

Understanding Russia's policies towards BRICS: theory and practice

Alexander Sergunin

Professor of International Relations

St. Petersburg State University

E-mail: sergunin60@mail.ru

Introduction

Moscow's foreign policy generally and in the BRICS context particularly is a vexed question both in the media and expert community. Since President Putin's speech at the 2007 Munich Security Conference, the launch of a proactive Arctic strategy in 2007-2008 and the "five-day war" with Georgia in August 2008 the Western experts have often described Russia's various foreign policies as expansionist, aggressive and even jingoistic or return to a "gunboat diplomacy."¹ With Crimea's take over and Moscow's support for the pro-Russian rebels in Donbass this criticism has been further strengthened. According to some Western analysts, because of its economic weakness and technological backwardness Russia tends to make an emphasis on military-coercive instruments to protect its national interests in the post-Soviet space and be assertive in its relations with the West.²

On the other hand, there are authors (mostly Russian) who prefer to depict Russia's foreign policy in a complimentary way - as "non-aggressive," "peaceful," "purely defensive," oriented to "protection of its legitimate interests," etc.³ According to them, Moscow does not pursue aggressive/revisionist foreign policies. On the contrary, Russia wants to solve all international disputes by peaceful means, with the help of international law and international institutions (including BRICS).

The Russian and international literature offers quite a few works that draw on various theoretical approaches and attempt to balance otherwise competing perspectives.⁴

The discussion of Russia and BRICS is part of this ongoing debate: What is Russia's interest in BRICS? Why does the Kremlin consider BRICS an important foreign and security policy priority? Which IR theories are helpful in explaining Russia's strategies toward and within BRICS and which ones do not work properly? What kind of Russian international strategy is emerging in the BRICS context? Is this forum helpful for Russia's reintegration into the existing world order – given Moscow's current international semi-isolation because of the

Ukrainian crisis? Or does the Kremlin hope to use BRICS (along with other multilateral institutions) to change the world order to its benefit?

These and related questions are addressed in the study below.

Russia's interest in BRICS

Russia's interests and policy priorities in the case of BRICS are described in the document titled "Concept of participation of the Russian Federation in BRICS"⁵ prepared by the Foreign Ministry on the eve of the BRICS' Durban summit in March 2013. Moscow's interest in this international grouping is of both geoeconomic and geopolitical nature. Geoeconomically, the Kremlin was keen on BRICS' creation and its further development for the following reasons:

- Along with other emerging economies Russia was (and is) discontent with the global economic and financial system which, the Kremlin believed, was established to the benefit of the 'club' of highly developed countries. It is not incidentally that BRICS has institutionally consolidated itself in the context of the global financial crisis of 2008-2010: its member states strongly believed that the West should be blamed for a 'short-sided' and 'reckless' financial policies that led to the crisis and that they should act together in this critical situation. Their decision to establish a \$100 billion bank to finance infrastructure projects and a \$100 billion reserve fund to steady their currency markets has aimed at creating safeguards against new global crises and making them less dependent on economic and financial rules imposed on the world by the wealthiest nations.⁶
- Moreover, the BRICS countries share common economic and financial problems as well as "the need for a large-scale modernization".⁷ For example, Brazil and India are permanently facing serious problems in stabilizing their currencies, since they are hard-pressed to maintain growth by encouraging domestic demand because of the generally high poverty levels. The Russian ruble has also depreciated considerably since the beginning of 2013, i.e. much earlier than the oil prices dropped and the Western sanctions were introduced in 2014. As for China, before February 2014 the government had been able to ensure exchange rate stability through strict regulatory measures, but then the policy of gradual depreciation of the yuan has been started. According to the World Economic Forum experts, China is now losing its another main economic advantage: a cheap labor force. China now comes only 29th in the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index, with South Africa lagging behind in 53rd place, Brazil in 56th, India in 60th, and Russia in 64th position.⁸ In the Kremlin's view, these structural economic problems can be solved by joint efforts. The above-mentioned Foreign Ministry's document had an impressive list of common BRICS activities

which included – along with trade and financial issues – cooperation in areas such as industries, energy, agriculture, telecommunications and information technologies, research, healthcare, higher education and culture.⁹

