergency situations is murky and unresolved

---

[437] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[438] Russia Today, 'Russia's new military doctrine approved', Russia Today [web page] (2010) < http://rt.com/usa/russia-military-doctrine-approved/>, accessed 1 June 2012.

by the choice of Dmitry Medvedev, the document authored by Patrushev in 2009 preconceived such an opportunity in which future doctrinal principles would have to be applied to foreign policy events.[439] Medvedev's habitual hesitation to employ the Russian Security Council during emergency foreign policy events cannot be affected because it is fully within the presidential prerogative to manoeuvre the mechanisms of power in this fashion. A preconceived doctrine is an abundant endeavour for the Russian Security Council to insert its worldview and influence the mechanisms of the foreign policy apparatus. There can be little doubt that Secretary Patrushev and General Baluyevsky, who had been marginalized thus far, would take this opportunity to sway the bureaucratic debates in the favour of a Silovik worldview that is also compatible with the military traditionalist ideology characterized by a Cold War era mentality.

The timing of the new doctrine could not have come at a better time to reflect the political and ideological fixation on NATO enlargement and the ongoing conflict with Georgia. The Silovik base's affinity for security against multilateral organizations of Western origin is apparent throughout the new military document. The ideological underpinning of the military doctrine is not dissimilar from the Putinist version in 2000. There were fundamentally few differences between Putin's military doctrine document and Medvedev's. It would be difficult to assume that security-obsessed Silovik Putin would allow the new military doctrine to be authored without his input. The personal relationship between the two is close and Putin's input, as well as the Russian Security Council's participation in drafting this document reflected an ideological affinity for the Silovik worldview of an aggressive approach to ensuring Russian security and absolute antipathy toward NATO. 'Despite the decrease in the possibility of unleashing a large-scale

[439] Ibid.

aggression using conventional arms and nuclear weapons against the Russian Federation, military threats to the Russian Federation have increased in a number of areas,' the document states.[440] According to the new military doctrine, Russia views the expansion of NATO as a primary threat to its security, as well as the international security sphere primarily depending on NATO and not sovereign states.[441] Another threat mentioned is 'the deployment of the strategic missile defence system that undermines international stability and violates the established balance of forces.'[442] The Putinist and Silovik aversion to the international security architecture remains persistent throughout the document.

Despite the ongoing presence of the Putin-appointed Siloviki, the military doctrine during the Medvedev presidency became more 'dovish' in one distinguishable aspect. Namely, the debate over nuclear capabilities in the military doctrine was subjected to various forms of analysis and inquiry by bureaucrats, but the outcome suggested that the Silovik control of this facet was not absolute. Nikolai Patrushev boasted that the Russian Security Council's new role in drafting military doctrine would most certainly signify an expansion of nuclear military doctrine in a formal document that was being authored, which eventually became the 2010 Russian Federation's military doctrine.[443] Patrushev's Silovik instincts were certainly ignited because of the Georgian conflict and his assessment of the threat of NATO's increasing membership; therefore, there can be little doubt that Patrushev's hawkish worldview would seek to formulate the new doctrine in a fashion that would solidify Russian foreign policy principles in favour of enabling the Kremlin to easily order nuclear strikes when Russian security is threatened. The Georgian conflict was the Kremlin's hawkish faction's opportunity to guide the debate toward a more aggressive

[440] Ibid.
[441] Ibid.
[442] Ibid.
[443] Nikolai Sokov, 'The New, 2010 Russian Military Doctrine: The Nuclear Angle.', James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies [online journal], (2010), <http://cns.miis.edu/stories/100205_russian_nuclear_doctrine.htm>, accessed 1 June 2012.

formal policy in foreign affairs. Oddly, the document does not reflect such a jingoistic, hawkish truculence that a Silovik controlled Russian Security Council would have envisioned. There are fewer paragraphs on nuclear protocol and many more details on modernizing conventional forces than in the 2000 military doctrine.[444] According to defence expert Nikolai Sokov, 'This shift of emphasis probably reflected the focus of the current political and military leadership on the undergoing military reform as well as the provision, contained in the 2000 National Security Concept, which regarded reliance on nuclear weapons as a stop-gap measure until thorough modernization of the Armed Forces is complete.'[445] The Serdyukov reforms of modernization and Medvedev's liberal predisposition serve as counterweights to the hardline elements of the Kremlin trying to sway foreign policy doctrine to become compatible with the Silovik worldview. In theoretical terms, the Technocrats did not view nuclear doctrine as a major necessity as opposed to the Siloviki who, as Patrushev loudly proclaimed, believed in a vigorous and aggressive foreign policy in relation to nuclear strike capability. The collective dread of the hawkish faction of the Kremlin is motivated by the desire to never return to the state of dismal capitulation that characterized the Yeltsin foreign policy in the minds of these bureaucrats.[446] Medvedev and Serdyukov's military reform agenda served to blunt this very desire by the Siloviki and the doctrine stands as a testament to the powerful technocratic operatives that present a serious obstacle for Silovik control of the foreign policy apparatus.

Regardless of the new military doctrine's de-emphasis of nuclear strike capability, the Siloviki and military traditionalists did not simply allow the entire doctrine to be an overture to the Technocrats who possessed leverage over their hawkish colleagues by virtue

---

[444] Ibid.

[445] Ibid.

[446] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

of the presidency and Minister of Defence position. NATO enlargement has maintained its relevance as the Kremlin's primary point of contention with respect to international security.[447] This fundamental grievance maintains its top priority by members of the foreign policy apparatus and the 2000 version of the military doctrine echoed these very sentiments after the disastrous Russian 'Partnership for Peace' with NATO initiated by the Yeltsin Administration. A collective contemptuous view of NATO never left the core of the Kremlin and the Putin era began by setting strict guidelines with NATO and its 'encroachment' against Russia. These very anti-NATO trends have continued unabated and the 2010 military doctrine further crystallizes and cements Russian aversion to this collective security organization of Western origin, which was historically anti-Soviet Union. It would be difficult for the Siloviki, Technocrats, and Yeltsin Liberals who spent their formative years schooled in the Soviet mentality and worldview to suddenly develop a trusting and binding relationship with an organization that was dreaded and feared throughout the years when the current leaders were children, adolescents, and young professionals undergoing the crucible of reaching adulthood. The Russian antipathy toward NATO by the Kremlin elite remains vigorous.

The new doctrine contained striking nuances that illuminate the Kremlin machinery and its production of the document. First, the Russian Security Council's 2009 document gave it the role and access to influence the military doctrine. The new Defence Doctrine document has telltale signs of the Silovik paranoia of NATO. Instead of focusing on other possible existential threats to the Russian Federation, the document maintains the Silovik fixation on NATO enlargement.[448] The fundamental motivation behind the authorship of

[447] European Dialogue, 'New Russian Military Doctrine Opposes NATO Enlargement', European Dialogue [web page] (2010) < http://eurodialogue.org/osce/New-Russian-Military-Doctrine-Opposes-NATO-Enlargement>, accessed 2 June 2012.

[448] Jacob W. Kipp, 'Russia's Military Doctrine: New Dangers Appear.', Eurasia Daily Monitor [online journal], 7/35 (2010), <http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=36073>, accessed 1 June 2012.

this document was the Georgian conflict and geopolitical and international ramifications that followed it. The Kremlin views NATO empowerment of Georgia as a key factor in the ongoing Georgian conflict. The shift from nuclear strike options to a further subversive attitude toward NATO is the Kremlin's retaliatory stance against NATO's increasing membership and Western support for Georgia, which the Russian Federation's government has vilified and its leader was determined persona non grata in Moscow. NATO leadership has persistently objected to Russian accusations that its security architecture on the world stage is a threat to Russia and its borders.[449] The rift between Russia and NATO has returned to a Soviet status quo after Russia's perceived embarrassment and marginalization during the Partnership for Peace agreement. Even though Medvedev is a Technocrat whose dutiful and liberal temperament are beyond reproach, the Putinist stance against NATO enlargement or any productive relations with the organization continues. The strong link between the Prime Minister and President has led to the continuation of many foreign policy trends started after Putin's inauguration in 2000. The Silovik controlled Russian Security Council, Vladimir Putin, and the other Siloviki in government have successfully swayed Medvedev's rhetoric in the Defence Doctrine document to outline that the Russian Federation vehemently opposes NATO and its enlargement.

The New START Treaty:

Both the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation have a history of signing treaties with the United States. Ever since Lyndon Johnson and Alexei Kosygin signed agreements to bolster cooperation and communication between their respective countries in 1967, there have been updates to this essential rapprochement by signing newer treaties every few years under different leaders. The New START Treaty was not exactly 'new,' and previous

[449] Ibid.

START Treaties and SALT Agreements provided the foundation for improving past treaties and facilitating better ones. President Barack Obama of the United States campaigned for the presidency during what may be described as the lowest point in American-Russian relations since the Cuban Missile Crisis. The conflict with Georgia served as a serious obstacle for the Bush Administration to continue peaceful and prosperous relations with the former Cold War nemesis of the United States. It comes as no surprise that a focal point of Obama's foreign policy was to facilitate better relations with the Russian Federation, which culminated in The New START Treaty. *The Washington Post* noted, 'The treaty, called New START, imposes new limits on ready-to-use, long-range nuclear weapons and pledges to reduce the two biggest nuclear arsenals on the globe. Both countries will be limited to 1,550 ready-to-use, long-range nuclear weapons in addition to the other parts of their nuclear stockpile.'[450] A 'Reset' policy was established by President Obama and its main architect, Michael McFaul. The Russian Federation was now theoretically striving to overcome the political ramifications of its war against Georgia by signing a treaty that starts a chapter of peaceful relations with a new American President.

American newspapers of record, such as *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, emphasized the historical importance of the signing of this new treaty in April 2010. *The New York Times* noted, 'The United States and Russia opened what they called a new era in their tumultuous relationship on Thursday as they signed an arms control treaty and presented a largely united front against Iran's nuclear program, marking a sharp change since they broke over the Georgia war two years ago.'[451] The primary issues of nuclear arms control were significantly discussed and negotiated to ensure a comprehensive treaty

[450] Michael D. Shear, 'Obama, Medvedev sign treaty to reduce nuclear weapons', The Washington Post, 8 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 June 2012.

[451] Peter Baker and Dan Bilefsky, 'Russia and U.S. Sign Nuclear Arms Reduction Pact', The New York Times, 8 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 June 2012.

that ensured mutual safety and cooperation.[452] According to *The Washington Post*, arms control experts were not wholly satisfied as this did not severely deter nuclear strike capabilities on either side and that it was not significantly different from past treaties and agreements.[453] David Speedie commented, 'New START is a good metaphor, but if one looks upon it as a harbinger on good things to come on arms control, it did not come about. There were different expectations on both sides.' [454] The New START Treaty did not practically achieve 'world peace' as its advocates claim. Furthermore, The New START Treaty was not official until both the American and Russian legislative bodies ratified it. Therefore, this event was a long process of mediation, negotiation, summitry, and then legislative ratification. The resounding success was muted by the realities of consensus-building and bureaucratic processes necessary for the adoption and authorization of the agreement signed by Obama and Medvedev. The signing ceremony was the epitome of summit diplomacy, which is viewed as definitive of success, but in realistic terms is one stage in the crucible of foreign policy-making.

Two blights on the process in the Russian foreign policy decision-making apparatus existed during this signing period, and in essence, these two outweighed the importance of the treaty in relation to the other issues not included in the American-Russian mediation and negotiation during the period from 2009 to 2010. The two issues were certainly motivating factors by the Kremlin elite who vigorously participated in the formulation of the new treaty. The first was the perceived security threat by the installation of the United States & NATO Missile Defence Shield in the Czech Republic. The second was building a consensus between Russia and the United States in regards to United Nations imposed

[452] Michael D. Shear, 'Obama, Medvedev sign treaty to reduce nuclear weapons', The Washington Post, 8 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 June 2012.
[453] Ibid.
[454] D. Speedie, 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 11 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

sanctions against Iran by the United Nations Security Council, which both countries are permanent members of.

Obama's first act of good will toward the Russian Federation was his announcement of a decision to cancel plans for the proposed Missile Defence Shield system in Poland.[455] This act promoted a new era of relations between the two countries, but because of the likelihood of a nuclear-armed Iran, Obama demurred on announcing any changes to the Missile Defence Shield system in the Czech Republic. The Obama Administration has continued the same argument for the existence of the missile system as proposed by the Bush Administration: Iran's nuclear development program is a threat to international security. According to the American argument, the Missile Defence Shield severely alters the security balance on the world stage in favour of any countries that Iran may strike in a nuclear capacity. The United States has approached these issues in an interconnected fashion by urging the international community to support sanctions against Iran's nuclear development program and supporting the Missile Defence Shield system that would ensure a certain level of security against the regime of the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei in the event he would order nuclear strikes if or when his government achieves the completion of a full nuclear arsenal. The Russian Federation is not convinced of the necessity of the United States & NATO Missile Defence System in the Czech Republic, which is perceived by the Russian foreign policy apparatus as a threat to its own security. According to the Nuclear Threat Initiative non-profit organization: 'On 7 April, the Russian Federation released a unilateral statement on missile defence, in which it stated its view that the Treaty "may be effective and viable only in conditions where there is no qualitative and quantitative build-up in the missile defence system capabilities of the United States of

[455]'Polish president accuses Obama of betraying Poland', The London Telegraph, 6 Aug. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 6 Aug. 2012.

America.'"[456] The Russian Federation's government resisted any attempt to ignore this issue, which the Siloviki would have vociferously pointed out to the President. Medvedev's hawkish advisors, especially Vladimir Putin who expressed his disapproval of the missile system while he was President, would surely have spoken directly and bluntly with his hand-picked successor about this alarming issue. The statement on April 7 is a testament to The New START Treaty not significantly altering relations between the two countries; this issue is still a heated topic of discussion at the time of this writing.

Medvedev was certainly prone to the temptation of summit diplomacy and its majestic elevation of his leadership. Medvedev, now the President, was aware of the power it would add to his image as Russia's skilled and pragmatic leader. Medvedev publicly declared the summit in 2010 as a milestone in American-Russian relations.[457] 'Mr. Medvedev called the treaty "a truly historic event" that would "open a new page" in Russian-American relations.'[458] *The New York Times* also noted: 'What matters most is that this is a win-win situation, "the Russian President said." No one stands to lose from this agreement. I believe that this is a typical feature of our cooperation. Both parties have won.'[459] According to Medvedev, the agreement elevates Russia to American hegemony as an equal. This surely posed as a political and international victory for the Russian President, who was certainly popular because of his association with Putin but not seen as a separate entity because of the 'tandem democracy' agreement. The implication of his statement is

[456] Nuclear Threat Initiative, 'Treaty between The United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (New START)', Google [web document] (2010), < http://www.nti.org/treaties-and-regimes/treaty-between-the-united-states-of-america-and-the-russian-federation-on-measures-for-the-further-reduction-and-limitation-of-strategic-offensive-arms/>, accessed 1 June 2012.

[457] Peter Baker and Dan Bilefsky, 'Russia and U.S. Sign Nuclear Arms Reduction Pact', The New York Times, 8 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 June 2012.

[458] Ibid.

[459] Ibid.

that 'the win-win situation' is the result of his presidential leadership and this has emboldened him to confidently make future decisions.

Medvedev spoke at length about the Iranian nuclear crisis when questioned immediately after The New START Treaty signing ceremony in 2010.[460] In the spirit of rapprochement, Medvedev did not object to American accusations of an inevitable nuclear crisis by the theocratic Iranian regime.[461] President Medvedev conveyed:

> The Russian signalled support for the American-led drive to impose new sanctions on Iran, saying that Tehran's nuclear program had flouted international rules. "We cannot turn a blind eye to this," Mr. Medvedev said, while adding that sanctions "should be smart" and avoid hardship for the Iranian people.[462]

Medvedev intentionally neglected to mention any concessions on the part of the Russian Federation in terms of the United States & NATO Missile Defence Shield. Support for sanctions against Iran was negotiable according to Medvedev, but the missile system in Europe, which the Kremlin believed infringed the Russian Federation's security, was non-negotiable. Medvedev obfuscated the post-ceremony discussion with journalists to focus on possible sanctions against Iran because of its unlawful nuclear development program. [463] Medvedev foreshadowed Russia's eventual decision to support sanctions:

> Mr. Medvedev said he "outlined our limits for such sanctions" to Mr. Obama in their private talks, without elaborating. Sergei Ryabkov, the deputy Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, said later that Mr. Medvedev supported sanctions "that are targeted, that are tailored," and opposed an embargo on refined oil products because it would be "a huge shock for the whole society.[464]

The statement clearly reflects that the Iranian issue was monitored and discussed in the Kremlin beforehand. It would be difficult to imagine security-obsessed Siloviki ignoring a looming nuclear confrontation in the 'near East.' In addition to this, Lavrov,

---

[460] Ibid.
[461] Ibid.
[462] Ibid.
[463]Ibid.
[464] Ibid.

Serdyukov, Patrushev, and Putin who are key players in Russia's foreign policy could not wilfully neglect the issue when their childhoods experienced a near nuclear holocaust in October 1962. The lessons of history that mired their upbringing would preclude an intentional abandonment of the Iranian issue. The current key players around Medvedev would not allow his presidency to be derelict in duty by being abysmally poor in assessing pressing dangers on the world stage. The Kremlin was fully engaged in the Iranian nuclear development program from the latter's inception during Vladimir Putin's first presidency.[465]

As jubilant as both Obama and Medvedev were during the signing of The New START Treaty, the summit diplomacy was not as effective as one would assume by reading newspapers or watching news reports. The treaty was not ratified by both governments until the end of the year, and even before that the Russian side did not hide its contempt for the lack of change in the Missile Defence Shield issue.[466] Mr. Richard Perle, Research Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and former Assistant Secretary of Defence for the Reagan Administration, when interviewed commented: 'The Russians complain about it endlessly. It is not clear why. It does not pose a challenge to their deterrent requirements. They do not like the idea that we (the United States) have effective missile defence when they do not. It conflicts with their perception of themselves as a great power.'[467] Medvedev's liberal temperament was noticeably missing in November 2010 when he threatened an arms race and abrogation of the treaty if the United States' missile

[465] Michael Wines, 'Putin to Sell Arms and Nuclear Help to Iran', The New York Times, 13 Mar. 2001, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 2 June 2012.
[466] Steve Gutterman, 'Russia's Medvedev warns of new arms race', Reuters, 30 Nov. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], 2 June 2012.
[467] R. Perle, 'Russia's Security Fears' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 7 January 2013, American Enterprise Institute, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

system issue were not properly rectified.[468] The hawkish elements of the Russian government certainly pressed hard on the President to abandon the warm dialogue and utilize an aggressive, direct tone that would surely arouse the American government's complete attention. Returning to a tone reminiscent of the Cold War would certainly evoke attention from the news media and American foreign policy-makers. This tactic was employed to convey that the Russian Federation steadfastly opposed the Missile Defence Shield system and would continue its campaign to find an equitable solution.

To consolidate and further convey the opposition to the West's Missile Defence Shield system by the Russian Federation, Medvedev outlined new plans to counter the threat it poses. 'These measures will be adequate, effective and low cost, "Medvedev said during a speech in 2010." If the above measures prove insufficient, the Russian Federation will deploy modern offensive weapons in the west and south of the country ensuring our ability to take out any part of the U.S. missile defence system in Europe.'[469] The military traditionalists and Siloviki were certainly a powerful voice in facilitating these plans and influencing Medvedev's posturing in relation to the issue. Medvedev's liberal temperament did not preclude his pragmatism and he did leave options for the American government. Medvedev said that the Kremlin will continue its dialogue with Washington on the issue.[470] 'There is still time to reach an understanding,' Medvedev stated.[471]

The Putin-Medvedev duo is a microcosm of the inner sanctum of the Kremlin elite, which is comprised of a mixture of Technocrat and Silovik inspired rhetoric and ideologies. Therefore, the response is a reflection of this. Even though Medvedev is seen as

---

[468] Steve Gutterman, 'Russia's Medvedev warns of new arms race', Reuters, 30 Nov. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], 2 June 2012.

[469] Sergei L. Loiko, 'Russia threatens to withdraw from arms control deal with U.S.', The Los Angeles Times, 23 Nov. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 2 June 2012.

[470] Ibid.

[471] Ibid.

aggressively touting Russia being the catalyst of a new arms race with the United States if the American and NATO missile system in the Czech Republic were not removed, he still leaves the opportunity for further dialogue to reach a consensus that will appease both sides. The inner sanctum within the Kremlin has these two political factions, the Siloviki and Technocrats, who respond to such issues differently because of different priorities and perceptions. The ultimate product of the clash of these two groups is an aggressive, concerted effort with a diplomatic but assertive posture. This is evident by Medvedev's hawkish threats of starting a new arms race, while claiming that negotiations for a proper settlement in relation to the Missile Defence Shield issue is still possible. The combination of Silovik tendencies and technocratic liberal temperament are apparent. This hybrid asserts itself during this period in relation to an issue of a simmering conflict in Kyrgyzstan during the events previously mentioned in this chapter.

Kyrgyzstan:

During the signing of The New START Treaty, *The New York Times* deftly noted that the unrest in Kyrgyzstan poses as a threat to the new bond forged between the Russian Federation and the United States.[472] The article reported that when asked Medvedev promptly voiced support for the new regime that had taken over after President Kurmanbek Bakiyev's ousting and called for the removal of an American military base in Kyrgyzstan.[473] Kyrgyzstan's importance for strategic military purposes is an understated fact that foreign policy-makers have not fully acknowledged in public. Kyrgyzstan's proximity to Russia and aerial accessibility for the United States to continue its anti-terrorism efforts in the Middle East make it an important country in terms of geopolitics and international security. *The London Telegraph* noted that the American military base in

[472] Peter Baker and Dan Bilefsky, 'Russia and U.S. Sign Nuclear Arms Reduction Pact', The New York Times, 8 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 June 2012.
[473] Ibid.

Kyrgyzstan commenced operations three months after the September 11 attacks and this fomented anti-American posturing by the Russian Federation.[474] The American military base was a threat to the Russian Federation in the eyes of the Kremlin elite.

The Prime Minister, Vladimir Putin, was quickly asked by journalists whether he was involved in Bakiyev's ousting and whether he supported the new regime.[475] '"Neither Russia nor your humble servant nor Russian officials have anything to do with these events," he said at a news conference.'[476] This statement was clearly not compatible with what the opposition leaders who swept to power had claimed in the aftermath of Bakiyev's ousting and escape to Belarus.[477] *RIA Novosti* pointed out that the opposition leaders claimed that Putin did in fact support them and was allied with the anti-Bakiyev forces.[478] Australia's *Sydney Morning Herald* reported a similar account of opposition leaders claiming they were bolstered by Putin's support and this was the enabling factor that ousted the Bakiyev regime.[479] 'Omurbek Tekebayev, who is in charge of constitutional matters in the new government, said: "Russia played its role in ousting Bakiyev. You've seen the level of Russia's joy when they saw Bakiyev gone."'[480] Putin's Silovik instincts would not have allowed an American military base in Kyrgyzstan, a country in the post-Soviet space, to exist unnoticed. Putin's fixation on Russian security was a motivating factor in the immediate support for the new regime and lack of support for Bakiyev. In 2009, the Kyrgyz government voted overwhelmingly to not renew a lease for the American military base and

[474]Richard Orange, 'US airbase threatened in Kyrgyzstan as Russian-backed parties poised to take power.', The London Telegraph, 11 Oct. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 2 June 2012.
[475]RIA Novosti, 'Russia not involved in Kyrgyz events - Putin', RIA Novosti [web page] (2010) < http://en.rian.ru/russia/20100407/158472404.html>, accessed 3 June 2012.
[476] Ibid.
[477] Ibid.
[478] Ibid.
[479] Yuras Karmanau, 'Russia helped rout leaders: Kyrgyz rebels', The Sydney Morning Herald, 10 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 3 June 2012.
[480] Ibid.

effectively evict American forces.[481] This was welcomed by the Kremlin and a collective sigh of relief was breathed by the Kremlin elite who favoured one more country free of American military presence. Moscow announced a generous financial aid package that possessed the potential to produce a viable rehabilitation and transformation of Kyrgyzstan's infrastructure.[482] Russian foreign policy-makers were clearly satisfied with the Kyrgyz leadership's cold relations with the United States. The Kremlin could only envision benefits for the lessening of Western influence in the post-Soviet sphere.

President Bakiyev's rhetoric and the legislation passed against the American military base portended a future with Kyrgyzstan removing the American presence in its country. *The New York Times* noted that the Obama Administration painstakingly 'courted' the Bakiyev regime and offered to pay a much higher sum than agreed to previously for use of the base.[483] Bakiyev reversed his decision and happily accepted American incentives for prolonging the American military base.[484] The Russian foreign policy apparatus decided to reward Bakiyev for his anti-Western stance prior to his policy reversal with respect to the Manas base and now the Kremlin was left with the possibility of the presence of the American military in Kyrgyzstan being prolonged indefinitely.[485] The absolute disdain and shock experienced by the main players of the Kremlin must have been tremendous. Dr. Alexander Cooley has commented, 'The fundamental thing that Bakiyev did was promise to close the base at Manas and didn't. That was the main issue. He took a financial package from Russia with the understanding that he would shut down Manas. He takes the money

[481] The BBC, 'Future of US base in Kyrgyzstan in question', The BBC [web page] (2010) <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/8611141.stm>, accessed 3 June 2012.
[482] Ibid.
[483]Clifford J. Levy, 'Upheaval in Kyrgyzstan Could Imperil Key U.S. Base', The New York Times, 7 Apr. 2010, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 3 June 2012.
[484] A. Cooley, 'The ouster of President Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 14 December 2012, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.
[485] Ibid.

and made deals with the US. He was playing both sides.'[486] The Putin-Medvedev regime felt that it was deceived and manipulated into providing generous aid for the developing country.

The Kremlin saw this issue as a battle of wills and influence in a country that was strategically important for security reasons. The United States and the Russian Federation were locked in a battle over 'the hearts and minds' of the Bakiyev regime. It seemed at first in 2009 that the United States had lost a vital geographic point in Central Asia that served its foreign policy and defence objectives. The Bakiyev regime proclaimed that the United States would no longer have the base for its military purposes, but American diplomatic posturing by virtue of offering generous incentives eventually reshaped Bakiyev's policy toward Manas.[487] The Russian Federation was still seething over the presence of the Missile Defence Shield system in Europe and Bakiyev's proclamation that the American military base would soon be evicted provided a form of catharsis for the Kremlin's security-obsessed bureaucrats. Bakiyev's reversal of policy hastened the Russian foreign policy apparatus to oppose him and his entire regime. *The New York Times* noted:

> Whatever happens domestically, a new government will have to decide how to balance the interests of the United States and Russia, which both have military bases in Kyrgyzstan and want to maintain a presence in the region. Paul Quinn-Judge, Central Asia project director for International Crisis Group, a research organization, said Russia had stoked anti-American sentiment in Kyrgyzstan in recent months, often over the issue of the base.[488]

The new regime headed by Rosa Otunbayeva was a new opportunity for the Russian Federation to forge a more secure post-Soviet space with lessened Western influence. The political obfuscation and denials on the part of the Russian Federation and its alleged non-role in the political unrest that led to Bakiyev's ousting are preposterous. The Russian

[486] Ibid.

[487] Clifford J. Levy, 'Upheaval in Kyrgyzstan Could Imperil Key U.S. Base', The New York Times, 7 Apr. 2010, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 3 June 2012.

[488] Ibid.

Federation had much to gain and was seeking to consolidate its control over a strategically important country in terms of Russian security. The Russian Federation's 'fingerprints' are easily discernible in this foreign policy event and the full support they offered to the new leaders after Bakiyev's ousting further proves this. The Kremlin's foreign policy apparatus moved in favour of bringing in a new Kyrgyz regime in order to return the balance of security to Russia's advantage. Dr. Alexander Cooley noted, 'For Russia, military bases equate to power and prestige. The Russians see Manas as an infringement of their influence in the region. It's a counter-reaction to the US.'[489]

The Russian Security Council's involvement in these events in relation to Kyrgyzstan is best described as 'marginal.' The Russian Security Council did not play a major role publicly in the response to these events in the post-Soviet sphere. Several reasons for this exist and for the purpose of understanding the Russian foreign policy apparatus during the Medvedev presidency, a thorough examination of these reasons will provide a detailed explanation of the Russian Security Council's persistent non-usage in the event of emergency foreign policy matters. Nikolai Patrushev's control of the advisory forum and its role in Russian foreign policy will be analyzed by virtue of the official and certified involvement of its mechanistic policy formulation or lack thereof.

Shortly before the uprising in Kyrgyzstan and Bakiyev's ousting, there were terrorist attacks on trains in Moscow that took the Russian Security Council's attention away from pressing foreign policy matters.[490] Patrushev's role as head of an advisory committee did not relegate his position in the Russian government's response to the domestic terrorist attacks by Islamic separatists. Patrushev was interviewed repeatedly in

[489] A. Cooley, 'The ouster of President Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 14 December 2012, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

[490] The BBC, 'Chechen rebel says he ordered Moscow Metro attacks', The BBC [web page] (2010) <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/8597792.stm>, accessed 4 June 2012.

the days after the attacks and fully recognized the potential dangers and tactics that caused Russia to be on high alert. [491] A 'civil war' or 'coup' in a small country in the post-Soviet space was not vital enough to demand his attention when terrorist attacks crippled the Russian capital's public transportation and ignited fear among Russian citizens across the country. Nikolai Patrushev, the Russian Security Council Secretary, commented:

> Following the tragic terrorist attacks in the Moscow metro important new thinking on counter-terrorism. In particular, the protection of crowded places, especially on public transport. Another important aspect. After the explosions, for some time, the population reacts by providing law enforcement information that is worrying them. May take a while, and this reaction is markedly reduced. And, perhaps, the police do not get the data to it. However, to increase operational and preventive work to prevent terrorist attacks. In general, we have built a system to prevent the attacks. A National Anti-Terrorism Committee, the Federal Emergency Headquarters, anti-terrorism committee and operational headquarters in the Russian regions.[492]

Patrushev's role in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks was to mollify public opinion and attempt to boost morale by presenting a strong, united front in response to the heinous crimes against innocent Russian citizens. The Kremlin allocated these duties to Patrushev and his role in relation to Bakiyev's ouster is not easy to discern because he neither made any memorable public statements regarding Kyrgyzstan, nor was there a Russian Security Council meeting convened for this important issue in the post-Soviet space. The importance of Kyrgyzstan did not reach the same level of priority as Georgia did, and the Kremlin was hesitant to magnify this issue by public pronouncements or media interviews. Even though links to Georgia's role in the terrorist attacks were not evident, Patrushev repeatedly accused Saakashvili and his regime of either fomenting or organizing

---

[491] 'Interview of Secretary of the Security Council of the Russian Federation Nikolai Patrushev: "Punishment awaits them all"' – The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/22/551.html&usg=ALkJrhgbcEeCODJLMgqXSbRRi2RRo7thHg>, accessed 3 June 2012.

[492] Ibid.

these terrorist attacks.[493] Even while Kyrgyzstan was undergoing a momentous transformation, Patrushev's fixation on Georgia remained abundant and uninterrupted to the point of implicating Georgian leadership in a terrorist conspiracy when evidence of this was non-existent.

The Russian Security Council held no meetings on Kyrgyzstan and was preoccupied with the terrorist attacks, the investigation, and recalibration of counter-terrorism resources in order to prevent additional attacks. One meeting worthy of note was a public discussion by the Russian Security Council of: 'Results of the public discussion of the project of state policy in the field of cultural and moral values, the strengthening of the spiritual unity of the Russian people.' [494] This may have not dealt specifically with the terrorist attacks but the objective to bolster national morale was clear. The Russian Security Council was assigned the role of providing the Russian people with the assurance they needed to move forward and return to a prosperous way of life after the attacks. The Kremlin also noted Patrushev's meeting with officials from the Volga District during this time in the following terms: 'This meeting is part of the work for the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation until 2020, and the strategic planning process in the Russian Federation, more efficient use of the potential of the Russian Presidential representatives in federal districts in meeting the challenges faced by the Security Council of the Russian Federation.'[495] The Russian Security Council's document that passed in 2009 by presidential authority encompassed this new role as 'protector' and strengthened protocol in 'the security apparatus,' but its responsibilities vary and are related to objectives regarding the prosperity

[493] Russia Today, 'Russia's Security Council head: "Georgia's trace" behind the blasts not excluded', Russia Today [web page] (2010) < http://rt.com/politics/blasts-metro-georgia-patrushev/>, accessed 4 June 2012.
[494] The Security Council of the Russian Federation 'News and Information', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2010) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/22/&usg=ALkJrhjCnpsisV5pXk8-eHfiRgSb0zoUqA>, accessed 3 June 2012.
[495] Ibid.

of the Russian Federation.[496] Prosperity is severely threatened by terrorist attacks in the social, economic, and security senses. Terrorism was now a major issue for the Russian Security Council's strengthened protocols since the authorization of the National Security Concept document in 2009. This provided the Russian Security Council with new duties and imperatives. Silovik Patrushev's impulses were a motivating factor behind the document and his new importance in security matters was welcomed by him and the hawkish bureaucrats on the Russian Security Council.

In the same vein, presidential authority by the conduct of Dmitry Medvedev precluded the Russian Security Council from exerting its influence in the decision to support Bakiyev's ouster and recognize the interim government. The Yeltsonian forces of the presidential system in the Russian Federation obstruct and neutralize any document or mechanism from asserting itself against the presidential prerogative. Patrushev was effectively marginalized in the events occurring in Kyrgyzstan and any policy input he would have offered was stymied. The 1993 Russian Constitution empowered Medvedev to exercise his control over the Russian Security Council by not convening the mechanism, even though the Russian Security Council Secretary may have attempted to insert himself and his advisory forum into the presidential decision-making. Medvedev's constitutional authority was unchallengeable and Patrushev was relegated to minor importance by the will of the Russian President. The Yeltsonian constitutional entitlements that create an exceptionally powerful presidency remain a guiding force in policy formation that allows the Russian President to employ or marginalize any ministry, agency, or department as he or she believes is necessary. In this case, Medvedev's continued marginalization of the

[496]Rustrans, 'Russia's National Security Strategy to 2020', Rustrans [web page] (2009 <http://rustrans.wikidot.com/russia-s-national-security-strategy-to-2020>, accessed 31Jan 2012.

Russian Security Council during Bakiyev's ouster was exercised fully within the scope of the office of the Russian presidency.

Patrushev was not the only key player in the Russian government to be marginalized. Sergei Lavrov, a Yeltsin Liberal, who has been a chief diplomat in the Russian government throughout the Yeltsin, Putin, and Medvedev years was not engaged in this issue or consulted by Medvedev or Putin in any noteworthy way. The Putin-Medvedev duo has maintained the persistent presence of Yeltsin Liberals in the foreign affairs branch of the Russian government, but they refuse to enlarge their role in the foreign policy formulation. The Kyrgyz issue was dealt with by the top level of the Russian governmental hierarchy, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was not engaged in this issue. No important speech or interview regarding Bakiyev's ouster or the new interim government was given by Lavrov. The Minister of Foreign Affairs was simply not instructed to assert his views on the matter and with the terrorist attacks in Moscow and a myriad of foreign policy issues on the world stage, Lavrov was not questioned about the issue in detail by the news media, nor did he instruct the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to publicly address it. Any involvement in the Kyrgyz issue by Lavrov was minimal at best.

To reiterate, Sergei Lavrov's obstacles to exerting powerful influence in the Kremlin's foreign policy decisions are effective. Lavrov does not enjoy a longstanding rapport with anyone from Putin's inner sanctum. Lavrov is a diplomat whose career was forged and defined by the Yeltsin years. The Siloviki and Technocrats brought into government by Putin in 2000 to address grievances against the Yeltsin Administration provided the new operatives in government with a dismal assessment of the Yeltsin bureaucrats, even if some did remain in government positions. Medvedev and Putin have kept Lavrov in this position because he is a consummate and loyal diplomat, but his input

in foreign policy decisions is not sought by the Siloviki or Technocrats because of the collective dread of the Yeltsin years. Lavrov rarely attends Russian Security Council meetings or meetings with the President or Prime Minister. His role has been stifled for his lack of rapport with members of Putin's inner sanctum and the taint of a presidential administration remembered for corruption and inefficiency. Lavrov's perfunctory role in government is that of a chief diplomat whose career has been stifled by the past and poor personal relations with the new powers in the post-Yeltsin Russia. Lavrov's unfortunate situation in which he is marginalized by the security-obsessed Siloviki and dutiful, pragmatic Technocrats is an extension of the anti-Yeltsin collective dread that caused the Yeltsin Administration to leave power prematurely. The 'guilt by association' and the 'outsider status' have proven to be difficult for Lavrov to overcome. Ambassador Stephen Sestanovich, former Ambassador-at-Large to the former Soviet Republics and professor at Columbia University, commented: 'Neither Lavrov or Churkin is a power player in palace politics. They're bureaucrats.'[497] Neither Medvedev or Putin properly consulted Russia's chief diplomat on the momentous and possibly dangerous situation in Kyrgyzstan; his lack of a public role in addressing this and absence as a chief interlocutor in this issue are a testament to this very fact.

Serdyukov's role in this was not dissimilar to Lavrov, even though Serdyukov was clearly a member of Putin's inner sanctum. Serdyukov was a dutiful, pragmatic Technocrat who never openly objected to the Medvedev presidency or offered independent or conflicting stances on pressing issues. Serdyukov was a loyal member of the Medvedev government. His actions in the conflict with Georgia and government service have never been within reproach. Serdyukov came to the Minister of Defence position with no

[497] S. Sestanovich, 'Russia's Role in Libya and Syria' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 24 January 2013, School of International & Public Affairs, New York, New York.

discernible political ideology and his relations with fellow Technocrat Medvedev have been cordial and not problematic. Serdyukov, similar to Lavrov, never made any serious public announcements or gave any significant interviews about the events in Kyrgyzstan. The issue was left out of the scope of the Minister of Defence and the Putin-Medvedev duo dealt with the specifics entirely out of view of the news media, which was focusing on the domestic terrorist attacks. The reasons why only the Russian President and Prime Minister formulated a response to the Kyrgyz issue merits investigation. Even an insider like Serdyukov whose loyalty and background are beyond reproach was marginalized by the Putin-Medvedev duo. The issue in Kyrgyzstan posed a serious risk to Russian defence and security and the Minister of Defence would have readily acknowledged this issue, but his involvement was not noteworthy. Serdyukov was left out of the policy formulation that occurred at the highest level of government. Similar to Lavrov, Serdyukov's only meaningful role in this issue was well after the outcome of Bakiyev's ouster and instalment of the new interim government headed by Rosa Otunbayeva. In late June of 2010, *The London Telegraph* reported the following:

> According to military sources quoted in authoritative Russian daily newspaper *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, President Medvedev has already ordered Anatoliy Serdyukov, the Russian Minister of Defence, to ensure that the new base, which it is estimated will cost Russia at least $250 million (£167 million) and house a minimum of one thousand troops, becomes a reality.[498]

The centrality of Serdyukov's role was to attend to military matters after the Kyrgyz issue quelled and the new leadership was firmly in power. The surreptitious method by which Serdyukov and Lavrov were employed by their superiors suggests that the Kremlin had already desired a certain outcome and bided its time while everything was set in place for it to establish and implement its plans. The Kremlin's longstanding opposition to

[498] Andrew Osborn, 'Russia plans second military base in Kyrgyzstan', The London Telegraph, 25 June 2010, Google News Archive [online database}, accessed 4 June 2010.

Western influence and NATO in the post-Soviet sphere is unquestionable. In addition to this, the method by which it handled this issue suggests a quiet, calculated response to the crisis in which it did not hastily intervene, nor did it seek to ignite by promoting bloodshed. The Russian military did not invade or increase its presence, but plans for a stronger Russian defence role in Kyrgyzstan were preconceived well before the crisis erupted. The Putin-Medvedev's marginal use of the Minister of Defence and Minister of Foreign Affairs suggests that plans to effectively increase the potency of its military base were planned well in advance on the presidential level and that the security balance in Russia's favour was now being achieved in a calculated and systematic manner.

The New START Treaty however did not stop Medvedev from threatening to commence a 'new arms race' if the Missile Defence Shield in the Czech Republic were not removed. NATO enlargement had been a perennial point of contention with Vladimir Putin during his presidency. The new Defence Doctrine adopted in 2010 did not alter the rhetoric of Russia's anti-NATO stance.[499] The Putin-Medvedev duo were not going to accept an American military base in Kyrgyzstan, which was close to its borders, if they had a role in influencing this perceived 'security imbalance' that threatened the Russian Federation. Dr. Alexander Cooley noted, 'During New START, Manas was an important issue. New START had no effect on the issue, however. There were no tangible gains for either, especially regarding Manas.'[500] Medvedev was entitled to marginalize any agencies or ministers as he believed necessary by virtue of the 1993 Russian Constitution that centralized power in the office of the presidency. The Yeltsonian forces precluded government ministers from effectively rebelling against the President in the event that

[499] Russia Today, 'Russia's new military doctrine approved', Russia Today [web page] (2010) < http://rt.com/usa/russia-military-doctrine-approved/>, accessed 1 June 2012.

[500] A Cooley, 'The ouster of President Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 14 December 2012, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Medvedev did not consult or involve them in decision-making. The Russian presidency did not operate in a government that required the consent of chief ministers. Yeltsin ensured that the government not resemble a parliamentary cabinet or collective leadership regime similar to the Soviet years. Medvedev's decision was his to make alone in regards to the Kyrgyz issue.

Medvedev never suggested his definite position on this issue, but hinted that change was necessary.[501] Medvedev argued, '"Our task is to help the Kyrgyz people find a calm way out of this crisis," Medvedev said, suggesting Bakiyev should formally step down to defuse a crisis he said could develop into a "second Afghanistan."'[502] Medvedev's 'innocuous' statement aimed to distance himself from the issue while still stating his support for the anti-Bakiyev forces. Putin took a more direct approach by speaking directly with Rosa Otunbayeva, the leader of the new interim government on April 8, and tacitly endorsing her and offering incentives for cooperation with Russia.[503] The support was appreciated to such a magnitude by the new government in Bishkek that a motion to name a mountain after Putin developed.[504] The outcome was clearly something the Putin-Medvedev duo desired but their surreptitious approach to the issue by not engaging chief government ministers or directly associating themselves with Bakiyev's ouster leads one to wonder why exactly this approach was taken.

The New START Treaty and Obama's decision to cancel missile installation plans in Poland was the beginning of the 'Reset' of relations. Accusations of fostering rebellion and insurrection in Kyrgyzstan would have damaged the Kremlin's credibility in the new

[501] 'US says it is prepared to help new Kyrgyz rulers', Todays Zaman, 15 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive, accessed 4 June 2012.
[502] Ibid.
[503] RIA Novosti, 'Putin speaks on phone with Kyrgyz opposition-nominated premier', RIA Novosti [web page] (2010) <http://en.ria.ru/world/20100408/158479220.html >, accessed 5 June 2010.
[504] Richard Orange, 'Kyrgyzstan to name mountain after Vladimir Putin', The London Telegraph, 4 Jan. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 5 June 2012.

rapprochement that started in 2009 after Obama's inauguration. The Putin-Medvedev duo needed a more covert method to foster change in Kyrgyzstan after Bakiyev failed or chose not to implement his government's decision to evict the American military base. Russia's generous financial aid package in the aftermath of Bakiyev's announcement that the American military base would be evicted was given in vain. The Kremlin's generosity was unrewarded and Russia sought to regain its control of its post-Soviet neighbour of great strategic importance. *Stratfor's Intelligence Analysis* published a report during the crisis and noted that: 'Given its strategic location, control of Kyrgyzstan offers the ability to pressure Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and China. Kyrgyzstan is thus a critical piece in Russia's overall plan to resurge into its former Soviet sphere.'[505] *The London Telegraph* reported in June 2010 that Russia planned to build a second military base in Kyrgyzstan, which *Nezavisimaya Gazeta* had reported Serdyukov was in charge of those military preparations and had already commenced.[506] The Kremlin's desire to secure this country for its own purposes is evident, but its indirect method cements its inherent involvement in the events that led to Bakiyev's ouster.

On April 1, 2010, shortly before Bakiyev's ouster *The Jamestown Foundation* assessed the Russian-controlled media campaign against Bakiyev and concluded that the Kremlin had made a decision that Bakiyev's regime was threatening Russian interests.[507] Dr. Alexander Cooley stated, 'Russians perpetuated anti-Bakiyev media exposés in newspapers and news reports of corruption. The timing was interesting. It started in the

[505] Lauren Goodrich, 'Kyrgyzstan and the Russian Resurgence', Stratfor Archive [web document] (2010), <http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20100412_kyrgyzstan_and_russian_resurgence>, accessed 5 June 2012.

[506] Andrew Osborn, 'Russia plans second military base in Kyrgyzstan', The London Telegraph, 25 June 2010, Google News Archive [online database}, accessed 4 June 2010.

[507] Eric Marat, 'Russian Mass Media Attack Bakiyev.' Eurasia Daily Monitor [online journal], 7/63 (2010), <http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=36226&tx_ttnews%5BbackPid%5D=27&cHash=5f81ad077b>, accessed 6 June 2012.

months before the ouster. The soft power barrage began.'[508] The Kremlin owns a vast portion of the media in Russia and Kyrgyzstan.[509] The potency to stoke anti-Bakiyev fervour in Russia and Kyrgyzstan was fully within the grasp of the Kremlin. Eric Marat, analyst for *The Jamestown Foundation*, opined on the media campaign against Bakiyev:

> In the past two weeks, the Russian media has fiercely criticized the Kyrgyz President, Kurmanbek Bakiyev's, regime. Newspapers and TV programs have sought to reveal the President's corruption and nepotism, with some newspapers alleging the regime's involvement in the killing of journalist Gennady Pavluk last December. The role of the President's son, Maksim, in corruption was also scrutinized.[510]

Medvedev and Putin recognized the Gorbachovian forces of democratization and empowerment of the former Soviet citizens in relation to their governments. The media campaign sought to change public opinion against Bakiyev within his own country and the Russian Federation, which was accomplished and effectively achieved his ouster. *The Jamestown Foundation's* article further asserts that the media campaign to alter public opinion illuminates a key facet in how the Kremlin seeks to foster change in the post-Soviet sphere.[511] Medvedev and Putin manipulated the Gorbachovian forces of democratization to influence the masses. In Russia, the media campaign to garner support for Medvedev's decision to endorse the post-Bakiyev government seeks to grant him the legitimacy needed to operate in the new political environment created by the reforms enacted by Gorbachev. In Kyrgyzstan, the Tulip Revolution in 2005 showed the world that the post-Soviet sphere was not impervious to the power of the Gorbachovian forces of democratization, which empowered the average citizen to enact change. Kyrgyzstan was prone to regime change as seen by the ouster of President Askar Akayev in 2005. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva opined, 'The

---

[508] A. Cooley, 'The ouster of President Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 14 December 2012, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

[509] Eric Marat, 'Russian Mass Media Attack Bakiyev.' Eurasia Daily Monitor [online journal], 7/63 (2010), <http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=36226&tx_ttnews%5BbackPid%5D=27&cHash=5f81ad077b>, accessed 6 June 2012.

[510] Ibid.

[511] Ibid.

people of Kyrgyzstan have a tendency of ousting people who fall in the court of public opinion.'[512] Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev's tandem democracy was now working in a surreptitious manner to manipulate the forces of democratization by authorizing a campaign of propaganda against a leader who had reneged on his promise to remove an American military base. The potency of the Gorbachovian democratization is clear by the quick and effective coup that ended Bakiyev's regime. The Putin-Medvedev regime governed in a country where Gorbachev's reforms were enacted for the benefit of the average citizen, but in this instance public legitimacy was denied to Bakiyev for a motive that served the interests of the Kremlin, not the citizens of Kyrgyzstan.

Reflections:

The system in which the Kremlin is operating manoeuvred its foreign policy mechanisms to surreptitiously enact regime change in a post-Soviet country where there was a competition for influence. Kyrgyzstan is the only country in the world with both American and Russian military bases.[513] Vladimir Putin spent his entire presidency advocating against NATO enlargement and Western influence in the post-Soviet space. Kyrgyzstan's strategic importance made it an important issue for the Kremlin. Dmitry Medvedev acted in a covert manner to oust President Bakiyev, who had reneged on a promise to evict the American military base. The Kremlin's lavish financial aid incentives reaped no rewards for the Russian Federation and because of this it was determined at the highest level of government that Bakiyev must be removed from the presidency.

This decision was made in the context of issues and events occurring simultaneously during the spring of 2010. A new treaty between the United States and

[512] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

[513] A. Cooley, 'The ouster of President Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 14 December 2012, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Russia was signed on the executive level; the Missile Defence Shield system installed by the United States and NATO in the Czech Republic caused Medvedev, a man of a mild temperament, to threaten the West with a new arms race if the missile system were not removed.[514] The new military doctrine in 2010 was not original and the anti-NATO rhetoric continued unabated and was vociferous in nature. The Russian Federation was being dovish and hawkish at the same time and a delicate balancing act ensued while still maintaining policies in the interests of the Kremlin and its goals. Medvedev's liberal temperament and Putin's hawkish tendencies were fully responsible for the array of events and responses during this period. There was bilateral cooperation and sharp posturing that reminded both former Cold War adversaries that the game of geopolitics and international security is not yet over.

Medvedev exercised his presidential powers fully within the Yeltsonian forces that empowered his office to lead the government as he sees necessary without needing to build a consensus among policy-makers. The Russian Security Council was not convened for the purpose of discussing the events in Kyrgyzstan and whether Russia should support Bakiyev or his opposition. The Minister of Defence was instructed to implement plans for increasing Russian military presence in Kyrgyzstan and his policy input regarding the ouster was not sought. Lavrov's role in the concerted effort to oust Bakiyev by the Russian Federation is difficult to assert because the Minister of Foreign Affairs kept unusually quiet on the subject or may have been excluded from these discussions altogether. Neither Lavrov, nor Serdyukov played an important role in this foreign policy decision.

The Putin-Medvedev duo decided to foster an insurrection by virtue of the order to perpetuate anti-Bakiyev news media and fully support the opposition. Dr. Alexander

[514] Steve Gutterman, 'Russia's Medvedev warns of new arms race', Reuters, 30 Nov. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], 2 June 2012.

Cooley noted, 'The effects of Georgia crystallized Russia's idea of the sphere of influence. The doctrine became formalized during the Medvedev presidency. The same grand strategy during Putin continued during Medvedev. If Putin had been in power, nothing would have been different.'[515] The media campaign against Bakiyev was effective, and the opposition leaders claim that Russian support helped them achieve the coup and install a new government.[516] Putin was among the first statesmen to publicly recognize Rosa Otunbayeva as the new leader and the new government publicly stated its intentions to name a mountain in Vladimir Putin's honour in 2010.[517] Dr. Alexander Cooley notes that the leader of the interim government after Bakiyev's ouster, 'Rosa Otunbayeva is pro-Russian and Moscow supports her. She immediately visits Russia and the CIS.'[518] It would be difficult to claim that Russia was not responsible for this foreign policy event. In the aftermath of Bakiyev's ouster, Russia was enabled to successfully enlarge its military presence and impede the American military base's efforts to negotiate a new deal with new post-Bakiyev leaders to prolong its presence. The battle over strategic control was won in Russia's favour.

This foreign policy event is a testament to the powerful impact of Gorbachev's democratization both in Russia and Kyrgyzstan. Putin and Medvedev remembered well how the Tulip Revolution in 2005 ousted a leader who had fallen in the court of public opinion in Kyrgyzstan. The lessons of history did not elude the top of the Russian foreign policy apparatus hierarchy. The Kremlin sought to regain control in the post-Soviet space in spite of the Missile Defence Shield in the Czech Republic and regardless of the new treaty

[515] A.Cooley, 'The ouster of President Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 14 December 2012, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

[516] Yuras Karmanau, 'Russia helped rout leaders: Kyrgyz rebels', The Sydney Morning Herald, 10 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 3 June 2012.

[517] Richard Orange, 'Kyrgyzstan to name mountain after Vladimir Putin', The London Telegraph, 4 Jan. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 5 June 2012.

[518] A. Cooley, 'The ouster of President Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 14 December 2012, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

that called for a renewed rapprochement between the former Cold War adversaries. The Russian media control ignited an insurrection that granted the new post-Bakiyev leadership legitimacy from the citizens in Kyrgyzstan, and granted the Putin-Medvedev duo legitimacy from Russian constituents in its decision to support the new government in Bishkek after Bakiyev's ouster. The Kremlin manipulated the forces of democratization to fulfil its own pragmatic objectives that it felt would ensure Russian security against NATO and the West. The Kremlin's objectives were achieved. Russian military presence is increasing in Kyrgyzstan, while that of the United States is precarious and unable to follow the same trend as the Russian Federation. After the interim government left power in Kyrgyzstan and a government elected by the Kyrgyz people for a full term was inaugurated, President Almazbek Atambayev announced that the American military base would be turned into a transportation centre for civilian purposes by 2014.[519] Dr. Alexander Cooley noted, 'The new President Atambayev has moved to join Russia's customs union. He has moved his country closer to Russia. He has pledged to close Manas by 2014.'[520] The United States will lose its military base in a country that it and the Russian Federation believe is of vital strategic importance.

[519] Michael Schwirtz, 'New Leader Says U.S. Base in Kyrgyzstan Will Be Shut', The New York Times, 1 Nov. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 5 June 2012.

[520] A. Cooley, 'The ouster of President Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 14 December 2012, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Chapter 5: Russia's Response to the Iranian Nuclear Threat

Introduction:

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1929 that passed in June 2010 against Iran for failure to comply with international nuclear protocol was the most stringent and binding set of sanctions against the country.[521] The Russian Federation ultimately consented to the resolution amidst a renewed rapprochement with the United States, even though contention with NATO's Missile Defence Shield system in the Czech Republic as well as a covert proxy battle over the strategic control of Kyrgyzstan were evident during 2010. The relationship between the United States and the Russian Federation was publicly closer after the signing of The New START Treaty. The disagreement over the missile shield issue between Russia and primarily the U.S. was an obstacle for peaceful, productive relations, but the United States led the call for sanctions against Iran because of its nuclear weapons development. The Russian Federation joined the cause.[522] The decision by the Russian Federation to consent to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1929 against Iran will be examined in the context of its relations with the West and its aversion to nuclear development in Iran. The Kremlin's decision to support sanctions in the interests of international security ranks among the most important Russian foreign policy decisions. Dr. Mark Galeotti noted the Russian response to the Iranian crisis as: 'Russia's interests require it to work in the framework of international structures. A nuclear Iran was not in Russia's best interests.'[523] Rogue regimes with nuclear development ambitions were not the primary

[521] 'US looking into range of possibilities against Iran', Zeenews, 11 Nov. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 July 2012.

[522] 'Security Council Imposes Additional Sanctions on Iran', United News Centre Archive [web document] (2010), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2010/sc9948.doc.htm>, accessed 18 June 2012.

[523] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

concern of Russian policy-makers so the Iranian issue deserves proper scrutiny to extrapolate the nuances and mechanisms of the Kremlin's foreign policy-making.

The current academic literature on the Russian Federation and its foreign policy has collectively neglected to examine the importance of the Russian Foreign Affairs Doctrine established in 2008 during the early days of the Medvedev presidency because of the collective dismissal of the merits of the foreign affairs arms of the Russian government in the policy formulation process. The Yeltsin Liberals, who occupy the foreign affairs branch of the government, have been marginalized by Putin's inner circle. This trend continued unabated during the Medvedev years. Sergei Lavrov's 'diplomatic but assertive' posturing was not ideologically or stylistically incompatible with the Kremlin, but the taint of the Yeltsin years and a general collective aversion to 'Yeltsin's bureaucratic mafia' precluded Lavrov and Ambassador Vitaly Churkin from guiding or affecting the foreign policy debates in the upper echelons of the government's hierarchy. There is a fascinating facet to the sanctions against Iran for the Kremlin; this issue was more of a diplomatic dilemma than an issue of defence for Russia. The decision was implemented within the United Nations machinery. The Security Council of the United Nations requires a unanimous vote, which includes the Russian Federation to consent to sanctions or abstain from a vote.

The issue was similar to the North Korean nuclear confrontation that required the consent of the Russian Federation for United Nations Security Council sanctions. Iran posed a similar threat to its region and invoked its sovereignty as the motivating factor in defying the will of the international community. The United States was heavily involved in

the Iranian issue to the same degree as it was with the North Korean nuclear confrontation.[524]

There were, however, three key differences with the Iranian crisis of 2010. The first is that by the middle of 2010 both the United States and the Russian Federation were seeing a reversal of the tensions that had escalated since the war with Georgia in 2008. The New START Treaty was in the process of being ratified in the respective legislatures after being signed on the executive level by both the American and Russian Presidents. Second, the United States and NATO had installed a Missile Defence Shield system in the Czech Republic because of what they perceived was a looming danger from Iran's nuclear weapons program. According to David Speedie, 'Putin proposed a joint-missile defence employment in Uzbekistan, but the United States wanted it in the Czech Republic, which is close to the target, Iran.'[525] This effort to enforce sanctions against Iran occurred shortly after the ousting of Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan, which was facilitated by the Kremlin. The desired goal by the Putin-Medvedev regime was achieved after it decided it was necessary to support ousting a leader who had no qualms about extending the lease of an American military base in Kyrgyzstan, which is part of the post-Soviet space. The ensuing revolution in Kyrgyzstan resulted in the United States losing a strategic position for waging its military operations in the Middle East, a feature of US policy which had begun after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. [526]

Earlier in this body of research, the Minister of Defence and the defence apparatus were not intricately involved with the North Korean issue. The issue played out within the

---

[524] CNN, 'Obama warns North Korea, Iran on nuclear weapons', CNN [web page] (2012) <http://articles.cnn.com/2012-03-26/asia/world_asia_korea-obama-visit_1_nuclear-summit-nuclear-weapons-nuclear-program?_s=PM:ASIA>, accessed July 21, 2012.

[525] D. Speedie, 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 11 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

[526] Richard Orange, 'US airbase threatened in Kyrgyzstan as Russian-backed parties poised to take power', The London Telegraph, 11 Oct. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 2 June 2012.

confines of the United Nations Security Council and within the Kremlin. The essential issues arising with the Iranian episode are how the presidential leadership responded to the crisis, what mechanisms within the Kremlin's foreign policy machinery were utilized, and how the clashes and contentions as well as the rapprochement with the West weighed on the ultimate decision to support the international consensus against Iran's increasing nuclear capabilities.

The Putin-Medvedev duo and the Kremlin elite were faced with a daunting task of reining in a rogue regime from pursuing nuclear weapons capability. The support for sanctions came at a time of contradictory relations for the Kremlin with the West; the time period can be described as one of productive, peaceful relations and diplomatic tension between former Cold War adversaries. Sanctions against rogue regimes with Russia's support were not unprecedented. The Putin presidency supported sanctions against Iran and North Korea multiple times.[527] Therefore, there is a collective, conscious effort by those in power in the Kremlin to support sanctions in order to safeguard international security. The justifications behind this foreign policy trend are examined to illuminate the approach to nuclear proliferation and rogue regimes by the Kremlin. The era of pragmatism has made the Russian Federation a seemingly assertive ally in an alliance to deal with potential threats that may result in large-scale nuclear catastrophes.

The Russian Federation's Foreign Policy Document must be examined to fully understand the Russian response to Iran's illegal nuclear activity. Furthermore, the Foreign Policy Document establishes principles for Russian diplomacy in the international arena.

[527] United Nations Security Council, 'Security Council Resolutions', United Nations [web page] (2013) < http://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/resolutions/index.shtml>, accessed 1 Mar. 2013.

Foreign Policy Document:

The Foreign Policy Document reflected the new Russian view of itself since the end of the Yeltsin presidency.[528] 'To promote an objective image of the Russian Federation globally as a democratic state committed to a socially oriented market economy and an independent foreign policy.'[529]

The Russian Foreign Policy Document was continuing the Putin era of projecting a new, vibrant Russia with a free market economy and a foreign policy guided by its own national interests.[530] Namely, the Partnership for Peace and Yeltsin's inhibited approach to dealing effectively with NATO to safeguard Russian security interests are inherent aversions in this statement. These principles are highly important as they are stated in the beginning of the document.[531] The document proceeds to grapple and solidify Russia's approach to world affairs and the grievances it has.[532] The Foreign Policy Document states:

> Russia, being a permanent member of the UN Security Council, participant in the G8 and other authoritative international and regional organizations, intergovernmental dialogue and cooperation mechanisms, and as a country possessing a major potential and significant resources in all spheres of human activities, vigorously developing relations with leading States and associations throughout the world and integrating consistently into the world economy and politics, exerts a substantial influence upon the development of a new architecture of international relations.[533]

The Russian Federation's foreign policy will now require the country to take a fundamental role in navigating the international arena in which states come together to coalesce alliances and formulate solutions for problems concerning the world stage. The elementary impulse of the Foreign Policy Document is to further distance itself from the

---

[528] 'The Foreign Policy Concept of The Russian Federation 2008', Ministry of Foreign Affairs [web document] (2012), <http://www.mid.ru/nsosndoc.nsf/1e5f0de28fe77fdcc32575d900298676/869c9d2b87ad8014c32575d9002b1c38?OpenDocument>, accessed 12 June 2012.

[529] Ibid.

[530] Ibid.

[531] Ibid.

[532] Ibid.

[533] Ibid.

Yeltsin years, a time when Russia was marginalized and manipulated in the minds of those who occupied important positions in the Kremlin during the Medvedev presidency. The text emphasizes the important role the Russian Federation has as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council and the Silovik controlled Kremlin would relish this importance as security is the theoretical underpinning of any like-minded Putinist individual who acts to thwart any developments or architecture on the world stage that may threaten Russia. The language was delicately tailored to be compatible with the Silovik worldview.[534] It would be nearly impossible to imagine that the influential Prime Minister did not heavily influence this document over any objection by Lavrov, the stalwart Yeltsin Liberal whose influence is marginal at best because of his ideology and past association.[535] The ultimate sin of Yeltsin's tenure for the current Kremlin elite was that NATO expansion was not thwarted or even impeded. The perceived capitulation during the 1990's was blamed for NATO's current emboldened position on the world stage and its encroachment on Russian security by the leaders in the Kremlin.[536] Vladimir Putin came to power in 2000 with the intention to bring the Russian Federation back to its status as a great power after the fall of the Soviet Union, which he has described as a terrible event in history.[537] The following text from the Russian Federation's Foreign Policy Document illustrates that the post-Yeltsin Russia will not allow NATO to gain strategically if Russian security is

[534] Ibid.

[535] Patrick Jackson, 'Profile: Putin's Minister of Foreign Affairs Lavrov', The BBC [web document] (2007),
< http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/6242774.stm>, accessed 18 June 2012.

[536] 'The Foreign Policy Concept of The Russian Federation 2000', Ministry of Foreign Affairs [web document] (2012),
< http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/russia/doctrine/econcept.htm>, accessed 12 June 2012.

[537] The BBC, 'Putin deplores collapse of USSR', The BBC [web page] (2005)
< http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/4480745.stm>, accessed 29 June 2012.

compromised.[538] This text is the fundamental mindset of the post-Yeltsin operatives who occupy powerful positions in the Kremlin:

> Russia will build its relationship with NATO taking into consideration the degree of the alliance's readiness for equal partnership, unswerving compliance with the principles and standards of international law, the implementation by all its members of the obligations, assumed within the framework of the Russia-NATO Council, not to ensure one's security at the expense of security of the Russian Federation, as well as the obligation to display military restraint. Russia maintains its negative attitude toward the expansion of NATO, notably to the plans of admitting Ukraine and Georgia to the membership in the alliance, as well as to bringing the NATO military infrastructure closer to the Russian borders on the whole, which violates the principle of equal security, leads to new dividing lines in Europe and runs counter to the tasks of increasing the effectiveness of joint work in search for responses to real challenges of our time.[539]

The title of the clause 'Strengthening international security' is the main ideological premise of the Silovik worldview evident in the document.[540] The Yeltsin Liberals in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs were, by virtue of the obvious Silovik-inspired rhetoric of the document, excluded from formulating a foreign policy guideline that is compatible with the liberal ideology of conceding to the West in the interests of rectifying past inequities. The Foreign Policy Concept contains no sense of loss over the Cold War and instead aims to resurrect the 'great power status' Russia once enjoyed.[541]

The previous text of the Foreign Policy Concept that was included in this chapter does noticeably include three important points of contention that it overtly mentions.[542] 'Equal partnership' in no uncertain terms reflects the foreign policy apparatus' belief that Russia should not and will not capitulate to NATO or any other Western-dominated

---

[538] 'The Foreign Policy Concept Of The Russian Federation 2008', Ministry of Foreign Affairs [web document] (2012), <http://www.mid.ru/nsosndoc.nsf/1e5f0de28fe77fdcc32575d900298676/869c9d2b87ad8014c32575d9002b1c38?OpenDocument>, accessed 12 June 2012.

[539] Ibid.

[540] Ibid.

[541] Ibid.

[542] Ibid.

collective organization.[543] The 'Partnership for Peace fiasco' in which Russia ended up with no diplomatic or defence gains lowered its position on the world stage even further. This was a primary characteristic of Boris Yeltsin's foreign policy.[544] The foreign policy guidelines insinuated that only equal, bilateral relations between Russia and Western security architecture will occur.[545] Furthermore, it states that NATO enlargement is a threat and that Ukraine and Georgia moving closer to NATO will only inflame the security dilemma and will not result in peaceful coexistence.[546] Yeltsin's lack of advocacy against NATO enlargement was believed to be another failure on his part by Putin's Siloviki and military traditionalists, who now occupy important positions in the Russian government.

The Iranian issue and the Missile Defence Shield in the Czech Republic were therefore interwoven. The phrase that objects to the NATO Missile Defence Shield installed to protect security interests against a possible Iranian nuclear strike is stated: 'to bringing the NATO military infrastructure closer to the Russian borders on the whole, which violates the principle of equal security.'[547] While this does not explicitly describe the Missile Defence Shield, there can be no doubt that this was a veiled reference to what was believed to infringe on Russian security because of the proximity of the Western security architecture to its borders.[548] The new President of the United States, Barack Obama, cancelled plans for another Missile Defence Shield system in Poland but refused to make

[543] Ibid.

[544] The Associated Press, 'Yeltsin To Review Russia's Entry Into Partnership For Peace With Am-Russia-Yeltsin, Bjt', The Associated Press [web page] (2012) <http://www.apnewsarchive.com/1994/Yeltsin-to-Review-Russia-s-Entry-into-Partnership-for-Peace-With-AM-Russia-Yeltsin-Bjt/id-b6dfd7cc1edcf59149ea11c2bf43e81c>, accessed 29 July 2012.

[545] 'The Foreign Policy Concept of The Russian Federation 2008', Ministry of Foreign Affairs [web document] (2012), <http://www.mid.ru/nsosndoc.nsf/1e5f0de28fe77fdcc32575d900298676/869c9d2b87ad8014c32575d9002b1c38?OpenDocument>, accessed 12 June 2012.

[546] Ibid.

[547] Ibid.

[548] Ibid.

any decision that would have involved removing the system installed in the Czech Republic.[549]

While Sergei Lavrov never maintained an influential position within the foreign policy apparatus, his role as perennial interviewee remained persistent throughout the Medvedev presidency. The Council on Foreign Relations interviewed him in 2008 to ask detailed questions about the new Foreign Policy Concept document and his answers continued to reflect the 'diplomatic but assertive' posturing that he began to utilize with the inauguration of Vladimir Putin in 2000.[550]

Lavrov answered his questions effectively. His responses on NATO made it abundantly clear that Russia would not permit an infringement of its security by any security architecture.[551] Lavrov said: 'We agreed in Russia-NATO Council, for example -- and this is the key issue for what we are discussing -- that security is indivisible and that no one should ensure his security at the expense of security of others.'[552] The phrase 'No one should ensure his security at the expense of security of others' is a veiled reference to the Missile Defence Shield system now in Europe that could potentially be used against Russia.[553] The Silovik advocacy found a new role for Sergei Lavrov and his status as perennial interviewee who could communicate Russian concerns to the news media. Lavrov, the Yeltsin Liberal who once was a chief diplomat in conducting perceived capitulation to the West by the Russian Federation, now played the role of spokesman for the Silovik worldview that precluded any collective organization or agreement from taking measures that may pose a threat to his country or its borders. NATO was Lavrov's main

[549] 'Polish president accuses Obama of betraying Poland', The London Telegraph, 6 Aug. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 6 Aug. 2012.

[550]The Council on Foreign Relations, 'A Conversation with Sergei Lavrov'. The Council on Foreign Relations [web page] (2008) < http://www.cfr.org/un/conversation-sergey-lavrov/p17384>, accessed 29 July 2012.

[551] Ibid.

[552] Ibid.

[553] Ibid.

point of contention with the West and this could not be further from the diplomacy of 'capitulation' that characterized the foreign affairs arm of the Russian government during the 1990's in the minds of the Russian citizenry. Dr. Mark Galeotti explains the non-obstructive role of the Yeltsin Liberals in the Putin-Medvedev regime by saying, 'Diplomats are very adept at adopting new rhetoric.'[554] Lavrov remained a dependable spokesman who clearly reflected the Putin-Medvedev sentiment in the Kremlin.

'Privileged interests' is a phrase implying that Russia will intervene when its security is threatened in any way regardless of whether it is a missile system or increasing membership of its neighbours in a Western security organization.[555] This phrase gave the Russian Federation the moral and geopolitical justifications to invade, attack, or sever relations with any country it believes is helping NATO tip the security balance against Russia. Lavrov has stated:

> Russia has areas where it has privileged interests, not privileged areas, but some areas are the areas of privileged interest of Russia. The Foreign Policy Concept says that we will -- you want to get an answer from Vitaly (Churkin) or -- (laughter) -- the Foreign Policy Concept said that we, Russia, will develop friendly, mutually beneficial relations with all those who are prepared to do the same on the equal and mutually beneficial basis, paying particular attention to the traditional partners of the Russian Federation.[556]

Lavrov's primary message is that the Foreign Policy Concept will enhance Russia's ability to act independently and for its own interests, especially when security is concerned. The interview reflects a Yeltsin Liberal who now advocates a very different message; one that is compatible with the wishes of the Kremlin elite. Lavrov has yet to challenge this line of Silovik thinking and there is no evidence to suggest that he has tried to do so. Dr. Sergei

---

[554] M. Galeotti, Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

[555] 'The Foreign Policy Concept of The Russian Federation 2008', Ministry of Foreign Affairs [web document] (2012), <http://www.mid.ru/nsosndoc.nsf/1e5f0de28fe77fdcc32575d900298676/869c9d2b87ad8014c32575d9002b1c38?OpenDocument>, accessed 12 June 2012.

[556] The Council on Foreign Relations, 'A Conversation with Sergei Lavrov'. The Council on Foreign Relations [web page] (2008) < http://www.cfr.org/un/conversation-sergey-lavrov/p17384>, accessed 29 July 2012

Khrushchev commented on the Yeltsin Liberals, 'They have no ideology. Maybe they have their own opinion, but they do not challenge anyone.'[557] Lavrov's chameleon-like qualities have allowed him to remain in a high-ranking position within the foreign policy apparatus, but his influence in the policy debates does not suggest his diplomatic upbringing or liberalism had any impact on the decisions made on the presidential level.

It is apparent that Lavrov, an outsider of the inner circle, did not channel his liberal views to the Kremlin. His influence has never been an overwhelming factor in the formulation of doctrines by the Russian government. The foreign policy doctrine reflects the Silovik worldview with its refusal to allow Western security architecture to interfere in its sphere of influence or allow any country to lessen Russian clout in collective organizations operated by principles of liberal institutionalism. The Yeltsin Liberals who still occupy important positions in the foreign affairs arm of the Russian government have not effectively swayed the foreign policy decisions to negate the Silovik tendencies that are apparent in every decision and doctrine implemented by the government. Ultimately, there is an inability for Lavrov to channel his concerns and beliefs to the ears of the President, Prime Minister, or Russian Security Council. Lavrov's lack of a personal relationship with members of Putin's inner sanctum and reluctance to credit liberal foreign policies with any successes during the 1990's have precluded him from being a powerful voice in the debates and deliberations within the bureaucracy. The crux of this situation is that the anti-Yeltsin vigour of the Kremlin elite is non-negotiable and refuses to concede to any foreign policy move that would allow a repetition of the 1990's. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva noted that, 'Yeltsin Liberals are not feared or respected because of their association with Yeltsin.'[558]

---

[557] S. Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.

[558] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

This fundamental stance of impeding Western security engagement runs counter to the spirit of The New START Treaty that brought a new period of rapprochement. The penultimate act between the two governments that ratified the agreement later in 2010, the signing ceremony, was a vibrant, cohesive act of summit diplomacy. Obama and Medvedev were in unison during the meeting and the Foreign Policy Concept would never have been considered reflective of the reality on the world stage at the time. However, summit diplomacy excluded the many problems that remain and the conflicts did not end with the signing of The New START Treaty by chief executives of the respective countries. Medvedev's threat of starting a new arms race would continue the contradictory relations between the United States and the Russian Federation.[559] The treaty was signed, but the Missile Defence Shield issue remained with no significant change. The events in Kyrgyzstan pointed to a Russia that may act diplomatically in a summit environment, but still employed tactics to alter the Western influence and security control in the post-Soviet space. The Foreign Policy Concept was much more accurate of Russian intentions and positions than any diplomatic summit would suggest, while the Iranian issue still had to be addressed.

US-Russian Rapprochement?

The New START Treaty was signed during a contentious episode over the Missile Defence Shield in Prague; both parties signalled that with the signing of the treaty a closer relationship with more communication and cooperation was possible.[560] The United States' mission against the Iranian regime and its nuclear ambitions started during the George W. Bush years and continued during the Obama Administration's tenure. The prospects of a

[559] Steve Gutterman, 'Russia's Medvedev warns of new arms race', Reuters, 30 Nov. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], 2 June 2012.

[560] The White House, 'Remarks by President Obama and President Medvedev of Russia at New START Treaty Signing Ceremony and Press Conference', The White House Press Release [web page] (2010) < http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-and-president-medvedev-russia-new-start-treaty-signing-cere>, accessed 25 Aug. 2012.

nuclear-armed Iran that is governed by an Islamic theocracy made the American foreign policy apparatus concerned about the destabilizing consequences in the region and possible impediments to military operations by the United States stemming from the September 11 attacks.[561] The United States needed to forge alliances to thwart the Iranian nuclear development and The New START Treaty was an opportunity to solidify diplomatic relations with the Russian Federation after a cooling of ties after the Georgian conflict and installation of the Missile Defence Shield. Iran was a rogue regime fixated on developing nuclear capabilities to increase its power in the international community, and the United States reconnected with its former Cold War adversary with the intention to court a permanent member on the United Nations Security Council in the event Iran violates international norms and becomes a nuclear state with sadistic ambitions. Furthermore, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, a figurehead representative of the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, never relented in his powerful anti-Israel rhetoric. The constant threats by Ahmadinejad echoed across the news media and only further alarmed American foreign policy-makers, as well as Israel, a stalwart ally of the West and the United States. It was in the United States' interests to do all it could to court the Russian Federation into beginning a new chapter of warmer relations in order to severely deter Iran's nuclear capabilities and its widely publicized ambitions to attack Israel. The Russian Federation's permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council is a direct reason for this. The New START Treaty was an effort to tilt the power balance against Iran by gaining the support of the Russian Federation. The Missile Defence Shield and Russia's concerns were interrelated with these strategic issues on the world stage. The New START Treaty allowed for discussion regarding the Missile Defence Shield and the possible Iranian threat. A

[561] Glenn Greenwald, 'The true reason US fears Iranian nukes: they can deter US attacks.' The Guardian, 2 Oct. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 30 Oct. 2012.

confluence of interests forged a new path for both the United States and the Russian Federation, and the new treaty was a step toward ameliorating concerns in the global community.

Regardless of the fact that The New START Treaty was signed in early 2010 and was not officially authorized until early 2011 after respective legislatures consented to the agreement, the convergence of interests and willingness to work together by Obama and Medvedev signalled that 'anything was on the table' for discussion.[562] The two leaders were now diplomatic 'friends' and both Presidents were able to convey mutual and personal concerns stemming from respective presidential vantage points. Max Bergmann, Nuclear Security expert at the Centre for American progress, said: 'This is a pivotal moment in not just U.S.-Russia relations, but also in Iranian-Russian relations.'[563] Russia as a result of signing the treaty undoubtedly had to recalibrate its relations with Iran to assuage the concerns of the United States, and the Kremlin would surely request for negotiations regarding the Missile Defence Shield in the Czech Republic, which was installed as a direct result of Iran's nuclear development according to American foreign policy-makers. The political wrangling in both countries died down as a result of the power of the presidential prerogative and superiority in conducting foreign relations. Both the Russian and American Presidents are primarily responsible for the shaping of foreign policy with minimal involvement of respective legislative branches in their governments. The possible outcomes of productive cooperation outweighed any political calls for an abrogation of the treaty; the 'Reset' as engineered by Obama and Michael McFaul was an American initiative that took

[562] The White House, 'Remarks by President Obama and President Medvedev of Russia at New START Treaty Signing Ceremony and Press Conference', The White House Press Release [web page] (2010) < http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-and-president-medvedev-russia-new-start-treaty-signing-cere>, accessed 25 Aug. 2012.

[563] Elizabeth Weingarten, 'The Iran-START Connection.' The Atlantic, 22 Nov. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Sep. 2012.

nearly two years of mediation and negotiation. The Kremlin did not hastily dismiss this opportunity to fundamentally alter any strategic issues that were against Russian interests.

Iran understood world politics to the extent that any sanctions enacted against it would necessitate a United Nations Security Council Resolution that requires a unanimous vote by permanent members. This integral mechanism for global governance established the importance of both Russia and China as non-Western states that are not always in agreement with the West and at times refuse to join the concert of powers in moves against rogue regimes. The New START Treaty posed a significant threat to any possible nuclear development deemed by the international community as endangering global security. The primary attribute of The New START Treaty is that the Obama and Medvedev Administrations now had a continuous dialogue that began with these negotiations and will continue in the event that a nuclear-armed Iran poses a threat anywhere on the world stage. *The Guardian* noted:

> In other words, New Start undercuts Iranian efforts to drive a wedge between Russia and the west. Historically Iran's policy shifts on its nuclear programme have correlated with upticks in US-Russia relations. Moscow is widely seen as perhaps the critical vote for a sanctions resolution, since most analysts predict that China would likely choose to abstain rather than exercise a veto – although there are some signs that even the Chinese position is softening.[564]

The international politics of agreeing to sanctions against rogue regimes is guided by principles of treaties or even executive-level agreements. The United States now had a closer bilateral relationship with Russia. The power balance in the diplomatic arena was becoming increasingly troublesome for Iran. The Iranian leadership would have a difficult mission to assuage Russian concerns when its newfound ally the United States is rallying the world to its cause to deny Iran the opportunity to continue its illegal nuclear

[564] Max Bergmann, Samuel Charap, Peter Juul, 'New Start to rein in Iran's ambitions.' The Guardian, 9 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 13 Sep. 2012.

development. Steven Pifer, director of the Arms Control Initiative at the Brookings Institution, commented: 'The treaty's ratification will reaffirm US leadership in reducing the global threat of nuclear weapons.'[565] The American hegemony now has one more ally in its mission to rid the world of rogue regimes that pose nuclear threats. The Obama Administration engaged with the Medvedev Administration to agree to a treaty and further open diplomatic channels. The Medvedev Administration's primary concern at the time was the American and NATO Missile Defence Shield, which the United States claimed was not installed to threaten Russia's strategic capabilities but to deter the Iranian leadership from launching nuclear armaments. The Russian foreign policy doctrine passed in 2008 made it abundantly clear that NATO and its security infrastructure must not infringe on Russian security.[566] The long-term Russian dread of NATO is historically and fundamentally unchanged since the end of the Cold War, and therefore, the Russian foreign policy doctrine during the Medvedev presidency officially recognizes NATO as an undesirable factor in regional and international security. The issue of Iranian nuclear development was a ripe opportunity for a 'meeting of the minds' and caused a convergence of concerns and interests by both the United States and the Russian Federation.

The American interests in signing The New START Treaty are indivisible with its goal to eradicate rogue regimes with increasing nuclear capabilities. *The Christian Science Monitor* noted:

> Some nuclear-non-proliferation advocates maintain that the issue of Iran, and how successful the US and other world powers are at stopping it from developing a nuclear weapon, will determine future steps at arms control. Indeed, one of the administration's arguments in favour of New START was that it would further the

[565] Howard Lafranchi, 'New START treaty: How will next efforts for nuclear weapons reduction fare?' Christian Science Monitor, 22 Dec. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 21 Sep. 2012.

[566] 'The Foreign Policy Concept of The Russian Federation 2008', Ministry of Foreign Affairs [web document] (2012), <http://www.mid.ru/nsosndoc.nsf/1e5f0de28fe77fdcc32575d900298676/869c9d2b87ad8014c32575d9002b1c38?OpenDocument>, accessed 12 June 2012.