- Moscow believes that the BRICS countries have an immense potential not only to solve existing problems but also to ensure their sustainable and prosperous socio-economic development. In the aftermath of the September 2013 G20 summit in St. Petersburg (where the BRICS countries had a meeting on the margins) Putin announced, as he has done on innumerable prior occasions, that “BRICS is the world’s biggest market and accounts for 40 (percent) of the world’s population – 2.9 billion people,” thereby indicating that whenever BRICS speaks, the world really should listen.¹⁰ The International Monetary Fund (IMF) says 2013 is the first year in which emerging markets will account for more than half of world GDP on purchasing power parity. Just 13 years ago, they accounted for less than a third. According to another account, China is the first “mega-trader” since colonial Britain. In the area of employment, the BRICS are far ahead. The McKinsey Global Institute says while emerging economies added 900 million non-farm jobs between 1980 and 2010; the advanced economies added just 160 million.¹¹

In this situation it is easy to see which bloc Russia would prefer.

Few experts doubt that the BRICS nations are rapidly developing countries (perhaps with exception of Russia in the post-Crimea era). However, to see BRICS solely through the lens of economic growth is to miss the point. As many analysts believe, they might also be the main poles of the emerging multi-polar world. For example, Fyodor Lukyanov, authoritative columnist and the President of the Council on Foreign & Defense Policies, the Russian influential think tank, emphasizes that “BRICS is primarily a political group that emerged in response to the obvious need for a more diverse and less Western-oriented global political structure.”¹² The Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov has also repeatedly noted that, for Russia, BRICS is first and foremost a geopolitical association.¹³

There are several reasons for Russia’s growing geopolitical interest in BRICS:

- It is becoming increasingly clear for the emerging powers that the structure of global institutions is inadequate to the 21st century realities, while the plans to reform these institutions remain just on paper. It should be noted that while these five very different countries do not agree on everything, they, however, are united in their dissatisfaction with their status in the world, even if their reasons are different and even incompatible.¹⁴ Existing political structures were built around the bipolar world of the Cold War and have remained virtually unchanged since then. The BRICS member states rightly question the legitimacy of the existing system and want a global political structure that reflects the multi-polar world

order that is gradually taking shape nowadays. That's, for example, why all the BRICS nations favor the UN Security Council reform because the current system is seen as a relic of the 1945 balance of power. However, these countries understand that it is uneasy to implement such a reform and that all the structural and procedural changes should be made gradually and in a cautious way. On the other hand, the BRICS countries underline that the proposed UN reform should not undermine the role of this organization. On the contrary, one of the main BRICS' priorities is "to preserve and strengthen the UN Security Council's role as a body bearing the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security."¹⁵

- It is also clear for the five BRICS nations that current global problems demand entirely new approaches. They believe that the West has monopolized the global debate and by doing this it impedes a search for fresh ideas and effective solutions that could result from a more inclusive discussion. The BRICS countries were especially unhappy about the frequent use of military force by the U.S. and its NATO allies in the post-Cold war era. The Russian strategic document on BRICS underlines the need "to prevent the use of the UN, first of all the Security Council, to cover up the course towards removing undesirable regimes and imposing unilateral solutions to conflict situations, including those based on the use of force."¹⁶
- Furthermore, all of the BRICS countries have found it difficult to increase their influence on the world stage within existing institutions, and they have been looking for ways to strengthen their geopolitical positions by forming a new global politico-economic structure. The fact that they represent different parts of the world lends even more weight to their aspirations.
- BRIC is a particularly useful concept for Russia, which has struggled since 1991 to find a stable identity in the global political arena. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia was reduced to the level of regional power. According to Lukyanov, "The notion of multipolarity has shaped Russian foreign policy horizon since mid-90s, when it became clear that Russian integration into Western system as an equal partner was not an option."¹⁷ The concept of BRICS offered Russia a way to reassert its global aspirations and to draw attention to its economic progress. Moreover, BRICS allowed Russia to do this in a non-confrontational way albeit the U.S. remains unconvinced that the group is not directed against anyone and still sees BRICS as a threat to its power.
- Russia also believes that BRICS can be helpful in promoting international security cooperation, more specifically in areas such as conflict resolution, non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, combating international terrorism, drug trafficking, piracy,

money laundering, illegal migration, etc. Moscow favors creation of joint institutions to coordinate BRICS' activities in the field of international security.¹⁸

Theorizing Russia's strategy on BRICS

As mentioned above many Western analysts prefer to characterize Russia as a revisionist power. The dichotomy of revisionist vs. status quo states stems from the realist/neo-realist *power transition theory* (PTT) by A.F.K. Organski¹⁹ and his followers.²⁰ This theory aimed at explaining the causes of international conflicts and wars by the rise of emerging powers that were discontent with international rules established by the dominant powers. According to this theory, powerful and influential nations such as the U.S. who have benefited from the previously established world order fall under the category of status quo states while nations dissatisfied with their place on the international spectrum are often considered revisionist states. The PTT was based on the assumption that the revisionist state aims at either a radical change of old rules or imposing new rules on other international actors.