> good relations with Russia that have been crucial to Moscow's cooperation in pressuring Tehran.[567]

The focal point of the 2010 Iranian security dilemma involved a rogue state that flouts international law and poses a threat to its neighbouring countries. The Russian Federation fully understood the perilous consequences of a nuclear-armed Iran in the region and this concerned Russia equally as it did the United States according to Dmitry Trenin, the preeminent expert on NATO-Russian relations in the United States.[568] There was however a serious issue that still did not elude the Russian President when he threatened a 'new arms race;' the United States and NATO have not altered their security architecture, specifically the Missile Defence Shield.[569]

Important statements were made on the day of the signing of The New START Treaty. Both Presidents were given the opportunity to engage in summit diplomacy and convey respective viewpoints that provided deep insights into the thinking of respective foreign policy apparatuses. President Barack Obama stated:

> That includes accountability for those that break the rules - otherwise the NPT is just words on a page. That is why the United States and Russia are part of a coalition of nations insisting that the Islamic Republic of Iran face consequences, because they have continually failed to meet their obligations. We are working together at the UN Security Council to pass strong sanctions on Iran. And we will not tolerate actions that flout the NPT, risk an arms race in a vital region, and threaten the credibility of the international community and our collective security.[570]

---

[567] Howard Lafranchi, 'New START treaty: How will next efforts for nuclear weapons reduction fare?' Christian Science Monitor, 22 Dec. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 21 Sep. 2012.

[568] Bloomberg News, 'How the Iran Nuclear Standoff Looks From Russia: Dmitri Trenin', Bloomberg News (web page) (2012) < http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-15/how-the-iran-nuclear-standoff-looks-from-russia-dmitri-trenin.html>, accessed 1 Oct. 2012.

[569] Steve Gutterman, 'Russia's Medvedev warns of new arms race', Reuters, 30 Nov. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], 2 June 2012.

[570] The White House, 'Remarks by President Obama and President Medvedev of Russia at New START Treaty Signing Ceremony and Press Conference', The White House Press Release [web page] (2010) < http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-and-president-medvedev-russia-new-start-treaty-signing-cere>, accessed 25 Aug. 2012.

President Dmitry Medvedev stated:

> Of course, we would not omit the Iranian nuclear problem. Regrettably, Iran is not responding to the many constructive proposals that have been made and we cannot turn a blind eye to this. Therefore I do not rule out the possibility of the Security Council of the United Nations will have to review this issue once again. [571]

President Dmitry Medvedev also commented:

> On that basis we will implement the newly signed treaty. It matters to us what will happen to missile defence. It is related to the configuration of our potential and our capacities, and we will watch how these processes develop. And the preamble has a language that, to a certain extent, replicates a legal principle of the unchangeability of circumstances that were basis for the treaty. But this is a flexible process, and we are interested in close cooperation over it with our American partners.[572]

For Obama, the issue of addressing Iran's nuclear development was paramount to achieving strategic objectives, including ensuring global security and lessening the potential of an attack on a close ally, Israel. [573] For political reasons within his country, specifically to decrease the security dilemma felt by the United States in confrontation with an increasingly alarming nuclear situation in the Middle East and for the mission of continuing America's safeguarding of international security, The New START Treaty was initiated and signed by the American President to thwart Iran by moving closer with Russia. Russia was simultaneously dealing with the prospect of a rogue state with nuclear weapons close in proximity, while also addressing the strategic and security implications of NATO's Missile Defence Shield in the Czech Republic. Medvedev made no attempt to hide the fact that cooperation on nuclear weapons between the two countries will lead to a strong consideration of the Iranian threat, but the Missile Defence Shield system in Prague was vital enough to be addressed as a high priority. This was Medvedev's express view and he

[571] Ibid.

[572] Ibid.

[573] Jeffrey Goldberg, 'Netanyahu to Obama: Stop Iran—Or I Will', The Atlantic, Mar. 2009, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 Oct. 2012.

was echoing much of what the Russian political community had felt was a legitimate grievance.[574]

The summit diplomacy and the treaty were relevant avenues that both Presidents believed should be the path to empathizing respective viewpoints and achieving objectives. The intended quid pro quo resulting from the signing was that dialogue between Russia and the United States would be enhanced to build support against Iran and eventually remove the Missile Defence Shield, since its sole stated purpose by NATO and the United States was to thwart the Iranian nuclear danger. A convergence of interests mired the Russian foreign policy decision to consider enforcing United Nations sanctions against Iran in 2010.

United Nations Resolution 1929:

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1929 against Iran was not passed as a result of sudden provocation. It represented an increasing consensus that Iran's nuclear development program violated international norms and posed a risk to international security. The United States and the West had been on a campaign to deter the Iranian nuclear program for several years and now United Nations Security Council Resolution 1929 was the most stringent set of sanctions against Iran in modern history. The Russian Federation's Security Council and its chief, Secretary Nikolai Patrushev, were involved in this matter to the extent of carrying out the necessary protocol.[575] On May 21, 2010, the Russian Security Council was assembled for an 'operational meeting' with both the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of Defence, but Prime Minister Putin was

[574] Steve Gutterman, 'Russia's Medvedev warns of new arms race', Reuters, 30 Nov. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], 2 June 2012.

[575] The Security Council of the Russian Federation, 'Operational meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation 21/5/2010', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/581.html&usg=ALkJrhgoZhQBccP3jL1GzcgtHJ3EqX8e7g> , accessed 18 October 2012.

conspicuously absent.[576] The presence of the Director of Intelligence was confirmed, however.[577] Patrushev's control of the Russian Security Council would not hinder any attempt by the Director of Intelligence to insert his knowledge and viewpoint regarding the ongoing Iranian nuclear issue. Patrushev's intelligence background and hawkish worldview would have made it viable for the Director of Intelligence, Mikhail Fradkov who is a member of the Silovik faction, to warn his fellow bureaucrats that Iran will become a lethal nuclear state in the near future, despite public objections and omissions by the Iranian leadership. Fareed Zakaria, a world affairs expert was interviewed and explained the situation thus:

> **CNN:** Why has Russia not been more supportive in helping address Iran's nuclear program?
> **Fareed Zakaria:** Actually, over the last six months, there have been signs that Russia is frustrated with Iran and is actually willing to go along with some sanctions. This is mostly because of Iran's stupidity. It has lied to almost everyone, including the Russians, hid the Qom reactor from them, and has proved a very erratic negotiating partner. [578]

Putin's absence from the 'operational meeting' does not necessarily signify a lessening of influence or involvement, but it was indicative that Putin was Medvedev's 'other half' and carried out duties relevant to Russian affairs while Medvedev was entangled in the protocol and bureaucracy of formal meetings. Similar to the Georgian confrontation when Putin was Medvedev's chief interlocutor with the Americans when engaged in face-to-face discussion with George W. Bush in Beijing, Putin, considering his eight years as President and possible return in 2012, was Medvedev's partner engaged in presidential duties that allowed for Medvedev to be the public face of Russian leadership.[579]

---

[576] Ibid.

[577] Ibid.

[578] CNN, 'Russia frustrated with Iran but unlikely to fully support sanctions', CNN [web page] (2005) < http://articles.cnn.com/2010-05-21/opinion/zakaria.russia_1_nuclear-program-russia-and-china-iran-issue?_s=PM:OPINION>, accessed 25 Oct. 2012.

[579] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

Putin's presence at the Russian Security Council meetings was just a formality, not a necessity, because of the close bond between the two men. Dr. Kimberly Marten characterized the relationship within the Putin-Medvedev duo as, 'They have a relatively comfortable relationship.'[580]

In addition to this, Putin's intelligence officer's worldview and hawkish instincts characteristic of the Silovik faction would clearly have led to his deep and unwavering monitoring of the nuclear development in Iran and the related Missile Defence Shield. It would be impossible for Putin who has spent his career as President and Prime Minister advocating against NATO encroachment of security to ignore the Missile Defence Shield that was installed in the Czech Republic because of the Iranian nuclear development. It was simply not in Russia's security interests to allow Iran to continue nuclear development and give NATO, the United States, and the West further opportunity to intervene in the region. Iran is the link that sparked the security dilemma between the West and Russia. The Kremlin would act in concert with the United States if it meant that a key reason for the Missile Defence Shield would now disappear. Putin's anti-Iranian nuclear development stance was a foregone conclusion.

The Kremlin officially posted an announcement on the internet stating that Secretary of the Russian Security Council Nikolai Patrushev spoke on the telephone with the Secretary of the Supreme National Security Council of Iran, Saeed Jalili.[581] The two National Security Council secretaries engaged in bilateral discussions that could have hardly altered the course of events in either country. Neither secretary possessed powerful

---

[580] K. Marten, 'Russian Foreign Policy' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 7 December 2012, Harriman Institute, Columbia University, New York, New York.

[581] The Security Council of the Russian Federation, 'A telephone conversation the Secretary of the Russian Security Council Nikolai Patrushev with Secretary of Supreme National Security Council of Iran Saeed Jalili', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/584.html&usg=ALkJrhjKHFWQQxVjbPXv95ZkAsBv3WbpPg> , accessed 18 October 2012.

influence within the respective decision-making of their governments. Patrushev served at the behest of a President whose ideological faction was in a constant clash with his own. Secretary Jalili served the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, whose authority is considered second only to God. Both individuals serve leaders with whom they have questionable ties and influence. The Kremlin's announcement noted the following in relation to the telephone conversation: that 'The Russian side expressed readiness to actively promote negotiations on the settlement of the situation around the INP and felt the need to rapidly search for mutually acceptable political and diplomatic solutions.'[582]

This telephone conversation can be directly attributed as arising from the foreign policy doctrine of the Russian Federation passed in 2008. Namely, Russia clearly and abundantly states in the document that it will exercise a cohesive, independent foreign policy.[583] This has been Putin's ideological fixation since the day he became President in 2000. The Russian Federation will not kowtow to the West or align itself against any state on the world stage because of American or Western pressure. The telephone conversation did not accomplish much diplomatically. Russia consented to sanctions and the Iranian concerns were ignored by the Kremlin, but the signal of Russia speaking to a country facing imminent sanctions speaks volumes about the length Russia will go to solidify its status as an independent country with no resemblance to the 'Yeltsinist capitulation' of the 1990's. The West, the United States, and permanent members of the United Nations Security Council closely observed Russian behaviour and did question whether the effort to deter the Iranian nuclear crisis would be successful. The telephone conversation was the Kremlin's stance that no country would influence its decisions, especially the United States that was leading the effort to impose sanctions against Iran. The Russian Federation would act

[582] Ibid.
[583] Ibid.

independently and the Kremlin used Secretary Patrushev to display this very fact. Mr. Richard Perle, during an interview with the author, commented, 'Are we together on Iran? They (the Russian Federation) reluctantly agreed to sanctions that are watered down. They are not predisposed to be cooperative. They grudgingly will make concessions.'[584]

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, its chief diplomat Sergei Lavrov, and United Nations Ambassador Vitaly Churkin continued the diplomatic posturing and advocacy compatible with the Kremlin's wishes. However, Minister of Defence Anatoly Serdyukov's role in the lead up to Resolution 1929 was marginal at best. Similar to the North Korean confrontation, this event was entirely played out in the diplomatic arena. Serdyukov's role as defence chief and his inherent objectives were related to the Iranian nuclear crisis to the extent that it would change the situation with regards to the Missile Defence Shield in the Czech Republic. Serdyukov's role in the aftermath of the sanctions will be examined later in this chapter. However, his role in the months prior to United Nations Resolution 1929 was wholly dependent on the prerogatives of the foreign policy apparatus, which repeated its inclination to not involve the Ministry of Defence in decisions made on the United Nations Security Council.

Sergei Lavrov's role in this diplomatic situation was vital for engaging the West and conveying concerns over possible sanctions. In March 2010, Lavrov's bilateral meeting with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was his venue to publicly and personally communicate to Hillary Clinton and the United States government that sanctions had to be "smart;" the same article quoted President Medvedev claiming that 'sanctions are usually pointless but may sometimes be necessary.'[585] The Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and

[584] R. Perle, Russia's Security Fears' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 7 January 2013, American Enterprise Institute, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

[585] 'Iran sanctions must be smart', Voice of Russia [web page] (2010) < http://english.ruvr.ru/2010/03/19/5457160.html>, accessed 30 October 2012.

the foreign policy doctrine of 2008 envision and advocate a 'diplomatic but assertive' posturing. Neither Putin, nor Medvedev has ever advocated a foreign policy that was isolationist or overly hawkish, but simultaneously resisted any reversal to the 'Yeltsinist foreign policy of capitulation.' The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Yeltsin Liberals were now more assertive but remained steadfast to the central principles of peaceful and cooperative relations with the West. They acted in perfect unison with the post-Yeltsin leaders, despite not being members of the 'inner circle.' Dr. Mark Galeotti noted, 'If the Foreign Ministry had been recalcitrant, there would have been a purge. They have not done this, so there was no need to remove the Yeltsin Liberals.'[586]

The United Nations Security Council vote passed with no opposition by the Russian Federation. Ambassador Churkin was noted by the United Nations as follows:

> VITALY CHURKIN (Russian Federation): said his vote in favour had been guided by his country's consistent position on the need for to resolve through dialogue all questions involving Iran's nuclear programme. Hopefully Iran would see the resolution as an appeal to launch substantial negotiations to clarify all issues and to fulfil its responsibilities toward IAEA and the Security Council. The Russian Federation would continue to make significant efforts to promote dialogue and the resolution of all such problems.[587]

The Russian Federation has consented to the most stringent set of sanctions against Iran in the history of the United Nations Security Council, but the phrasing and nonchalance of the Russian Ambassador's response signifies important elements of the central underpinning of the Russian decision. First, the decision was motivated by the belief that resolving this issue through 'dialogue' implied that American and NATO military presence, especially the Missile Defence Shield, was no longer needed as the result of passage of this resolution. Second, the fundamental belief was that the vote will lead to Iran

---

[586] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

[587] 'Security Council Imposes Additional Sanctions on Iran', United News Centre Archive [web document] (2010), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2010/sc9948.doc.htm>, accessed 18 June 2012.

complying with the IAEA and international norms. This did not necessarily mean that NATO and the United States will achieve its goal of removing nuclear capabilities from Iran. The Kremlin would not want this vote to reflect any hallmarks of the perceived 'Yeltsinist capitulation' to the West of the 1990's. Even when the Russian Federation aligns itself with the West, it is presenting itself as assertive and independent. This diplomatic approach is the Putinist foreign policy that has been the persistent doctrine since 2000. The Foreign Policy Concept has been officially authorized in doctrinal form in 2000 and 2008. The foreign policy doctrine has been this strategic and diplomatic arsenal of tactics to ensure Russian interests and prestige remain protected.

Lavrov played the 'diplomatic but assertive' role well in the sense that he did not ultimately align himself with the United States after the United Nations Security Council Resolution passed. 'Assertive' in the Russian context means to be independent and assert Russian interests before those of the West or international community. Immediately after the resolution passed Lavrov stated that: 'absolute protection for all significant channels of trade and economic cooperation existing between Russia and Iran.'[588]

Lavrov was the voice of an independent Russia that will continue relations with a state classified as a 'rogue regime' that was struck with sanctions by the international community. Russia's nonchalance and ignorance of the Western and American security and political objectives remain unabated. Even though sanctions were unanimously agreed upon by Russia and the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, Russia resisted the efforts by others to infringe upon Russian-Iranian relations. Furthermore, on the same day the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs announced that a sale of Russian surface-

[588] RIA Novosti, 'Russian-Iranian S-300 missile deal not against UN resolution — U.S.', RIA Novosti [web page] (2010) < http://en.rian.ru/world/20100611/159382525.html>, accessed 3 Jan. 2013.

to-air missiles to Iran would proceed.[589] The Russian Federation was simultaneously cooperating with the West but choosing its own path and approach to dealing with Iran that runs counter to the wishes of the international community. The foreign affairs arm of the Kremlin is continuing the new foreign policy era that started with Yeltsin's resignation. The Russian Federation would not be marginalized or be a capitulator.

Russia's independence would not be impeded or entangled because of any country or multilateral agreement, even a United Nations Security Council Resolution. In the aftermath of Resolution 1929, *RIA Novosti* reported Lavrov as saying that Russia would still cooperate with Iran's nuclear plant regardless of anything.[590] Russia was 'playing both sides.' Its diplomatic posturing was self-serving to both embolden its position on the world stage and its importance to the West and the United States in achieving objectives to safeguard international security.

When asked whether Russia would continue its role in supporting sanctions against Iran only a few months later, the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs stated that: 'Further sanctions would mean the suppression of the Iranian economy and creation of social problems for the population. We will not be able to support this, I really mean it.'[591] Russia was adamant that it would respond and deal with international issues on its own terms and its loyalties were tied to its own interests. Russia was truly independent and Russian diplomacy in the Iranian crisis is a testament to this.

While the United Nations Security Council was formally deciding whether to pass sanctions against Iran on June 9, 2010, the Russian Security Council was engaged in a

[589] Ibid.

[590] Ibid.

[591] Maria Chupina, 'Russia opposes new sanctions against Iran', Voice of Russia [web page] (2011) <http://english.ruvr.ru/2011/02/16/44633997.html>, accessed 3 Jan. 2013.

meaningless and redundant meeting about 'domestic shipbuilding'[592] The keynote address at this meeting was by Igor Sechin, known to be the most hawkish Silovik in the Russian government.[593] Medvedev's persistent marginalization of the Russian Security Council has made it difficult for the forum to exert the influence it sought with the passage of the 2009 National Security Concept document. Igor Sechin and Nikolai Patrushev are ardent Siloviki whose ideological fixation and intelligence officer's methodology clash with the liberal-minded, technocratic President. The Yeltsonian forces of a powerful constitution that enable the President to manoeuvre the levers of power to his or her liking are apparent. It is because of the Yeltsonian forces that embolden Medvedev that he is using his foreign policy mechanisms in a manner that suggests that the Silovik controlled advisory forum, the Russian Security Council, will not impede or accelerate his decisions. The Siloviki and military traditionalists on the Russian Security Council have been alienated from the presidential decision-making, despite the Russian Security Council's document passed in 2009 that theoretically strengthened it as an institution.

The Russian Security Council's ultimate objective was to be a forum for foreign policy deliberation and formulation, but the practical elements of the Kremlin's governmental machinery have precluded this from occurring. Medvedev's temperament is not compatible with the military traditionalists, such as General Baluyevsky, or Siloviki, such as Secretary Patrushev, who continue to control the Russian Security Council. Dr. Mark Galeotti commented on the difficult relationship between Medvedev and Patrushev, 'Patrushev acted as Putin's inside view of presidential and defence briefings. He was the

[592] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'Meeting of the Security Council of the Russian Federation "On the state and prospects of development of the domestic shipbuilding"', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2010) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/587.html&usg=ALkJrhg_AkA0bvNW0zfhavR38xq8pahmGQ>, accessed 5 Jan. 2013.

[593] Ibid.

Prime Minister's spy.'[594] It can be easy to conclude that Medvedev's preference would be to engage with the Yeltsin Liberals of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs who would not openly voice jingoistic truculence or any systematic approach toward beginning a military offensive that clashes with Medvedev's dovish outlook and methodical style. The advice Medvedev sought was not emanating from the Silovik faction, but rather from the dovish factions and bureaucrats in government. The Russian Security Council contained the powerful voices of the countervailing ideology that was incompatible with liberal-minded Medvedev. Therefore, the Russian Security Council's marginalization has continued unabated during the Medvedev years.

The Russian Security Council and its security-obsessed ideologues would have surely sought to be involved in the Iranian nuclear crisis. Iran's nuclear development program and the decision over whether to support sanctions was a consequential foreign policy debate that affected the world stage in a myriad of forms in terms of security, which is a Silovik's theoretical underpinning. 'Domestic shipbuilding' in the age of military warfare by airpower does not in any conceivable way outweigh the importance of placing sanctions against a country pursuing nuclear weapons capability. Igor Sechin, Nikolai Patrushev, and General Baluyevsky were impeded from advising Medvedev on what to do in regards to the United Nations multilateral effort to impose sanctions against Iran. The Yeltsonian forces of obstructing mechanisms of decision-making by using the powers of the presidency as envisaged by the 1993 Russian Constitution allowed this to happen. Medvedev has successfully used the Yeltsonian forces to preclude the Russian Security Council from having a proper platform on which the advice formulated in the forum could potentially influence presidential decision-making. The Yeltsonian legacy of an empowered

[594] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

presidency has continued under Medvedev, and his alienation of the Russian Security Council exemplifies this very fact of the Kremlin's responses to foreign policy issues.

As Dr. Sergei Khrushchev noted earlier, there may be competition between the Technocrats and Siloviki, but the relationship between Medvedev and Putin is untainted by political rivalries.[595] Throughout the Medvedev presidency to this point in 2010, the public relationship between the Russian President and his Prime Minister was always a close one. There were few public disagreements and never any words of criticism between the two. The Medvedev presidency was considered legitimate because 'the saviour' Vladimir Putin had personally handpicked his successor and supported the government completely. The Gorbachovian forces of democratization would dictate that Medvedev keep his close relationship with Prime Minister Putin vibrant and uninterrupted. The independent Levada Centre has polled the popularity of the high-ranking leaders in government and has always found that Vladimir Putin's popularity has made him the most respected and honoured member of government, while Dmitry Medvedev's popularity has never surpassed Putin's.[596] This polling was carried out in 2010 and the actions taken by the Kremlin must be seen in this context. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva stated: 'Putin is the most popular politician in Russia. Absolutely. Definitely.'[597] The polling asked participants whether the two men were trusted and supported by the Russian citizens.[598] Dmitry Medvedev and Vladimir Putin were popular with the overwhelming majority of participants.[599] Medvedev's legitimacy hinged on his relationship with his mentor, and any decision of the magnitude

[595] S. Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.

[596] Thomas Grove, 'Putin and Medvedev closest ever in popularity: poll', Reuters, 29 Oct. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 12 Jan. 2012.

[597] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

[598] Thomas Grove, 'Putin and Medvedev closest ever in popularity: poll', Reuters, 29 Oct. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 12 Jan. 2012.

[599] Ibid.

that the Iranian nuclear crisis entailed would have to be formulated harmoniously and closely with his popular Prime Minister.

Russian public opinion polling on Iran does not sufficiently exist for any research purposes for similar reasons in the case of the North Korean nuclear confrontation. This issue is not relevant to the daily lives of Russian citizens. A nuclear development program in the Middle East does not ignite the same passions as does NATO enlargement or Georgian provocation. The Russian people are concerned more with geopolitical issues of relevance to the security and prosperity of their country, not the possible existential threat the Iranian nuclear development poses to Iran's regional adversaries. In February 2012 toward the end of the Medvedev presidency, Dmitry Trenin an expert on Russian security issues assessed the Russian attitude with regards to Iran from historical and security perspectives.[600] Trenin opined that Russia as a collective whole views Iran as a respectable country that seeks to further its capabilities but is wary of Iran acquiring nuclear weapon potential.[601] It supports Iran's efforts for nuclear development for civil purposes, but it has also aligned with states concerned with the possible nuclear crisis as a result of this.[602] The positions and views regarding Iran are mixed and have varied among Russian constituents. The Russian people have contradictory and mild feelings toward the Iranian nuclear development, and it is for these reasons that sanctions were not wholly supported or opposed by the Russian citizens. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva characterized the Russian public's perception of Iran as follows: 'The Russian public was not sensitive to Iran. Russians don't

[600] Bloomberg News, 'How the Iran Nuclear Standoff Looks from Russia: Dmitri Trenin', Bloomberg News (web page) (2012) < http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-15/how-the-iran-nuclear-standoff-looks-from-russia-dmitri-trenin.html>, accessed 1 Oct. 2012.

[601] Ibid.

[602] Ibid.

believe Iran is a threat.'[603] There was a mix of apathy and consternation with Iran and the legitimacy for any action against it by Russia rested on the cohesion of the Putin-Medvedev duo that needed to explain their reasoning for the consent of sanctions. The Gorbachovian forces that empowered the Russian citizens to either grant or deny political capital was the fundamental factor in allowing Medvedev to consent to Resolution 1929 and this legitimacy was granted as a result of Putin's favourable public image in the eyes of the Russian denizens.

The hybrid of a Silovik and Technocrat in the form of the Putin-Medvedev duo has resulted in mildly hawkish foreign policy decision-making that results in decisions that are assertive and independent, but are open to the opportunity of multilateral diplomacy. Putin and Medvedev were both questioned about Russian intentions with regards to Iran and the statements are illustrative of the independent jousting and balancing between being assertive and conciliatory simultaneously. When asked by CNN to assess the Iranian nuclear situation, Dmitry Medvedev commented:

> Iran is ignoring questions from the international community about its nuclear program, using "small phrases" to make "small suggestions," Russian President Dmitry Medvedev said Tuesday. Medvedev said he does not support crippling sanctions that can hurt the people of Iran, "but if nothing happens, we will have to use sanctions."[604]

Medvedev in his statement to CNN emphasizes that Iran has to fulfil its obligations to the international community.[605] This would hardly appease the hawkish faction within the Kremlin. Neither the Security Council Secretary, nor any other member of the Silovik faction would push for Russia to influence Iran to subjugate itself and suspend its sovereignty in these exceptional circumstances. The Siloviki and military traditionalists

---

[603]N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

[604] CNN, 'Medvedev: Iran 'ignoring questions' about nuclear program', CNN [web page] (2010) <http://edition.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/europe/04/14/medvedev.iran.russia/index.html>, accessed 18 Jan. 2013.

[605] Ibid.

would have argued that the West must stay out of this issue, which is a matter of sovereignty, not security. Putin's statement on the same issue reveals the contradictory viewpoints between the Siloviki and Technocrats. Putin made a public statement, which served as both an endorsement of Medvedev's decision and the Russian justification for the consent to sanctions:

> We have worked a great deal and we believe that the resolution has been practically agreed on. We maintain that the forthcoming decisions must not be excessive ones. Nor must they put the Iranian people in a dubious position, make them faced with obstructions on the way toward civilian nuclear power.[606]

Putin flexed his independence in the face of the international community by insisting that Iran should not develop nuclear weapons, but nuclear development for civil purposes in Iran is welcomed by the Russian Federation.[607] This dualistic approach to international affairs represents the hybrid of Technocrat and Silovik tendencies. The leadership duo sought to ensure that Iran would comply with international norms, but it refused to allow the West to intervene in Iran and deny its sovereignty, which would result in an increase of Western dominance in the Eastern hemisphere. Dr. Kimberly Marten noted, 'One Russian fear is that the US is trying to create a revolution in Iran.'[608]

Russia's ultimate decision was to support sanctions expressly against the development of nuclear weapons in Iran. 'Medvedev said Thursday that "Iran must find courage and start fully fledged cooperation with the international community even if it dislikes some of the issues it faces."'[609] The decision was made with the intention to deter the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran, but Russia's behaviour suggests it was playing a

---

[606] Russia Today, 'Solution on Iranian nuke program should fit all sides – Putin', Russia Today [web page] (2010) <http://rt.com/politics/putin-iran-nuclear-ahmadinejad/>, accessed 25 Jan. 2013.

[607] Ibid.

[608] K. Marten, 'Russian Foreign Policy' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 7 December 2012, Harriman Institute, Columbia University, New York, New York.

[609] Fox News, 'Medvedev Tells Iran to Come Clean on Nukes', Fox News [web page] (2010) <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2010/07/15/medvedev-tells-iran-come-clean-nukes/>, accessed 31 Jan. 2013.

diplomatic balancing act between satisfying the will of the international community and ensuring that Iran's civil nuclear capabilities remain undeterred. The hybrid interests of Silovik Putin and Technocrat Medvedev would have predicted a foreign policy decision with regards to Iran that would entail curbing the nuclear crisis but ensuring that Iran's sovereignty and citizens were unaffected. The decision-making apparatus denied the Russian Security Council the opportunity to interject in the deliberations and utilized the foreign affairs arm of the government to implement a 'diplomatic but assertive' decision. The foreign affairs arm of the government and the Putin-Medvedev duo act in absolute unison because of a predilection for multilateral, but assertive diplomacy.

The West and the United States spent several years using public platforms to convey to the world that Iran must be stopped and its nuclear program would be a danger to innocent people. Russia remained steadfast in its opposition to any wars by the United States in 'the interests of international security.' Putin famously opposed the Iraq War and insisted that American and international forces not start another war that will lead to a serious military escalation with no achievable outcome in sight.[610] As evident with the foreign policy episode in Kyrgyzstan, Russia was keen to remove American military presence during the Medvedev presidency. The Missile Defence Shield further aggravated Russian-Western tensions. The Russian foreign policy apparatus dreaded the possibility of another war and strategic opportunity for NATO and the United States to continue their involvement in Russia's proximity. According to International Affairs expert, Dmitry Babich:

> Actually, the logic is very simple: Russia is concerned about Iran's nuclear programme. It has no sympathy for Islamist fundamentalism but, considering Iran is right next to Russia's border and to the borders of Azerbaijan, a former Soviet

[610] ABC News, 'Iraq war was unjustified, Putin says', ABC News [web page] (2003) < http://www.abc.net.au/news/2003-12-19/iraq-war-was-unjustified-putin-says/108124>, accessed 29 Jan. 2013.

republic with a several million-strong Azeri minority in Iran, it is extremely keen to avoid a war breaking out on its doorstep. [611]

The security-obsessed Putin would never allow an escalation of a nuclear crisis that posed the risk of igniting a war that would certainly involve NATO and the United States. Russia's objectives with regards to Iran are to curb its nuclear program, but not to completely submit to Western ambitions of reining in the Iranian regime at any cost. The prospects of escalation so close to the Russian borders did not evade Putin whose intelligence officer's worldview would have created a fixation on Western intentions of how to deal with the alarming nuclear crisis. The possibility of American or NATO military intervention in Iran was non-negotiable for a Silovik. Putin and Medvedev agreed to sanctions for the primary reason of ensuring that a war does not erupt near its borders so that the United States and NATO do not gain another strategic military stronghold. The consent to sanctions was a pragmatic exercise in containing the American-NATO military forces from inserting themselves in Iran by Russia acting independently and assertively on the world stage. This diplomatic posturing is compatible with the foreign policy doctrine of 2008, which was ultimately conceived with the inauguration of Vladimir Putin in 2000.

Reflections:

The Iranian crisis served as an important test for Russian diplomacy. The West and the United States summoned the international community in order to place stringent sanctions against Iran to deter its nuclear weapons development. The Russian Federation was in a period of somewhat contradictory relations with the United States; the aftermath in Kyrgyzstan proved that Russia would not allow the continuing presence of American military bases in the post-Soviet space. It simultaneously signed The New START Treaty

[611] Dmitry Babich, 'Avoiding war in Iran is Russia's aim', The London Telegraph, 2 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 3 Jan. 2013.

that assured the United States that the Russian Federation would comply with limiting its nuclear stockpile and would further seek to solidify peaceful and productive relations with its former Cold War adversary. The Missile Defence Shield installed in the Czech Republic proved to be the starting point for the Iranian nuclear crisis. The United States and NATO claimed that the missile system was installed in the event that Iran obtained nuclear weapon capability. The New START Treaty provided the opportunity for more communication between Medvedev and Obama, and this was clearly a benefit for both Presidents who could easily convey concerns to each other. The quid pro quo for effective resolution would have been Medvedev's consent to sanctions against Iran and Obama's removal of the Missile Defence Shield. Sanctions were passed with the Russian Federation striving for a United Nations Security Council Resolution that impeded dangerous nuclear development, but refrained from affecting nuclear development for civil purposes in Iran.[612]

The 'diplomatic but assertive' posturing is a result of the hybrid of Technocrat Medvedev and influential Silovik Prime Minister Putin. The Putin-Medvedev duo projected a mildly hawkish and openly diplomatic foreign policy stance that resulted in engaging the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Foreign Affairs in implementing this brand of diplomacy. The Security Council of the Russian Federation and its Silovik and military traditionalist occupants are marginalized by Technocrat Medvedev as a means to blunt the voices of the hawkish faction within the government that would try to force the Russian Federation's decision in favour of an unrelenting security-based approach to maximizing Russian power, specifically in favour of Russia's security interests in the Eastern hemisphere. The Foreign Policy Concept of 2008 is an accurate reflection of a foreign policy that is diplomatic, assertive, and independent. The Putin and Medvedev co-

[612] 'Security Council Imposes Additional Sanctions on Iran', United News Centre Archive [web document] (2010), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2010/sc9948.doc.htm>, accessed 18 June 2012.

leadership acted cohesively and in ideological bliss with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Similar to the North Korean issue, Putin and Medvedev did not choose to utilize the technocratic Minister of Defence Serdyukov, even though his style and temperament have proven him to be a loyal and dutiful minister to implement foreign policy decisions. It is clear that when issues pertaining to the United Nations Security Council arise, the Putin-Medvedev duo choose to only engage the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Sergei Lavrov has played the role of chief diplomat on the world stage projecting the Putinist image of an independent, but diplomatic Russian Federation without any discernible friction with his superiors. Serdyukov is known for voicing his concerns and involvement with issues regarding NATO enlargement and security in Central Asia and Eastern Europe. The Iranian nuclear crisis, as well as the North Korean nuclear confrontation continued to evade his priority list. The Minister of Foreign Affairs dealt with issues of security that were decided by the international community, even when the issues were related to defence and security interests.

While Putin and Medvedev's decision-making led to a fluid implementation by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with the approval of sanctions by the United Nations Security Council, the decision was still made in the context of the political environment inherited from Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin. The personal dynamics played out in the new Russia in which a powerful presidency made decisions based on public legitimacy. Putin's popularity was high and his public image was that of a saviour. Medvedev's close relationship with Putin enabled the President to rise in popularity during this time period. Being handpicked by 'the saviour of Mother Russia' and enjoying a close public friendship with Putin granted Medvedev legitimacy in spite of issues that did not particularly concern the Russian public. Iran paled in comparison with the importance that the Russian public

regarded NATO enlargement or the Georgian confrontation. The Iranian issue did not stir any passions in the minds of the Russian citizenry.[613] The powerful Gorbachovian forces allowed the Kremlin leadership to make a decision about an issue that did not concern the Russian citizens, but the public legitimacy based on Putin's popularity and Medvedev's close association with him allowed them to manoeuvre the decision with the full knowledge of the Russian constituents they governed. The issue did not concern the Russian public, but the trust in the Putin-Medvedev duo and their political party was unwavering. It was for these reasons Putin and Medvedev aligned themselves with the will of the West and the international community.

The Iranian issue however deeply concerns the Siloviki who as a unified voice on the Security Council of the Russian Federation would have sought for quick and decisive action that was incompatible with the liberal-minded and methodical Dmitry Medvedev, whose only loyalty was to Putin, but not other Siloviki and hawkish members of government. The powerful Yeltsonian forces that created a superior presidential system precluded any member or agency of government to force the President's decision in any manner adverse to Medvedev's preferences. The office of the Russian presidency was granted nearly unlimited power over agencies within the executive branch, as well as the other branches of government. Medvedev bypassed the Russian Security Council and did not engage with the Minister of Defence, even though the military reforms prior to this issue centralized all defence capabilities and protocol in the office of the Minister of Defence. Therefore, the reforms made the Minister of Defence a powerful position in the Russian defence apparatus, but the Kremlin treated this issue as a matter of diplomacy. Medvedev's presidential powers overrode any other mechanisms of the government as

[613] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

envisioned by the Yeltsonian constitutional entitlements of the Russian President that legally and mechanistically made it impossible for collective leadership to exist. All power was vested in the office of the Russian presidency, and Medvedev, who was granted public legitimacy because of his relationship with Putin, was able to formulate and implement a decision that was 'diplomatic but assertive' without interference from the defence apparatus or the Russian Security Council.

The sanctions agreed to upon by the Russian Federation against North Korea and Iran were similarly passed during Putin's presidency by the United Nations Security Council, and Russia's involvement in the breakaway regions of Georgia and the affairs of the Bakiyev regime in Kyrgyzstan were well-rooted. Libya, a sovereign country with an autocratic regime, was experiencing tremendous political tremors from within. The Khadafy regime in Libya reacted to the mass uprisings within its borders with force and the international community sought to rectify this situation. This completely unprecedented foreign policy issue tested the personal dynamics and political forces that characterized the Kremlin during the Medvedev presidency. Once again, the author of this thesis has utilized the fundamental principles of Graham Allison's Governmental Politics Model to examine the personal dynamics of the Kremlin's decision-making within the Russian political atmosphere as moulded by Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin respectively. The next chapter examines the Russian Federation's response to the Libyan crisis in 2011.

Chapter 6: The Decision to Support Sanctions against the Khadafy Regime

Introduction:

The foreign policy episode in Libya provides an abundant source of analysis for understanding the Kremlin during the Medvedev presidency by using Graham Allison's Governmental Politics Model. The Libyan crisis took the world by surprise at a time when Dmitry Medvedev had become fully accustomed to the presidential mechanisms and trappings of power. This was the beginning of the fourth year of his presidency, and the response to the Libyan foreign policy episode was an act of the Kremlin exercising foreign policy formulation when the Medvedev Administration and the various doctrines and protocols of the period were well into fruition. 2011 was a year of momentous change for the Middle East because of the Arab Spring, a series of uprisings in countries controlled by dictatorial or pseudo-democratic regimes. The Medvedev presidency was forced to confront the ongoing ousters of regimes that were incompatible with the wishes of their respective citizens. The fundamental issue for the Russian Federation was how to intervene in these uprisings and whether to support the United States and the West in enforcing sanctions against regimes that violently refused to leave power. United Nations Resolution 1970 in February 2011, which the Russian Federation voted in favour of, and United Nations Resolution 1973 in March 2011, which the Russian Federation abstained from, are the most important actions taken by the international community in relation to the Arab Spring. Muammar Khadafy's regime had been considered a repressive and undemocratic government for decades. It can be said that the Russian Federation and its previous incarnation, the Soviet Union, enjoyed favourable relations with the Khadafy regime in spite of the Western sentiment against Libya and its government's perpetual abuse of human rights. The Russian Federation during the Medvedev presidency consented to

sanctions that condemned and aimed to deter Khadafy's lethal response to the Libyan uprising in the form of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1970, but chose to abstain in subsequent Resolution 1973 that ultimately led to the demise of the regime. The Russian Federation's decisions must be analyzed in the context of its behaviour on the United Nations Security Council in response to the Libyan Civil War in 2011. Libya was the only country affected by the Arab Spring that the Russian Federation agreed to impose sanctions against during the Medvedev presidency. It did not inhibit the implementation of a 'no-fly zone' by NATO in 2011. These actions are analyzed in a foreign policy framework to understand the decisions that led to the demise of the Khadafy regime.

The 2011 decisions with respect to Libya occurred at a time when the Medvedev presidency and its foreign policy apparatus had fully matured. The defence reforms and military doctrine were finalized. In addition to this, the foreign policy doctrine of 2008 and the National Security Concept document were well ingrained in the Medvedev government. The decisions taken were reflective of the essence of the Medvedev foreign policy, and these decisions merit examination to illuminate the Russian decision-making with regards to looming international issues. The Libyan issue was a sudden and alarming event that did not allow the foreign policy-makers to formulate a plan of action well in advance; this was a reaction to momentous changes on the world stage. The Putin-Medvedev duo, Siloviki, Technocrats, and Yeltsin Liberals were now faced with the challenge of exercising Russian foreign policy with the independence and vigour that characterized the post-Yeltsin Russian Federation. Previous decisions on the United Nations Security Council involved the Russian Federation and the prevention of further Libyan bloodshed required Russian consent for sanctions. Russia chose to support sanctions for United Nations Security Council Resolution 1970, but not impede Resolution 1973, which ousted Khadafy and his

regime. The defining principles and tendencies of the new Russian Federation can be investigated and extracted by examining the Kremlin's decisions with respect to the international community and its diplomatic arena.

Dmitry Medvedev's tenure was by this stage in its maturity. Medvedev's mastery of the presidential and foreign policy mechanisms was well into fruition. The exercise of formulating foreign policy decisions reached the point of his presidency where Russia with its well-defined foreign policy, defence policy, and national security policy was now a complete reflection of the Medvedev era. There were no more institutional changes or mechanistic recalibrations. Russia was now exercising and projecting the new Russian foreign policy. The transformations were complete and the decision-making was the inherent exercise of these doctrines translated into practice by the intertwinement of factions within the Kremlin in the new Russian political environment. The Libyan Civil War and sanctions against the Khadafy regime were momentous events on the world stage. Russia's involvement in these events therefore provides ample understanding of the Kremlin's positioning and entanglement in world affairs.

The Arab Spring preoccupied the minds of foreign policy-makers around the world in 2011. The sudden eruption of change within the Middle Eastern countries became the fixation of the international community.[614] The ultimate multilateral decision-making for the international community occurred on the United Nations Security Council on which Russia holds a permanent seat and therefore an important role in passing sanctions. The issue of the abuse of human rights in Libya and the cessation of the catastrophic violence became the United Nations Security Council's primary goal in 2011. The Kremlin's decisions regarding these two United Nations Security Council Resolutions provide the

[614] Jean-Marie Guehenno, 'The Arab Spring Is 2011, Not 1989', The New York Times, 21 Apr. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 10 Oct. 2012.

necessary foreign policy cases for understanding how the Medvedev presidency reacted to these events on the world stage that now involved the reformed and rehabilitated agencies of government that began to evolve with Medvedev's ascension to the presidency.[615]

The Libyan regime is also the only government in the series of Arab Spring uprisings that received global attention that led to a response from the international diplomatic arena. The outcome of the multilateral actions taken heralds a powerful precedent in enforcing sanctions against other countries with similar human rights abuses as a result of uprisings by citizens. Khadafy's regime collapsed under the pressure of the United Nations sanctioned no-fly zone because of the multilateral efforts agreed upon on the United Nations Security Council.[616] Russia's role in these events is considered of primary importance during the Medvedev presidency and the outcome serves as an ideological and practical influence on whether similar actions against countries considered 'rogue regimes' could be taken again in the future. Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev were considered allies of Muammar Khadafy and his regime, but now the responsibilities and international norms that the Russian Federation is obligated to fulfil will be tested. The Kremlin's decisions regarding Libya have had wide-scope implications on the world stage and the foreign policy episode ranks as one of the most important during the Medvedev presidency. The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1970 against Libya was the first of two sets of sanctions that were passed against the Khadafy regime during the Arab Spring.[617]

---

[615] Eugene Ivanov , 'Russia's response to the Libyan crisis: a paradigm shift?', 25 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 12 Oct. 2012.

[616] The BBC, 'Libya UN Resolution 1973: Text analysed', The BBC [web page] (2011) <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-12782972>, accessed 12 Jan. 2012.

[617] The BBC, 'Libya: UN resolution on no-fly zone', The BBC [web page] (2011) < http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-12783819>, accessed 12 Jan. 2012.

United Nations Resolution 1970:

The Russian Federation ultimately consented to United Nations Resolution 1970 after international attention was aroused by Khadafy's violent response to protestors. The Russian Federation's role on the United Nations Security Council ranks as highly important because of its historic role as the countervailing force against Western calls for international action. The Putin-Medvedev duo and the government they lead were now responsible for providing a vote that would seemingly align their country with the United States and the West. The Foreign Policy Concept in 2008 dictated foreign policy decisions that are compatible with Russia's interests in spite of Western proposals for taking action on the world stage.[618] Resolution 1970 entailed an arms embargo, an asset freeze, and a travel ban on Khadafy and his inner circle.[619] The sanctions did not deny or infringe on Libyan sovereignty in any powerful way and did not provide effective impediments to Khadafy's disproportionate violence against his own citizens as evident in the exponential increase in deaths of innocent civilians after United Nations Resolution 1970 was passed.[620]

Medvedev has asserted that the orders were directly from him regarding the consent to Resolution 1970 and he conveyed this to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which promptly followed orders by virtue of its United Nations Ambassador Vitaly Churkin voting in favour of sanctions.[621] Russian Ambassador to the United Nations Vitaly Churkin was noted as follows:

---

[618] 'The Foreign Policy Concept Of The Russian Federation 2008', Ministry of Foreign Affairs [web document] (2012), <http://www.mid.ru/nsosndoc.nsf/1e5f0de28fe77fdcc32575d900298676/869c9d2b87ad8014c32575d9002b1c38?OpenDocument>, accessed 12 June 2012.

[619] 'United Nations Resolution 1970 (2011)', United Nations Security Council Document Database [web document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1970(2011)>, accessed13 October 2012.

[620] The BBC, 'Libya: UN resolution on no-fly zone', The BBC [web page] (2011) < http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-12783819>, accessed 12 Jan. 2012.

[621] 'Statement by Dmitry Medvedev on the situation in Libya', The President of Russia Database [web document] (2011), <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/1933>, accessed 19 Oct. 2011.

> VITALY CHURKIN (Russian Federation) said he supported the resolution because of his country's deep concern over the situation, its sorrow over the lives lost and its condemnation of the Libyan Government's actions. He opposed counterproductive interventions, but he said that the purpose of the resolution was to end the violence and to preserve the united sovereign State of Libya with its territorial integrity. Security for foreign citizens, including Russian citizens, must be ensured.[622]

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been a useful tool for the Medvedev presidency in asserting a diplomatic, assertive, and independent foreign policy. The Yeltsin Liberals believe in fruitful multilateral diplomacy with a tough, assertive projection of power and interests. The Medvedev decision was utterly compatible with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' institutional predispositions, as well as its chief diplomats, Lavrov and Churkin. Both men were not hawkish Siloviki or military traditionalists with Cold War views of the world. Medvedev's decision-making was promptly supported and implemented by his chief diplomats because of the common liberal temperament and pragmatic approach to world affairs. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs did not obstruct any decision made by the Kremlin and it has continued to execute orders efficiently and loyally.

Medvedev's utilization of the Russian Security Council continued a trend of marginalization that started with the episode with Georgia. On January 28, 2011 with the Libyan situation spiralling out of control, Medvedev chose to communicate the passage and authorization of The New START Treaty, a treaty in which the Russian Security Council had no discernible role. The Russian Security Council under the Medvedev leadership was a forum used for announcements of policy decisions by the President, rather than a body for consultation and deliberation. In addition to this, Medvedev has never sought to use Russian Security Council Secretary Patrushev as a tool for exercising foreign policy. For example, during the momentous change sweeping the Middle East, Patrushev never dealt

[622] 'In Swift, Decisive Action, Security Council Imposes Tough Measures On Libyan Regime, Adopting Resolution 1970 In Wake Of Crackdown On Protesters', The United Nations Security Council [Web Document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/news/press/docs/2011/sc10187.doc.htm>, Accessed 18 Oct. 2012.

directly with any of the leaders of countries with uprisings against the regimes in power. Patrushev, a Silovik, and his primary deputy, General Baluyevsky, the military traditionalist with Cold War notions of the world were never compatible with Medvedev's temperament or methodical approaches to world affairs. The quick and decisive actions taken by a Silovik or military traditionalist were not seen during the Medvedev presidency. The tandem democracy was led by a Technocrat in the official top position of government. The foreign policy apparatus served Medvedev, not Putin.

On February 1 of that year, Patrushev attended a meeting in Poland to discuss issues regarding NATO's security architecture.[623] The Kremlin noted that nothing of actual substance was discussed, however.[624] The meeting occurred to make mutual assurances that future summits will occur and that the dialogue will continue.[625] The term 'meaningless diplomacy' could be accurate in this instance. The Russian Security Council Secretary was utilized as a simple and unimportant representative to convey the general sentiments of the Kremlin during a meeting in which nothing constructive was discussed. The Russian Security Council was convened for three 'operational meetings' during February 2011.[626] The Kremlin has not noted that any of these three meetings were convened to discuss the uprisings in the Middle East, but rather note that Medvedev used these three 'operational meetings' to convey his thoughts and wishes to the forum.[627] The platform for the President was not a necessary one and provided superfluous resolution in the context of the

[623] 'About the visit of the Secretary of the Russian Security Council Nikolai Patrushev to the Republic of Poland', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/630.html&usg=ALkJrhieVr9v4AqkeNV-tPOGoJnTVGsKiQ>, accessed 19 Oct. 2012.

[624] Ibid.

[625] Ibid.

[626] 'News and Information', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/index8.html&usg=ALkJrhjdZfCFeOmRab3TT4rlrckFbGOc4w>, accessed 19 Oct. 2012.

[627] Ibid.

marginally important issues Medvedev chose to speak about, rather than discuss anything of major importance with the advisors comprising the Russian Security Council.

The Russian Security Council did not have a meaningful role in the formulation of the decision to enforce sanctions against Libya in the form of United Nations Resolution 1970. The Russian Security Council's marginalization in important decisions has become a hallmark of the Medvedev-led foreign policy apparatus. There was only one Russian Security Council event of note that took place immediately prior to the resolution being passed by the United Nations Security Council.[628] A meeting between the Russian Security Council and a United States representative entitled: 'Bilateral Russian-American consultations on issues of international security' occurred two days prior to the passage of United Nations Resolution 1970 against Libya.[629] However, neither Patrushev, nor any high-ranking member of the American government attended this meeting.[630] Instead, one of Patrushev's underlings on the Russian Security Council and a special assistant to the American President attended.[631] This clearly denotes a mutual neglect for placing importance on this meeting by choosing not to engage on higher levels between the foreign policy apparatuses of the United States and the Russian Federation, respectively. Furthermore, the meeting convened for issues related to 'cyber terrorism.'[632] Any meaningful role for the Russian Security Council to have considerable influence in the debate over Libya was kept out of reach by presidential prerogative. Medvedev's response to the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1970 clearly indicates that the Russian

---

[628] 'Bilateral Russian-American consultations on issues of international security, The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/635.html&usg=ALkJrhinGRljgwUDL2le_AnOUL6NO4HRcw>, accessed 19 Oct. 2012.

[629] Ibid.

[630] Ibid.

[631] Ibid.

[632] Ibid.

Security Council was intentionally marginalized in order to not become part of the policy formulation in terms of deciding whether sanctions against Libya were necessary.

Minister of Defence Serdyukov's role in the United Nations Resolution continued his role as the country's leading advocate against issues that are relevant to Russian security in the eyes of the Russian public and foreign policy community. Namely, Russian defence revolves closely around Russian perceptions of what breaches its security. NATO enlargement, the Missile Defence Shield, and countries that allow the West to gain strategic footholds in Eastern Europe or Central Asia maintain the highest priority for the Russian Ministry of Defence. Serdyukov's primary role is the chief minister for implementing defence capabilities at the presidential behest, but the daily issues that require Serdyukov's attention are not ones dealt with in the diplomatic arena. Serdyukov, by virtue of his defence position, is unconcerned with multilateral diplomacy at the United Nations, unless it were to affect the strategic battles between NATO and Russia in the region. Serdyukov similarly did not play an important role in the decisions with regards to the North Korean confrontation or the Iranian nuclear crisis. The diplomatic arena was not Serdyukov's primary concern and the defence capabilities, as well as NATO encroachment of Russian security, were paramount to the Minister of Defence's role and daily objectives.

Furthermore, Serdyukov was not a Silovik whose fixation on security would motivate him to intervene in every facet of decision-making similar to Putin. The defence arm of the government was led by a Technocrat whose loyalty and dutifulness were never questioned, as he always performed the functions of his position without politicizing any possible disagreements. Serdyukov was a loyal member of the inner circle operating in the Kremlin since Putin's inauguration in 2000. He was the Putin-Medvedev duo's dependable Minister of Defence, who happened to be a loyal bureaucrat and not a politician full of

ambition who clashed with his superiors. Serdyukov was not an ideological minister and did not seek to win political battles for his faction within the Kremlin, the Technocrats. The Minister of Defence served Medvedev and Putin as they instructed him without any of his personal feelings or beliefs seeking to change the decisions made by the Kremlin's leadership.

With the Russian Security Council marginalized and the Minister of Defence a non-entity in this foreign policy episode, the office of the Russian President conveyed its wishes to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for a United Nations Security Council vote that would pass sanctions against the Khadafy regime. Medvedev's legal upbringing and methodical approach to issues led him to be completely direct when he explained the logical rationale behind his support for sanctions against the Libyan authorities because of their behaviour in response to the mass uprisings. Unlike Putin, Medvedev's mind always focused on the legal and moral justifications for action and rarely did he invoke Russian prestige or honour. For Medvedev, sanctions meant rectifying wrongs on the world stage, rather than exercising Russia's dominance in global politics. Medvedev said the following regarding his decisions for United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1970 and 1973:

> At the same time, let us not forget what motivated the Security Council resolutions in the first place. These resolutions were passed in response to the Libyan authorities' actions. This was why we took these decisions. I think these are balanced decisions that were very carefully thought through. We gave our support to the first Security Council resolution and abstained on the second. We made these decisions consciously in the aim of preventing an escalation of violence.[633]

Medvedev did not possess Putin's intelligence officer's worldview or nonchalance to violence against innocent civilians.[634] Medvedev was not a KGB operative during his formative years, but rather a highly successful legal professional whose battles were waged

[633] 'Statement by Dmitry Medvedev on the situation in Libya', The President of Russia Database [web document] (2011), <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/1933>, accessed 19 Oct. 2011.
[634] Ibid.

within a courtroom and the justice system.[635] The Russian President was sensitive to the plight of Libyan civilians who were brutally attacked and murdered by the Khadafy regime.[636] Medvedev persisted in objecting to the violence and condemned Muammar Khadafy and his violent tactics.[637] Putin, on the other hand, did not vocally protest against the bloodshed in Libya. For Putin, sovereignty was paramount and these were not exceptional circumstances that for him and his Silovik mentality justified Western interference in Libya. There can be little doubt that Putin was intricately involved in the decision, but Medvedev's liberal temperament and sensibilities precluded Russia's veto for sanctions against Libya. The United Nations Security Council sought to prevent future bloodshed in Libya, and United Nations Resolution 1970 did not directly impact civilians, but rather affected Khadafy, his regime, and their ability to perpetuate violent activities against civilians.[638] Resolution 1970 banned travel, access to assets, and the ability to receive arms for Khadafy and his regime.[639] Medvedev's public pronouncement that Khadafy and his regime must be prevented from 'an escalation of violence' was going to be theoretically administered.

Lavrov and Churkin have throughout the Medvedev presidency acted as systematic mechanisms for implementing foreign policy decisions. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is controlled by Yeltsin Liberals, and Medvedev were compatible with one another in their liberal temperament and aversion to the Cold War truculence and hawkishness that still pervades the Silovik faction within the Kremlin. 'Russia condemns such violence,

---

[635] The BBC, 'Profile: Dmitry Medvedev', The BBC [web page] (2011) < http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-15047827>, accessed 16. Oct. 2012.

[636] 'Statement by Dmitry Medvedev on the situation in Libya', The President of Russia Database [web document] (2011), <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/1933>, accessed 19 Oct. 2011.

[637] Ibid.

[638] 'In Swift, Decisive Action, Security Council Imposes Tough Measures on Libyan Regime, Adopting Resolution 1970 in Wake of Crackdown on Protesters', The United Nations Security Council [web document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10187.doc.htm>, accessed 18 Oct. 2012.

[639] Ibid.

requires its immediate ending and calls for respect of international humanitarian law,' Sergei Lavrov was quoted as saying.[640] Lavrov channelled Medvedev's worldview that the international community must insist on the observance and enforcement of international law. The Khadafy regime violated central tenets of international law that forbid disproportionate violence against innocent civilians.[641] United Nations Resolution 1970 effectively punished Khadafy and his regime for violating international norms, but it did not alter the course of events in Libya.[642] The 'diplomatic but assertive' foreign policy by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is completely compatible with the hybrid of the Putin-Medvedev duo. While Medvedev believed that the Libyan regime must be held accountable for its actions, which Resolution 1970 calls for an investigation by the International Criminal Court, the Silovik tendencies would prevent Russia's cooperation for a resolution that may have necessitated NATO or American military intervention. Indeed, the West gaining another strategic foothold in the Eastern hemisphere would have clashed with Putin's Silovik instincts. Therefore, Medvedev's consent to a resolution that did not involve Western intervention was 'diplomatic but assertive' in nature and did not clash with his senior mentor. The resolution aimed to force the Khadafy regime to comply with international norms to prevent further violence and the possibility of foreign military intervention if the situation continued. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs dutifully implemented this decision because of its affinity for international principles of human rights, and Medvedev's decision to agree to the resolution did not disturb the other half of

[640]EU The International Community, 'The international community finally moved toward sanctions against Libya'. EU The International Community [web page] (2011) < http://www.euinside.eu/en/news/international-community-finally-resorted-to-sanctions-against-libya >, accessed 1 Dec. 2012.

[641] Ibid.

[642] 'In Swift, Decisive Action, Security Council Imposes Tough Measures on Libyan Regime, Adopting Resolution 1970 in Wake of Crackdown on Protesters', The United Nations Security Council [web document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10187.doc.htm>, accessed 18 Oct. 2012.

the tandem democracy because this resolution would likely prevent the possibility of the United States or NATO intervening militarily.

The Gorbachovian forces of democratization enabled the Libyan crisis to be reported accurately and transparently without the government being able to effectively censor information or deny the Russian citizens to become fully informed about the actions of the Khadafy regime. The Russian public had a 'right to know' and the internet and television news media created an enhanced flow of information that led to the Kremlin taking calculated steps not to foment domestic opposition to foreign policy decisions. The 24 hour a day news cycle via a myriad of television channels and websites was unstoppable in terms of providing Russian citizens the pertinent information about developments in Libya. The Kremlin was forced to grapple with the public's views on foreign policy situations or risk public protests and a loss of legitimacy.

The Khadafy regime and Libya were not prominent factors in the perceptions of the Russian public. Libya, a country in the Middle East with a lukewarm relationship with the Kremlin, did not evoke the passions of the Russian intelligentsia or citizens. The Russian Federation's preoccupation with NATO and Western influence far outranked any internal strife in a country not within the post-Soviet space or European continent. Furthermore, there was no cultural or religious link between the Russian Federation and Libya. Historically, the two countries were allies with no discernible special relationship. The Russian public's perceptions of Libya were similar to the historical relationship between the two countries: mildly important. The Russian-Libyan historical legacy is unremarkable. The Russian public was far more concerned with the ongoing tension with Georgia and the Missile Defence Shield in the Czech Republic.

Furthermore, Libya was not the only country experiencing momentous change in the form of public uprisings against unpopular regimes. Several countries were experiencing the same issues and violence erupting in a manner similar to Libya.[643] The news media had been overwhelmed with reports of uprisings and violence against protestors in several countries in addition to Libya.[644] The international community decided to respond to Libya, while other countries were experiencing similar events in this period of revolution. The Russian public was inundated with news reports regarding issues important to Russia in addition to the Arab Spring uprisings. The confluence of uprisings neutralized any possible public response from Russian citizens because of the myriad of similar events occurring simultaneously. The Russian public's response to this issue did not evoke any serious protests because the Libyan crisis was not relevant to Russia's security or prosperity, and the public was inundated with news reports from several countries with uprisings of their own. The Russian public remained informed but uninvolved for these reasons.

Public legitimacy rested on the trust in the top leaders of government. Vladimir Putin remained the most popular politician in the Russian Federation and was known as 'the saviour.' Medvedev by all accounts did have a respectful and congenial relationship with his mentor, but the relationship was also politically convenient and required for Medvedev's legitimacy in governing and making foreign policy decisions. Medvedev's foreign policy decisions were seen through the prism of his relationship with Putin by the Russian public. Every major foreign policy decision by Medvedev was intricately formulated with and endorsed by Putin. The Prime Minister was nearly always present at

[643] Jean-Marie Guehenno, 'The Arab Spring Is 2011, Not 1989', The New York Times, 21 Apr. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 10 Oct. 2012.

[644]Habibul Haque Khondker 'Role of the New Media in the Arab Spring', Globalizations, 8/5, (2011) 675-679, in Taylor & Francis Online [online database], accessed 12 Nov. 2012.

Russian Security Council meetings where Medvedev announced, rather than deliberated, decisions pertaining to world affairs. The tandem democracy was politically necessary for Medvedev to continue his tenure with the legitimacy granted by constituents. Being handpicked by Putin and enjoying a close public relationship with him enabled Medvedev to make foreign policy decisions when the Russian public was indifferent or ambivalent. Medvedev made foreign policy decisions in concert with Russian public opinion or the lack of public opinion when the issues were of marginal importance to Russian security and prosperity. The Putin-Medvedev duo were operating on the popularity of Putin's reputation and political party that was seen as a guiding light that rehabilitated Russia after the disastrous Yeltsin years.

Putin's public persona during the Medvedev presidency has been that of an undisputed leader who publicly steps away from quarrelling or objecting to any actions taken by the Russian government. A multitude of photo-ops, newspaper articles, and public pronouncements by both men have reinforced the Russian public's perception that the two men are a cohesive team acting in the best interests of the Russian Federation. The political theatre perpetuated by the Putin-Medvedev duo has ingrained the Russian public with the certainty that Medvedev's actions are at least partly guided by Putin's pragmatic and successful approach to decision-making. Dr. Sergei Khrushchev has asserted that the relationship between the two men is unquestionably close and respectful.[645] The factions within the Kremlin however are constantly competing for influence and political victories according to Dr. Sergei Khrushchev.[646] This conflict between factions is not evident in Putin and Medvedev's relationship. There is no evidence that either man acts for the empowerment of his respective faction.

[645] S. Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.
[646] Ibid.

Medvedev's foreign policy decisions from the beginning of his presidency to the decision of whether to consent to United Nations Resolution 1970 suggest that the two men have always acted in concert with each other and public opinion. In the event public opinion is lacklustre either way, the Putin-Medvedev duo is granted legitimacy by the Russian public because of Putin's constant public support for his handpicked successor.[647] Putin's popularity is Medvedev's fundamental political tool to make foreign policy decisions without risk of evoking domestic opposition in the form of public protests. Medvedev's presidency has depended on its close association with the influential Prime Minister for its legitimacy from constituents. It is for this express reason that Medvedev made the decision to consent to United Nations Resolution 1970 when the Russian public found the issue irrelevant to the Russian sphere. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva explains the lack of the Russian public's concern, 'The Russian public is constantly angered by the West. It is the United States. Putin made peace with Europe, but the US is still the enemy.'[648] Libya was not considered important in the minds of the majority of Russian constituents.

The mild interest in the issue by the Russian public now gave Medvedev freedom to utilize the foreign policy mechanisms to make his decision. The Yeltsonian forces of a powerful presidency did not evade Medvedev. Throughout the Arab Spring and the Libyan crisis, Medvedev has been the voice of reason pointing out that exigent circumstances exist in Libya that require sanctions against the murderous regime. As quoted earlier, Medvedev was concerned for the loss of life and human rights abuses; the Russian President set the tone and agenda of the debate regarding Libya before any actions were taken.[649] His liberal

---

[647] 'Medvedev's Strength Is Putin: Poll', The Moscow Times, 16 Jan. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 20 May 2012.

[648] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

[649] 'Statement by Dmitry Medvedev on the situation in Libya', The President of Russia Database [web document] (2011), <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/1933>, accessed 19 Oct. 2011.

temperament was sensitive to the plight of innocent civilians, and he could not ignore the international condemnations against the murder of Libyan protesters. The Russian Security Council would have surely resisted any attempts to enforce sanctions against the Libyan regime because it could potentially embolden the West. Patrushev, Baluyevsky, and the other Siloviki and military traditionalists would have been influenced by their hawkish worldview and opposed any measures against Libya. The Russian Security Council would have objected to intervening in this situation by claiming that Libyan sovereignty must remain uninhibited. Medvedev repeatedly marginalized the Security Council of the Russian Federation to blunt the calls of the hawkish elements within the Kremlin. Medvedev's public statements all point to the fact that he was concerned deeply with the human rights abuses in Libya and did agree with international sentiments against the Khadafy regime. Medvedev used his powerful constitutional powers as authored by Yeltsin to calibrate his foreign policy mechanisms in a manner that suited his needs and desires. The National Security Concept of 2009 could not have competed against the presidential powers ingrained by Yeltsin after the 1993 coup. Medvedev's marginalization of the Russian Security Council is a direct result of the superior presidential system inherited by Yeltsin's successors.

In addition to this, Medvedev had been leading a rapprochement with the United States in the form of The New START Treaty, notwithstanding the ongoing Missile Defence Shield issue. Medvedev was diplomatically entangled with the West and in the nature of compromise and good faith could not simply ignore American concerns about Libya. The rapprochement was precarious and not a panacea for all diplomatic problems, but it did cement ties between Obama and Medvedev to the point that there was an open line of communication in the aftermath of the treaty signing and ratification. Medvedev was

responsible for carrying out a foreign policy decision based on his humanitarian intentions and productive dialogue with the United States. The Russian President was now going to align his country with the international community partly because of New START's diplomatic links with the West.

It has been commonplace in Russian foreign policy episodes during the Medvedev presidency for the Minister of Defence to be a non-entity pertaining to issues in the diplomatic arena. The United Nations Security Council decisions have not included the Russian Minister of Defence in any meaningful fashion. Serdyukov, the dutiful Technocrat, has obediently performed his work functions and focused his efforts on regional security, NATO enlargement, and the Missile Defence Shield issue. The Kremlin has allocated certain duties and issues for the Minister of Defence and has not shown a predisposition to include Serdyukov in foreign policy decisions occurring in the diplomatic arena. The Minister of Defence has played a much more regional role in security and defence issues and the Putin-Medvedev duo have not changed this usage of the chief defence bureaucrat. For the Medvedev presidency, neither the Russian Security Council, nor the Minister of Defence is an important mechanism for grappling with issues on the United Nations Security Council or in the diplomatic arena in general. The Serdyukov reforms that started prior to Medvedev's presidency began a centralization of all defence capabilities in the Minister of Defence position for the empowerment of the presidential levers of power.[650] The Russian Chief of General Staff and other high-ranking defence officials were neutralized by the reforms and this enabled the Russian presidency to fully control the defence apparatus by the link with the appointed Minister of Defence.[651] The Ministry of

[650] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.
[651] Ibid.

Defence's doctrine of 2010 during the Medvedev presidency left the defence apparatus largely unchanged; this was Medvedev's use of the Yeltsonian forces that allowed the Russian President to manoeuvre the foreign policy mechanism according to his preferences.

The powerful Russian presidency, which resulted from the 1993 Russian Constitution, is most certainly not a collective leadership. The Russian Constitution ensures that only one individual makes the decisions for the country and does not need the approval of any agency, minister, or mechanism within the Russian government.[652] Medvedev and his most important advisor Prime Minister Vladimir Putin were the hybrid of a foreign policy hawk and dove. Medvedev did not have an affinity for hawkish truculence. The decisions made were always 'diplomatic but assertive.' United Nations Resolution 1970 enforced sanctions against the regime in order to prevent it from murdering innocent civilians, but it did not have the potential for regime change or the infringement of Libyan sovereignty.[653] Vladimir Putin has cautiously resisted any attempts by the West to intervene in a country for 'humanitarian purposes.' The mistrust of the West pervades the Siloviki and military traditionalists and Medvedev's relationship with Putin would have entailed a detailed discussion about the concerns that a possible intervention could pose. Medvedev and Putin agreed to a United Nations Resolution that would leave the Khadafy regime in power but would enforce sanctions in the hopes to end the bloodshed.

The Yeltsonian forces of a powerful presidency have enabled Medvedev to allow the expansion of influence of the Russian Prime Minister, traditionally a sinecure, to become the most powerful advisory position in the Russian government. This emphasis of importance by Medvedev of Putin's role in government has resulted in foreign policy

[652] Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010), < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.

[653] 'In Swift, Decisive Action, Security Council Imposes Tough Measures on Libyan Regime, Adopting Resolution 1970 in Wake of Crackdown on Protesters', The United Nations Security Council [web document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10187.doc.htm>, accessed 18 Oct. 2012.

decisions that are 'diplomatic but assertive.' The Silovik and Technocrat agreed to United Nations Resolution 1970 as a compromise between an individual who was concerned with the humanitarian crisis and an individual opposed to the West empowering itself by intervening in a sovereign country. This hybrid as a result of the Yeltsonian forces that allow the Russian President to keep Putin in that position without any legislative or judicial means to block this appointment results in a decision that espouses Western liberal principles but insists that the West not deny the sovereignty of any country for its own purposes. The Yeltsonian forces allow Medvedev to implement this decision in his foreign policy apparatus by alienating individuals and mechanisms that would protest the decision or sabotage the policy formulation, and communicate the decision for its implementation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is completely compatible with the decisions made by the ideological hybrid of Putin and Medvedev's tandem democracy. The personal dynamics and political forces shaping the Kremlin were on a collision course with respect to United Nations Resolution 1973, which ended the Khadafy regime.

United Nations Resolution 1973:

United Nations Resolution 1973 against Libya passed on March 17, 2011 with the Russian Federation abstaining from either consenting or vetoing the sanctions.[654] Ultimately, the Russian Federation chose to allow stringent sanctions that could have potentially ousted the Khadafy regime. The Russian Federation's Security Council continued its trend of not being important in the foreign policy decision-making apparatus.

Medvedev used his presidential powers granted by Yeltsin's 1993 constitution to exert complete control over the foreign policy-making apparatus. The Silovik controlled Russian Security Council was not compatible with his liberal temperament and methodical

[654] 'Security council approves "no-fly zone" over Libya, authorizing "all necessary measures" to protect civilians, by vote of 10 in favour with 5 abstentions', The United Nations Security Council [web document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/news/press/docs/2011/sc10200.doc.htm >, accessed 18 Nov. 2012.

approach to world affairs. In March 2011, two meetings of the Russian Federation's Security Council were convened.[655] United Nations Resolution 1973 was passed on March 17, while the Russian Security Council meetings were held on March 9 and March 11.[656] The subject-matter of these meetings is not publicly known, but the timing between the actual passage of Resolution 1973 and the Russian Security Council meetings to discuss 'operational issues' would equate to a lack of involvement in the presidential decision to instruct the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to abstain from the vote.[657] The effective decision was communicated by Medvedev to Lavrov and Churkin. The Russian Security Council did not possess any channels of communication to the top diplomats immediately prior to the decision. The several days between the meetings of the Russian Security Council prior to the vote on the United Nations Security Council posed a difficult task for the advisory board to insert itself into what was essentially a telephone call between the office of Dmitry Medvedev and the offices of Lavrov and Churkin. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was Medvedev's singular tool for implementing his presidential decisions in the diplomatic arena. The Russian Security Council reconvened on March 18, which is one day after the Russian Federation abstained from vetoing United Nations Resolution 1973 against Libya.[658] The March 18 meeting was Medvedev's chance to discuss issues and mention the decision with regards to Libya in passing. The Russian Security Council by the powers of the Yeltsonian forces that Medvedev inherited was bypassed and marginalized in the decision to enforce severe sanctions against Libya and the Khadafy regime.

---

[655] 'News and Information', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/index7.html&usg=ALkJrhheAnEF9o46hQw2HYjEL5W7C2UmeQ>, accessed 19 Oct. 2012.

[656] Ibid.

[657] Ibid.

[658] Ibid.

The Russian Security Council was instructed by the Kremlin to engage in meetings pertaining to 'domestic aircraft production.'[659] Medvedev was continuing a trend and hallmark of his presidency of not using the Russian Security Council for any meaningful purpose. The Kremlin's website notes the meetings with regards to aircraft production and domestic progress in aviation, but resists noting any opposition or disagreements with regards to the decision made to enforce stringent sanctions against Libya that had the potential to oust the Khadafy regime.[660] The Medvedev presidency was alienating and muffling hawkish concerns and positions and ensuring that the presidential will pervades every facet of the government. The Yeltsonian forces of a powerful presidency precluded the Russian Security Council and its Siloviki and military traditionalists who disagree with Medvedev and the Technocrats from projecting their views. The Security Council of the Russian Federation was a meaningless mechanism used at the behest and to the preferences of the Russian President and no one else. The Russian Security Council Secretary was not chosen by Medvedev to be an important factor in the decision-making apparatus because of a lack of ideological compatibility and personal affinity.

The Kremlin's website offered interviews of Russian Security Council Secretary Patrushev discussing issues of minor importance in the context of current events, such as domestic aviation products and bilateral meetings with low-ranking officials from other countries.[661] Medvedev treated Patrushev and his office with the intention to blunt its possible interference in the decision-making process. Patrushev was a Silovik with an

---

[659] 'On State Policy of the Russian Federation in the field of aviation,' The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/640.html&usg=ALkJrhhjsqaI4QLmo72ExLZVt8QxntynGw>, accessed 19 Oct. 2012.

[660] Ibid.

[661] 'News and Information', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/index7.html&usg=ALkJrhheAnEF9o46hQw2HYjEL5W7C2UmeQ>, accessed 19 Oct. 2012.

extensive intelligence background and he did not find himself compatible with the views of Technocrat Medvedev. These men belonged to different factions within the Kremlin, and they did not share a personal connection. Medvedev chose to marginalize Silovik Patrushev and the advisory forum that he controlled.

When questioned by independent journalists from *Russia Today*, Patrushev described his quandary with the intervention in Libya as a result of United Nations Resolution 1973 in the following terms:

> The world is still far from acquiring universal rules that would legalize international interference into internal conflicts, and guarantee it lacks any bias and is efficient at the same time. Meanwhile, interference in the internal affairs of sovereign nations is proceeding under various pretexts, such as "preventing mass casualties of peaceful civilians, rendering humanitarian relief aid, or promoting political settlement," Patrushev said. These lofty slogans are being used to "carry out unilateral or bloc-backed interference with an aim to overthrow the ruling regime, provide access to natural resources, or win control of vital transportation routes, often by-passing the United Nations Security Council."[662]

Patrushev echoed all of the Silovik concerns of the West intervening in a sovereign country under dubious pretexts.[663] Patrushev believed that the West used any reason, humanitarian or otherwise, to flout international law and norms to expand its influence.[664] Patrushev's security-obsessed ideology and predisposition would preclude his support for any intervention in which the West, the United States, or NATO may possibly gain another strategic foothold in the Eastern hemisphere. The Siloviki are fundamentally opposed to any security architecture or intervention from the West that may infringe on Russian security in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, or in any location in the Eastern hemisphere that poses a risk to the Russian Federation. Patrushev and the Silovik controlled Russian Security Council would have advised Medvedev against Resolution 1973. Medvedev chose

[662]Russia Today, 'NATO will never replace the United Nations - Lavrov', Russia Today [web page] (2011) < http://rt.com/politics/nato-russia-lavrov-security-patrushev-025/>, accessed 30. Nov. 2012.
[663] Ibid.
[664] Ibid.

to alienate this mechanism in order to prevent an escalation of violence as he claimed, but the Siloviki were unconcerned with any humanitarian crisis if it led to intervention by the West and its security architecture.

The abstention on the United Nations Security Council was a tacit endorsement of enforcing a no-fly zone and shifting the balance of power within Libya against the Khadafy regime. The Russian Federation did not veto this resolution, and Medvedev publicly acknowledged that the resolution was the proper course of action against the murderous regime.[665] The Minister of Defence played no discernible role in this decision, nor did he influence prior United Nations Security Council votes. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was Medvedev's key link to implementing decisions made in the upper echelons of power in the Kremlin when implementation occurred within the machinery of the United Nations. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs with the obedient Yeltsin Liberals and the Ministry of Defence with Technocrat Serdyukov were arms of the Kremlin that were effectively neutralized by having the organizations led by ministers whose ideologies and temperaments did not clash with the office of the Russian President. The decision to abstain from United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973 is a direct result of the decision-making at the top of the Kremlin hierarchy. The Russian Security Council was marginalized as previously mentioned, and the decision to not veto the United Nations Security Resolution 1973 was a process between the two men comprising the Putin-Medvedev duo. Vladimir Putin's reservations and outright disgust with the intervention in Libya are apparent in his statement on the matter:

> It resembles a medieval appeal for a crusade in which somebody calls upon somebody to go to a certain place and liberate it. This is becoming a persistent tendency in US policy, "mentioning the bombing of Belgrade during the 1999

[665] 'Statement by Dmitry Medvedev on the situation in Libya', The President of Russia Database [web document] (2011), <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/1933>, accessed 19 Oct. 2011.

> Kosovo war, and subsequent US-led wars in Afghanistan and Iraq." Now it is Libya's turn, under the pretext of protecting the peaceful population. But in bomb strikes it is precisely the civilian population that gets killed. Where is the logic and the conscience?[666]

Vladimir Putin was throughout his tenure as Prime Minister the most influential Silovik in the Russian government. His aversion to Western influence, NATO's security architecture, and American intervention were integral to his presidency, as well as the guiding principles he used to approach foreign policy issues. Putin was absolutely outraged when NATO enforced the no-fly zone.[667] Putin's fundamental objection was that the enforcement of the no-fly zone not be another excuse for NATO enlargement or the emboldening of the West's strategic footholds in the Eastern hemisphere.[668] Putin was completely opposed to NATO, the Missile Defence Shield, or any Western security architecture pervading the post-Soviet space or anywhere else that can pose as an existential threat to the Russian Federation. Putin's hawkish instincts and Silovik mentality led him to publicly disparage the outcome in Libya and Dmitry Medvedev responded by criticizing his mentor and influential Prime Minister by defending his decision:

> It is absolutely inexcusable to use expressions that, in effect, lead to a clash of civilizations, such as "crusades," and so on. That is unacceptable. All that is now happening in Libya is the result of the appalling behaviour of the Libyan leadership and the crimes it committed against its own people. Russian diplomats did not veto the authorization of force resolution when it came before the Security Council because I do not consider this resolution to be wrong.[669]

Medvedev's approach to the Libyan crisis was rooted in his concern for the civilians who were being murdered by Khadafy and his regime.[670] Dr. Mark Galeotti has noted, 'On

---

[666] Fred Weir, 'Medvedev slams Putin's "inexcusable" Libya "crusade" comments.', Christian Science Monitor, 22 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Oct. 2012.

[667] Ellen Barry, 'Putin Criticizes West for Libya Incursion', The New York Times, 26 Apr. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 30 Oct. 2012.

[668] Ibid.

[669] Fred Weir, 'Medvedev slams Putin's "inexcusable" Libya "crusade" comments.', Christian Science Monitor, 22 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Oct. 2012.

[670] Ibid.

security, Medvedev was more focused on institutions and norms.'[671] Medvedev, the Technocrat, was sensitive to the mass slaughter of innocent Libyans and his loyalty to Putin was tested against his concern for human rights. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva commented, 'It (Libya) was one of those things that Medvedev presented he was on the right side of humanity.'[672] Medvedev did not possess the Cold War hawkish worldview of Putin or the other Siloviki. Medvedev espoused liberal principles and felt no qualms by the possibility of NATO intervention if it meant that the Khadafy regime no longer possessed the capability to murder innocent civilians. Medvedev was a Technocrat who was not suspicious of the West to the same degree as the hardliners in the Kremlin. Every public statement by Medvedev on the Libyan crisis urged international action to end the violence against innocent people.[673] Medvedev believed that the Khadafy regime should be held accountable for its actions against its own people, and the first resolution against the Khadafy regime specifically demanded a thorough investigation by the International Criminal Court.[674] The Libyan crisis was escalating and the violence against innocent civilians was increasing at an astonishing speed. Medvedev as evident by all public statements about the issue wanted the violence against civilians to end. Medvedev was a Technocrat who, unlike Putin, believed that human rights must be protected in foreign countries.

The Putin-Medvedev duo now had its first public rift. The hybrid of a Technocrat and Silovik worked harmoniously together until the Libyan crisis ignited Medvedev's

---

[671] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

[672] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

[673] Thomas Grove, 'Medvedev tells Obama: prevent Libyan civilian deaths', The Reuters, 24 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive, accessed 1 Nov. 2012.

[674] 'In Swift, Decisive Action, Security Council Imposes Tough Measures on Libyan Regime, Adopting Resolution 1970 in Wake of Crackdown on Protesters', The United Nations Security Council [web document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10187.doc.htm>, accessed 18 Oct. 2012.

technocratic concern for his fellow man and Putin's disgust to Western security architecture toppling the Khadafy regime. Pavel Salin, an eminent academic working under the auspices of the Russian government, opined:

> But the issue of Libya, a client state of the former USSR, appears to have brought on a real split. Putin, given his past [KGB] experience, is inclined to a conspiratorial view and his remarks had a certain anti-American spin. Medvedev, on the other hand, does not think in cold war terms. He would like to see Russia on good terms with everybody and perhaps play the role of an intermediary in this situation.[675]

For Medvedev, the importance of international norms that safeguarded human rights outweighed Putin's hawkish concerns about international security. The Russian President was now exercising his authority. The vote to abstain was a tacit endorsement of enforcing the no-fly zone and spoke volumes about the inner turmoil and logical rationale in the Kremlin with regards to this decision. The Russian Ambassador to the United Nations was noted by the United Nations as follows:

> VITALY CHURKIN (Russian Federation) said he had abstained, although his country's position opposing violence against civilians in Libya was clear. Work on the resolution was not in keeping with Security Council practice, with many questions having remained unanswered, including how it would be enforced and by whom, and what the limits of engagement would be. His country had not prevented the adoption of the resolution, but he was convinced that an immediate ceasefire was the best way to stop the loss of life. His country, in fact, had pressed earlier for a resolution calling for such a ceasefire, which could have saved many additional lives. Cautioning against unpredicted consequences, he stressed that there was a need to avoid further destabilization in the region.[676]

Churkin's statement is an accurate reflection of the Medvedev presidency's decision to abstain from vetoing the resolution. Churkin emphasized that the Russian Federation is deeply concerned about the violence against innocent civilians.[677] Churkin did however note that the enforcement of the no-fly zone and the security measures taken were not

---

[675] Fred Weir, 'Medvedev slams Putin's "inexcusable" Libya "crusade" comments.', Christian Science Monitor, 22 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Oct. 2012.

[676] 'Security council approves "no-fly zone" over Libya, authorizing "all necessary measures" to protect civilians, by vote of 10 in favour with 5 abstentions', The United Nations Security Council [web document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/news/press/docs/2011/sc10200.doc.htm >, accessed 18 Nov. 2012.