While this theory (mainly designed for the Cold War period) can still probably work in some cases even in the present-day world, it does not hold much explanatory power with regard to the BRICS countries' foreign policy behavior. None of them can be considered as purely status quo or revisionist power. The BRICS 'five' hardly can be considered as status quo/dominant powers who want to impose their rules on other international players and whose positions are challenged by the rising powers. Their legitimate rights and interests – be it exclusive economic zones (EEZs) in the surrounding seas and oceans or safe borders - are not questioned by other states. At the same time, from the PPT perspective, the BRICS countries can be seen as revisionist powers because some of them have ambitions to extend their EEZs (like Russia in the Arctic or Pacific oceans) or reform the IMF and other global financial institutions, i.e. to change existing rules. But in contrast with the PTT postulates, these quasi-revisionist states aim at solving disputable questions in a 'civilized' way, through negotiations and international institutions. All of them have repeatedly proclaimed that they intend to solve all the disputes by peaceful methods through negotiations and on the basis of international law.

The problem with the revisionist/status quo powers theory is that it largely ignores the existence of the third type of states - the reformist one. Similar to the revisionist powers this kind of states is unsatisfied with the existing rules of the 'game' but they do not want to change them radically; rather they aim at reforming them to adapt them to the new realities and make them more comfortable for all the members of world or regional community. Such states prefer to act on the basis of existing rules and norms rather than challenge them. All changes (reforms) should

be made gradually, through negotiations and to the benefit of all the parties involved. It is safe to assume that all the BRICS states perfectly fall into this category, including Russia. One can distinguish between more or less assertive reformist actors but even most assertive ones hardly can be seen as revisionist states.

The concept of a reformist state is relatively new in the IR literature. Scholars prefer to call them 'pluralist', 'non-aligned', etc. The concept of 'coexistence' (but without its Marxist connotation) has recently become again popular in the IR literature with regard to the emerging powers (such as the BRICS countries).²¹ According to this school, countries with completely different socio-economic and political systems can peacefully coexist. The emerging powers agree to play by existing rules but want to make them more just and adequate to the changing realities.²² They do not accept a dominant state (states) imposing rules on the rest of the world and favor a multipolar world model. The 'coexistence' concept quite nicely fits the reformist state's political philosophy and can be applicable to the explanation of foreign policy behavior of many newly emerging powers, including Russia.²³

The concept "peaceful coexistence" has a strong pedigree in Russia and some other BRICS countries. In fact, it emerged already shortly following the 1917 October Revolution as Soviet leaders started debating whether war between the new communist state and the capitalist world was inevitable or whether the two could in some way co-exist peacefully. This concept was formally proclaimed as the Soviet foreign policy doctrine at the April 1922 International Economic Conference in Genoa. The Indian idea of *Pancha Chila*, or "Five Principles" formed the basis of the 1954 Indian-Chinese peace treaty. *Pancha Chila* included "coexistence, respect for the territorial and integral sovereignty of others, nonaggression, noninterference in the internal affairs of others and the recognition of the equality of others."²⁴

In the Soviet basic documents the "peaceful coexistence" concept was based on the following principles: sovereign equality; mutual renunciation of the use or threat of force; inviolability of frontiers; territorial integrity of states; peaceful settlement of disputes; non-intervention in internal affairs; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; the equal rights of peoples and their right to decide their own destiny; co-operation among states; and fulfillment in good faith of obligations arising from the generally recognized principles and rules of international law, and from the international treaties signed by the (Soviet Union).²⁵

Despite – or rather, as a consequence of – its central position in Soviet foreign policy thinking, peaceful coexistence is largely absent from the contemporary lexicon of political life in Russia.²⁶ Even if the principles may still exist, the term itself is viewed mainly as an historical phenomenon; it carries such strong Marxist-Leninist connotations that any Russian audience will almost automatically associate it with a different use in a different time. Writers may even use

this association to create certain impressions – as when the prominent foreign policy commentator Sergey Karaganov asked whether Russia and the United States would be “going back to peaceful coexistence?,” thereby making a slightly ironic suggestion about the nature of the Russian-US relationship and about the post-Cold War international system.²⁷