[677] Ibid.

exactly planned, but the Russian Federation's concerns with the crimes committed against innocent civilians in Libya outweigh all issues pertaining to this resolution.[678] Churkin was directed by the Kremlin to carry out an act that would neither directly endorse a possible Western or NATO intervention, nor object to a resolution that would save the lives of innocent people.[679] Ambassador Stephen Sestanovich opined that, 'The President of the Russian Federation conducts diplomacy and can give instruction to his ambassadors to follow without Putin's oversight.'[680] The 'diplomatic but assertive' posturing by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation continued. Russia did not consent to Western calls for action overtly and it did not reject them directly. Russia, always keen on practicing an independent foreign policy on the world stage, chose to officially not block this resolution from being passed. The abstention was an act of an independent, assertive foreign policy, even though Medvedev was in agreement with the West that Khadafy and his regime must be stopped from perpetuating violence. The foreign policy doctrine of 2008 and the new era in the post-Yeltsin years dictated a Russian Federation that would not capitulate to pressures from the West or the United States. Even though Medvedev wanted to commit the Russian Federation to this humanitarian-motivated resolution, the hardline elements in his government would have called for foreign policy posturing that would ensure that the Kremlin was independent. This intergovernmental bargaining between Putin and Medvedev led the latter to not fully enrage the many hardliners in government by choosing to abstain and not vote in favour of United Nations Resolution 1973 against Libya.

[678] Ibid.

[679] Ibid.

[680] S. Sestanovich, 'Russia's Role in Libya and Syria' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 24 January 2013, School of International & Public Affairs, New York, New York.

The clash between Putin and Medvedev resulted in a 'diplomatic but assertive' posturing that favoured Medvedev's technocratic leanings more than Putin's Silovik tendencies. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its Yeltsin Liberals who espoused liberal democratic principles, cooperation with the West, and an assertive foreign policy were ideologically and temperamentally compatible with Medvedev's order to abstain from the vote. This made Russia look independent but willing to help safeguard international norms, especially with respect to human rights. Churkin and Lavrov, Yeltsin Liberals who adopted an assertive rhetoric with the inauguration of Putin, did not object or sabotage this vote by any means. The foreign affairs arm of the Kremlin favoured this recognition of international norms by not vetoing the Western-led calls for enforcing sanctions against the murderous Khadafy regime. The hybrid governing duo's policy debate over this issue resulted in an intervention by the implementation of a no-fly zone to ensure that innocent civilians in Libya be protected from the murderous regime it no longer considered legitimate. Medvedev's order was not a complete endorsement of the Western calls to action against the Khadafy regime, but it was a muted indirect endorsement that did not completely infuriate the Siloviki and military traditionalists on the same magnitude as a vote in favour of allowing Western security architecture to intervene. The hybrid of Technocrat Medvedev and Silovik Putin chose to risk the possibility of Western intervention for the sake of innocent Libyan civilians during a time the Russian public was mildly concerned with the situation.

The Russian public was fully engaged in the affairs sweeping the Middle East, including Libya. The Gorbachovian forces of democratization enabled the Russian public to be completely up to date and informed with the uprising in Libya and the Khadafy regime's disproportionate violence against its own citizens. The Russian public was for the most part

still mired in the aftermath of the Georgian conflict, and all Russian eyes were on the Missile Defence Shield. The primary issues relevant to Russia were NATO and Western influence in the post-Soviet space and Eastern Europe. The Russian public had never protested Russian foreign policy because the foreign policy apparatus until this decision, United Nations Resolution 1973 against Libya, did not clash with the security perceptions of the constituents.

As the Libyan crisis was unfolding, Russian opinion was never wholly in favour or against sanctions in response to the Libyan crisis. Khadafy had been traditionally an ally of the Russian Federation and Putin's relationship with the Libyan regime was always productive. The Russian public was also indifferent to the plight of the Libyans because of a lack of historical, cultural, or religious ties. For example, the Russian public's opposition to military action against Serbia was a defining attribute of the 1990's because of the ties between Russians and Serbians. The Russian Federation's public during 2011 simply felt ambivalent and indifferent toward Libya. This gave Medvedev the opportunity to set the tone for the public debate over Libya and channel his beliefs in order to gain legitimacy among the masses. Putin was an influential advisor and a prominent and likely candidate for President in the 2012 election. However, Putin was throughout the Libyan crisis steadfastly cooperative and loyal to Medvedev. He chose not to publicly disparage his handpicked successor before the passage of United Nations Resolution 1973.

Putin's actions of not publicly sabotaging the Russian President's actions beforehand demonstrate that Putin is fully cognizant of the powerful Gorbachovian forces that could cripple the government's ability to conduct foreign policy in the face of public opposition. All polls as previously mentioned in this body of research strongly suggest that Medvedev's overall legitimacy rested on his close association with Russia's most popular

politician in history, Vladimir Putin. Putin's objections became publicly known by his own choosing after the decision was implemented in the form of an abstention on the United Nations Security Council. Putin was careful not to foment public opposition toward Medvedev and he chose to remain silent until after the fact in the event that the resolution proved to be against Russian interests. Putin simultaneously distanced himself from the United Nations Resolution that resulted in NATO intervention in Libya and remained a loyal member of the Kremlin who does not sabotage presidential decisions. The Silovik qualms about the resolution were present throughout the decision-making process, and Putin chose not to engage the public until after the resolution passed. Putin's handling of this issue suggests that he did not risk destroying the legitimacy of the Putin-Medvedev regime before Resolution 1973 was passed by igniting public opposition, and that the Gorbachovian forces were a powerful tool for emboldening or crippling the Kremlin's leadership. Putin's refusal to publicly disagree with Medvedev before the abstention on the United Nations Security Council was proof of that.

Medvedev's liberal temperament and technocratic leanings certainly did not preclude his utilization of the Yeltsonian forces inherited by the occupant of the office of the Russian presidency. Medvedev made decisions according to his own preferences and formulated and implemented them through the foreign policy apparatus in a manner that suited him. Medvedev exhibited little regard for the Russian Security Council that is controlled by Silovik Patrushev and his bitter enemy, military traditionalist General Baluyevsky. Medvedev does not possess the same hawkish truculence or tendencies that the Siloviki or military traditionalists possess. Medvedev has persistently blocked or blunted the Russian Security Council's role as an advisory committee that seeks to set the tone and agenda for foreign policy deliberations. Both instances in which the Russian

Federation made a decision regarding a United Nations Security Council Resolution against Libya, Medvedev communicated his decision after the fact to the advisory mechanism's forum. The Russian Security Council was Medvedev's tool to convey his decisions, not openly discuss or debate them. The National Security Concept of 2009 could not counter the powerful Yeltsonian forces stemming from the 1993 Russian Constitution that gave the Russian President unlimited powers to control his decision-making apparatus, which is a perennial theme of this body of research. The 1993 Russian Constitution legally and constitutionally obstructs any government doctrine, agency, or department that seeks to forcefully influence or impede the Russian President's decisions.[681] This was not a government that needed a bureaucratic consensus for decision-making. Medvedev made his decisions without the Siloviki or military traditionalists on the Russian Security Council being able to insert themselves into the process. The presidential prerogative was the overwhelming force in this decision-making process, and Medvedev used it to suit both his needs and plans.

The 1993 Russian Constitution further allowed the President to utilize the different arms of government without interference from other branches outside of the executive structure or within it.[682] Throughout Medvedev's presidency neither the State Duma, nor the Russian Supreme Court was able to successfully raise objections to any of his decisions. The 1993 Russian Constitution effectively neutralized every facet of the government at the cost of empowering the office of the Russian presidency. Medvedev, in the interests of implementing his decisions, only needed to communicate his wishes to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in regards to taking action on the United Nations Security Council. The Minister of Defence's position was fully able to implement any decisions with regards to

[681] Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010), < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.
[682] Ibid.

engaging Russia's defence capabilities because of the Serdyukov reforms that centralized all power in the top position of the Ministry of Defence.[683] The Ministry of Foreign Affairs' doctrine was virtually unchanged in terms of operating mechanisms or governmental powers with regards to decision-making, but the Russian Security Council continued its aversion to any foreign policy moves that could be viewed as capitulation to the West. Medvedev chose to leave the Russian Security Council on the sidelines with no discernible connection to his decision-making. Medvedev used the forum to make public statements about decisions that were formulated beforehand. The Russian Security Council's National Security Concept of 2009 paled in comparison to the power of the Yeltsonian constitutional forces that allowed the President to block the Russian Security Council's attempts to influence decisions. Medvedev, the consummate Technocrat, and his liberal temperament were incompatible with the Russian Security Council that was a bastion of hawkish truculence that was not in sync with his worldview or methodical nature. Medvedev chose to implement his decisions regarding Libya by utilizing the foreign affairs arm of the executive government without interference from any mechanisms that posed an impediment to enforcing his will. Medvedev was only allowed to do this because of the powerful Yeltsonian constitutional forces he inherited when he became President.

The true test of the personal dynamics between Medvedev and Putin was the decision to abstain from vetoing a no-fly zone resolution by the United Nations Security Council against Libya. Medvedev and Putin's close working relationship, as well as personal relationship, experienced a rift.[684] In the aftermath of the decision to abstain from United Nations Resolution 1973 against Libya, Putin vociferously protested the decision

[683] O. Oliker, K. Crane, L. Schwartz, & C. Yusupov. 'Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.', Rand Project Air Force [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012.

[684] Clifford J. Levy, 'In Rare Split, Two Leaders in Russia Differ on Libya, The New York Times, 21 Mar. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 30 Nov. 2012.

that his superior in the Putin-Medvedev leadership made.[685] There can be little doubt that Putin, the most influential member of the Medvedev presidency, voiced his disapproval of a resolution that denied Libyan sovereignty and led to intervention by Western security architecture beforehand to Medvedev. Ambassador Stephen Sestanovich noted, that 'Putin's instincts were against what Medvedev did on Libya.'[686] Putin's Silovik tendencies, as his comments after the fact point to, categorically place him in the opposition to Medvedev's decision to abstain from vetoing Resolution 1973.[687] It is not certain when the decision for Putin to run for President in the 2012 election was made, but in 2011 Medvedev was the most powerful member of the Russian government as envisioned by the 1993 Russian constitution. Dr. Mark Galeotti commented, 'He (Medvedev) was still toying with the idea of challenging Putin for the presidency.'[688] The influential Prime Minister was aware that Medvedev possessed the power to dismiss him from his position without the need for legislative, judicial, or bureaucratic approval. Putin was entangled in a situation that made his role in government subservient to his mentee whom he handpicked to be his successor.

For the first time in the Putin-Medvedev duo's tenure during the Medvedev presidency, the Yeltsonian forces of a powerful presidency by virtue of the 1993 Russian Constitution was overshadowing the personal dynamics within the Kremlin. Dr. Mark Galeotti noted, 'The rift was real. When Medvedev came in, he knew he was just the front man and Putin was in charge of security. The trappings of the presidency appealed to

---

[685] Fred Weir, 'Medvedev slams Putin's "inexcusable" Libya "crusade" comments.', Christian Science Monitor, 22 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Oct. 2012.

[686] Sestanovich, S., 'Russia's Role in Libya and Syria' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 24 January 2013, School of International & Public Affairs, New York, New York.

[687] Fred Weir, 'Medvedev slams Putin's "inexcusable" Libya "crusade" comments.', Christian Science Monitor, 22 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Oct. 2012.

[688] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

Medvedev over time, as well as people around Medvedev pushing for this. He was beginning to be more challenging to Putin.'[689] Medvedev's will was to stop the bloodshed of innocent Libyans, and while Putin's involvement in this decision precluded a full endorsement of the sanctions by voting in favour of Resolution 1973, Putin could not successfully convince the President to veto the United Nations Security Council action against Libya. Putin's Silovik-inspired concerns were acknowledged by Medvedev not completely joining the international community's action against Libya and continuing a 'diplomatic but assertive' foreign policy that did not equate to capitulation. Medvedev used the foreign policy apparatus, including the advice of his influential Prime Minister, to implement his own will. Putin was fully aware that if he voiced his opposition to Medvedev prior to the measure being taken, he risked being dismissed by his partner who was empowered by the powerful Yeltsonian forces. Putin understood well that the personal dynamics between Medvedev and him were insufficient to counter the powerful forces Medvedev inherited as a result of Boris Yeltsin's legacy of a superior presidential system.

Conclusion:

The Medvedev presidency was faced with the Libyan crisis amid the Arab Spring that led to unprecedented uprisings in countries ruled by regimes that lost legitimacy with their respective citizenries. The Libyan Civil War was prominently monitored by the international community because of the abuse of human rights by the Khadafy regime. Medvedev's technocratic leanings made him highly sensitive to the plight of innocent Libyan civilians, and his presidential will led to the enforcement of two United Nations Security Council Resolutions that ultimately signalled the death knell for Khadafy's rule. Medvedev's calibration of foreign policy and his manner of implementing it is a testament

[689] Ibid.

to the powerful Yeltsonian forces that allowed him to control his government to an unusual degree. Furthermore, Putin's lack of ability to stop United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973 is another event that illuminates the powerful Yeltsonian forces that blocked his attempt to deter Medvedev's decision with regards to Libya. Putin's cognizance that the Russian Federation's Constitution of 1993 as authored by Boris Yeltsin gave Medvedev the full power to dismiss Putin without any justification or bureaucratic wrangling was a powerful deterrent that stopped a 'civil war' within the Kremlin between the respective leaders of the Technocrats and Siloviki. Putin had no choice but to be silent and only have his Silovik views and objections known after the United Nations Security Council Resolution was abstained from, which effectively authorized it. Putin did not want to foment public opposition to Medvedev's presidency because this may lead to an erosion of legitimacy among the Russian people in relation to the Putin-Medvedev regime. Putin's political leadership rested on the legitimacy of his inner circle, while he waited to run for President again in 2012. In addition to this, Putin did not want to foment opposition by publicly stating his objections that could potentially impede Medvedev's decision-making beforehand. Infuriating the Russian President who could potentially dismiss the Prime Minister because of the powers granted in the 1993 Russian Constitution could have led to Putin's political demise. Putin was cautious not to compete against or sabotage Medvedev, who was far more superior in terms of constitutional power over the government because of the Yeltsonian forces. The new political environment of the Russian Federation of a powerful presidency as envisioned by Yeltsin and an empowered citizenry as envisioned by Gorbachev subdued Putin's Silovik leanings and forced him to remain on the sidelines, while Medvedev resisted a veto to a resolution that was ideologically incompatible with Putin's worldview.

The personal dynamics within the Kremlin were important factors in the implementation of both United Nations Security Council Resolutions against Libya. Medvedev had little regard for the Russian Federation's Security Council as he has not held a single meeting in this advisory forum to deliberate a vital foreign policy decision. All decisions are announced at these meetings to the chagrin of the Siloviki and military traditionalists who sought and seek to direct the foreign policy debate with a Cold War warrior worldview, rather than one espoused by Technocrats, which would be an independent, assertive foreign policy characterized by cooperation with the West and the international community. The technocratic President had an aversion to the hawkish bureaucrats and the foreign policy mechanisms they occupy. Medvedev sought to implement his decisions unimpeded by the hawkish truculence he would have to compete with during meetings with the Russian Security Council members if he allowed them the opportunity to insert themselves into the foreign policy debates. Medvedev used the Yeltsonian forces of an empowered presidency to effectively relegate the Russian Security Council to a position of minor importance. Medvedev was able to use the advisory forum as a tool for communication, rather than deliberation because of the constitution authored by Yeltsin in 1993.

As seen throughout the Medvedev presidency, his decisions were formulated within the ruling tandem and communicated to the technocratic Minister of Defence or Yeltsin Liberals in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for implementation. Both arms of government were led by individuals who were compatible with Medvedev's liberal temperament, methodical style, and non-Cold War worldview. The Russian President implemented his decisions through channels that posed no risk of sabotage or impediment to his will. Furthermore, as seen during the Libyan episode, Medvedev's close relationship with Putin

did not consistently dictate a foreign policy that was completely compatible with Putin's worldview. Medvedev allowed Putin unlimited influence and access to the affairs of the Russian government, but this did not enable Putin to fully control his handpicked successor. Medvedev's liberal temperament and concern for the human rights abuses in Libya were empowered by the Yeltsonian forces that allowed the Russian President to be the sole decision-maker, notwithstanding any personal dynamics within the government. Medvedev formulated decisions regarding the Libyan violence on his own terms and implemented it in a manner that would neutralize opposition within the Kremlin.

In essence, the Russian decisions regarding Libya were the acts of an independent and assertive foreign policy that cooperated with the West and the international community. Medvedev did not share Putin's hawkish worldview and believed that sanctions against the Libyan regime would preserve the sanctity of human life and protect human rights. Medvedev used the powers of his office to implement his decision, which he had by the fourth year of his presidency fully mastered, and his influential Prime Minister had no remedy but to remain on the sidelines. Putin neither impeded the decision within the Kremlin beforehand, nor did he publicly disparage the decision to abstain on the United Nations Security Council before it was conveyed with regards to Resolution 1973. Putin was fully aware that a decision regarding Libya that conflicted with his Silovik beliefs would be made. Putin chose not to foment public opposition before the decision was conveyed in order to not damage the President who possessed the power to dismiss the Prime Minister. The powerful Yeltsonian and Gorbachovian forces resulted in Putin choosing not to defy the Russian President, which would directly lead to a weakening of Medvedev's legitimacy. The Russian political system that resulted because of the legacies of Gorbachev and Yeltsin precluded Putin from doing anything to stop a United Nations

Security Council Resolution that was compatible with Medvedev's core beliefs and worldview. After the Khadafy regime was deposed and its leader executed, the Assad regime in Syria became the fixation of the international community. The Russian Federation's decision with respect to Syria is mired in the aftermath of United Nations Resolution 1973 against Libya and the announcement that Vladimir Putin, not Dmitry Medvedev, will run for President in the 2012 election.

Chapter 7: The Refusal to Consent to Sanctions against the Assad Regime in Syria

Introduction:

Prior to 2011, the Assad regime in Syria seemed beyond reproach and completely ingrained in the governmental system. Similar to the Soviet Union during the late 1980's, Syria started undergoing a transformation from within. Syrian constituents began to rebel against their government in a manner reminiscent of the Moscow Spring. The viability for the Assad regime's demise was now becoming a reality akin to how the unshakable grasp of the Soviet government became increasingly weaker and led to its fall from power. The Syrian crisis was one of most violent civil wars that erupted as a result of the Arab Spring in 2011. After forty years of the Assad family's rule, Syrians protested against the pseudo-democratic regime. The protestors wanted free and fair elections and the enjoyment of their full civil liberties. In the context of the change sweeping the Middle East, the Syrian protestors demanded that President Bashar al-Assad step down and allow democratic reform to take place. President Assad refused and engaged in a violent battle with rebel forces similar to Khadafy in Libya. Assad refused to make any major concessions and this only fuelled civil discontent. The international community was now desperately trying to keep the Middle East from erupting into further mass chaos and the use of sanctions was conceivable after the Libyan intervention. The use of military and economic sanctions as authorized by the United Nations Security Council was now open for debate.

The Russian Federation, as did the rest of the world, watched these events unfold with no foreseeable data or reports that prepared them for the consequences. The Kremlin's foreign policy had since 1991 been wholly centred on relations with the West, the United States, NATO, China, and the former Soviet Republics. The Arab Spring now posed as a theoretical and practical dilemma. The Kremlin's foreign policy apparatus was faced with

Middle Eastern countries experiencing civil wars as a result of denying citizens freedoms that have come to shape the new Russian political environment. Namely, Russia now had a political environment that the protestors in the Middle East theoretically strived for. The abandonment of Communist totalitarianism has created a powerfully informed and engaged Russian citizenry. The Russian government now espoused principles that were adverse to the rule of leaders such as Khadafy and Assad. The Russian role in these events posed the existential question of whether Russia will commit itself to spreading the principles it has been formed by and whether multilateral intervention in Syria is the proper course.

The Libyan Civil War came to an abrupt end on October 20, 2011 with the murder of a captured Colonel Khadafy by the rebels he had sought to defeat.[690] The eyes of the world now shifted to Syria where the bloodshed had been disproportionate and Assad refused to make any concessions to his constituents or the international community. The widely publicized bloodshed and the sudden conclusion to the Libyan Civil War now enabled the international community to continue its efforts to quell the violence and attempt to bring stability to a region severely destabilized by a democratic reform movement that has enveloped several countries. Syria's representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Bashar Ja'afari, has publicly stated on numerous occasions that President Assad was foremost a democratic reformer and that he did not violate any international norms.[691] The Assad regime made no attempt to indicate that it may leave the corridors of power or agree to a deal that would save it from prosecution in the event Assad was removed from government.[692]

---

[690] Kareem Fahim, Anthony Shadid and Rick Gladstone, 'Violent End to an Era as Qaddafi Dies in Libya', The New York Times, 20 Oct. 2011, The New York Times Archive, accessed 21 Oct. 2012.

[691] Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations, 'Press Releases', Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations [web page] (2012) < http://www.un.int/syria/ >, accessed 12 Nov. 2012.

[692] 4news, 'Syria protests: no concessions from President Assad', 4news [web page] (2011) < http://www.channel4.com/news/syria-protests-no-concessions-from-president-assad>, accessed 3 Nov. 2012.

The Russian Federation however was internally beginning to show its own civil discontent. The scope was not of the Arab Spring, but the citizenry began to show its mild support for United Russia and the Putin-Medvedev regime.[693] In 2011, Medvedev and Putin announced that the latter would be the presidential candidate for the 2012 election, not Medvedev.[694] The Russian citizenry was initially polarized by this announcement and United Russia lost its nearly complete control of the legislature, which had lessened from 64% to 50%.[695] In addition to this, Russians began to protest the decision to return Putin to the presidential office.[696] The younger generation began to form a powerful democratic reform movement that resulted in the Kremlin's political posturing and concessions to pacify the vociferous citizens who were opposed to the return of Putin.

There was the Libyan crisis which saw Russia consenting to what eventually became a NATO and Western military intervention. The hawkish elements of the Kremlin were outraged that the Russian Federation allowed the West and NATO to gain another strategic foothold on the world stage, which was seen as a threat to Russian security. The Siloviki and military traditionalists attempted to reform the levers of power in the Kremlin's foreign policy apparatus by strengthening the position of the Chief of Presidential Administration, which became occupied by an influential Silovik, Sergei Ivanov.[697] The decision to strengthen this role was to be a counterweight to the technocratic President who decided to risk NATO intervention for the sake of Libyan citizens. This

[693] Miriam Elder, 'Putin shaken by United Russia's poor election performance', The Guardian, 5 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Nov. 2012.
[694] Ellen Barry, 'Putin Once More Moves to Assume Top Job in Russia', The New York Times, 24 Sep. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 29 Nov. 2012.
[695] Miriam Elder, 'Putin shaken by United Russia's poor election performance', The Guardian, 5 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Nov. 2012.
[696] Miriam Elder & Tom Parfit, 'Russian anti-Putin protests draw thousands to Moscow again', The Guardian, 24 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 24 Nov. 2012.
[697] Russia Today, 'Sergey Ivanov appointed presidential head of staff', Russia Today [web page] (2011) < http://rt.com/politics/ivanov-kremlin-administration-head-421/>, accessed 19 Nov. 2012.

sensitivity to a human rights issue was seen as a leading cause for Medvedev's decision to abstain from a veto in the United Nations Security Council vote. The rivalries within the Kremlin were now manifesting itself in reforms of the Kremlin's machinery. The attempt to strengthen the Russian Security Council's role in presidential decisions by national edict in May 2011 in the foreign policy apparatus is an important theme in this chapter.

In the decision to deny the United Nations Security Council the opportunity to enforce military and economic sanctions that may have entailed regime change in Syria, the Medvedev presidency's last foreign policy decision of intransigence is a vital point in understanding the foreign policy of this time period for the Russian Federation. The decision to veto the United Nations Security Council Resolutions against the Assad regime that would have ended the violence and possibly seen the ousting of President Assad played an important role in the continuation of the Syrian Civil War. This issue has carried over into the Putin presidency and remains a source of international tension at the time of this writing.[698] The decision to deny the international community the opportunity to end the conflict was analyzed in the context of the Russian civil discontent, the aftermath of the Libyan intervention, the recalibration of the Chief of Presidential Administration role in the Kremlin, and a presidential edict that strengthened the Russian Security Council. The official Russian policy of intransigence in the effort to end the Syrian Civil War by proposed sanctions imposed by the international community will contribute to understanding the Medvedev era foreign policy.

Libyan Aftermath:

The aftermath of Medvedev's surprise decision to abstain from vetoing United Nations Resolution 1973 against the Khadafy regime had powerful political implications

[698] David M. Herszenhorn, 'Putin Defends Stand on Syria and Chastises U.S. on Libya Outcome', The New York Times, 20 Dec. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 Feb. 2013.

for his leadership. For the first time since becoming President in 2008, Medvedev and Putin openly sparred in the public arena over the decision.[699] Medvedev repeatedly affirmed that the massacre against Libyan protestors must be stopped and international norms must be preserved.[700] Putin, a Silovik with little regard for the human rights of innocent protestors in a foreign country, remained vociferously opposed to Russia's indirect endorsement of United Nations action against Libya that led to Western intervention.[701] The outcome of the civil war, which ended with Khadafy's murder, was condemned by the Russian Prime Minister.[702] Putin stated, 'Nearly the entire Gaddafi family was killed. His corpse was shown on all world TV channels. It's impossible to look at it without disgust!'[703] Putin was appalled by the murder of a leader of a sovereign country.[704] The sovereignty of Libya was denied in these exceptional circumstances by the international community, and Putin's hawkish tendencies precluded him from supporting this action. Dr. Graham Allison notes, 'Medvedev thought he agreed to a humanitarian mission in Libya, but it was converted to regime change. Russia felt double-crossed. It definitely had an impact on the Syrian case.'[705] Putin's Silovik tendencies would have dictated staying out of a conflict that had no impact on the Russian Federation. This disagreement was the first public rift between the two men, and the news media promptly followed the verbal sparring. The Silovik and the Technocrat were on different sides of the policy divide, and the extension of the inner

[699] Fred Weir, 'Medvedev slams Putin's "inexcusable" Libya "crusade" comments.', Christian Science Monitor, 22 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Oct. 2012.
[700] Ibid.
[701] Ibid.
[702] RIA Novosti, 'Putin condemns footage showing Gaddafi death', RIA Novosti [web page] (2011) <http://en.rian.ru/world/20111026/168144832.html>, accessed 2 Feb. 2013.
[703] Ibid.
[704] Ibid.
[705] G. Allison, 'The Governmental Politics Model in Perspective' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 19 December 2012, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

rivalries between the Technocrats and Siloviki who controlled the Kremlin played out at the highest level of government.

The NATO imposed no-fly zone was not included in the text of United Nations Resolution 1973 and this detail was left unresolved.[706] Medvedev's technocratic sensitivity to the plight of Libyan civilians caused him to intentionally disregard the specifics of the security architecture needed to enforce United Nations Resolution 1973 against Libya. NATO forces intervened and amounted to decimating the Khadafy regime. 'What kind of no-fly zone is this if they are striking palaces every night?' Putin said.[707] 'What do they need to bomb palaces for? To drive out the mice?'[708] *RIA Novosti* noted:

> Putin also suggested that Libya's waste oil resources could be "the main object of interest to those operating there. Libya has the biggest oil resources in Africa and the fourth largest gas resources. It raises the question: isn't this the main object of interest to those operating there."[709]

Putin was completely against NATO intervention. The Prime Minister's security impulses precluded his consent to an intervention; this refusal was incompatible with the humanitarian sentiment sweeping the international community. The intervention to Putin was just another ploy by the West to empower its control of international security. Putin rejected the notion that NATO intervened on humanitarian grounds and attributed this action to the West's greed for oil.[710] In public, Medvedev was forced to reinforce the logical rationale for his decision and indirect consent to the military venture for

---

[706] 'Security council approves no-fly zone over Libya, authorizing "all necessary measures" to protect civilians, by vote of 10 in favour with 5 abstentions', The United Nations Security Council [web document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/news/press/docs/2011/sc10200.doc.htm >, accessed 18 Nov. 2012.

[707] RIA Novosti, 'Putin says dumbfounded over NATO operation in Libya', RIA Novosti [web page] (2011) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20110427/163739739.html >, accessed 2 Feb. 2013.

[708] Ibid.

[709] Ibid.

[710] Ibid.

humanitarian purposes in Libya.[711] NATO took full command of the military campaign in Libya and this amounted to being a Silovik's nightmare, another incursion by NATO that further loosens the security grip of the Russian Federation in the Eastern hemisphere. Putin viewed every move by the West in terms of international security, while Medvedev did not. The different personalities and formative backgrounds of Medvedev and Putin were now responsible for this rift. The President and Prime Minister disagreed on Russian foreign policy in Libya because of different priorities and perceptions. The rift continued and was a major aspect of the decision with regards to Syria by the Russian Federation.

The public spectacle of having the technocratic President urging an end to the Libyan crisis on humanitarian grounds and the Prime Minister disavowing any responsibility for what he viewed as 'immoral NATO domination' played out in the eyes of an engaged citizenry that was fully informed of the events and disagreements now plaguing the Kremlin. The public rift of the Putin-Medvedev regime alerted Russians to the focal point of the Kremlin's foreign policy debates, the Arab Spring. While these events were occurring, Russian interest revolved around far more relevant matters such as NATO, European politics, and relations with the West. Russians were not notified by Medvedev beforehand that he would consent to a possible intervention entailing Western security architecture attempting to resolve the Libyan crisis. NATO was a major point of contention in the Russian public's perception and Medvedev skilfully avoided the political entanglement by obfuscating the inherent predisposition of the international community to use NATO to achieve its objectives.

In the aftermath of the Libyan intervention by NATO, WCIOM independent polling of Russian opinion pointed to the fact that Medvedev avoided facing opposition from the

[711] Fred Weir, 'Medvedev slams Putin's "inexcusable" Libya "crusade" comments.', Christian Science Monitor, 22 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Oct. 2012.

anti-NATO, anti-foreign interventionist Russian public by abstaining from a veto of United Nations Resolution 1973 by acting quickly and efficiently.[712] Dr. Kimberly Marten commented, 'They felt betrayed. Russians wanted to make the point that that the West won't be able to do the same thing they did in Syria that they did in Libya.'[713] A few days after Russia abstained from vetoing the United Nations Resolution that resulted in the ouster of Khadafy because of NATO intervention, Russians overwhelmingly opposed these measures.[714] 'Most of Russians think other countries should not intervene in the conflict and leave the citizens of Libya tackling their problems alone (62%).'[715] The polling took place on 19-20 March, 2011.[716] NATO command of the Libyan campaign was not in full effect until March 31 as the official statement declared.[717] The Russian public was not clear on the fact that NATO and Western-dominated agendas were now set to 'invade' and topple a criminal regime. Ambassador Stephen Sestanovich opined, 'the confusion was whether it was a no-fly zone or to unseat Khadafy.'[718] The Russian public was grappling with the new age of multilateral diplomacy in the forum of world institutions of which Russia was an active and important member. Medvedev believed in the preservation of international norms as evident by his indirect consent to intervening in Libya and stopping the bloodshed of innocent civilians, while Putin represented the Cold War era security-based worldview of non-intervention and respect for sovereignty. The two approaches to

[712] WCIOM, 'War In Libya: View From Russia', WCIOM [web page] (2011) < http://wciom.com/index.php?id=61&uid=44>, accessed 1 Nov. 2012.
[713] K. Marten, 'Russian Foreign Policy' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 7 December 2012, Harriman Institute, Columbia University, New York, New York.
[714] WCIOM, 'War in Libya: View From Russia', WCIOM [web page] (2011) < http://wciom.com/index.php?id=61&uid=44>, accessed 1 Nov. 2012.
[715] Ibid.
[716] Ibid.
[717] NATO, 'NATO takes command in Libya air operations', NATO [web page] (2011) <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_71867.htm>, accessed 1 Dec. 2012.
[718] S. Sestanovich, 'Russia's Role in Libya and Syria' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 24 January 2013, School of International & Public Affairs, New York, New York.

the world stage were inextricably linked together politically and the rift was a result of the different visions of foreign policy clashing.

The Russian public that monitored these events closely and benefited from the Gorbachovian forces that empowered them fomented a powerful aversion to foreign interventionism. The resulting outcome when NATO took full command of the military operation in Libya only reinforced this majority view. The opinion of the Russian public, which suggested a powerful opposition to any possible intervention in Libya, clearly indicated that the majority of Russians polled do not feel that even humanitarian reasons justify an invasion to topple a criminal regime.[719] WCIOM published the following poll results:

> Most of Russians do not support the international military operation in Libya (64%). An overwhelming majority of Russians considering the conflict in Libya to be the internal problem of the country oppose the international military operation (85%). From the point of view of the majority of Russians, Russia should be neutral with respect to what is happening in Libya and should not intervene in the conflict (56%).[720]

Medvedev's method of evading the major obstacles to his decision are telling signs of the powerful factors that posed a detriment to his presidential will. Medvedev manoeuvred the foreign policy apparatus in a manner that alienated the Siloviki and military traditionalists. The powerful Yeltsonian constitutional forces envisaged a President who completely and unquestionably controlled the decision-making apparatus, and Medvedev's decision to forgo the advice of the Silovik controlled Russian Security Council and the advice of his mentor are attributes of the superior presidential system he was now at the apex of. The Russian President made a decision by virtually ignoring the Silovik concerns of important bureaucrats in the Kremlin who possessed influential vantage points.

[719] WCIOM, 'War In Libya: View From Russia', WCIOM [web page] (2011) < http://wciom.com/index.php?id=61&uid=44>, accessed 1 Nov. 2012.
[720] Ibid.

Neither the Prime Minister, nor any Silovik bureaucrat who opposed the Libyan intervention was able to successfully persuade the President to veto United Nations Resolution 1973. The Yeltsonian forces that allowed him to manoeuvre his decision in a manner that allowed the decision to be implemented by abstaining from the vote were clear, but the Yeltsonian forces of a powerful presidential office were impervious to the powerful Russian public that Medvedev until now acted in concert with. The Russian President in the democratized Russian political environment made a decision that was not in sync with the Russian public's ardent views against interventionism.[721]

Before the decision regarding United Nations Resolution 1973, Medvedev never attempted to act in a manner that would foment public opposition. The Gorbachovian forces of an empowered Russian citizenry granted Medvedev the legitimacy he needed to successfully and effectively lead the Russian government in its domestic and foreign affairs. No speech by Medvedev, Lavrov, or Churkin indicated that United Nations Resolution 1973 would entail Western security architecture in Libya. This fundamental omission was a politically expedient tactic in order not to have the President of the Russian Federation fall out of favour with a Russian public whose granted legitimacy was a requirement for his tenure. Within the Kremlin it is fairly certain that Putin and the Siloviki attempted to warn Medvedev that if the Russian Federation were not to veto a resolution that would enforce a no-fly zone by dubious means it may result in NATO receiving an opportunity to assert its security control in Libya, which would be adverse to Russian interests.[722] After the NATO intervention in Libya, the Russian public was resistant to any

[721] Ibid.

[722] David M. Herszenhorn, 'Putin Defends Stand on Syria and Chastises U.S. on Libya Outcome', The New York Times, 20 Dec. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 Feb. 2013.

similar action taken in Syria, a country with a strong historical link to the Russian Federation.[723]

The Russian public would not have supported any multilateral effort against violence in a foreign country if it entailed NATO intervention.[724] Therefore, Medvedev had to use the Yeltsonian forces of his presidential office to stifle the internal opposition within the Kremlin. Putin understood that once the decision was made and NATO intervention occurred that Medvedev's legitimacy would be damaged. The Russian public viewed the decision to abstain as the President of the Russian Federation appeasing NATO and the West. Putin used every interview in the aftermath of the NATO intervention to distance himself from this decision. He vociferously responded to questions of who was responsible for allowing NATO to 'invade' Libya. It is not certain at what point the decision for Putin to run for President in 2012 was made, but Putin's political ambitions created the rift that caused him to disavow any decision made that the public viewed as a concession to NATO and the West, which infringed on Russian security.

Putin's rift with Medvedev was intentional. He did not agree with Medvedev and believed that public support for his presidency was becoming endangered with increasing NATO domination of Libya. Khadafy's bloody end only punctuated the longstanding Silovik contention with this decision. Putin's Silovik tendencies were much more compatible with the Russian public, than Medvedev's belief in humanitarian interventionism by cooperation with Western security architecture. Putin's eventual run for the presidency required him to distance himself from a decision made by Medvedev that intentionally obfuscated the presidential order to not veto United Nations Resolution 1973 that would inevitably clash with the Russian public's views on the matter. NATO was the

[723] WCIOM, 'Conflict in Syria: What Russia Should Do', WCIOM [web page] (2012) <http://wciom.com/index.php?id=61&uid=693>, accessed 1 Nov. 2012.
[724] Ibid.

de facto security architecture to be used by the international community as conventional wisdom suggested. Medvedev acted surreptitiously in relation to the Gorbachovian forces by not fomenting opposition with the convenient omission of possible NATO intervention. The Russian public's opposition ignited after NATO effectively took the country from Khadafy's regime by force.[725]

Medvedev's decision to manipulate his decision to shield him from the Gorbachovian forces of an empowered, informed citizenry cost him politically as will be discussed later. Furthermore, the Siloviki attempted to rein in the powerful President with his humanitarian inclinations by strengthening another mechanism within the Kremlin for the benefit of the hardliners, the Chief of Presidential Administration position. Medvedev's decision enraged the Silovik faction as this decision was seen as being dangerous to Russian security interests and a rift with his mentor and most influential member of the Russian government ensued.[726] The political ramifications after the NATO intervention in Libya within the Kremlin and a chagrined Russian public now posed the most significant threats to Medvedev's presidency. He exercised his powers because of the 1993 Russian Constitution that made him the ultimate decision-maker, but with the current state of Putin's inner circle dominating the Kremlin, this did not preclude him from fracturing the sensitive personal dynamics that had until now been characterized as productive coexistence between two competing factions. The Syrian crisis and Medvedev's support for sanctions against Libya are interrelated because of the political fallout after Russia's abstention of United Nations Resolution 1973.

[725] WCIOM, 'War in Libya: View from Russia', WCIOM [web page] (2011) < http://wciom.com/index.php?id=61&uid=44>, accessed 1 Nov. 2012.

[726] RIA Novosti, 'Putin says 'dumbfounded' over NATO operation in Libya', RIA Novosti [web page] (2011) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20110427/163739739.html >, accessed 2 Feb. 2013.

Protests:

In September 2011, the role of Putin's tenure as Prime Minister was finally revealed when both he and Medvedev announced that Putin, not Medvedev, would run in the presidential election as the candidate for United Russia in 2012.[727] Ambassador Stephen Sestanovich comments, 'During the Medvedev interregnum, the thought of Putin returning gave people the feeling that this return was out of the confines of the European political theatre.'[728] The tandem democracy was never believed to be anything less than an opportunity for Putin to maintain his influence in the government, but Medvedev did show independent initiatives and rhetoric different from Putin. Dr. Sergei Khrushchev notes, 'Medvedev had many independent initiatives.'[729] The anti-corruption campaign by Medvedev, for example, gave citizens the impression that Medvedev would seek to continue his role as President by running again. The Russian public supported Medvedev because of his close association with Putin, and during the Medvedev presidency Putin generally resisted any attempt to voice criticism or anti-Medvedev sentiments. The Russian public was now informed that Putin would return to the presidency, and this ignited protests and opposition. The younger voters believed that Medvedev was a younger non-Cold War era member of government who sought to modernize the government as he claimed in speeches and statements. The return of the former KGB operative and Yeltsin's handpicked successor was a reversal of the progression in national politics since Putin stepped down and became Prime Minister. The Russian citizenry and political intelligentsia felt deceived. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva opined, 'All hell broke loose in September 2011 when Putin

[727] Ellen Barry, 'Putin Once More Moves to Assume Top Job in Russia', The New York Times, 24 Sep. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 29 Nov. 2012.

[728] S. Sestanovich, 'Russia's Role in Libya and Syria' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 24 January 2013, School of International & Public Affairs, New York, New York.

[729] S..Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.

announced he will return to the presidency. Libya was important and this announcement only infuriated the Russian citizens more.'[730] United Russia's legitimacy was dealt a severe blow by the Gorbachovian forces of democratization.

The enraged, informed citizenry began protesting on the streets and the internet.[731] The Russian public viewed the switch as a political manoeuvre to remain in power. Putin's reputation from 'saviour' during his presidency evolved into 'puppet master' toward the end of the Medvedev presidency. The legitimacy of the Putin-Medvedev duo had already been dealt a serious blow with the public rift of the two men over the Libyan Civil War, which resulted in NATO intervention. The foreign policy decision, which was made by obfuscating the probability of NATO involvement, violated key security fears of the Russian public. NATO was an undesirable entity in the Eastern hemisphere, and the Russian public nervously watched the further integration of NATO's security architecture in various countries. Medvedev's decision to not veto such a measure polarized the public and the regime's legitimacy had already entered the crucible of the Gorbachovian forces that determine whether an elected official can operate in a political environment that makes public support a foundation for governance. 2011 saw the unravelling of the political partnership between Medvedev and Putin in addition to the latter making his intention to seek the presidency again. Putin seeking the presidency nullified the political pregnancy of Medvedev's tenure as President. Russian citizens were now simultaneously questioning Medvedev's foreign policy decisions and Putin's morally dubious control of the Kremlin.

[730] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

[731] Ellen Barry, 'Rally Defying Putin's Party Draws Tens of Thousands', The New York Times, 10 Dec. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], 1 Dec. 2012.

The events of 2011 contributed to a significant erosion of support for the Putin-Medvedev regime, and the 2011 Duma elections were evidence of this fact.[732]

According to *The Guardian*, United Russia's composition in the Duma fell from 64% to 50% and this marked the first serious political loss in its history during the Putin and Medvedev years.[733] The non-United Russia political candidates were voted into government in significant numbers when considered how unremarkable their performance was in past elections. Putin's popularity and the legitimacy of his political party were waning. Vladimir Ryzhkov, a liberal opposition politician stated:

> These elections are unprecedented because they were carried out against the background of a collapse in trust in Putin, (President Dmitry) Medvedev and the ruling party. I think that the March (presidential) election will turn into an even bigger political crisis; disappointment, frustration, with even more dirt and disenchantment, and an even bigger protest vote.[734]

The presidential election in 2012 which almost certainly meant Putin's return and the confirmation of Medvedev's role as a 'puppet' were now prominently points of contention among the Russian public. 'Free and fair elections' as brought in by the Gorbachovian reforms were now dubious in the Putin-controlled Russia. The Russian public began to seriously question the validity of the Putin-Medvedev regime's legitimacy. Mikhail Gorbachev stated on *Ekho Moskvy* radio: 'We do not have real democracy and we will not have it if the government is afraid of their people, afraid to say things openly.'[735] Putin's actions that can be described as the 'bait and switch' between him and Medvedev were viewed in the most repugnant manner. The Russian citizenry was not completely shocked, but felt it was quietly deceived. Russian public opinion was confirmed that United

---

[732] Miriam Elder, 'Putin shaken by United Russia's poor election performance', The Guardian, 5 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Nov. 2012.

[733] Ibid.

[734] Timothy Heritage and Ralph Boulton, 'Russia's Putin and party suffer election blow', Reuters, 4 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], 1 Dec. 2012.

[735] Richard S. Williamson, 'Time to Reset Obama's Reset Policy', The American, 28 Feb. 2012, Google News Archive [online datbase], accessed 30 Nov. 2012.

Russia was a political organization intended to keep Vladimir Putin in power while democratic change was stifled. The Gorbachovian forces of democratization therefore posed a serious threat to Putin's return to the office of the Russian President, as well as the final months of the Medvedev presidency. The crucible of the Gorbachovian forces was set on a collision course with the next moves of the Putin-Medvedev regime. After United Russia's abysmal performance in the parliamentary elections in late 2011, Vladimir Putin stated:

> I want to speak to all citizens of the country and, above all, those who voted for the party, "Putin said, his eyebrows twitching and his gaze wandering." Despite a rather complicated period in the life of our government, despite the [financial] crisis, despite the fact that responsibility for these difficulties has laid and lies on the shoulders of the party, people – our voters, our citizens – kept us as the leading political party in the country.[736]

For the first time in Putin's career since he became President in 2000, his rhetoric from resolved, unyielding leader changed to a politician willing to make concessions. During his statement, he was visibly nervous and made sure to reinforce the notion that all political imperatives stem from the people's consent.[737] Vladimir Putin's reputation as 'the saviour' no longer applied to him in the eyes of the Russian public. His statement emphasized that the Russian citizenry was responsible for keeping United Russia in power.[738] This was a veiled reference that his eventual return to the presidency requires legitimacy from the Russian citizens. The Gorbachovian forces of democratization dealt United Russia a serious blow to its legitimacy, and Putin was well aware of the powerful forces that could potentially end his political career. This cautious attitude was to become a permanent fixture for the remainder of the Medvedev presidency. The bureaucratic rebellion by the hawkish elements of the Kremlin against Medvedev continued and resulted

[736] Miriam Elder, 'Putin shaken by United Russia's poor election performance', The Guardian, 5 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Nov. 2012.
[737] Ibid.
[738] Ibid.

in his elevation of the Silovik and military traditionalist bastion, the Russian Security Council.

Presidential Edict of May 2011:

On May 6 of 2011, President Medvedev convened a routine Russian Security Council meeting in which he announced the signing of a decree that would theoretically strengthen the role of the Kremlin's Security Council and the position of Russian Security Council Secretary.[739] The role of the Russian Security Council during the Medvedev years had been marginal. Medvedev used the forum to convey decisions and make announcements. The Russian Security Council was not an important mechanism in the Medvedev presidency's foreign policy apparatus. The Siloviki and military traditionalists who controlled the Russian Security Council were among Medvedev's harshest critics who possessed the general ideological fixation for truculence and hawkishness. This was incompatible with Medvedev's liberal temperament. Medvedev chose to evade the Russian Security Council's attempts to influence his decisions. The Yeltsonian forces granted Medvedev the unlimited power to use the foreign policy mechanisms according to his wishes. Medvedev's presidential powers made it unnecessary to build a consensus among the quarrelsome group of bureaucrats from different factions.

Medvedev's decision to abstain from vetoing a United Nations Resolution against Libya that facilitated NATO intervention clashed deeply with hardline elements within the Kremlin. The Siloviki and the military traditionalists would have firmly protested such a decision and would claim that the risk to Russian security outweighed the plight of the Libyan civilians. The multilateral humanitarian intervention to the Siloviki and military

[739] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'President of the Russian Federation signed a decree "by the Security Council of the Russian Federation."', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2011) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/645.html&usg=ALkJrhgS3bZp2DQNyPfzKVK2f8TgnVtUJg>, accessed 30 Nov. 2012.

traditionalists would have been viewed as another ploy to enhance NATO's stranglehold of the international security sphere. Medvedev disregarded this collective opinion of the hardliners and as he repeatedly did with other foreign policy decisions, he marginalized the Russian Security Council by merely communicating his decision to it. The decision was formulated beforehand and the chagrined members of the Russian Security Council were left no option but to accept the decision by Medvedev whose use of the Yeltsonian forces of a powerful presidency prevented others from thwarting his will. Medvedev was the ultimate decision-maker and the 1993 Russian Constitution gave him the authority to relegate any mechanism within the executive branch of the government in order to successfully implement his decisions.

Until the Russian Federation's decision to abstain from vetoing United Nations Resolution 1973 against Libya, the relationship between Medvedev and Putin was close, amiable, and respectful. Medvedev showed little regard for hawkish bureaucrats, except for his mentor, Vladimir Putin. Putin handpicked and groomed Medvedev for the presidency, and Medvedev always regarded Putin as a senior colleague whom he admired.[740] Putin's appointment by Medvedev to the position of Prime Minister reinforced the belief that Putin and Medvedev were members of a close political partnership. Putin never expressed any disagreement with Medvedev about any decision until the United Nations Security Council decision against Libya, which Medvedev could have vetoed, that opened the possibility and eventual outcome of NATO intervention. The outcome of the resolution against Libya deeply disturbed Putin and he repeatedly condemned and disavowed responsibility of Medvedev's decision.[741] The Silovik tendencies within Putin were ignited when NATO

[740] Andrew Osborn, 'Dmitry Medvedev's Russia still feels the cold hand of Vladimir Putin', The London Telegraph, 7 Mar. 2010, in Google News Archive, accessed 1 Mar. 2012.

[741] David M. Herszenhorn, 'Putin Defends Stand on Syria and Chastises U.S. on Libya Outcome', The New York Times, 20 Dec. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 Feb. 2013.

forces became present in Libya and the West gained another strategic foothold in the Eastern hemisphere. The Siloviki and military traditionalists within the Kremlin were similarly disturbed by this decision they believed would contribute to the erosion of Russian security. The Russian Security Council's Patrushev and Baluyevsky would have condemned the move and urged Medvedev to act in Russia's interests, not for those of the Libyans. Medvedev knew of the possible outcome and he evaded those who would seek a reversal of his decision. Putin and Medvedev's public sparring after the decision was made highlights the first major clash between the Russian President and his Prime Minister.

The internal politics of the Kremlin were set to create a bureaucratic rebellion. Both Putin and the Russian Security Council had a common grievance against Medvedev. Putin, Patrushev, and Baluyevsky attempted to strengthen the role of the hardliners within the Kremlin by convincing Medvedev that a new presidential edict that would give the Russian Security Council and the Security Council Secretary expanded roles should be signed into law.

Alexander Golts, an analyst for *The St. Petersburg Times* wrote:

> From now on, the Security Council secretary will be responsible for "the control of Russia's armed forces, other forces, military formations and bodies," according to Medvedev's decree. That is to say the secretary will control not only the armed forces, but also law enforcement and intelligence agencies. Moreover, Medvedev's decree stipulates that the Security Council secretary will "participate in formulating and implementing foreign policy." The secretary will also "make proposals to the Security Council for coordinating the work of federal and regional executive bodies in national emergencies." In effect, the country's Siloviki, who previously answered only to the president, now have their own "czar."[742]

[742] Radio Free Europe, 'A National Leader in Search of a Post', Radio Free Europe [web page] (2011) <http://www.rferl.org/content/a_national_leader_in_search_of_a_post/24272951.html>, accessed 1 Dec. 2012.

Medvedev announced the edict during a Russian Security Council meeting and then switched the subject to recent forest fires in Russia.[743] The President did not focus solely on this new edict that may strengthen the role of the Russian Security Council. The President because of the Yeltsonian constitutional powers still controlled all the levers of power regardless of any document that theoretically strengthened a mechanism in the foreign policy apparatus.[744] The edict gave Patrushev a more visible presence in policy debates and provided new regulations for the Russian Security Council, but the Russian President's will was the overwhelming factor in whether this new edict that theoretically gave the Siloviki and military traditionalists a stronger platform on which they can advocate their beliefs in foreign policy matters would be implemented.

The new edict and Medvedev's signing of it, however unenthusiastic as it was, reveal that Medvedev had no choice but to appease the hawkish bureaucrats, especially Putin with whom he had had a public rift. The internal dynamics of the Kremlin began to form a serious challenge to Medvedev after his persistent marginalization of the Russian Security Council and decision to ignore the concerns of Putin with regards to Libya. The decision to abstain vetoing United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973 created an internal conflict within Putin's inner circle. The Russian President chose to make a decision that alienated the hawkish bureaucrats who occupy important roles in the government. Dr. Mark Galeotti commented on the edict, 'In symbolic terms, these moves were important, but in the Russian government the official rules are not always the same as the rules that are

[743] The Russian Security Council, 'Operational meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2011) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/646.html&usg=ALkJrhhFosLo94xufAX4cJ3U63tvakUUcA>, accessed 30 Nov. 2012.

[744] Boris Yeltsin, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010), < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.

unofficially practiced.'[745] The signing of an edict that theoretically strengthened the hardliners was Medvedev's attempt to pacify important members of the Kremlin who felt disenfranchised. The bureaucratic rearrangement and new edict were now to go in effect in confronting the decision of whether to consent to sanctions against the Assad regime in Syria.

Decisions:

The Russian Federation during the Medvedev presidency chose to veto United Nations Security Council sanctions against the Assad regime in Syria in October 2011 and February 2012.[746] Dr. Mark Galeotti notes, 'Russia felt cheated in Libya, so with Syria the Russians feel they have to go the other way to show they will not tolerate being treated that way.'[747] The position of intransigence in consenting to multilateral humanitarian intervention was characteristically different from the response to Libya. Putin announced his intention to return to the presidency, public support for the Putin-Medvedev regime was eroding, and the hardliners in the Kremlin attempted to expand their influence by reforming the internal machinery responsible for foreign policy formulation. The Kremlin was wary of the ramifications of making a decision that may have another NATO intervention because of Russian consent. The parliamentary elections and the protests were indicative of the precarious position United Russia was in. The Siloviki and military traditionalists were now determined to ensure that another 'NATO invasion' would not occur. Politically, Putin understood that in order to return to the presidency the Russian government must refrain

[745] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

[746] Paul Harris, 'Syria resolution vetoed by Russia and China at United Nations', The Guardian, 4 Feb. 2012., Google News Archive [online database], accessed 2 Dec. 2012.

[747] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

from making any foreign policy decisions that would ignite further tension among the Russian public.

With the foreign and defence arms neutralized because of loyal diplomats and a non-ideological Minister of Defence, the centre of foreign policy debate lay within the Kremlin between the technocratic President and hawkish bureaucrats belonging to the faction led by Prime Minister Putin, who sought to reassert the government under his control in order to safeguard his election and any 'spill over' effects from Medvedev's tenure into the new Putin presidency. Vladimir Putin was politically endangered and his relationship with his liberal handpicked successor was tested. The public rift, which lasted until Khadafy's bloody murder, was over and the necessary shift of the levers of power from the President to his inevitable successor was taking place. Medvedev's begrudging handling of the Syrian issue illuminates the internal dynamics that were chaotic within the Kremlin and the political ramifications in Russia's political environment. Putin needed to act cohesively with a Russian President who showed an independent nature in foreign policy, which was a quality that Medvedev lacked until the decision with regards to Libya.

The Gorbachovian forces of democratization were now working against a regime that had its legitimacy stem from the popularity and public image of Vladimir Putin. Putin's return to the presidency tarnished his image as well as United Russia's. The Libyan crisis that saw the intervention of a Western security organization did not stir any positive emotions from the Russian public. The surprise decision to abstain from vetoing the resolution against Libya was executed in a manner to evade the Russian citizenry from voicing its opposition. In June 2012 independent polling in Russia asked citizens about whether they believe Russia should intervene in Syria: 'Russians do not support any of the

parties involved in the conflict (57%).'[748] A majority of Russians believed that Russia should remain neutral and not support any factions involved.[749] The Russian public did not believe that the Libyan outcome was the proper course and this affected the public view of Syria's crisis. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva asserts that, 'The Russian public was very angry about the Libyan outcome. Russians keep saying that with Assad we don't trust the West in Syria.'[750]

In addition to the distrust stemming from United Nations Resolution 1973 against the Khadafy regime, Russian-Syrian ties were vastly different from the Russian-Libyan relationship. Syria and the Russian Federation had closer historical, political, and cultural links.[751] David Speedie asserts, 'Russia's history with Syria is much closer. Syria is a key player in the Middle East, where Russia tries to maintain influence. Syria is also a bulwark against regional powers. There are a million Russians working in Syria. Syria is vital for Russia's interests in the Middle East.'[752] The Putin-Medvedev regime, already experiencing an erosion of its legitimacy, had to act cautiously in order not to foment further public opposition in a political environment that made the support of the governed a requirement for governance.

Putin repeatedly disavowed his responsibility for the Libyan outcome and became much more sympathetic to the anti-Medvedev sentiment within the Kremlin displayed by the hardline elements.[753] Putin was in fact fighting for his political survival after Medvedev

---

[748] WCIOM, 'Conflict In Syria: What Russia Should Do', WCIOM [web page] (2012) <http://wciom.com/index.php?id=61&uid=693>, accessed 1 Nov. 2012.

[749] Ibid.

[750] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

[751] D. Speedie, 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 11 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

[752] Ibid.

[753] CNN, 'Putin and Medvedev spar over Libya', CNN [web page] (2011) <http://edition.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/europe/03/21/russia.leaders.libya/index.html>, accessed 2 Dec. 2012.

made a foreign policy decision that resulted in the unpopular NATO 'invasion' and the newly announced political arrangement that revealed Medvedev's role as nothing but a mere 'seat warmer.' The simultaneous events began a steady erosion of United Russia's control of the government. Therefore, Medvedev's political future was in danger as well. Putin's inner circle was collectively anxious over whether any possible future decisions will worsen the situation in relation to the constituents and further erode the legitimacy of the bureaucratic clan in power. The foundation for the regime's legitimacy was experiencing the most powerful tremors in its history, and the Gorbachovian forces of democratization had the potential to create mass discontent that could result in the democratic ouster of any politician or political party. The Russian public was fully informed and engaged with the affairs of domestic and foreign policy matters. Every decision was now tremendously important in continuing the transition into the Putin presidency and the continuation of United Russia's rule in Russian politics. As influential and popular as Putin was, the tides of popular opinion were now relegating him to a mere mortal fighting for political survival.

The world's attention was fixated on the current events in Syria after the Libyan crisis had come to an abrupt end. The Russian Federation rejected passing a United Nations Security Council statement condemning the Assad regime earlier in 2011 and now it was faced with motions to enforce sanctions.[754] With the new presidential edict strengthening the role of the Russian Security Council in May 2011, the presidential advisory forum had the opportunity to be a relevant mechanism in the decision-making process. Immediately prior to the vote on the United Nations Security Council, Medvedev convened his Security

[754] Paul Harris, 'Syria resolution vetoed by Russia and China at United Nations', The Guardian, 4 Feb. 2012., Google News Archive [online database], accessed 2 Dec. 2012.

Council to discuss pertinent matters on September 30, 2011.[755] The meeting was 'operational' and did not evoke any sense of emergency over a looming decision on the United Nations Security Council against Syria.[756] Medvedev, in his attempt to unify the fractious group of bureaucrats from distinctive factions, was forced to allow the Russian Security Council and its hawkish members to inquire about any possible decisions. Given this opportunity, the Russian Security Council, which is controlled by Siloviki and military traditionalists, would almost certainly attempt to sway the President into making a decision that would be compatible with the hawkish worldview that NATO should not be allowed to intervene in the domestic matters of a state for the sake of international security. This meeting then followed the Russian Security Council Secretary's meeting with the Supreme Allied Commander of NATO.[757] The meeting was described by the Russian government as follows:

> During the meeting generally agreed on the importance of understanding and strategic partnership between Russia and NATO. They discussed issues of cooperation between the Russian Federation and the Alliance for a settlement in Afghanistan, international security, the fight against piracy and the European missile defence system.[758]

The Silovik Patrushev was beginning to meet with high-ranking members on the world stage, and this marked a significant difference from his previous role as lower-level bureaucrat who met with unimportant foreign dignitaries. Patrushev was communicating directly with NATO and the Silovik faction was able to further widen its influence because

---

[755] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'Operational meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2011) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/677.html&usg=ALkJrhgzQW791cB1WAaQx7Zd9XY1cJOU4Q>, accessed 2 Dec. 2012.

[756] Ibid.

[757] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'On the meeting the Secretary of the Russian Security Council Nikolai Patrushev to the Supreme Allied Commander of NATO in Europe, Admiral Dzh.Stavridisom', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2011) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/676.html&usg=ALkJrhi1MrEsOu-Z8UEvJYpZhhA2-1AuFQ>, accessed 2 Dec. 2012.

[758] Ibid.

of the new opportunity and expanded role in foreign affairs. Patrushev and the Russian Security Council were now using the text of the presidential edict of May 2011 and the discouraged Prime Minister to mount a powerful offensive against Medvedev's foreign policy direction. The outcome of the Libyan Civil War and NATO intervention severely fractured the relationship between Medvedev and the Siloviki in the foreign policy apparatus. The expanded role was a move to pacify the disenchanted Prime Minister and Siloviki that Medvedev led in the formulation of foreign policy decisions. The tremors within the Kremlin because of what the hawkish bureaucrats viewed as 'the Libyan debacle' now shifted the personal dynamics and resulted in a stronger role of the faction opposed to Medvedev's 'multilateral humanitarian intervention' policy. Patrushev's meeting with the chief commander of NATO was a significant stroke of power that the Siloviki now enjoyed. Medvedev understood that the political fallout within the Kremlin because of his decision regarding Libya necessitated employing the Russian Security Council in a more potent manner for foreign policy matters and the need to pacify the disenchanted members of Putin's inner circle who occupy vital positions in government.

Patrushev's expanded role in the Kremlin took full force. In January 2012, Patrushev made an important statement with regards to a possible veto on the United Nations Security Council if sanctions were sought against Syria.[759] Nikolai Patrushev said, 'We are getting information that NATO members and some Persian Gulf States, operating according to the Libya scenario, intend to move from indirect intervention in Syrian affairs to direct military intervention.'[760] The Silovik worldview had an expanded platform and was reaping the rewards of the presidential edict of May 2011. It was akin to a 'new lease on life' for the Russian Security Council Secretary who was persistently marginalized by

[759] Andrew Osborn, 'Syria: NATO "planning direct military intervention', Russia claims"', The London Telegraph, 12 Jan. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 Dec. 2012.
[760] Ibid.

Medvedev. Technocrat Medvedev's concessions to the Silovik faction included an important presidential appointment in addition to the presidential edict and a generally more favourable treatment of the Russian Security Council.

Sergei Ivanov, an ardent Silovik and powerful voice in Russian politics, was appointed to Chief of Presidential Administration in December 2011.[761] Medvedev, the liberal-minded Technocrat, appointed one of the most forceful Siloviki in Russian political history to serve as his chief of staff and incidentally become a member of the Russian Security Council. Sergei Ivanov spent six years as the Russian Minister of Defence and notoriously opposed Putin's plans to cooperate with NATO and American military operations in Afghanistan.[762] Sergei Ivanov is fanatically anti-NATO and his appointment to become Medvedev's chief of staff is certainly an act in giving the Siloviki more opportunities to assert their policy beliefs. This further appeased the Silovik faction after the internal political fallout over the Libyan outcome.

On January 27, 2012, a week before the decision by the Russian Federation to veto a United Nation Security Council attempt to enforce sanctions against the Assad regime, the Russian Security Council was convened with Sergei Ivanov present, as well as the other influential Siloviki who were emboldened with an edict that was signed by Medvedev as a concession.[763] Medvedev was convening an advisory board with a strengthened role, controlled by bureaucrats with policy beliefs adverse to his liberal temperament. Medvedev was evidently kowtowing to the Siloviki who were mounting a powerful force against any

---

[761] Russia Today, 'Sergey Ivanov appointed presidential head of staff', Russia Today [web page] (2011) < http://rt.com/politics/ivanov-kremlin-administration-head-421/>, accessed 19 Nov. 2012.

[762] Michael Wines, 'After The Attacks: In Moscow; Russia Takes Stand Against Terrorism, but the Stance Wavers Quickly', The New York Times, 16 Sep. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 1 Dec. 2012.

[763] Security Council of The Russian Federation, 'Operational meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2012) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/693.html&usg=ALkJrhiuLQVZItU-3tObUT0B_wnGh8bPFg>, accessed 3 Dec. 2012.

decision that may help NATO gain another strategic foothold in the Eastern hemisphere. Sergei Ivanov, Nikolai Patrushev, and Vladimir Putin who were present during this meeting now had a united agenda: to prevent the Russian government from allowing any sanctions to be implemented against Syria that may become another excuse for NATO intervention. The Siloviki were united in their ideological policy pursuit and Medvedev was conciliatory in his treatment of them. The new balance of power within the Kremlin was a technocratic President making amends at the urging of the marginalized Siloviki whose leader was going to return to the presidency. Medvedev's technocratic style also precluded him from lashing out at the bureaucracy. The legal professional, who found that he was leading a Kremlin full of ideological clashes, was now mediating between himself and the Silovik faction for his political survival. The Syrian crisis was treated with greater Silovik involvement at the behest of a President who sought to prevent the inner circle from erupting into chaos.

Medvedev's decisions to veto the United Nations Security Council sanctions against Syria in October 2011 and February 2012 were made with the Silovik worldview becoming a powerful factor in the policy debates. The debates were not confined to personal discussions between Medvedev and Putin, but made it necessary within the inner sanctum for Medvedev to listen to the opinions of other influential Siloviki and military traditionalists during Russian Security Council meetings. The rift between Putin and Medvedev over Libya made Putin's loyalty lie more with his faction than his handpicked successor. When Putin's advice against the Libyan resolution was ignored, the rift contributed to a loss of internal political support from Putin. This transferred to the hawkish bureaucrats who with Putin now had a common grievance. While the internal dynamics had altered, the method with which the Kremlin implemented its decision still lay with the

Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Lavrov and Churkin remained loyal diplomats who believed in assertive diplomacy based on Western principles. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs' chameleon-like quality to project an assertive Putinist Russia with the hopes of solving issues in diplomatic forums has remained. Both decisions in October 2011 and February 2012 were conveyed to Lavrov and Churkin without any friction or ideological differences. Vitaly Churkin was noted as saying the following at the United Nations Security Council:

> Russia's UN ambassador, Vitaly Churkin, told the council after the vote that his country did not support the Assad regime or the violence but opposed the resolution because it was "based on a philosophy of confrontation," contained "an ultimatum of sanctions" and was against a peaceful settlement. He complained that the resolution did not call for the Syrian opposition to disassociate itself from "extremists" and enter into dialogue.[764]

'Based on a philosophy of confrontation' is the Kremlin's inherent fear that NATO will 'invade' Syria akin to the Libyan crisis.[765] The Siloviki and military traditionalists in the Kremlin feared that any sanctions against a state in the Middle East experiencing a civil uprising will lead to NATO and American intervention. The encroachment on international security in the Eastern hemisphere conflicts with core principles of the hawkish bureaucrats who view the world with a Cold War lens. The imminent NATO intervention was obfuscated during the Libyan crisis and the Russian Federation, even though it was characteristically against any Western intervention, indirectly consented to the sanctions against Libya with the myopic belief that the plight of Libyans outweighed the risk of NATO intervention. The United States, the West, and NATO were wilfully ignorant of Russian grievances against NATO in the aftermath. The Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs reflected this fact in a statement by its United Nations Ambassador regarding a possible outcome in Syria akin to Libya:

---

[764] 'Russia and China veto UN resolution against Syrian regime', The Guardian, 5 Oct. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 3 Dec. 2012.

[765] Ibid.

> Russia's U.N. envoy, Vitaly Churkin, accused the resolution's backers of "calling for regime change," pushing the opposition toward power and not stopping their provocations and feeding armed struggle. Some influential members of the international community, unfortunately including those sitting around this table, from the very beginning of the Syrian process have been undermining the opportunity for a political settlement.[766]

Churkin forcefully voiced the need for a peaceful solution and a 'political settlement' that do not involve the use of military force from foreign sources or regime change reminiscent of Khadafy's murder on live television.[767] The Kremlin was collectively against the Syrian regime being toppled by circumstances similar to the Libyan situation. After United Nations Resolution 1973 was passed, the outcome in Libya was vociferously protested by Putin.[768] He made no attempt to hide his disgust with what happened in Libya.[769] The Ministry of Foreign Affairs channelled the Kremlin's wishes and reflected the general sentiments of the Russian foreign policy apparatus. The Kremlin was always prone to implement decisions through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs without any bureaucratic obfuscation, meandering dialogue, or politicization of decisions. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was the dependable arm of the government because of the existence of the Yeltsin Liberals who remained loyal to the new leadership after Yeltsin's resignation. Lavrov and Churkin remained obedient and competent throughout their tenures that have spanned from the 1990's until the current day.

The defence and foreign affairs arms of the government were neutralized with loyal, obedient ministers who did not have political agendas of their own. This essentially meant that the only obstruction for policy decisions was within the Kremlin, especially when Medvedev's decisions were discussed and dissected beforehand as the presidential edict has

---

[766] Joseph Logan and Patrick Worsnip, 'Anger after Russia, China block U.N. action on Syria', Reuters, 5 Feb. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 3 Dec. 2012.

[767] Ibid.

[768] RIA Novosti, 'Putin says 'dumbfounded' over NATO operation in Libya', RIA Novosti [web page] (2011) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20110427/163739739.html >, accessed 2 Feb. 2013.

[769] Ibid.

expanded the role of the Russian Security Council. The internal mechanics of the Kremlin's foreign policy apparatus now allowed for Putin and the Siloviki to successfully influence against and possibly intervene in decisions that clash with central tenets of the Silovik or military traditionalist worldview. The Russian President addressed the possible United Nations sanctions against Syria:

> "Russia will use its rights as a permanent member of the Security Council. However, other appeals or statements on Syria, including under the UN Security Council's auspices, are possible," Medvedev said in an interview with the Financial Times newspaper published on Monday. "What I will not support is a resolution similar to 1973 on Libya, because I am convinced that a good resolution has been turned into a piece of paper to cover a senseless military operation," the President said.[770]

Medvedev's reasoning behind his decision to veto sanctions against Syria is directly related to the outcome of the Libyan sanctions that he chose to abstain from vetoing. David Speedie notes, 'Russia felt it was lied to about Libya, and it refuses to play a pivotal role in Syria, which is a closer ally. There was a sense of betrayal.'[771] Medvedev's statement is a clear reflection of the Silovik faction's expanded influence. The statement sounds almost directly from the mouth of Vladimir Putin. With the Russian Security Council meetings taking on a more important role, Sergei Ivanov, Vladimir Putin, and Nikolai Patrushev possessed the initiative and opportunity to voice their concerns regarding a possible intervention in Syria if Medvedev chose to consent to or abstain from United Nations Security Council sanctions. The collective voice was strengthened as a result of Medvedev's authority and concessions to the bureaucrats who were dismayed with his decision regarding Libya. The Siloviki were unconcerned with civilian casualties in Syria if it meant Western security architecture were able to firmly insert itself into another country. The world stage for the Siloviki revolved around the balance of power in the international

[770] RIA Novosti, 'Medvedev opposes Libya-style resolution on Syria', RIA Novosti [web page] (2012) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20110620/164716194.html>, accessed 3 Dec. 2012.

[771] D. Speedie, 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 11 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

security arena. Medvedev now faced this internal rebellion that also made him appoint Sergei Ivanov, a member of the opposite side of the political spectrum, to be his chief of staff. Medvedev knew that his presidency was facing internal dissent in the Kremlin and it was important to not marginalize the Siloviki further, especially since Putin announced his intention to return to the presidency.

The personal dynamics between Putin and Medvedev had always shielded the latter from the ideological and bureaucratic wrath of the Silovik faction, but Medvedev's actions with regards to Libya thwarted the ruling tandem. Putin allied himself with his fellow Siloviki and internally moved to give his faction more authority to return Russian foreign policy to a more independent, non-Western sympathetic set of policies. Intervening in a foreign country during a civil uprising and facilitating Western intervention violated core tenets of Putin's worldview. The appointment of Sergei Ivanov and the Russian Security Council's strengthened role now shifted the policy debates in a more Cold War worldview of international affairs. Putin's eventual return to the presidency was beginning to erode the Medvedev era's uniqueness. The Russian government reminiscent prior to Medvedev's inauguration in 2008 was beginning to reassert itself.

Medvedev's response to the internal backlash because of his Libyan decision reveals that the personal dynamics within the Kremlin maintain a powerful incentive for concessions as evident in his edict and appointment of Sergei Ivanov to the Chief of Presidential Administration position. Dr. Mark Galeotti comments on the importance of the appointment, 'Sergei Ivanov was another Putin, speaks to the same constituency and to the same issues.'[772] The Russian President had severely fractured his relationship with his mentor and the hawkish bureaucrats who occupy powerful positions in the Kremlin. Putin

[772] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

had announced his intention that he will run for President in the 2012 election. Medvedev was a loyal, obedient Technocrat who possessed little ambition of his own. He publicly acknowledged the support of Putin as a cornerstone of his presidency, and he gladly stepped down from the presidency in 2012. Putin and Medvedev's relationship may have been strained, but Medvedev's respect for his mentor remained. Medvedev still desired to remain active in Russian politics and knew that his relationship with Putin needed to be rehabilitated in order to remain in the highest corridors of power. The Yeltsonian forces were shifting from Medvedev to Putin; this fact meant that Medvedev's decisions must not further create tension within the Kremlin. Medvedev's political survival in terms of having an important role in the Russian government rested on the opinion of one man, Vladimir Putin. Medvedev's furious mentor was the man who would most likely become President in 2012 and possibly remain in that position until 2024.

The Medvedev presidency was in full conciliatory mode to appease Putin and the Siloviki with whom Medvedev would have to compete with for influence in the post-Medvedev presidency. The Yeltsonian forces of the Russian presidency would soon become Putin's again and as important as Medvedev's career has been for Russia, Putin will be able to theoretically dismiss him without any justifiable reason when he returned to the highest office in government. The 1993 Russian Constitution gives the Russian President unlimited power over the executive branch of government, and Medvedev's arrangement will make him susceptible to the powerful Yeltsonian forces when he steps down. A decision to consent to sanctions against Syria after experiencing a personal rift with Putin after the Libyan outcome would have certainly made Medvedev a prime candidate for dismissal by Putin when the latter eventually became President. Medvedev was cautious not to further infuriate the man who most likely will be empowered by the

constitutional powers authored by Yeltsin to give the occupant of the presidential office unquestionable, unchallengeable power to wield authority over the bureaucracy that served the Russian President. Medvedev was now unable to agree to sanctions against the Assad regime because his political future within Putin's inner circle depended on it.

Announcing the return of Vladimir Putin to the presidential arena and Medvedev consenting albeit indirectly to NATO intervention in Libya severely damaged the legitimacy of the Putin-Medvedev regime that had until now governed with the overwhelming confidence of the Russian public. The decision to enforce sanctions against Libya that resulted in Khadafy's bloody demise on live television and NATO's 'domination' of another country resulted in a public questioning of Medvedev's intentions. The Medvedev government made a decision that led to foreign intervention by the West and resulted in the infringement of Libyan sovereignty. NATO taking full command of the military operations offended the security instincts of the Russian public that had historically viewed the collective military organization as a threat to Russia. The Russian government was seen as 'emboldening the enemy' and Medvedev's foreign policy intentions were now open for debate and criticism. The Russian President effectively allowed the West to commence a military intervention that toppled a foreign government; the domestic political scene was left wondering why Medvedev, a stalwart ally of Putin, would allow this to happen. The Russian public was left to debate over whether civilian casualties in a foreign country gave Medvedev the moral justification to allow NATO intervention. The foreign policy credentials of the Medvedev presidency were now being actively examined by the Russian public.

The NATO intervention of Libya and the announcement of Putin's return to presidential politics were fomenting active opposition by the engaged Russian citizenry.

The Gorbachovian forces of an empowered Russian public now posed a challenge to Putin, Medvedev, and United Russia. The political party suffered substantial losses during the parliamentary elections in December 2011.[773] Public legitimacy for United Russia and its leading politicians was eroding. The Libyan outcome and Medvedev's intention to step down were driving forces behind the Russian public openly and vociferously questioning the ruling party and its leader, Vladimir Putin, and his 'pawn,' Dmitry Medvedev. The Kremlin was subjugated to months of protests and activists criticizing the Putin-Medvedev regime. The political environment that heralded the democratic forces facilitated by Gorbachev now gave Putin and Medvedev powerful imperatives to not act in any way that can be interpreted as against the interests of the Russian citizens and their country. Risky or dangerous moves were not an option during a time of such civil discontent. The tone of the Kremlin became conciliatory and United Russia and its presidential candidate were for the first time in political danger.

Medvedev, even if he had desired to, could not make a decision that would consent to sanctions imposed by Western security architecture. The timing within the Russian political environment was during an erosion of legitimacy. The political future of all important members of United Russia now depended on quelling public discontent by acting cautiously and in concert with public opinion. Making a decision that emboldened NATO and revealing that Medvedev was a mere 'seat warmer' for Putin posed powerful risks to the credibility and validity of the Putin-Medvedev regime. Medvedev could not consent to sanctions against Syria. If he had made that decision, the erosion of support may have been catastrophic for Putin's inner circle and Putin himself. The Gorbachovian forces of democratization were working against the Medvedev presidency and the cautious behaviour

[773] Miriam Elder, 'Putin shaken by United Russia's poor election performance', The Guardian, 5 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Nov. 2012.

of the regime is a testament to how the public opinion of constituents is the most powerful force within the Russian Federation. No leader of the Russian government can neglect the wishes of the governed without risking the end of his or her political career.

Reflections:

The final legacy of the Medvedev presidency will be one of intransigence in relation to the Syrian crisis that is ongoing at the time of this writing. The Russian Federation's decision to not veto sanctions against Libya and its outcome had a direct impact on the foreign policy decision with regards to Syria. The Putin-Medvedev regime was suffering from an erosion of legitimacy at a time when foreign policy crises erupted in the Middle East. Prior to the announcement of Putin's return to presidential politics, the Russian public was increasingly critical of the NATO intervention in Libya that Medvedev chose not to veto. The confluence of these events put the Putin-Medvedev regime through the crucible of the Gorbachovian forces of democratization. The empowered masses began to vocally and actively question the leaders in the Kremlin. For the first time since Putin was inaugurated to the Russian presidency in 2000, the Russian public chose to confront the government with the full force of an informed, engaged citizenry that was moulded by the Gorbachovian reforms of Glasnost and Perestroika. The Putin-Medvedev regime during 2011 and 2012 was acting in a political environment that threatened its leadership and had the ability to facilitate its ouster. The parliamentary elections in 2011 and Putin's conciliatory tone were a testament to the power of the Russian citizenry.[774] The Russian Federation's government was subservient to the constituents it served. United Russia's existence in political life was being threatened, and the bureaucrats who were affected by this now acted cautiously to not further foment public opposition.

[774] Ibid.

The foreign policy decision made by Medvedev with respect to Libya clashed with Putin and the Siloviki in government. Giving NATO the opportunity to further increase its control of international security did not please the hardline elements of the Kremlin. Putin and Medvedev's public rift was proof that Medvedev chose to exercise his own judgment over the objections of his mentor. Whether Putin was set to run for President again at that time is not certain, but with the announcement that he would made in September 2011 it became clear that Medvedev was now making decisions with the full knowledge that his Silovik mentor would hold the reins of power again. Medvedev understood that with Putin in the office of the Russian President again he was now ending his presidency with the necessity that he must act according to the wishes of the man who would eventually reassert his control of the Yeltsonian constitutional forces. Prime Minister Putin could only criticize the decisions of President Medvedev, but President Putin could seek to rectify past grievances that existed in his mind by demoting or dismissing Medvedev from United Russia completely. Medvedev was also acting in the interest of preserving his close relationship with Putin, who opposed sanctions against Syria and could potentially seek political revenge against his handpicked successor within the 'palace politics' of the Kremlin.

The Medvedev presidency for the first time in its history was experiencing internal tremors within the Kremlin and a harsh political environment that was beginning to vociferously oppose United Russia and its leaders. Medvedev sought to pacify the Siloviki by signing a presidential edict strengthening the role of the Russian Security Council, appointing an influential Silovik to be his chief of staff, and vetoing any United Nations Security Council efforts to sanction the Assad regime in Syria. These concessions clearly show that Medvedev aimed to preserve his connection to Putin and the Siloviki he leads in

government in order to maintain a close personal and professional association with them in the future of the post-Medvedev presidency. The statements Medvedev made about a possible resolution against the Assad regime echoed all of the sentiments of Putin, the Siloviki, and any security-obsessed bureaucrats. The Medvedev presidency was predicated on the Technocrats and Siloviki of Putin's inner circle working productively together and Medvedev's decision to abstain from vetoing the Libyan resolution severely fractured the personal dynamics upon which his presidential career relied. The Medvedev presidency was transitioning into the Putin presidency, and now the Gorbachovian and Yeltsonian forces obstructed Medvedev's ability to produce any vote other than a veto of the Syrian sanctions on the United Nations Security Council. In addition to this, Medvedev's need to pacify his mentor and the Siloviki led to significant changes in the bureaucratic arrangements of the Kremlin. Namely, the Russian Security Council featured more prominently in policy debates and the Chief of Presidential Administration position was given to a Silovik who rivalled Putin's influence and anti-Western sentiment in the Kremlin. Repeating the Libyan outcome in Syria was not viable.

Medvedev's presidency ended with the inauguration of President Putin and his appointment to Prime Minister in 2012. Medvedev's political career was secure to the extent that his decision with regards to Syria did not further damage his relationship with his hawkish mentor. Had his decision in response to Syria taken a similar course to that in Libya, Medvedev's reputation for conceding Russian security to NATO would have further destroyed his reputation within Putin's inner circle and may have even led to a Russian uprising against the Putin-led government. Medvedev did not therefore risk enraging his mentor who would eventually possess the Yeltsonian powers that enable the termination of Medvedev's career, nor did he seek to allow NATO to intervene again to the chagrin of the

Russian public and the hardline elements within the Kremlin. Medvedev's final decision was made with the full knowledge that the next Russian President must be appeased and that the Russian citizenry must regain trust in United Russia by witnessing a rejection of NATO's expanding security grip. Medvedev's rejection of the resolutions against Syria was influenced by the Yeltsonian and Gorbachovian forces that posed a threat to his career and United Russia's rule. The only viable option was to veto a possible repetition of the Libyan outcome in Syria. Medvedev's decision appeased the Russian public who had the potential to oust United Russia from government. It also appeased the Siloviki and their leader, Vladimir Putin, whose own presidency in 2012 was characterized by the same intransigence with respect to the Syrian crisis. The Governmental Politics Model was utilized by the principles expressly included earlier in this thesis. The issue of decision-making with respect to the Arab Spring uprisings and the current state of Putin's inner circle dominating the Kremlin make Graham Allison's mode of analysis convenient for examining the personalities, ideologies, and informal networks of power involved in this foreign policy episode.