The term, however, is still understood of course. So when representatives of other states – for instance from BRICS – make references to peaceful coexistence, they tap into a strong collective consciousness in Russia about at least its general principles as these were put forward before the end of the Cold War.²⁸

The “status panic” theory is also instrumental in explaining Russia’s foreign policy behavior which sometime seems “irrational”. The collapse of the USSR, which is perceived by current Russian leadership as the greatest geopolitical disaster of the 20th century, and the concomitant loss of super power status have left Russia with an agonizingly uncertain status. While Russia’s nuclear arsenal still makes it qualify for top tier, its performance in almost any other area leaves it among states which were, until recently, inferior to it. This relatively sudden development has arguably resulted in a kind of status inconsistency or even “status panic”, from which post-Soviet Russia is still struggling to emerge. With the help of BRICS Russia hopes to restore its former great power status (including political privileges and prestige) as well as to elevate its standing in relation to other world players.²⁹

To explain further the complexity of status-seeking behavior it should be noted that achievements in various fields do not necessarily bring the external recognition expected by a status-seeker (there can be a discrepancy between self-perception of status and externally-defined positions). This can, in turn, to push a status-seeker towards engaging in symbolic actions and gestures to demonstrate capabilities (space, economic, military, cultural, etc.) to win higher status recognition albeit such ‘symbolic policies’ can not match its economic, defense, socio-political and moral resources. For example, some analysts question whether Moscow’s mega-projects such as the 2014 Sochi Winter Olympic Games or 2018 World Soccer Cup are really affordable and economically viable for Russia or they simply aim at Russia’s status elevation and seeking an international prestige? In the same vein other experts are puzzled by the question whether Putin’s decision to take over Crimea was a result of careful calculation or a poorly thought out improvisation to ‘punish’ Ukraine for ousting the pro-Russian Viktor Yanukovich regime and demonstrate that the West has crossed one more ‘red line’ drawn by the Kremlin?

A state may strive for a higher status in the international hierarchy of decision-making through the employment of various tools. I am particularly interested in the question how Russia used its soft power in case of BRICS. My argument is that Russia is striving to build up its soft

power vis-à-vis the other BRICS member states, while also using BRICS to increase its soft power appeal in the eyes of the rest of the international community, riding on the back of BRICS into the world.

Coexistence and soft power policy

The past decade has seen the development of a very strong interest in both the development and employment of soft power in Russia and this has spilled over into Russia's view on and relations with BRICS also. It is seen as part of a complex three-stage strategy: Soft power helps to build up normative power which in turn helps to shape the future world order in Russia's (and BRICS') image.

The use by Russia of its soft power is probably more instrumental than what we usually associate with the term. It is clearly not a wish to be attractive simply to be attractive; it is to be attractive in order to achieve something quite specific and the term thus acquires a political-technocratic flavor.

It is now widely argued that in the post-Cold War period key international players prefer to exercise soft rather than hard power. According to those subscribing to the soft power concept, the economic, socio-cultural, institutional and legal instruments are now much more effective than military power or direct political pressure. For many states, hard power has become an exceptional tool and a last resort in their foreign relations rather than a day-to-day practice. Hard power is now mainly applicable to and against those international actors who violate international law or directly threaten national, regional or global security.

The concept of soft power has become increasingly attractive to the Russian leadership. In the 2011-2012 electoral cycle in Russia, the soft power theme was a popular refrain in the debates, including the so-called "programmatic" articles by Putin. Following his re-election to the presidency in 2012, Putin called on Russian foreign policy-makers to start thinking about how to utilize non-traditional foreign policy instruments, including the soft power ones. The need for soft power capabilities was mentioned both in the foreign policy doctrine and BRICS strategy (February and March 2013, respectively).³⁰

This development has several explanations, including most basically a painful realization that the stated objectives of the previous foreign policy doctrines had been met only partially at best.³¹ According to Konstantin Kosachev, director of *Rossotrudnichestvo* (Russia's governmental agency responsible for maintaining relations with the CIS and compatriots abroad), Russia has managed to preserve its hard power parity with other key international actors, but it is still lagging behind them in terms of soft power.³² What this indicates is that

Russia has failed even to shape the CIS – its most immediate neighboring space – as it has intended.