Chapter: Conclusion

Introduction:

The thesis introduced a foundation for understanding the modern day Kremlin through the prism of Graham Allison's Governmental Politics Model. The introduction and the first chapter of this thesis both detailed the necessary framework from *Essence of Decision* for the analysis of foreign policy episodes during the Medvedev presidency.[775] The chapters that followed using this framework illuminated the foreign policy decision-making for the reader by consciously assessing the five central principles of the Governmental Politics Model.

Ultimately, this thesis took the view that institutions are controlled by people with particular characteristics, tendencies, and perceptions. The modern Kremlin is no exception. As was evident in previous chapters, Kremlin bureaucrats have reacted to foreign policy issues with the personal dynamics playing out in the new Russian political atmosphere, which was moulded by both Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin, respectively. No modern day Russian President or political circle occupying the Kremlin can now wilfully ignore the passions of the governed. The President of the Russian Federation is beholden to the constituents he or she governs as a result of the Gorbachovian forces of democratization. By the same token, the government agencies and mechanisms within the executive branch and outside of the executive structure are beholden to the President of the Russian Federation. This is, as has been argued, because of the Yeltsonian forces stemming from the vastly superior presidential entitlements of the Yeltsin-authored constitution in 1993. The personal dynamics of the bureaucrats occupying powerful positions within the

[775] Graham T. Allison and Philip D. Zelikow, Essence of Decision, (Boston, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publisher Inc., 1999).

Kremlin play out within this political atmosphere created by Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin. The thesis traced these respective legacies throughout the chapters.

The Power of The Citizenry:

The Gorbachovian forces of democratization have made the Russian public and its perceptions and opinions a vital cornerstone of the Kremlin's decision-making and political posturing. The Russian public is mistrustful of the West more so than any other political or geographical aspect of the world stage. Dr. Sergei Khrushchev notes, 'Western countries are responsible for more deaths and violence in the Russian mind.'[776] The United States, the symbolic leader of the West, has never been regarded by the Russian public as a harmonious partner in the international community. The Soviet era may be over, but the perception of the United States as a country that acts for its own interests persists among the Russian citizenry.

Russians are not particularly concerned with rogue regimes, such as Iran or North Korea. In addition to this, Russians are not motivated to support any foreign intervention on humanitarian grounds when it does not concern Russia directly. The international community's calls to enforce human rights norms are viewed as inspired by the United States widening and strengthening its hegemony. This clashes with the view that Russia is still a great power, notwithstanding the fall of the Soviet Union. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva opines, that 'Russians are Russians and believe they are a great nation.'[777] This nationalist sentiment among Russians is undeniable and is a key reason for the aversion toward the West and NATO. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva also asserts that, 'Russians believe America dictates the world. NATO is an extension of the West and that whole Missile Defence

[776] S. Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.

[777] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

Shield is an extension of this.'[778] This refusal to wholly cooperate with NATO stems from the mistrust of the West and the belief that Russia's great power status must not be thwarted by the United States or any Western collective security organization.

The Kremlin was able to order military operations against Georgia in its breakaway regions because the Russian public linked Saakashvili to NATO enlargement. Saakashvili's pro-West, pro-NATO foreign policy made him a major enemy of the Russian Federation in the court of public opinion. Medvedev was fully empowered to make this decision because Russian public opinion was overwhelmingly against Saakashvili and his regime. Medvedev's first major foreign policy act, which was the Russian Federation's first unilateral war against another country, was ordered in concert with the public opinion of his constituents upon whom the careers of Medvedev and Putin, as well as the inner circle, depended. Military action against a country next to Russia's borders moving closer to NATO when a Missile Defence Shield installed by the West existed in the Czech Republic satisfied the Russian constituents because this was done for the express reason to safeguard citizens against Western security architecture.

The Russian public is unconcerned with any nuclear threat from North Korea or Iran because it does not consider these countries to be 'rogue regimes.' Russians are hesitant to accept any such Western characterizations because ulterior motives are always attributed to American foreign policy and intervention. The Kremlin however was fully observant of all events on the world stage and the events in Kyrgyzstan are proof of this. Kyrgyzstan is not a major country of importance in the minds of the Russian public, but the Kremlin made the decision to support and implement the ousting of President Bakiyev, who had reneged on his agreement to evict the American military base in his country. The

[778] Ibid.

decision to support his ousting and endorse the new government after Bakiyev was a concerted effort by the Russian foreign policy apparatus that had its tentacles reach throughout the uprising and establishment of a new pro-Russian government in Kyrgyzstan. The Russian public required coaxing in order to grant legitimacy to the Russian political leadership for such a foreign policy approach. For several months, the Kremlin directed all state-owned media in Russia and Kyrgyzstan to perpetuate anti-Bakiyev propaganda to sway public opinion against him in both countries. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva observed the blatant use of media control for the Kremlin's goals in Kyrgyzstan in the following terms: 'In propaganda, war is a breeding ground for propaganda. You need to convince your people that the decision was right.'[779] The Kremlin, after months of anti-Bakiyev media propaganda inundating the lives of citizens in Russia and Kyrgyzstan, was fully empowered by the Russian constituents to support and openly play a hand in establishing a post-Bakiyev government. The Kremlin manipulated the powerful forces of Gorbachovian democratization for its own purposes, and this manipulation is evidence that when Russian public opinion matters in foreign policy decisions, the political leadership must coalesce and court the public opinion of its constituents. A blatant disregard for Russian public opinion when Russians are fully involved in foreign policy events is the equivalent of risking political demise.

Dmitry Medvedev's decision to abstain from vetoing United Nations Resolution 1973 against Libya is a case in point. The decision was made quickly as events both in Libya and the international community were occurring rapidly. President Medvedev wilfully neglected the concern that the resolution may entail NATO intervention and he chose to proceed, even though the Russian public would disapprove of this resolution if the

[779] Ibid.

Western collective security architecture added Libya to its myriad of strategic footholds in the Eastern hemisphere. Ambassador Stephen Sestanovich has asserted that NATO intervention in the event the resolution was passed was unquestionable.[780] This signifies that Medvedev chose to indirectly endorse a resolution that would bring in Western security architecture into Libya, which his constituents feared and mistrusted. This was a foreign policy act that clashed with Russian public opinion. In addition to this, the decision for Putin to return to the presidency was announced months later. The Russian public was furious over Medvedev's role in NATO's 'domination' of Libya and the fact that the 'tandem democracy' was a political ploy to keep Putin in power. Russian public opinion against the Putin-Medvedev regime was now in full force.

The Medvedev presidency was in conciliatory mode until Medvedev handed Putin the reins of power in 2012. The Syrian crisis enveloped the attention of the international community, and Medvedev could not make a similar decision that would involve a possible foreign intervention to end the Assad regime's violence. Russian public opinion after the Libyan intervention was overwhelmingly against similar action, and the polls asking Russian citizens about a possible intervention in Syria cemented the need for the Kremlin to choose a policy of intransigence by its refusal to commit to sanctions against the Assad regime or repeat an abstention. The politically damaged Kremlin and Putin's candidacy for the presidency did not counter the powerful Gorbachovian forces of an empowered citizenry that was going to elect the next President of the Russian Federation in 2012. The parliamentary elections in 2011 indicated that United Russia's poor performance was a result of the damaging actions taken by the Putin-Medvedev regime. Sanctions against Syria akin to the Libyan outcome were not viable because Russian public opinion was

[780] S. Sestanovich, 'Russia's Role in Libya and Syria' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 24 January 2013, School of International & Public Affairs, New York, New York.

already eroding the legitimacy of the Kremlin's inner circle. The 2012 presidential election precluded any sanctions against the Assad regime because of the precarious ground the Kremlin stood on in terms of Russian public opinion. The reforms of Mikhail Gorbachev and his empowerment of the Russian citizenry were therefore arguably in full fruition.

The Yeltsonian Office of The Russian President:

While the Russian President is beholden to the Russian constituents because of Mikhail Gorbachev's legacy, the Russian government is wholly subservient to the Russian President because of Boris Yeltsin's legacy. Boris Yeltsin's constitutional crisis in 1993 resulted in a vastly more powerful Russian presidency. Dr. Sergei Khrushchev notes, 'It was this event by Yeltsin that created the current presidential system.'[781] The Yeltsonian forces of a superior presidential office in relation to the other branches of government and the agencies and mechanisms within the executive branch have established Medvedev's firm control over the bureaucracy that served him. No facet of the Russian government can obstruct or compete with the office of the Russian presidency because of the broad constitutional powers it possesses.

In every foreign policy decision analyzed in this body of research, Medvedev ordered and implemented his decisions without any involvement, interference, or supervision of the judicial or legislative branches of the Russian government. No Supreme Court Judge or Duma elected official can pose any obstruction to the will of the President, which is the overriding force shaping the modus operandi of the Russian government. The decision to commit to a war against Georgia only required the order of Dmitry Medvedev. No member of government was constitutionally entitled to inquire about the decision, nor was any member of government able to sway the decision or implementation to any degree

[781] S. Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.

that would be against Medvedev's wishes. Furthermore, the decision to intervene in the Kyrgyz uprising against Bakiyev required only the office of the Russian presidency to be involved and make pertinent decisions regarding goals with respect to this country. In spite of the National Security Concept document of 2009 and the edict in 2011 strengthening the role of the advisory mechanism, Medvedev chose not to involve this facet of his office to help him formulate and implement decisions with respect to foreign policy issues until the end of his presidency because of the tense personal dynamics involved. Medvedev was characteristically and temperamentally incompatible with Nikolai Patrushev and General Baluyevsky, who controlled the Russian Security Council. The Yeltsonian forces of a powerful presidency allowed Medvedev to impede and marginalize this presidential mechanism that sought a more important role during his presidency. The will of Dmitry Medvedev was the ultimate factor in the utilization of the Russian Security Council. Medvedev's foreign policy decisions however always entailed consulting his Prime Minister and instructing the relevant ministry for implementation. The Yeltsonian forces relegated the Siloviki and military traditionalists with whom Medvedev did not want to conduct foreign policy. The will of the Russian President was the supreme and unquestionable factor in how the office of the Russian President chose to facilitate the desired outcomes of pressing foreign policy issues.

The most important example of the powerful effects of the Yeltsonian forces was Medvedev's ignorance of concerns by the hardline elements of the Kremlin, as well as those of his mentor and Prime Minister, when the Russian President chose to abstain from vetoing United Nations Resolution 1973 against Libya. Medvedev used his presidential powers to ignore the concerns of all influential Siloviki and military traditionalists by instructing the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to abstain on the United Nations Security

Council. This important foreign policy episode is a testament that even though the Prime Minister was immensely influential and his inner circle occupied the Kremlin, the President of the Russian Federation was the final authority on the Libyan matter. Medvedev's will to save innocent Libyans from the Khadafy regime's wrath was the overriding factor in this foreign policy decision.

The decision for Putin to return to the presidency was announced in September 2011 when the Syrian crisis was escalating. Medvedev was still in control of the executive branch of the government and he theoretically was able to make the decision to consent to sanctions against the Assad regime. The Medvedev presidency was transitioning into the Putin presidency with the latter's victory a foregone conclusion. The powerful Yeltsonian forces would soon be in the hands of Vladimir Putin and Medvedev would become constitutionally subservient to him reminiscent of the first Putin presidency. Medvedev could not make another decision that would entail foreign intervention in Syria when Putin was furious because of the NATO 'invasion' in Libya. Medvedev's future career would soon be in the hands of Vladimir Putin, who would be entitled to dismiss Medvedev because of the 1993 Russian Constitution. Medvedev chose not to risk his political demise within Putin's inner circle because the powerful presidential entitlements would soon make Medvedev completely subservient in relation to his infuriated mentor. Medvedev's refusal to consent or abstain from sanctions in Syria resulted from his cognizance that Putin was the final authority in determining the path of Medvedev's career in a second Putin presidency. The case studies in this thesis provided the analysis that confirmed the two powerful legacies of Gorbachev and Yeltsin were respectively ingrained in Russian foreign policy-making.

Chapters 3 and 5 examined the Russian Federation's approach toward nuclear security issues. The Medvedev Administration faced international calls to enforce sanctions against rogue regimes developing illegal nuclear weapon arsenals. The Russian predisposition to consent to United Nations Security Council sanctions against Iran and North Korea is well established; the Putin presidency consented to similar sanctions against both countries several times. During the author's interview with the former United States Assistant Secretary of Defence, Mr. Richard Perle comments, 'The Kremlin is largely in the hands of former KGB operatives.'[782] As evident by the continuation of this trend of consenting to sanctions against rogue regimes that pose a significant nuclear threat, the Medvedev presidency was strongly influenced by the security-obsessed bureaucrats to rein in these regimes from acquiring nuclear potential.

The security threat of nuclear-armed Iran and North Korea are horrifying to the Siloviki who would not allow these issues to be ignored. David Speedie asserts that, 'The pattern Russia has is fear of unstable regimes to its south. Russia is a neighbour to every nasty situation from North Korea to the Middle East.'[783] North Korea's nuclear range would be able to target eastern Russia, while Iran's nuclear weapons might start a war in the 'near East.' Both possibilities are of great relevance to Putin and the Siloviki who believe that Russian security must come first in terms of priority. There is a striking nuance, however. Russia still enjoys fruitful relations with both countries that are considered flagrant violators of international law. As examined earlier, during the Medvedev presidency, Russia still supports China in its defence of North Korea in denuclearization negotiations and even after sanctions against the regime of Kim Il Jung

[782] R. Perle, 'Russia's Security Fears' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 7 January 2013, American Enterprise Institute, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

[783] D. Speedie, 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 11 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

were passed by the United Nations Security Council, Vladimir Putin called the North Korean government on one of its public holidays to express warm wishes. In a similar situation during the Medvedev presidency, the Russian government reached out to Teheran after the United Nations Security Council sanctions against Iran passed. The 'diplomatic but assertive' foreign policy that dictates complete independence from the West has not evolved from the early days of the Putin presidency in 2000. The sanctions passed against rogue regimes are blunted because Russia insists that United Nations Security Council Resolutions should not affect the citizens or economies of respective countries. The Russian foreign policy approach with respect to rogue regimes has not changed since it was originally initiated by Vladimir Putin in 2000.

Chapters 2 and 4 examined the Kremlin's approach toward issues in the post-Soviet space, which of course the Russian Federation aims to influence and dominate. The Medvedev presidency began during a time when an increased focus on the Central Asian region had been in fruition since after the September 11 attacks.[784] David Speedie notes, 'Putin has a strong nationalist strain that focuses on a Eurasian foreign policy.'[785] The episode with Georgia proved that the Central Asian sphere and its control by the Russian Federation was a primary goal of the Medvedev Administration. While the Yeltsin Administration placed a powerful emphasis on its foreign policy with the West, the post-Yeltsin Kremlin has reasserted Russian involvement in the Central Asian region.[786] The Russian Federation had watched the American involvement in the Middle East increase exponentially after the terrorist attacks in September 2001. The Kremlin began a collective

[784] Roy Allison, 'Strategic Reassertion in Russia's Central Asia Policy.' International Affairs Journal, 80/2 (2004), 277-293 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3569242>, accessed 2 Feb. 2013.

[785] D. Speedie, 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 11 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

[786] Roy Allison, 'Strategic Reassertion in Russia's Central Asia Policy.' International Affairs Journal, 80/2 (2004), 277-293 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3569242>, accessed 2 Feb. 2013.

effort to solidify its grasp on Eurasia as a result of the new tentacles of power in the Middle East. Furthermore, the Missile Defence Shield in the Czech Republic hastened Russian foreign policy-makers to assert the Russian Federation in regions where the United States' influence was tenuous. The strategic battle over military basing in Kyrgyzstan further proves this point. The Russian Federation's security dilemma stemmed from American domination in the Middle East and NATO security architecture looming in Eastern Europe. Central Asia was Russia's last hope to preserve its 'great power status.' The balancing and jousting for influence and control was centred in this region.[787]

Pro-active manoeuvres in the Central Asian region were manifested in the orders to launch a war against Saakashvili in Georgia and support the ouster of Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan. Both of whom were considered pro-West, pro-American by the Kremlin in a region that Russia sought to dominate. The war against Georgia, which was motivated by Tbilisi's alignment with the West and NATO, was ordered by Dmitry Medvedev by virtue of the order being given to and implemented by the Minister of Defence of the Russian Federation. The personal dynamics of the Kremlin played out in this episode with Georgia. Namely, Medvedev intentionally left the Russian Security Council out of the equation because of his personal aversion to those who control it. Dr. Mark Galeotti stated, that 'The Medvedev team had no real traction with the Siloviki. With Georgia, it was clear that Putin had to consent first.'[788] Medvedev showed absolutely no loyalty toward or acknowledgment of the other Silovik bureaucrats serving him, except for Vladimir Putin who was his mentor. In addition to this, Medvedev allowed time between the Georgian attack against Russian personnel in the breakaway regions and his order to respond militarily. Medvedev,

[787] Roy Allison, 'Strategic Reassertion in Russia's Central Asia Policy.' International Affairs Journal, 80/2 (2004), 277-293 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3569242>, accessed 2 Feb. 2013.

[788] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

the new President of the Russian Federation, delayed the order for the purpose of being able to have Putin insert his input in the decision. Putin admitted to being in communication with the Kremlin while he was in Beijing during that time period. Dr. Mark Galeotti notes, 'Medvedev knew he couldn't give the order without Putin. That would have been a declaration of war in more ways than one because of the internal dynamics.'[789] Medvedev implemented this order by using his presidential prerogative not to include hawkish bureaucrats with whom he had no ideological or personal affinity and delaying the order to allow Putin's involvement in this decision, which Medvedev claims was his own.

Former republics of the Soviet Union were experiencing uprisings and revolutions that ignited the security concerns of the Kremlin, especially Vladimir Putin who increased Russian involvement in these countries during his first presidency. Dr. Alexander Cooley comments, 'After the Colour Revolutions, the Kremlin began to think the West is facilitating these and now they were jostling with the US for influence. It offended Russia's image of its power and prestige.'[790] Russia's perception of its 'great power status' is a key motivation for its intricate involvement in the region. The pro-American Bakiyev and his regime in Bishkek became persona non grata in the Kremlin when he reneged on his plans to close the American military base in Kyrgyzstan. His ousting, which the anti-Bakiyev opposition attributes to the support of Vladimir Putin, has facilitated a pro-Russian government that now espouses the Kremlin as its primary political and economic link on the world stage. Dr. Alexander Cooley states, 'Today, Kyrgyzstan is very close to Russia politically and economically. Russia sees the country as a client outpost.' [791]

[789] Ibid.

[790] A. Cooley, 'The ouster of President Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 14 December 2012, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

[791] Ibid.

The Kremlin publicly denied any involvement, even though the anti-Bakiyev forces revealed the extensive role Russia played. Medvedev and Putin made this decision to support Bakiyev's ousting, but the decision continues the Russian trend in Central Asia started by Vladimir Putin during his first term as President. Dr. Alexander Cooley opines, 'I don't see Medvedev's imprint on the ousting of Bakiyev. This was implementing Putin's vision.'[792] The Russian goal of securing the Central Asian region most notably began when Sergei Ivanov voiced his opposition to Russia assisting the United States and NATO with access to military bases in Uzbekistan or any other post-Soviet country. While Vladimir Putin consented to assisting with military operations in Afghanistan, he rejected any possibility for assistance with the Iraq War.[793] This is an example of today's Russia that is assertive and defines its involvement in world affairs by the vision of Putin and the Siloviki. Russian security and the balance of power were paramount to prosperity according to the security-obsessed bureaucrats.

NATO enlargement concerned Putin and every Silovik and military traditionalist in the Russian government. New START and the episode with Kyrgyzstan occurred simultaneously. While New START provided a cogent diplomatic summit, it did not amount to any tangible gains by either side. Russian consent to the treaty stemmed from its wishes to begin discussing alternatives to the Missile Defence Shield system in Prague. Dr. Alexander Cooley comments, 'Russia wanted new world security architecture, so they see it (The New START Treaty) as a building block toward this goal of replacing NATO. It was mostly summitry.'[794] The security interests of Russia were the guiding force in cooperating with this act of summit diplomacy. When the Kremlin's wishes to negotiate the

[792] Ibid.

[793] Walter Pincus, 'Russia Warned U.S. About Iraq, Putin Says', The Washington Post, 19 June 2004, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 21 Feb. 2013.

[794] Ibid.

Missile Defence Shield were ignored, Medvedev promptly and uncharacteristically issued a warning of an impending arms race if the United States did not address this situation with Russia in an equitable manner.

The Russian Federation today still believes that the post-Soviet space is a 'privileged interest' as it has officially stated. No bureaucrat who believes Russia is a great power is willing to concede countries that once belonged to the Soviet Union to NATO and Western influence. Kyrgyzstan began drifting toward the West during a time NATO enlargement was increasing and Western security architecture in the Czech Republic concerned bureaucrats in the Kremlin. Russia's 'privileged interests' were being trampled on. The mercurial Bakiyev and his cooperation with an American military base in Kyrgyzstan now posed a significant threat in the minds of Russian Cold War warriors and former intelligence operatives. Dr. Alexander Cooley comments on Russian unease over Kyrgyzstan, 'Putin's vision of the world was that Kyrgyzstan should have consulted him about allowing the Americans to use Manas for their military purposes.'[795] The Kremlin's outright anger over Bakiyev's 'double-dealing' made him an enemy in the collective sentiment of the Russian foreign policy apparatus. It was this issue that led the Kremlin to covertly support his ousting by ordering government-owned media to begin a propaganda offensive against him. Putin's vision of a Russian-dominated post-Soviet space and its jostling with the United States and the West were manifested in a strategic battle of control over military bases in Kyrgyzstan. The Russian Federation acted in a manner to countervail the increasing Western and NATO security architecture inhibiting or infringing Russian security at a time NATO and the United States were intricately involved in the Middle East

[795] Ibid.

and Europe. Putin and the hawkish bureaucrats acted in the interests of preserving Russian influence to ensure the prosperity and security of the Russian Federation.

Chapters six and seven examined Russia's responses to the uprisings in Libya and Syria as a result of the Arab Spring. In every foreign policy decision until the Libyan crisis, Medvedev had alienated the Siloviki and military traditionalists, but accommodated his Prime Minister. David Speedie notes, 'Putin and Medvedev have a mentor-mentee relationship.'[796] The relationship between these two men was robust and politically necessary for Medvedev's leadership. While Medvedev was a legal professional who believed in international norms with respect to human rights, Putin resisted any attempts by the West to intervene in foreign matters on 'humanitarian grounds.' The latter always remained sceptical and was cognizant that the Libyan issue was another excuse to tip the security balance on the world stage in favour of the West at Russia's expense. The international calls to enforce sanctions against the Khadafy regime in Libya happened at rapid speed as the escalation of violence was unpredictable. Ambassador Stephen Sestanovich comments, 'There was a misunderstanding over what the mission entailed. This was all moving very fast.'[797] Medvedev believed in the humanitarian justification for intervention in Libya, even though NATO intervention was expected. Every public statement by Medvedev alluded to his concern for the well-being of innocent Libyans who were being murdered. Putin, on the other hand, was not concerned with a civil uprising in a country that had little strategic importance to the Russian Federation, nor did he believe the West should intervene. The intelligence officer's worldview precluded Putin from feeling sympathy for Libyans whose government posed no risk to Russia's security or prosperity.

[796] D. Speedie, 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 11 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

[797] S. Sestanovich, 'Russia's Role in Libya and Syria' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 24 January 2013, School of International & Public Affairs, New York, New York.

The different perceptions and priorities of the two men clashed for the first time during the Medvedev presidency, which resulted in a public rift.

Regardless of Putin's opposition to intervention in Libya, Medvedev was the most powerful member of the Russian government. The mentor was the junior member of the Putin-Medvedev duo, and Medvedev's decision was made during a muddled period within the Kremlin. Dr. Mark Galeotti notes, 'Medvedev had lost control of the security agenda when Putin had not re-established control of the security agenda. There was disarray in the Kremlin.'[798] The decision for who would run in the 2012 presidential election was evidently not made yet, and Medvedev was theoretically and practically able to marginalize his influential Prime Minister, which he did. However, Medvedev abstained from a veto instead of consenting directly, which is evidence that he chose a cautious approach not to evoke the complete ire of the hawkish bureaucrats within the Kremlin he would have to explain his decision to. The internal tremors resulted regardless of the indirect endorsement of the Libyan intervention.

The political fallout within the Kremlin resulted in a public rift between Medvedev and Putin with the President insisting he made the proper decision with respect to United Nations Resolution 1973. The issue of Syria and the Assad regime's violent response to protestors became the focal point of the international community after Khadafy's murder by the Libyan rebels. Syria was far more vital to Russian interests than Libya had been. David Speedie comments, 'Syria is the only Russian foothold in the region.'[799] The Russian government's close political and economic relations with the Assad regime remained a primary obstruction to any similar events akin to Libya. The humanitarian crisis in Syria

[798] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

[799] D. Speedie, 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 11 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

was comparable to the Libyan situation, however. Any of Medvedev's inclinations to support intervention in Syria would have been forcefully opposed by Putin and the hawkish bureaucrats in the Kremlin. The decision for Putin, not Medvedev, to run in the presidential election was made at the same time the Libyan intervention resulted in Khadafy's murder and NATO 'domination' of Libya. The Russian public was wholly unhappy with the simultaneous events and the legitimacy for the Putin-Medvedev regime began to erode. Medvedev's cognizance of the fact that his future role in Putin's next presidential administration was on precarious grounds precluded the possibility of a Syrian intervention. Putin and Medvedev's relationship was damaged because of the Libyan outcome, and Putin's candidacy for the presidency may have come into jeopardy with the constituents who chose whether to re-elect Putin and United Russia if similar action were taken in Syria. Medvedev had no choice but to resist any sanctions against the Assad regime because his relationship with Putin and future career in government depended on it. The Syrian decision was directly related to a great extent to the internal backlash of the Libyan outcome and Putin's decision to run for President again. The personal dynamics of foreign policy decision-making within the Kremlin were throughout the Medvedev presidency a persistent interwoven facet of the decisions examined in this thesis.

Personal Dynamics:

Graham Allison's Governmental Politics Model, which espouses the importance of personal relationships, informal networks of power, and perceptions among bureaucrats, is an effective method to understand the Kremlin's foreign policy from 2008 to 2012. The Medvedev presidency's foundation was the personal relationship between Dmitry Medvedev and Vladimir Putin. President Medvedev allowed his underling unlimited access and influence in the Kremlin. Medvedev's unyielding respect for his mentor is illustrated

by this very fact. In policy debates, the Putinist vision of the world in which Russian security and prosperity were major priorities became a fixture of Russian foreign policy during the Medvedev presidency from 2008 to 2012. Dr. Graham Allison notes, 'Putin remained the more influential player than Medvedev.'[800] Putin's influence was a major component of the personal dynamics that influenced decisions and their implementation. Dr. Sergei Khrushchev opines, 'Putin was more dominant. It was very difficult to challenge Putin.'[801] Medvedev's elevation of Putin was a result of Putin's overwhelming popularity among Russian constituents and Putin's control of the Siloviki and hawkish bureaucrats in the Kremlin. As evident by Medvedev's persistent marginalization of the Russian Security Council, he had no sympathy for any Siloviki or military traditionalists. Putin was the only non-Technocrat with whom he consulted and chose to engage in the majority of foreign policy decisions. Medvedev chose to implement his decisions by communicating with Technocrat Serdyukov or Yeltsin Liberals Lavrov and Churkin, while Silovik Patrushev and military traditionalist General Baluyevsky were neglected in the decision-making process.

The Russian Security Council was not a primary tool for foreign policy formulation, but the inherent nature of this mechanism illuminates the inner turmoil and collusion of the Kremlin elites. Throughout this thesis, the Russian Security Council has been examined to understand how the fruitless efforts to gather all bureaucrats together in relation to foreign policy have resulted in revealing the feuding factions and bureaucrats and how the tense and close relationships play out when decisions are formulated. The Russian Security Council with the National Security Concept Document of 2009 and presidential edict in

[800] G. Allison, 'The Governmental Politics Model in Perspective' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 19 December 2012, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

[801] S. Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.

May 2011 provided evidence that the hardline elements within the Kremlin sought to empower the institution that they control in order to rein in the Technocrat Dmitry Medvedev whose presidency clashed with hawkish bureaucrats after choosing to exclude them from foreign policy formulation and ignoring the Siloviki by acting on his humanitarian inclinations. The hawkish faction has attempted to empower the Russian Security Council to prevent Russian foreign policy from becoming overly dovish at the expense of Russian security and prosperity. The Russian Security Council, therefore, was an important facet in this thesis to understand how the conflicts of Putin's inner circle manifested themselves in the foreign policy apparatus during the Medvedev presidency.

During the presidency of Dmitry Medvedev, the foreign affairs arm was frequently utilized to implement decisions. Sergei Lavrov, the perennial Minister of Foreign Affairs since Putin's first term before the Medvedev presidency, has chosen to engage with the world stage as a consummate diplomat who advocates the diplomatic route, such as the Six-Party Talks and denuclearization negotiations with Iran, but when the decisions are made within the Putin-Medvedev duo, Lavrov maintains his role as chief spokesman. His liberalism is non-negotiable and maintains its relevance in his performance because of his diplomatic upbringing, career elevation during the Yeltsin years, and general propensity to deal with the West on favourable terms.

While he is unquestionably an extension of the Putin-Medvedev regime by virtue of his top position in the foreign affairs arm of the government, he maintains a careful balance between being a stalwart Yeltsin Liberal and obedient Putinist spokesman. Lavrov's diplomatic impulses and affinity for diplomatic solutions remain as he has advocated a non-security based approach to pressing issues on the world stage. His orders from the Kremlin were never sabotaged or ignored. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was guided during the

Medvedev presidency by a man who is institutionally and professionally opposed to hawkish truculence, but he maintains an obedient nature. Sergei Lavrov continues to balance his diplomatic impulses as ingrained in every Yeltsin Liberal to cooperate fruitfully with the West and his advocacy of what the highest level within the Kremlin has envisioned Russian foreign policy to be.

Medvedev had no political or personal connection with the hawkish bureaucrats who were characteristically and temperamentally incompatible with the technocratic President. Dr. Mark Galeotti asserts, 'Medvedev knew the Siloviki were important; he genuinely did not have the power to control them.' [802] The bureaucratic wrangling before, during, and after foreign policy decisions that were made are an extension of these two factions, the Technocrats and Siloviki, that are in conflict with each other inside the Kremlin. The Russian President had the constitutional authority to manage the bureaucrats in any fashion he wished and during the Medvedev presidency every hawkish bureaucrat, except Putin, was generally marginalized. Dr. Mark Galeotti states, 'Putin's supporters were being constantly pushed to the side by Medvedev.'[803] In the decisions regarding Georgia, North Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Iran, and Libya, Medvedev wilfully obstructed the ability of undesired bureaucrats, who happened to be either Siloviki or military traditionalists, to influence his policy deliberations and the Russian President communicated his decisions for implementation to either the defence or foreign affairs arm of the government over which he occupied unquestionable authority. In the decision regarding Libya, Medvedev chose to alienate Putin and his Silovik concerns. This cost Medvedev great political cohesion as Putin for the first time had aligned himself with the hawkish bureaucrats that Medvedev had persistently marginalized in the aftermath of the

[802] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.
[803] Ibid.

Libyan intervention. The harmony between Putin and Medvedev was over. Medvedev was in full conciliatory mode until the end of his presidency. Medvedev appointed an influential Silovik to be his chief of staff, signed an edict that theoretically strengthened the Russian Security Council and began using it to engage with NATO officials, and resisted United Nations Security Council sanctions against the Assad regime in Syria. Medvedev's intentional marginalization of Putin during the Libyan crisis cost him dearly and is directly related to Medvedev's intransigence in terms of the Syrian Civil War.

Medvedev, the liberal-minded, methodical legal professional did not possess the personal characteristics to forcefully and successfully challenge his influential Prime Minister. Dr. Sergei Khrushchev opines, 'Personality and power are very important. Medvedev's initiatives did not challenge Putin.'[804] Medvedev could not be as influential over the many bureaucrats from Putin's inner circle that occupy positions in the Kremlin when compared with Putin. Medvedev arrived into government because of Putin's influence, and he became President because he was Putin's handpicked successor. Putin's domination of the inner circle and popularity among Russians made him a formidable force that Medvedev could not challenge. Medvedev understood that influence and power lay in Putin's hands and he therefore consented to becoming President with Putin as a guiding force in the affairs of the Russian government. Dr. Kimberly Marten notes, 'There is an informal contract they (Putin and Medvedev) have reached with each other. Medvedev as a statesman is incredibly weak.'[805]

Five of the six foreign policy decisions examined in this thesis reflect the Putinist vision of the world. Putin's vision of Russia is 'a great power' exercising unlimited

[804] S. Khrushchev, 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.

[805] K. Marten, 'Russian Foreign Policy' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 7 December 2012, Harriman Institute, Columbia University, New York, New York.

influence in the post-Soviet space and living in a world where NATO and the West do not have complete control of the world stage. Dr. Mark Galeotti states, 'The degree to which Medvedev controlled the agenda was limited.'[806] The one instance in which Medvedev deviated from the Putinist vision with respect to Libya resulted in a 'political earthquake' within the Kremlin. Medvedev used the Yeltsonian forces of a powerful Russian presidency to make his decision to abstain from vetoing sanctions against Libya which conflicted with Putin's wishes and he chose to omit the likelihood of NATO intervention from his constituents by using mercurial political tactics to obfuscate this fact, which aroused an anti-United Russia sentiment among citizens. Medvedev may have mastered the levers and mechanisms of presidential power, as well as the art of political obfuscation, but the ruptured personal dynamics within the Kremlin led him to be conciliatory for the rest of his presidency. The people occupying the Kremlin and the internal dynamics were powerful factors in the conduct of Russian foreign policy.

Medvedev's foreign policy was inherently exercising the Putinist vision with his own presidential and personal preferences stemming from his liberal temperament and methodical style, which was not similar to the Silovik modus operandi. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva comments, 'The President and Prime Minister became an absurdity. Medvedev's foreign policy became symbolic of these two characters.'[807] In the final analysis, the Russian constituents are the overriding force determining who does and who does not occupy powerful positions in the Russian government. Putin and his like-minded bureaucrats are publicly appreciated to a far greater extent than the Yeltsin Liberals or Technocrats. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva opines, 'Siloviki are everywhere. Russia views them

[806] M. Galeotti, 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

[807] N. Khrushcheva, 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

much more favourably than the Yeltsin Liberals. Siloviki are respected.'[808] Putin and his vision of the world are ultimately the guiding force of Russian foreign policy because of the Gorbachovian forces of democratization. With the Yeltsin Liberals relegated to non-influential positions in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Siloviki compete with the Technocrats. Dr. Nina Khrushcheva notes, 'The Technocrats are incredibly pervasive, but they are invisible. No one can pinpoint who they are or what they do.'[809] The Technocrats, including Medvedev, are not forceful advocates of their disagreements with the Siloviki. Similar to Medvedev rarely challenging the Putinist vision, the Technocrat base does not have any bureaucrat with the comparable influence or vociferousness of Vladimir Putin, Igor Sechin, Nikolai Patrushev, or Sergei Ivanov. The Siloviki are inherently more forceful in advocating their positions, while the Technocrats are not. This is also true of the Silovik and Technocrat occupying the Putin-Medvedev duo during the Medvedev presidency.

Putin's foreign policy stances were in concert with the anti-West, anti-NATO Russian public, and these positions were forcefully advocated while President Medvedev was loyally and quietly cognizant of the decisions that would result from Putin's advocacy. The Silovik worldview is emboldened as the guiding policy of Russian foreign policy decisions because it is in concert with the public opinion of Russian constituents and advocated by powerful personalities who overshadow the objections of the Technocrats. The Libyan decision was one instance where Medvedev took advantage of the internal disarray and muddled process with which the situation was being dealt with by the international community, and he intentionally abstained to save innocent Libyans to the chagrin of hawkish bureaucrats who opposed a foreign or NATO intervention. This one rogue act that deviated from the Putinist vision of the world cost Medvedev personally in

[808] Ibid.
[809] Ibid.

terms of the fallout with his mentor. Medvedev's intransigence in relation to intervention in Syria is the effect of the internal backlash against his leadership. Ultimately, the forces shaping the Russian political atmosphere were shaped by Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin, but the personal dynamics within the Kremlin are never predictable, nor predetermined. The personal dynamics played out in a manner that suggests Vladimir Putin and his Silovik base navigate Russian foreign policy to a powerful extent, even with a Technocrat President who was incompatible with the Silovik worldview and style.

The Medvedev presidency from 2008 to 2012 provided six major foreign policy decisions that both revealed key trends of the personal dynamics within the Kremlin, as well as important political factors in the Russian Federation. Technocrat Medvedev was President with the full support of his mentor, Vladimir Putin, who casts a long shadow over Russia's government and people. Medvedev's use of the presidential powers unquestionably allowed him to firmly control the government and formulate decisions to his liking. Furthermore, the members of United Russia did not trample on the desires of the Russian public, which holds the key to the Putin-Medvedev regime's legitimacy. Medvedev acted in accordance with either popular will or the absence of any discernible position by the constituents. The Libyan episode and the policy toward Syria of intransigence suggest that Medvedev's presidency was wholly dependent on maintaining a favourable opinion in the eyes of Vladimir Putin and the Russian public. After Medvedev abstained from a veto against Libya and obfuscated imminent NATO intervention from the Russian public, his presidency was severely weakened internally and externally. Vladimir Putin had no ideological contention with sanctioning North Korea and Iran with moderately stringent sanctions to prevent the regimes from developing nuclear arsenals further, nor did the Russian public that only views these countries as minor issues that the West is exaggerating

for its own purposes. Vladimir Putin still harbours a longing to maintain influence in the post-Soviet space against the West and NATO, which the Russian public views as former Russian territory that must be safeguarded. Medvedev's presidency saw military action against a government in Tbilisi that sought to align with the United States, NATO, and the European Union. Vladimir Putin's security instincts would have created a fixation on the military base in Kyrgyzstan at a time the Missile Defence Shield in Prague already posed a threat to Russia. The Russian public viewed Georgia and President Saakashvili as dangerous elements on the world stage that threaten Russia's peace and prosperity. In addition to this, the Kremlin used its vast media control to perpetuate anti-Bakiyev propaganda to convince the Russian people that Moscow's hand in the events that led to Bakiyev's ousting was inserted in order to rid the world of a corrupt politician who threatened Russia and Kyrgyzstan.

Medvedev deviated from his role as President who always considered his mentor's opinion and the position of the Russian public in the case of Libya. Medvedev was damaged internally and externally by the fallout with Putin, who aligned himself with the hawkish bureaucrats on the Russian Security Council, and the Russian public that lost confidence in Medvedev for the decisions with regards to Libya and his support for Putin running in the 2012 presidential election. Medvedev's last year in the presidency was a testament to the powerful Gorbachovian forces of democratization that pose the risk of political demise if the Russian public is disregarded, and the personal dynamics within the Kremlin that play out in the formulation of foreign policy decisions. The decision to resist sanctions against the Assad regime in Syria is proof that the Russian public's appeasement is a necessary factor for political rule, as well as the intricate web of personal relationships

and the Yeltsonian superiority of the Russian presidency that play out within the Kremlin's overall responses to foreign policy dilemmas.

This thesis examined the Kremlin during the Medvedev presidency utilizing the Governmental Politics Model to simultaneously assess the current inner circle and its bureaucrats acting in the Russian political atmosphere moulded by Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin. The Putin-Medvedev regime is beholden to the constituents it serves, and the overriding force within the government is the will of the President of the Russian Federation. Every foreign policy decision made by the Kremlin was affected by the need to acquiesce to the wishes of the constituency and formulate policies in a manner suiting the preferences of Dmitry Medvedev, regardless of his Prime Minister's influence. The state of personal dynamics during these years suggests that personalities, friendships, and perceptions among the bureaucrats have a powerful collective effect on decision-making. The personal dynamics of the Kremlin played out in a democratized country with a powerful presidential office. Graham Allison's Governmental Politics Model fits the new democratic Russian Federation precisely because of the reforms by Gorbachev and empowerment of the Russian presidency by Yeltsin, which is the exact type of government Allison's theoretical framework was created for. This thesis has added to the body of knowledge in Kremlinology by using the Allisonian mode of analysis to understand how personal relations and political forces collide, coexist, and diverge in the context of the Kremlin's foreign policy decisions and the inherent process of their formulation. The Allisonian framework has allowed the author to enhance the understanding of the Kremlin during the Medvedev presidency with respect to vital foreign policy decisions.

Bibliography:

Interviews-

Allison, G., 'The Governmental Politics Model in Perspective' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 19 December 2012, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Cooley, A., 'The ouster of President Bakiyev in Kyrgyzstan' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 14 December 2012, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Galeotti, M., 'Russian Security' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 10 December 2012, Center for Global Affairs, New York University, New York, New York.

Khrushchev, S., 'Russia during Medvedev's Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 17 December 2012, Watson Institute of International Studies, Brown University, Cranston, Rhode Island.

Khrushcheva, N., 'The Russian Public & The Medvedev Presidency' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 23 January 2013, New School University, New York, New York.