Moving beyond the regional to the global level, soft power is of no less importance to Russia as it strives to influence the order of the latter. The cooperation within BRICS offers Russia an opportunity to define and to project a new international role for itself which should be different from its traditional image of a great (hard) power. The concept of soft power looks promising for the Kremlin because - in contrast with Europe - it can suggest “for sale” on the BRICS “market” not only raw materials but also industrial products and high technologies (both military and civilian) as well as the Russian high education and culture. Supported by BRICS, Moscow hopes to ascertain its global authority by other means and in its new capacity: Not as a militarist and expansionist country but as a soft power which is attractive for international partners economically, politically and culturally.

A key component of soft power, the political values of a state, may serve to attract other actors when these former are “universal” in nature and when their actual political expressions promote “values and interests that others share.”³³ An attractive domestic model can be another potential value-based soft power resource. As follows from the Russian foreign policy documents, Moscow has an ambition not only to promote universal values but also to export the Russian traditions of inter-ethnic and inter-religious tolerance and multiculturalism.³⁴

An attractive foreign policy is a valuable asset for the soft power strategy for any state as well. Russia is eager, both within BRICS and in a wider global setting, to present itself as a responsible and peaceful actor concerned not only about its own national interests but also about regional and global security. Russian diplomatic initiatives (for example, Medvedev’s 2009 proposal for a comprehensive European Security Treaty) are regularly launched with the aim to develop this positive image. While the actual term is not being employed, the essence of these initiatives, including the foreign policy doctrines as laid out above, may be boiled down to peaceful co-existence.

Despite their general *rapprochement* with Moscow over the last two decades Russia’s neighboring and the BRICS countries are quite suspicious about Moscow’s soft power policies in the world. Both the policy-oriented and research literature is replete with critical assessments of the Russian soft power strategies in the region. According to one Western assessment, “unlike the traditional definition of soft power, Russia’s soft power does not display emphasis on legitimacy and moral authority.... It serves to divide rather than unite and to arouse apprehension rather than provide comfort.”³⁵ The list of complaints includes “creation, maintenance and support of Kremlin-friendly networks of influence in the cultural, economic and political sectors,” dissemination of the biased information, local agenda-setting through the Russia-state-

controlled media, making the compatriots loyal to Kremlin, etc. Some analysts believe that in many cases Russia's main objective is to enhance its own sphere of influence. According to other accounts, "the Kremlin is seeking to exploit the Western concept of 'soft power'...reframing it as a euphemism for coercive policy and economic arm-twisting."³⁶

Regarding the attractiveness of the Russian political values, as many foreign experts maintain, Russia has problems with harmonizing its traditional and internationally recognized democratic values and standards. On the one hand, Kosachev assumes that "freedom, democracy, rule of law, social stability and respect for human rights have become 'a consumer basket' of the modern world" but, on the other, he insists that "there are differences in their (that is, values) *individual manifestation* due to national, historical and other specifics."³⁷ In other words, Moscow finds it difficult to persuade others that it shares universal values and is ready to disseminate them throughout the world. Equally, Russia is unable to make its domestic socio-economic and political model attractive and sell it to other nations. Even Kosachev admits that Russia cannot export its specific model since "it has not developed any such model yet."³⁸

Moscow is also short of efficient foreign policy tools in the soft power domain. None of Russia's large-scale foreign policy initiatives (including its proposal for a European Security Treaty) have gained solid support (not even among the other BRICS states). A notable exception, though a very concrete action which may only influence the world order quite indirectly, was delivered by Russia's successful mediation efforts in the Syrian crisis in 2013. Notably, these efforts included the flexing of the collective BRICS normative power muscle at the St. Petersburg G20 summit; by supporting Putin's initiative, the other BRICS states also supported Russia's soft power ambitions.

However, the Ukrainian crisis has again undercut Russia's soft power diplomacy not only in its 'near abroad' but also globally. The BRICS countries did not join the West's anti-Russian political and economic sanctions but at the same time did not support Crimea's take-over by Russia and reiterated their preference for non-coercive, non-military instruments of international policies.

To continue the analysis of Russia's soft power shortcomings, it should be noted that Moscow's instruments in this field are predominantly "statist," that is, government-based and controlled. The NGO potential and resources are basically not in demand. The NGOs "officially" allowed to participate in soft power activities in reality are semi-governmental and they are perceived by the "target audiences," especially in the post-Soviet countries, as such.³⁹

To sum up, the Russian interpretation of soft power is rather pragmatic and interest-centric. For example, the current foreign policy doctrine defines soft power as a "complex set of instruments to achieve foreign policy aims by means of the civil society, information-

communication, humanitarian and other methods and technologies that are different from classical diplomacy.”⁴⁰ It remains to be seen whether this will be adequate to support Russia’s ambitions for the future global order – and those of BRICS.