Marten, K., 'Russian Foreign Policy' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 7 December 2012, Harriman Institute, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Mitchell, L., 'Russia's war with Georgia' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 12 December 2012, School of International & Public Affairs, Columbia University, New York, New York

Perle, R., 'Russia's Security Fears' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 7 January 2013, American Enterprise Institute, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

Rosenthal, J., 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 25 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

Sestanovich, S., 'Russia's Role in Libya and Syria' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 24 January 2013, School of International & Public Affairs, New York, New York.

Speedie, D., 'Russian-American Strategic Engagement' [interviewed by Julian Reder], 11 January 2013, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, New York, New York.

Official Russian Documents-

‘About the visit of the Secretary of the Russian Security Council Nikolai Patrushev to the Republic of Poland’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web document] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/630.html&usg=ALkJrhieVr9v4AqkeNV-tPOGoJnTVGsKiQ>, accessed 19 Oct. 2012.

‘Bilateral Russian-American consultations on issues of international security, *The Kremlin Archive* [web document] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/635.html&usg=ALkJrhinGRljgwUDL2le_AnOUL6NO4HRcw>, accessed 19 Oct. 2012.

‘The Foreign Policy Concept of The Russian Federation 2000’, *Ministry of Foreign Affairs* [web document] (2012), <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/russia/doctrine/econcept.htm>, accessed 12 June 2012.

‘The Foreign Policy Concept of The Russian Federation 2008’, *Ministry of Foreign Affairs* [web document] (2012), <http://www.mid.ru/nsosndoc.nsf/1e5f0de28fe77fdcc32575d900298676/869c9d2b87ad8014c32575d9002b1c38?OpenDocument>, accessed 12 June 2012.

‘Interview of Secretary of the Security Council of the Russian Federation Nikolai Patrushev: "Punishment awaits them all"’, The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2010) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/22/551.html&usg=ALkJrhgbcEeCODJLMgqXSbRRi2RRo7thHg>, accessed 3 June 2012.

‘News and Information’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web document] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/index7.html&usg=ALkJrhheAnEF9o46hQw2HYjEL5W7C2UmeQ>, accessed 19 Oct. 2012.

‘News and Information’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web document] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/index8.html&usg=ALkJrhjdZfCFeOmRab3TT4rlrckFbGOc4w>, accessed 19 Oct. 2012.

‘On State Policy of the Russian Federation in the field of aviation,’ *The Kremlin Archive* [web document] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/640.html&usg=ALkJrhhjsqaI4QLmo72ExLZVt8QxntynGw>, accessed 19 Oct. 2012.

‘Statement by Dmitry Medvedev on the situation in Libya’, *The President of Russia Database* [web document] (2011), <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/1933>, accessed 19 Oct. 2011.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ‘Home Page’, *Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation* [web page] (2013) < http://eng.mil.ru/en/index.htm>, accessed 29 July 2012.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ‘Speech at Inauguration Ceremony as President of Russia’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2008) <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2008/05/07/1521_type82912type127286_200295.shtml>, accessed 29 May 2012.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ‘Statement on the Situation in South Ossetia’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2008) <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2008/08/08/1553_type82912type82913_205032.shtml >, accessed 29 May 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ‘About News and Information’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web document] (2009), <http://translate.google.co.uk/translate?hl=en&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/&ei=wUzST_f0IIKL8gPN3ZCdAw&sa=X&oi=translate&ct=result&resnum=5&ved=0CHIQ7gEwBA&prev=/search%3Fq%3Dsecurity%2Bcouncil%2Bof%2Brussian%2Bfederation%26hl%3Den%26safe%3Dactive%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvnsu>, accessed 29 July 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ‘About the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation to 2020’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web document] (2009), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?depth=1&ei=wUzST_f0IIKL8gPN3ZCdAw&hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3Dsecurity%2Bcouncil%2Bof%2Brussian%2Bfederation%26hl%3Den%26safe%3Dactive%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvnsu&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/437.html&usg=ALkJrhh7ynhSmehB7SALhJYniUfvp9ZU0w>, accessed 29 July 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ‘Activities,’ *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2008) <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/text/news/2008/07/204320.shtml>, accessed 29 May 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ‘A telephone conversation the Secretary of the Russian Security Council Nikolai Patrushev with Secretary of Supreme National Security Council of Iran Saeed Jalili’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web document] (2010) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/584.html&usg=ALkJrhjKHFWQQxVjbPXv95ZkAsBv3WbpPg> , accessed 18 October 2012

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ‘Dmitry Medvedev had a telephone conversation with President of Georgia Mikhail Saakashvili’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2008) <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/text/news/2008/06/202706.shtml>, accessed 29 May 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ‘Emergency operative meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation.’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2008) <http://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/340.html >, accessed 29 May2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ‘Meeting of the Security Council of the Russian Federation “On the state and prospects of development of the domestic shipbuilding”’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2010) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/587.html&usg=ALkJrhg_AkA0bvNW0zfhavR38xq8pahmGQ>, accessed 5 Jan. 2013.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ‘News and Information’, *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2010) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/22/&usg=ALkJrhjCnpsisV5pXk8-eHfiRgSb0zoUqA>, accessed 3 June 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION. 'On the meeting the Secretary of the Russian Security Council Nikolai Patrushev to the Supreme Allied Commander of NATO in Europe, Admiral Dzh.Stavridisom', *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2011) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/676.html&usg=ALkJrhi1MrEsOu-Z8UEvJYpZhhA2-1AuFQ>, accessed 2 Dec. 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 'Operational meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation', *The Kremlin Archive* [web document] (2009), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?depth=1&ei=wUzST_f0IIKL8gPN3ZCdAw&hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3Dsecurity%2Bcouncil%2Bof%2Brussian%2Bfederation%26hl%3Den%26safe%3Dactive%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvnsu&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/449.html&usg=ALkJrhjhOHY5vmGify3ZRtgHpimZNTxiHw>, accessed 29 July 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 'Operational meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation', *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2011), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/646.html&usg=ALkJrhhFosLo94xufAX4cJ3U63tvakUUcA>, accessed 30 Nov. 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 'Operational meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation 21/5/2010', *The Kremlin Archive* [web document] (2010), <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/581.html&usg=ALkJrhgoZhQBccP3jL1GzcgtHJ3EqX8e7g> , accessed 18 October 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 'Operational meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation', *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2011) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/677.html&usg=ALkJrhgzQW791cB1WAaQx7Zd9XY1cJOU4Q>, accessed 2 Dec. 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 'Operational meeting of the permanent members of the Security Council of the Russian Federation', *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2012) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/693.html&usg=ALkJrhiuLQVZItU-3tObUT0B_wnGh8bPFg>, accessed 3 Dec. 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 'Operational Meeting of The Permanent Members of The Security Council of The Russian Federation August 1, 2008', *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2008) <http://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/339.html>, accessed May 29 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 'President Dmitry Medvedev met with US President George W. Bush', *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2008) <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/text/news/2008/07/203730.shtml>, accessed May 29 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 'President of the Russian Federation signed a decree "by the Security Council of the Russian Federation."', The Kremlin Archive [web page] (2011) <http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=en&prev=/search%3Fq%3DSecurity%2BCouncil%2Bof%2Bthe%2BRussian%2BFederation%26hl%3Den%26biw%3D1024%26bih%3D743%26prmd%3Dimvns&rurl=translate.google.co.uk&sl=ru&u=http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/645.html&usg=ALkJrhgS3bZp2DQNyPfzKVK2f8TgnVtUJg>, accessed 30 Nov. 2012.

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 'The President of Russia met with German Vice-Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs Frank-Walter Steinmeier', *The Kremlin Archive* [web page] (2008) <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/text/news/2008/07/204320.shtml>, accessed 29 May 2012.

YELTSIN, BORIS, 'The 1993 Constitution of the Russian Federation', *The Kremlin Archive* [web document] (2010), < http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/articles/ConstMain.shtml>, accessed 30 May 2012.

Media Sources-

‘A Vote for Soviet Democracy’, *The New York Times*, 26 March, 1989, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 12 June 2012.

‘FM: Russia urges DPRK to demonstrate responsibility’, *People’s Daily Online*, 25 May 2009, in Google News Archive, accessed 12 June 2012.

‘In Swift, Decisive Action, Security Council Imposes Tough Measures On Libyan Regime, Adopting Resolution 1970 In Wake Of Crackdown On Protesters’, *The United Nations Security Council* [Web Document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/news/press/docs/2011/sc10187.doc.htm>, accessed 18 Oct. 2012.

‘Iran sanctions must be smart’, *Voice of Russia* [web page] (2010), <http://english.ruvr.ru/2010/03/19/5457160.html>, accessed 30 October 2012.

‘Medvedev's Strength Is Putin: Poll’, *The Moscow Times*, 16 Jan. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 20 May 2012.

‘Polish president accuses Obama of betraying Poland’, *The London Telegraph*, 6 Aug. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 6 Aug. 2012.

‘Russia and China veto UN resolution against Syrian regime’, *The Guardian*, 5 Oct. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 3 Dec. 2012.

‘Security Council Approves “No-Fly Zone” over Libya, Authorizing “All Necessary Measures” to Protect Civilians, by Vote of 10 in Favour with 5 Abstentions’, The united nations security council [web document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10200.doc.htm>, accessed 18 Nov. 2012.

‘Security Council Imposes Additional Sanctions on Iran’, *United News Centre Archive* [web document] (2010), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2010/sc9948.doc.htm>, accessed 18 June 2012.

‘United Nations Resolution 1970 (2011)’, United Nations Security Council Document Database [web document] (2011), <http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1970(2011)>, accessed 13 October 2012.

‘US looking into range of possibilities against Iran’, *Zeenews*, 11 Nov. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 July 2012.

‘US says it is prepared to help new Kyrgyz rulers’, *Todays Zaman*, 15 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive, accessed 4 June 2012.

‘Vladimir Putin Calls off US Trip’, *The Guardian*, May 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 10 May 2012.

‘War Erupts in Georgia’, *The Economist*, 8 Aug. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 May 2012.

4NEWS, ‘Syria protests: no concessions from President Assad’, *4news* [web page] (2011) < http://www.channel4.com/news/syria-protests-no-concessions-from-president-assad>, accessed 3 Nov. 2012.

ABC NEWS, ‘Iraq war was unjustified, Putin says’, *ABC News* [web page] (2003) <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2003-12-19/iraq-war-was-unjustified-putin-says/108124>, accessed 29 Jan. 2013.

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, ‘Yeltsin To Review Russia's Entry Into Partnership For Peace With Am-Russia-Yeltsin, Bjt’, The Associated Press [web page] (2012), <http://www.apnewsarchive.com/1994/Yeltsin-to-Review-Russia-s-Entry-into-Partnership-for-Peace-With-AM-Russia-Yeltsin-Bjt/id-b6dfd7cc1edcf59149ea11c2bf43e81c>, accessed 29 July 2012.

BABICH, DMITRY, ‘Avoiding war in Iran is Russia's aim’, *The London Telegraph*, 2 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 3 Jan. 2013.
BAKER, PETER AND BILEFSKY, DAN, ‘Russia and U.S. Sign Nuclear Arms Reduction Pact’, *The New York Times*, 8 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 June 2012.

BARRY, ELLEN, ‘Putin Criticizes West for Libya Incursion’, *The New York Times*, 26 Apr. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 30 Oct. 2012.

BARRY, ELLEN, ‘Putin Once More Moves to Assume Top Job in Russia’, *The New York Times*, 24 Sep. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 29 Nov. 2012.

BARRY, ELLEN, ‘Rally Defying Putin’s Party Draws Tens of Thousands’, *The New York Times*, 10 Dec. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], 1 Dec. 2012.

BARRY, ELLEN, ‘Russian President Says U.S. Had Role in Georgian Conflict’, *The New York Times*, 5 Aug. 2011, in The New York Archive [online database], accessed 1 May 2012.

BARTIROMO, MARIA, ‘Medvedev's Strong Words for North Korea ’, *Bloomberg Businessweek*, 3 June 2009, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 July 2012.

THE BBC, ‘1991: Hardliners stage coup against Gorbachev’, *The BBC* [web page] (2005) <http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/august/19/newsid_2499000/2499453.st>, accessed Feb. 13 2013

The BBC, ‘Boris Yeltsin: President of Russia 1991 - 1999’, *BBC* [web page] (2013), <http://www.bbc.co.uk/wales/ps/sites/politicsguide/hall_of_fame/pages/boris_yeltsin.sht>, accessed 3 Feb. 2013.

THE BBC, ‘Chechen rebel says he ordered Moscow Metro attacks’, *The BBC* [web page] (2010) <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/8597792.stm>, accessed 4 June 2012.

THE BBC, ‘Future of US base in Kyrgyzstan in question’, *The BBC* [web page] (2010) <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/8611141.stm>, accessed 3 June 2012.

THE BBC, ‘Libya UN Resolution 1973: Text analyzed’, *The BBC* [web page] (2011) <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-12782972>, accessed 12 Jan. 2012.

THE BBC, ‘Libya: UN resolution on no-fly zone’, *The BBC* [web page] (2011) <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-12783819>, accessed 12 Jan. 2012.

THE BBC, ‘Profile: Dmitry Medvedev’, *The BBC* [web page] (2011) <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-15047827>, accessed 16. Oct. 2012.

THE BBC, ‘Putin deplores collapse of USSR’, *The BBC* [web page] (2005) < http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/4480745.stm>, accessed 29 June 2012.

BERGMANN, MAX, CHARAP, SAMUEL, & JUUL,PETER ‘New Start to rein in Iran's ambitions.’ *The Guardian*, 9 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 13 Sep. 2012.

BLOOMBERG NEWS, ‘How the Iran Nuclear Standoff Looks from Russia: Dmitri Trenin’, *Bloomberg News* (web page) (2012), <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-15/how-the-iran-nuclear-standoff-looks-from-russia-dmitri-trenin.html>, accessed 1 Oct. 2012.

BROWN, ARCHIE, ‘The Real Yeltsin Legacy.’, *The Guardian*, 26 April 2007, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 23 May 2012.

BROWN, ARCHIE, ‘Reform, Coup and Collapse: The End of the Soviet State’, *BBC*, 17 Feb. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 13 May 2012.

BRYANSKI, GLEB, ‘Russian Generals Attack Medvedev over Georgia War,’ *Reuters*, 9 Aug. 2012, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 Sep. 2012.

CHARLIE ROSE, *An Hour with Mikhail Gorbachev*., [online video] (2006) <http://www.charlierose.com/view/interview/176>, accessed 20 April 2012.

CHUPINA, MARIA, ‘Russia opposes new sanctions against Iran’, *Voice of Russia* [web page] (2011) <http://english.ruvr.ru/2011/02/16/44633997.html>, accessed 3 Jan. 2013.

CNN, ‘Medvedev: Iran “ignoring questions' about nuclear program”’, *CNN* [web page] (2010), <http://edition.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/europe/04/14/medvedev.iran.russia/index.html>, accessed 18 Jan. 2013.

CNN, ‘Obama warns North Korea, Iran on nuclear weapons’, CNN [web page] (2012) <http://articles.cnn.com/2012-03-26/asia/world_asia_korea-obama-visit_1_nuclear-summit-nuclear-weapons-nuclear-program?_s=PM:ASIA>, accessed July 21, 2012.

CNN, ‘Putin and Medvedev spar over Libya’, *CNN* [web page] (2011) <http://edition.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/europe/03/21/russia.leaders.libya/index.html>, accessed 2 Dec. 2012.

CNN, ‘Russia frustrated with Iran but unlikely to fully support sanctions’, *CNN* [web page] (2005) < http://articles.cnn.com/2010-05-21/opinion/zakaria.russia_1_nuclear-program-russia-and-china-iran-issue?_s=PM:OPINION>, accessed 25 Oct. 2012.

ELDER, MIRIAM, ‘Putin shaken by United Russia's poor election performance’, *The Guardian*, 5 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Nov. 2012.

ELDER, MIRIAM and PARFIT, TOM, ‘Russian anti-Putin protests draw thousands to Moscow again’, *The Guardian*, 24 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 24 Nov. 2012.

EUROPEAN DIALOGUE, ‘New Russian Military Doctrine Opposes NATO Enlargement’, *European Dialogue* [web page] (2010) < http://eurodialogue.org/osce/New-Russian-Military-Doctrine-Opposes-NATO-Enlargement>, accessed 2 June 2012.

EU THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY, ‘The international community finally moved toward sanctions against Libya’. *EU The International Community* [web page] (2011) <http://www.euinside.eu/en/news/international-community-finally-resorted-to-sanctions-against-libya >, accessed 1 Dec. 2012.

FOX NEWS, ‘Medvedev Tells Iran to Come Clean on Nukes’, *Fox News* [web page] (2010) <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2010/07/15/medvedev-tells-iran-come-clean-nukes/>, accessed 31 Jan. 2013.

GORBACHEV, MIKHAIL, ‘End of the Soviet Union; Text of Gorbachev’s Farewell Speech’, *The New York Times*, 26 Dec. 1991, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 21 July 2012

GORBACHEV, MIKHAIL, ‘Text of Gorbachev Speech’, *Associated Press Archive* [web document] (1989), <http://www.apnewsarchive.com/1989/Text-of-Gorbachev-Speech/id-9f9af12bfbeda79deebc76e1423b8ba8>, accessed 28 April 2012.

GREENWALD, GLENN, ‘The true reason US fears Iranian nukes: they can deter US attacks.’ The Guardian, 2 Oct. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 30 Oct. 2012.

GROVE, THOMAS, ‘Medvedev tells Obama: prevent Libyan civilian deaths’, *The Reuters*, 24 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive, accessed 1 Nov. 2012.

GROVE, THOMAS, 'Putin and Medvedev closest ever in popularity: poll', *Reuters*, 29 Oct. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 12 Jan. 2012.

GUEHENNO, JEAN-MARIE, 'The Arab Spring Is 2011, Not 1989', *The New York Times*, 21 Apr. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 10 Oct. 2012.

GUTTERMAN, STEVE, 'Russia's Medvedev warns of new arms race', *Reuters*, 30 Nov. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], 2 June 2012.

HARRIS, PAUL, 'Syria resolution vetoed by Russia and China at United Nations', *The Guardian*, 4 Feb. 2012., Google News Archive [online database], accessed 2 Dec. 2012.

HELMER, JOHN, **'**Russia Bids to Rid Georgia of Its Folly', *The Asia Times*,12 Aug. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 May 2012.

HERITAGE, TIMOTHY AND BOULTON, RALPH, 'Russia's Putin and party suffer election blow', *Reuters*, 4 Dec. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], 1 Dec. 2012.

HERSZENHORN, DAVID M., 'Putin Defends Stand on Syria and Chastises U.S. on Libya Outcome', *The New York Times*, 20 Dec. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 Feb. 2013.

HEUVEL, KATRINA VANDEN & COHEN, STEVE F., 'Gorbachev on 1989', *The Nation*, 16 Nov. 2009, in The Nation Archive [online database], accessed 29 June 2012.

GOLDBERG, JEFFREY, 'Netanyahu to Obama: Stop Iran—Or I Will', *The Atlantic*, Mar. 2009, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 Oct. 2012.

IVANOV, EUGENE, 'Russia's response to the Libyan crisis: a paradigm shift?', 25 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 12 Oct. 2012. <http://www.euinside.eu/en/news/international-community-finally-resorted-to-sanctions-against-libya >, accessed 1 Dec. 2012.

JACKSON, PATRICK, 'Profile: Putin's Minister of Foreign Affairs Lavrov', The BBC [web document] (2007), <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/6242774.stm>, accessed 18 June 2012.

KARMANAU, YURAS, 'Russia helped rout leaders: Kyrgyz rebels', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 3 June 2012.

KELLER, BILL, 'Soviet Voters Deal Humiliating Blow To Party Officials', *The New York Times*, 28 March, 1989, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 12 June 2012.

KIPP, JACOB W., 'Russia's Military Doctrine: New Dangers Appear.', *Eurasia Daily Monitor* [online journal], 7/35 (2010), <http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=36073>, accessed 1 June 2012.

KRAMNIK, ILYA, 'Russia's Security Council turns to Arctic ', *Google News Archive* [web document] (2009), <http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20090330/120824719.html>, accessed 2 June 2012.

LAFRANCHI, HOWARD, 'New START treaty: How will next efforts for nuclear weapons reduction fare?' *Christian Science Monitor,* 22 Dec. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 21 Sep. 2012.

LARRY KING, 'Interview with Russian Prime Minister Putin', CNN Archive [web document] (2010), <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1012/01/lkl.01.html>, accessed 29 July 2012.

LAVROV, SERGEI, 'America Must Choose Between Georgia and Russia ', *The Wall Street Journal*, 20 Aug. 2008, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 20 May 2012.

LEVY,CLIFFORD J. 'In Rare Split, Two Leaders in Russia Differ on Libya, *The New York Times*, 21 Mar. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 30 Nov. 2012.

LEVY, CLIFFORD J., 'Upheaval in Kyrgyzstan Could Imperil Key U.S. Base', *The New York Times*, 7 Apr. 2010, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 3 June 2012.

LOGAN, JOSEPH AND WORSNIP, PATRICK, 'Anger after Russia, China block U.N. action on Syria', *Reuters,* 5 Feb. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 3 Dec. 2012.

LOIKO, SERGEI L., 'Russia threatens to withdraw from arms control deal with U.S.', *The Los Angeles Times*, 23 Nov. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 2 June 2012.

MARAT, ERIC, 'Russian Mass Media Attack Bakiyev.' Eurasia Daily Monitor [online journal], 7/63 (2010), <http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=36226&tx_ttnews%5BbackPid%5D=27&cHash=5f81ad077b>, accessed 6 June 2012.

MKILVEEN, LUKE, 'Kevin Rudd reveals Bush-Putin argument at Opening Ceremony', *The Australian*, 10 Aug. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 May 2012

NATO, 'NATO takes command in Libya air operations', *NATO* [web page] (2011) <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_71867.htm>, accessed 1 Dec. 2012.

NATO UPDATE, 'Press Releases' *NATO*, [web page] (2012) <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_38988.htm>, accessed 3 May 2012.

ORANGE, RICHARD ‘Kyrgyzstan to name mountain after Vladimir Putin’, *The London Telegraph*, 4 Jan. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 5 June 2012.

ORANGE, RICHARD, ‘US airbase threatened in Kyrgyzstan as Russian-backed parties poised to take power’, *The London Telegraph*, 11 Oct. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 2 June 2012.

OSBORN, ANDREW, ‘Dmitry Medvedev's Russia still feels the cold hand of Vladimir Putin’, *The London Telegraph*, 7 Mar. 2010, in Google News Archive, accessed 1 Mar. 2012.

OSBORN, ANDREW, ‘Russia plans second military base in Kyrgyzstan’, *The London Telegraph*, 25 June 2010, Google News Archive [online database}, accessed 4 June 2010.

OSBORN, ANDREW, ‘Syria: NATO “planning direct military intervention”, Russia claims’, *The London Telegraph*, 12 Jan. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 Dec. 2012.

PERMANENT MISSION OF THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC TO THE UNITED NATIONS, ’Press Releases’, *Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations* [web page] (2012) <http://www.un.int/syria/>, accessed 12 Nov. 2012.

PINCUS, WALTER, ‘Russia Warned U.S. About Iraq, Putin Says’, *The Washington Post*, 19 June 2004, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 21 Feb. 2013.

PUKHOV, RUSLAN, ‘Serdyukov 4 Years On’, *The Moscow Times*, 3 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 Aug. 2012.

QUIJANO, ELAINE, ‘Bush Mixes Diplomacy, Sports in Beijing’, *CNN*, 11 Aug. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 May 2012.

RADIO FREE EUROPE, ‘A National Leader in Search of a Post’, *Radio Free Europe* [web page] (2011) <http://www.rferl.org/content/a_national_leader_in_search_of_a_post/24272951.html>, accessed 1 Dec. 2012.

RAI AND CORRIERE DELLA SERA, ‘President of Russia Interview’, The Kremlin Archive [web document] (2009), <http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2009/07/05/1000_type82914type82916_219023.shtml>, accessed 29 July 2012.

REUTERS, ‘Bush and Putin Discuss Georgia Fighting’, *Reuters* [web page] (2008) <http://uk.reuters.com/article/2008/08/08/us-georgia-ossetia-bush-idUKWAT00988620080808>, accessed 29 May 2012.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Medvedev Defends Ousted Defense Minister in TV Interview’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2012) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20121207/177976558.html>, accessed 25 July 2012.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Medvedev opposes Libya-style resolution on Syria’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2012) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20110620/164716194.html>, accessed 3 Dec. 2012.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Medvedev Signs Landmark Anti-Corruption Law’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2011) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20110504/163854280.html>, accessed 25 May 2012.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘New START treaty “lays foundation”" for Russia-U.S. cooperation - Lavrov’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2011) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20110205/162466422.html>, accessed 1 June 2012.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Putin condemns footage showing Gaddafi death’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2011) <http://en.rian.ru/world/20111026/168144832.html>, accessed 2 Feb. 2013.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Putin congratulates North Korea on 61st anniversary ’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2009) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20090909/156070761.html>, accessed 29 July 2012.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Putin says dumbfounded over NATO operation in Libya’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2011) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20110427/163739739.html>, accessed 2 Feb. 2013.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Putin speaks on phone with Kyrgyz opposition-nominated premier’, RIA Novosti [web page] (2010) <http://en.ria.ru/world/20100408/158479220.html>, accessed 5 June 2010.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Russia not involved in Kyrgyz events - Putin’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2010) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20100407/158472404.html>, accessed 3 June 2012.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Russia says Georgia's entry to NATO could lead to war’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2011) <http://en.rian.ru/world/20111208/169485481.html>, accessed 30 May 2012.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Russian, Chinese Defense Ministers to Meet in Beijing’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2012) <http://en.rian.ru/world/20081210/118777026.html>, accessed 25 July 2012.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Russian-Iranian S-300 missile deal not against UN resolution — U.S.’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2010) <http://en.rian.ru/world/20100611/159382525.html>, accessed 3 Jan. 2013.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Russian President Approves National Security Strategy until 2020’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2009) <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20090513/121575657.html>, accessed 20 May 2012.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Russian President approves new military doctrine’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] (2010) <http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20100205/157785368.html >, accessed 1 June 2012.

RIA NOVOSTI, ‘Russian-U.S. panel says missile shield in Europe ineffective’, *RIA Novosti* [web page] <http://www.rianovosti.com/world/20090519/155043876.html>, accessed 29 June 2012.

RUSSIA TODAY, ‘NATO will never replace the United Nations - Lavrov’, *Russia Today* [web page] (2011) < http://rt.com/politics/nato-russia-lavrov-security-patrushev-025/>, accessed 30. Nov. 2012.

RUSSIA TODAY, ‘Russia’s new military doctrine approved’, *Russia Today* [web page] (2010) <http://rt.com/usa/russia-military-doctrine-approved/>, accessed 1 June 2012.

RUSSIA TODAY, ‘Russia's Security Council head: “Georgia's trace” behind the blasts not excluded’, *Russia Today* [web page] (2010) <http://rt.com/politics/blasts-metro-georgia-patrushev/>, accessed 4 June 2012.

RUSSIA TODAY, ‘Sergey Ivanov appointed presidential head of staff’, *Russia Today* [web page] (2011) <http://rt.com/politics/ivanov-kremlin-administration-head-421/>, accessed 19 Nov. 2012.

RUSSIA TODAY, ‘Solution on Iranian nuke program should fit all sides – Putin’, *Russia Today* [web page] (2010) <http://rt.com/politics/putin-iran-nuclear-ahmadinejad/>, accessed 25 Jan. 2013.

RUSSIAN ANALYTICAL DIGEST, ‘Russia-Georgia Relations’, *Jstor* [web document] (2009), <http://home.gwu.edu/~cwelt/Russian_Analytical_Digest_68.pdf>, accessed 19 May 2012.

SCHWIRTZ, MICHAEL, ‘New Leader Says U.S. Base in Kyrgyzstan Will Be Shut’, *The New York Times*, 1 Nov. 2011, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 5 June 2012.

SHEAR, MICHAEL D., ‘Obama, Medvedev sign treaty to reduce nuclear weapons’, *The Washington Post*, 8 Apr. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 1 June 2012.

SPECTER, MICHAEL, ‘Opposition Gains As Russians Elect New Parliament’, *The New York Times*,18 Dec. 1995, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 11 Feb. 2012.

STEELE, JONATHAN, ‘Medvedev Describes Georgia Attack as Russia's 9/11’, *The Guardian*, 13 Sep. 2008, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 23 May 2012.

SWEENEY, CONOR, ‘Russia's Lavrov warns against haste over North Korea’, *Reuters*, 7 Apr. 2009, Google News Archive [online datavase], accessed 11 June 2012.

TENGRI NEWS, ‘Putin's Election Rating Down 20% Since '08: Poll’, *Tengri News* [web page] (2011) <http://en.tengrinews.kz/politics_sub/Putins-election-rating-down-20-since-08-poll--4102/>, accessed 30 May 2012.

TIMES TOPICS, ‘Mikheil Saakashvili’, *The New York Times* [web page] (2013) <http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/mikheil_saakashvili/index.html>, accessed 25 May 2012.

THE UNITED NATIONS, ‘Citing Iran’s failure to clarify nuclear ambitions, UN imposes additional sanctions.’, *The United Nations News Centre*, [web page] (2010), <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=34970&Cr=iran&Cr1=>, accessed 1 March, 2013.

THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL, ‘Press Releases’, The United Nations [web page] (2009) <www.un.org/en/unpress/>, accessed 20 June 2012.

THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL, ‘Security Council, Acting Unanimously, Condemns In Strongest Terms Democratic People’s Republic Of Korea Nuclear Test, Resolution 1874’ The United Nations [Web Page] (2009) <Http://Www.Un.Org/News/Press/Docs//2009/Sc9679.Doc.Htm>, accessed 20 June 2012.

THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL, ‘Security Council Resolutions’, United Nations [web page] (2013) <http://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/resolutions/index.shtml>, accessed 1 Mar. 2013.

VARNER, BILL AND GREEN, PETER S., ‘UN Votes to Punish North Korea for Nuclear Test’, *Bloomberg*, 12 June 2012, Google News Archive, accessed 28 June 2012.

VASILEYA, NATALIYA, ‘Medvedev Predicts Long Life for Tandem with Putin’, *Salon*, 26 Apr. 2012, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 May 2012.

WALKER, SHAUN, ‘Medvedev Reignites War of Words over Blame for Georgia Conflict’, *The Independent*, 8 Aug. 2011, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 30 May 2012.

WEINGARTEN, ELIZABETH, ‘The Iran-START Connection.’ *The Atlantic*, 22 Nov. 2010, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Sep. 2012.

WEIR, FRED, ‘Medvedev slams Putin's “inexcusable” Libya “crusade” comments.’, *Christian Science Monitor*, 22 Mar. 2011, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 22 Oct. 2012.

WEIR, FRED, ‘Was Putin in charge during Georgia war? Medvedev begs to differ’, *CS Monitor*, 10 Aug. 2012, Google News Archive [online database], accessed 12 Aug. 2012.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 'Remarks by President Obama and President Medvedev of Russia at New START Treaty Signing Ceremony and Press Conference', *The White House Press Release* [web page] (2010) < http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-and-president-medvedev-russia-new-start-treaty-signing-cere>, accessed 25 Aug. 2012.

WILLIAMSON, RICHARD S., 'Time to Reset Obama's Reset Policy', *The American*, 28 Feb. 2012, Google News Archive [online datbase], accessed 30 Nov. 2012.

WINES, MICHAEL, 'After The Attacks: In Moscow; Russia Takes Stand Against Terrorism, but the Stance Wavers Quickly', *The New York Times*, 16 Sep. 2001, in The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 29 May 2012.

WINES, MICHAEL, 'Putin to Sell Arms and Nuclear Help to Iran', *The New York Times*, 13 Mar. 2001, The New York Times Archive [online database], accessed 2 June 2012.

ZOLOTOV JR, ANDREI, 'Less is more for Modern Military', The London Telegraph, 22 Sep. 2009, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 20 May 2012.

Books & Journal Articles-

ALLISON, GRAHAM T. AND ZELIKOW, PHILIP D., *Essence of Decision*, (Boston, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publisher Inc., 1999).

ALLISON, ROY, 'Russia Resurgent? Moscow's Campaign to 'Coerce Georgia to Peace.' *International Affairs*, 84/6 (2008), 1145-1171 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25144986>, accessed 2 Jan. 2012.

ALLISON, ROY, 'Strategic Reassertion in Russia's Central Asia Policy.' *International Affairs Journal*, 80/2 (2004), 277-293 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3569242>, accessed 2 Feb. 2013.

ARBATOV, G., 'Sovietology and Kremlinology?', *International Institute for Strategic Studies* [online journal], 12:6, 208-209, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00396337008441111>, accessed 1 June 2012.

BENDOR, JONATHAN AND HAMMOND, THOMAS H., 'Rethinking Allison's Models.' *The American Political Science Review*, 86/2 (1992), 301-322 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1964222>, accessed 1 Dec.2011.

BREMMER, IAN AND CHARAP, SAMUEL, 'The Siloviki in Putin's Russia: Who They Are and What They Want', *The Washington Quarterly* [online journal], 30/1 (2006), 83–92 <http://www.units.muohio.edu/havighurstcenter/russianstudies/documents/siloviki.pdf>, accessed 18 July 2012.

BROWN, A., *The Gorbachev Factor*, (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1996).

CHECKEL, JEFF, 'Ideas, Institutions, and the Gorbachev Foreign Policy Revolution.', *World Politics* [online journal], 45/2 (1993), 271-300 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/info/2950660?seq=1&type=ref#infoRef>, accessed 13 July 2012.

CNS STAFF, 'North Korea's Nuclear Test and its Aftermath: Coping with the Fallout', *Google* [web document] (2009), <http://www.nti.org/analysis/articles/north-koreas-nuclear-test-aftermath/>, accessed 19 June 2012.

THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, 'A Conversation with Sergei Lavrov'. *The Council on Foreign Relations* [web page] (2008) < http://www.cfr.org/un/conversation-sergey-lavrov/p17384>, accessed 29 July 2012.

D'AGOSTINO, A., The Gorbachev Revolution (New York, NY, New York University Press, 1998).

DONALDSON, ROBERT H., '*Boris Yeltsin's Foreign Policy Legacy*.', University of Tulsa, [web page], (2000), <http://www.personal.utulsa.edu/~robert-donaldson/yeltsin.htm>, accessed 12 June 2012.

FAHIM, KAREEM, SHADID, ANTHONY AND GLADSTONE, RICK, 'Violent End to an Era as Qaddafi Dies in Libya', *The New York Times*, 20 Oct. 2011, The New York Times Archive, accessed 21 Oct. 2012.

FELGENHAUR, PAVEL, 'Putin Confirms the Invasion of Georgia Was Preplanned', *Google Search* [web document] (2012), <http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=39746&cHash=177fd31d57370a96ac7da644dc280014>, accessed 1 October 2012.

FRANK, PETER, 'Gorbachev and the 'Psychological Restructuring' of Soviet Society.', *The World Today* [online journal], 43/ 5 (1987), 85-87 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40395932>, accessed 19 June 2012, 86.

FRIEDMAN, GEORGE, 'The Russo-Georgian War and the Balance of Power', *Stratfor* [web document] (2008), <http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/russo_georgian_war_and_balance_power>, accessed 11 May 2012.

GELMAN, HARRY & LEVIN, NORMAN D., 'The Furture of Soviet-North Korean Relations', *The Rand Air Force Project Report* [online journal], (1984), 1-71 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/reports/2009/R3159.pdf>, accessed 20 May 2012.

GILES, KEIR, 'Russia's National Security Strategy to 2020', *NATO Defense College* [web document] (2009), <http://conflictstudies.co.uk/files/RusNatSecStrategyto2020.pdf>, accessed 2 June 2012.

GOLDGEIER, J., *Leadership Style and Soviet Foreign Policy* (Baltimore, Maryland, The John Hopkins University Press, 1994).

GOODRICH, LAUREN**, '**Kyrgyzstan and the Russian Resurgence', *Stratfor Archive* [web document] (2010), <http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20100412_kyrgyzstan_and_russian_resurgence>, accessed 5 June 2012.

HILL, RON, 'The Collapse of the Soviet Union.', *History Ireland* [online journal] , 13/ 2 (2005), 37-42 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27725240>, accessed July 3 2012

HOUGH, JERRY F., 'Gorbachev's Politics.', *Foreign Affairs* [online journal] , 68/5 (1989), 26-41 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20044198>, accessed 4 June 2012.

KENNEDY, R., *Thirteen Days* (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, 1969).

KHONDKER, HABIBUL HAQUE, ‘Role of the New Media in the Arab Spring’, *Globalizations*, 8/5, (2011) 675-679, in Taylor & Francis Online [online database], accessed 12 Nov. 2012.

LEVADA ANALYTICAL CENTER, ‘RUSSIAN PUBLIC OPINION March 2008 – March 2009’, *Jstor* [web document] (2009), <http://www.levada.ru/sites/default/files/levada_2008_eng.pdf>, accessed 19 May 2012.

LYNCH, ALLEN C., ‘The Realism of Russia's Foreign Policy.’, *Europe-Asia Studies* [online journal] , 53/1 (2001), 7-31 < http://www.jstor.org/stable/826237>, accessed 17 Feb. 2012.

MALCOLM, NEIL AND PRAVDA, ALEX, ‘Democratization and Russian Foreign Policy.’ *International Affairs* [online journal] , 72/3 (1996), 537-552, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2625556>, accessed 18 July 2012.

MANDELBAUM, MICHAEL, ‘Coup de Grace: The End of the Soviet Union.’, *Foreign Affairs* [online journal], 71/1 (1991), 164-183 < http://www.jstor.org/stable/20045116>, accessed 30 July 2012.

MCDERMOTT, ROGER , ‘Russia Prepares a New Draft Security Strategy Through 2020.’, The Jamestown Foundation [online journal}, 6/2 (2009), < http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=34307>, accessed 1 June 2012.

NUCLEAR THREAT INITIATIVE, ‘Treaty between The United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (New START)’, *Google* [web document] (2010), <http://www.nti.org/treaties-and-regimes/treaty-between-the-united-states-of-america-and-the-russian-federation-on-measures-for-the-further-reduction-and-limitation-of-strategic-offensive-arms/>, accessed 1 June 2012.

O. OLIKER, K. CRANE, L. SCHWARTZ, & C. YUSUPOV. ‘Russian Foreign Policy: Sources and Implications.’, *Rand Project Air Force* [online journal], (2009), 1-197 <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG768.pdf>, accessed 10 February 2012).

PETRO, NICOLAI N., The Russia–Georgia War: Causes and Consequences.’ *Global Dialogue* [online journal], Vol. 11 (2009), <http://www.worlddialogue.org/content.php?id=439>, accessed 17 May 2012.

REMINGTON, THOMAS F., ‘The Evolution of Executive-Legislative Relations in Russia since 1993.’, *Slavic Review* [online journal] , 59/3 (2000), 499-520 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2697343>, accessed 30 Mar. 2012.

RUSTRANS, ‘Russia's National Security Strategy to 2020’, *Rustrans* [web page] (2009), <http://rustrans.wikidot.com/russia-s-national-security-strategy-to-2020>, accessed Jan 31 2012

SCHLESINGER JR., A., *The Imperial Presidency* (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2004).

SHLAPENTOLKH, DMITRY, 'Dugin Eurasianism: a window on the minds of the Russian elite or an intellectual ploy?' *Studies in East European Thought* [online journal], 59/3 (2007), 215 – 236 < http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11212-007-9030-y/fulltext.html>, accessed 19 July 2012.

SHTUKINA, EKATERINA, 'Medvedev Defends His Georgia Attack Decision in 2008', *RIA Novosti*, 8 Aug. 2012, in Google News Archive [online database], accessed 29 Sep. 2012.

SOKOV, NIKOLAI, 'The New, 2010 Russian Military Doctrine: The Nuclear Angle.', James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies [online journal], (2010), <http://cns.miis.edu/stories/100205_russian_nuclear_doctrine.htm>, accessed 1 June 2012.

STARR, S. FREDERICK, 'The Paradox of Yeltsin's Russia', *The Wilson Quarterly [online journal]* 19/3 (1995), 66-73, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40259015>, accessed July 19, 2012.

THE THOMAS JEFFERSON ENCYCLOPAEDIA, 'Spurious Quotations', *The Thomas Jefferson Foundation* [web page] (1996), < http://www.monticello.org/site/jefferson/when-governments-fear-people-there-libertyquotation>, accessed 2 Mar. 2013.

TSYGANKOV, A. *Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006).

WCIOM, 'Conflict in Syria: What Russia Should Do', *WCIOM* [web page] (2012) <http://wciom.com/index.php?id=61&uid=693>, accessed 1 Nov. 2012.

WCIOM, 'War in Libya: View From Russia', *WCIOM* [web page] (2011) <http://wciom.com/index.php?id=61&uid=44>, accessed 1 Nov. 2012.