Conclusions

Overall the Russian policies towards and within BRICS represent a combination of ideational and material motives. On the one hand, BRICS is important for the Kremlin in terms of status seeking: it believes that by joining forces with other major states it will be easier for Russia to return and maintain its status of a great power, to shape the future world order and to make the West (particularly the United States) abide by the rules of that order. On the other hand, Moscow values its economic and strategic partnerships with the BRICS states which are important for Russia’s well-being and for counter-balancing the West in the global geoeconomic and geopolitical game.

At the same time, the Russian attitude to BRICS demonstrates a certain duality, however. It is being celebrated as the wave of the future of global politics – as the coming of a more just, equitable and peaceful world – but skepticism is also being expressed, if mostly indirectly only. It gives reason to speculate that a gap may exist between what is being *pronounced* and what is being *thought* by Russian politicians. The point is that BRICS for Russia seems to represent mainly a vehicle for *global normative transformation*, while for achieving specific geopolitical objectives Moscow prefers to use other organizations such as the CIS, Collective Security Treaty Organization and Shanghai Cooperation Organization which are *regional* in scope and more *practical* in their outlook.

In line with the “peaceful coexistence” concept and reformist political philosophy Moscow has opted for the non-coercive, soft power foreign policy methods in the BRICS context. The Russian soft power arsenal includes a variety of instruments ranging from efforts to make cooperation with Russia economically attractive to cultural and education/research incentives. An impressive institutional mechanism has been created to this end. It should be noted, however, that despite financial support and other efforts invested into the soft power strategy, its performance and efficiency are far from being ideal.

The Russian understanding of soft power strongly deviates from either the ‘classic’ one (Nye-based) or suggested by other Western academics and practitioners. The Russian interpretation of soft power is rather instrumentalist, pragmatic and interest-centric.

Presently, the Russian soft power has a rather contradictory performance: On the one hand, Russia possesses huge soft power resources of economic, societal, political and cultural

nature. On the other hand, Moscow is often unable to use these resources in a proper and coherent way. As Nye pointed out, ‘...for China and Russia to succeed, they will need to match words and deeds in their policies, be self-critical, and unleash the full talents of their civil societies’.⁴¹

Contrary to Russian expectations, Moscow’s soft power diplomacy has failed to contribute to the improvement of its bilateral relations with the neighboring countries. Rather, these countries are quite suspicious about some of Kremlin’s methods (for instance its efforts to make the local Russian-speaking communities pro-Kremlin lobbies) and tend to interpret the Russian soft power strategy as a neo-imperialist instrument. The Russian soft power strategy also lacks the non-governmental actors’ participation, transparency and public control as well and often suffers from low competence and corruption.

It goes without saying that the above-mentioned shortcomings as well as international crises such as the Georgian and Ukrainian ones make the Russian soft power policies less efficient and sometime undercut the Kremlin’s strategies in the neighbouring regions. It is still a long way to go to bring Moscow’s soft power strategy to widely-accepted standards and make Russia a really attractive international partner.

However, the very fact that Moscow has decided to redesign its foreign policy in a way to support and further develop international norms, rules and institutions and has preferred non-coercive, soft power methods deserves both attention and encouragement. If other BRICS countries follow the same pattern this may be an important contribution to the rise of a really new – more secure and just – world order in the foreseeable (but still distant) future.

Endnotes

¹ Stephen Blank, “Russia’s Geo-economic Future; The Security Implications of Russia’s Political and Economic Structure,” *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 24, no. 3 (2011), 351–95; Ariel Cohen and R.E. Hamilton, *The Russian Military and the Georgia War: Lessons and Implications* (Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 2011); Matthias Schepp and Gerald Traufetter, “Riches at the North Pole: Russia Unveils Aggressive Arctic Plans,” *Spiegel Online International* (January 29, 2009), www.spiegel.de/international/world/riches-at-the-north-pole-russia-unveils-aggressive-arctic-plans-a-604338.html; Stephen Walt. “The Bad Old Days Are Back”, *Foreign Policy*, May 2, 2014, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2014/05/02/the-bad-old-days-are-back/>.

² Zoltan Barany, “Civil-Military Relations and Institutional Decay: Explaining Russian Military Politics,” *Europe-Asia Studies* 60, no. 4 (2008), 581–604; Rob Huebert, Heather Exner-Pirot, Adam Lajeunesse, and Jay Gulledge, *Climate Change & International Security: The Arctic as a Bellwether* (Arlington, VA: Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, 2012), www.c2es.org/docUploads/arctic-security-report.pdf; Andrei Illarionov, “The Siloviki in Charge,” *Journal of Democracy* 20, no. 2 (2009), 69–72; Mark Smith and Keir Giles, *Russia and the Arctic: «The last Dash North»* (Shrivenham, England: Defense Academy of the United Kingdom, 2007).

-
- ³ Mikhail Barabanov, ed., *Russia's New Army* (Moscow: Center for Analysis of Strategies and Technologies, 2011); Mikhail Barabanov, Konstantin Makienko and Ruslan Pukhov, *Military Reform: Toward a New Look on the Russian Army* (Moscow, Russia: The Valdai Discussion Club, 2012), http://vid-1.rian.ru/ig/valdai/Military_reform_eng.pdf; Andrei Diev, *Arkticheskaya Strategiya Rossii* (Russia's Arctic Strategy) (2009), <http://flot.com/nowadays/concept/navyrole/arcticstrategy.htm>; Fyodor Lukyanov. "Russian Dilemmas in a Multipolar World", *Journal of International Affairs*, 2010, [Vol. 63, No. 2](http://jia.sipa.columbia.edu/russian-dilemmas-multipolar-world/), <http://jia.sipa.columbia.edu/russian-dilemmas-multipolar-world/>.
- ⁴ Kjell Engelbrekt and Bertil Nygren, eds., *Russia and Europe. Building Bridges, Digging Trenches* (London: Routledge, 2010); Flemming S. Hansen and Alexander Sergunin. "Russia, BRICS, and peaceful coexistence: between idealism and instrumentalism", in Cedric de Coning, Thomas Mandrup and Liselotte Odgaard (eds.). *The BRICS and Coexistence: An Alternative Vision of World Order*. Abingdon: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2014, pp. 75-99; Andrey Makarychev and Alexander Sergunin, "The EU, Russia and Models of International Society in a Wider Europe," *Journal of Contemporary European Research* 9, no. 2 (2013); Tatiana Shakleina, "Russia in the New Distribution of Power," in Vidya Nadkarni and Norma Noonan (eds.). *Emerging Powers in a Comparative Perspective: The Political and Economic Rise of the BRIC countries*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 2013, pp. 163-188; Andrei P. Tsygankov, *Russia and the West from Alexander to Putin. Honor in International Relations* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2012);
- ⁵ *Concept of participation of the Russian Federation in BRICS*. Moscow: Russian Foreign Ministry, 2013, <http://eng.news.kremlin.ru/media/events/eng/files/41d452b13d9c2624d228.pdf>
- ⁶ "Russia Says BRICS Development Bank Ready to Launch", *The Moscow Times*, July 9, 2014, <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/russia-says-brics-development-bank-ready-to-launch/503183.html>
- ⁷ *Concept of participation of the Russian Federation in BRICS*, p. 3.
- ⁸ Viktor Kuzmin. "New BRICS reserve pool to fight currency shocks", *Russia Beyond The Headlines*, September 11, 2013, http://in.rbth.com/economics/2013/09/11/new_brics_reserve_pool_to_fight_currency_shocks_29263.html
- ⁹ *Concept of participation of the Russian Federation in BRICS*, p. 10-16.
- ¹⁰ "Vladimir Putin's news conference following the G20 Summit" (6 September 2013), <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/5950>.
- ¹¹ Rakesh Krishnan Simha. "Why Russia prefers BRICS to Europe", *Russia Beyond The Headlines*, October 8, 2013, http://in.rbth.com/blogs/2013/10/08/why_russia_prefers_brics_to_europe_29979.html
- ¹² Fyodor Lukyanov. "BRICS goes from fantasy to reality", *Russia in Global Affairs*, April 17, 2011, <http://www.globalaffairs.ru/redcol/BRICS-goes-from-fantasy-to-reality-15169>.
- ¹³ Lukyanov. "BRICS goes from fantasy to reality"; Adam Wolfe. "The Building BRICs (Brasil, Russia, India and China) of a New International System?", *World Politics Review*, 21 May 2008, <http://www.godlikeproductions.com/forum1/message661927/pg1>;
- ¹⁴ Oliver Stuenkel. "Emerging Powers and Status: The Case of the First BRICS Summit", *Asian Perspective*, 2014, Vol. 38, no. 1, <http://kr.vlex.com/vid/emerging-powers-status-brics-summit-494287502>
- ¹⁵ *Concept of participation of the Russian Federation in BRICS*, p. 5.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- ¹⁷ Fyodor Lukyanov. "Russian Dilemmas in a Multipolar World".
- ¹⁸ *Concept of participation of the Russian Federation in BRICS*, p. 6-7.
- ¹⁹ Organski, A.F.K. *World Politics*. New York: Alfred and Knopf, 1958.

-
- ²⁰ Eugene R. Wittkopf. *World Politics: Trend and Transformation*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997; Ronald L. Tammen et al. *Power Transitions: Strategies for the 21st Century*. New York: Seven Bridges Press, 2000.
- ²¹ Liselotte Odgaard. *China and Coexistence: Beijing's National Security Strategy for the 21st Century*. Washington, D.C: Woodrow Wilson Center Press/Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012.
- ²² Vidya Nadkarni and Norma Noonan, eds. *Emerging Powers in a Comparative Perspective: The Political and Economic Rise of the BRIC countries*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- ²³ Cedric de Coning, Thomas Mandrup and Liselotte Odgaard (eds.). *The BRICS and Coexistence: An Alternative Vision of World Order*. Abingdon: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2014.
- ²⁴ Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, "India's Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs* 34, no. 3 (1956): 436.
- ²⁵ *Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics* (1977), art. 29, www.departments.bucknell.edu/russian/const/77cons01.html#chap04.
- ²⁶ It should be added that it is still widely used in the analysis of inter-confessional and inter-ethnic relations in Russia.
- ²⁷ Sergey Karaganov, "Rossiya – SshA: Obratno k mirnomu sosushestvovaniyu?" (Russia-USA: Back to Peaceful Coexistence?), *Rossiiskaya Gazeta* (24 March 2006).
- ²⁸ See for instance the comments by then Chinese President Jiang Zemin following the August 1999 Bishkek Declaration of the Shanghai Five; in "Stroitelstvo novogo mirovogo porjadka" (Building a New World Order), *Rossiiskaya Gazeta* (undated article), www.rg.ru/prilog/es/0904/1.htm.
- ²⁹ Hansen and Sergunin. Op. cit.; Stuenkel. Op. cit.
- ³⁰ *The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation* (12 February 2013), www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/0/76389FEC168189ED44257B2E0039B16D; *Concept of participation of the Russian Federation in BRICS*, p. 4.
- ³¹ Vladimir Putin, Ukaz Prezidenta RF ot 7 Maya 2012 No. 605 "O merakh po realizatsii vneshnepoliticheskogo kursa Rossiyskoi Federatsii" (Decree of the President of the RF, 7 May 2012, No. 605 "On the measures on the implementation of the Russian Federation's foreign policy course"), <http://text.document.kremlin.ru/SESSION/PILOT/main.htm>.
- ³² Konstantin Kosachev, "V mire slozhilas prezumptsiya vinovnosti Rossii" (Presumption of Russia's culpability exists in the world), in *Kommersant*, (1 September 2012).
- ³³ Joseph Nye. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004, p. 11.
- ³⁴ Summed up in its current Russian usage as "peaceful coexistence"; see Vladimir Putin, "Rossiya i menyauschisysya mir" (Russia and the changing world), *Moscow News* (27 February 2012), www.mn.ru/politics/20120227/312306749.html; *The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation* (2013).
- ³⁵ Agnia Grygas, *Legacies, Coercion and Soft Power: Russian Influence in the Baltic States* (London: Chatham House, 2012), 9 - 13, http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/Research/Russia%20and%20Eurasia/0812bp_grigas.pdf.
- ³⁶ Dumitru Minzarari, "Soft Power with an Iron Fist: Putin Administration to Change the Face of Russia's Foreign Policy Toward Its Neighbours," *Eurasia Daily Monitor* 9, no. 163 (10 September 2012), www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=39821.
- ³⁷ Konstantin Kosachev, "The Specifics of Russian Soft Power", *Russia in Global Affairs* (7 October 2012), <http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/number/The-Specifics-of-Russian-Soft-Power-15683>.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ See e.g. Gatis Pelnéns, ed., *The “Humanitarian Dimension” of Russian Foreign Policy Toward Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine, and the Baltic States* (Riga, Latvia: Centre for East European Policy Studies, 2010).

⁴⁰ *The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation* (2013).

⁴¹ Joseph Nye. “What China and Russia Don't Get About Soft Power”, April 29, 2013. Available from: http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/04/29/what_china_and_russia_don_t_get_about_soft_power