

**RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
INSTITUTE FOR SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION
IN SOCIAL SCIENCES**

INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

**RUSSIA
AND
THE MOSLEM WORLD
2010 – 12 (222)**

Science-information bulletin

The Bulletin was founded in 1992

**Moscow
2010**

Director of publications L.V. SKVORTSOV,
Deputy Director of the Institute for Scientific
information in Social Sciences
of the Russian Academy of Sciences (RAS)
Founder of the project and scientific consultant –
ALBERT BELSKY
Editor-in-Chief –
ELENA DMITRIEVA

Editorial board:

OLGA BIBIKOVA
(First Deputy Editor-in-Chief),
ALEXEI MALASHENKO,
DINA MALYSHEVA,
AZIZ NIYAZI
(Deputy Editor-in-Chief),
VALIAHMED SADUR,
DMITRY FURMAN

CONTENTS

<i>Georgy Malinetsky.</i> Projection of the future and modernization of Russia.....	4
<i>Tatyana Litvinova.</i> “Information jihad” in global network	39
<i>Georgy Rudov.</i> Russia–Central Asia and radical Islam	46
<i>Kamaludin Gadjiev.</i> Will Azerbaijan become second Kuwait?	51
<i>M. Akulova.</i> The world democracy and Tajikistan.....	59
<i>G. Rudov.</i> Turkey’s and Iran’s role in Central Asia and stability problems.....	66
Contents of “Russia and the Moslem world” bulletin for 2010 № 1(211)–12(222).....	72

Georgy Malinetsky,

doctor of physical-mathematical sciences,
deputy director of Keldysh Institute of
Applied Mathematics
(Russian Academy of Sciences)

**PROJECTION OF THE FUTURE AND
MODERNIZATION
OF RUSSIA**

Russia is on the eve of the crucial decade. The country goes on through the systemic crisis, which has the only exit – the accelerated innovation development. In any other case the disintegration of the country is unavoidable. If we do not break the present dangerous trends of the Russian Federation's movement, nothing will save us. The RF will not be able to be even of the resources' supplement of the developed world. Nobody doubts that modernization is one of the imperatives of Russia's development. The similar task emerged not once in our country's history. What is modernization today? The most significant part of this multilateral phenomenon is the break in the scientific-technical sphere, in the field of high-tech. Archimedes considered that he would turn the Earth over, if he gets fulcrum.

Modernization of Russia also should gain the foot-hold in the scientific, educational, expert and technological space of Russia.

What could become such foot-hold?

In terms of the scientific aspect of this task one may see that it surprisingly coincides with the half-century old discussion on the ways of Soviet science between prominent Soviet physicist academician L. Artsimovich and mathematician, president of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR M.V. Keldysh. For these years of rapid development of natural sciences, cybernetics they felt that Karl Marx prediction came true and science would become the direct productive force. The excellent book of Stanislav Lem “Technologies in Sum” became a symbol of such scientific-technological optimism. Proceeding from this paradigm, academician L.A. Artsimovich asserted that science is satisfaction of individual curiosity at the expense of the state. In essence it is a value orientation, and it is not so important what to do, it is important to do it at the high level. Academician M.V. Keldysh shared the other point of view. He considered that development of science, perceived as a significant institution of society, is determined by some big practical tasks, which are not numerous. In times of Keldysh, the priority directions were as follows: mastering of nuclear technologies, creation and perfection of cosmic apparatuses and ballistic rockets, elaboration of computerized systems of governance and adjacent program-complexes. In other words, it was the purposeful orientation at the state level.

It is possible to say that in the past the outcome of historical development to a large extent was determined in research institutions, in scientific laboratories, in testing areas. The knowledge, transformed into military technologies, became the force, which was able to save the world of great conflicts. M.V. Keldysh considered that the future of Soviet science consisted in the distant cosmos. According to him, the

cosmic industry (in Soviet times – over 1.5 million people and about 1200 enterprises) was the high-tech locomotive for the whole national industry. At present, when our country for eighteen years lacked a single apparatus in the distant cosmos, when many technologic chances were lost, the truth of this paradoxical conclusion becomes evident. This trend turned out to be the world evidence. One of the American presidents responded to the question about the American discoveries on the moon in the following way: many good micro schemes. The biggest and most advanced centers, charged with military problems, started to make gradually the larger input into the fundamental research, the high technologies of the civil sector of economy.

Since the middle of the XX century, the computer simulation started to play the principal role. In essence, the experimental method and theoretical research were supplemented by the technology of scientific research – the computational research. The defense and economic potential of the country started to be determined, inter alia, by the possessed mathematical models and data, by the collectives, which are able to imitate and study computerized processes of different types, to make projects and to prognostications on the basis of this knowledge.

And quite other conclusion may be made on the priorities and the attitude to science for the period of the 1990s-2000s: despite the models, prognoses, warnings, made by the researchers, the elites and the leaders of our country did not pay attention to them.

The role of the scientific prediction, of the historic and strategic prognosis has grown enormously. The new reality, which confronts the mankind, may be qualified as the epoch of choice. The economic, technological and social development allows the mankind to realize different directions of the XXI century. Our civilization will have to choose the wished option of its future consciously, basing on scientific

prediction, and to be responsible for this choice. Otherwise, this choice will be made spontaneously, contrary to our plans, wishes, accompanied by the corresponding risks. What should be the direction of industrial policy of Russia today? It should be the achievement of the principal aim, fixed by the president of Russia D. Medvedev: the efficient governance of Russia within its present borders. The aim may seem to be too modest. But is it so? American political scientist and sociologist S. Huntington, who has a great influence on the American Administration, calls the XXI century to be the epoch of clashes among civilizations, the time of struggle for resources on the geopolitical arena. Actually, we see an acute competition and opposition in the economic, military-political and information sphere, in the space of notions and values, projects of the future among the biggest geopolitical players.

What are the present potentials of different civilizations?

The disintegration of the USSR became the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the XX century. Actually, our country was the second economy in the world before the beginning of Gorbachyov perestroika. In terms of the size of the GNP, one of the most significant macro-economic indexes, the Soviet economy accounted in these years for 60% of the American economy and surpassed by five times the Chinese economy. The present Russian economy makes 6% of the American economy and one fifth of the Chinese economy. For twenty five years of reforms the national “economic elephant” (by the world measures) has transformed itself into “moska”. Overcoming the unfavorable demographic trends will be a great problem not only for the present generation but also for the next two generations. We lack any more any chances to get the upper hand by the number and not by skill. And this factor determines the choice of Russia in favor of a forced growth of manufacture high-tech industry and innovation development. The task,

set by the Russian president, demands the exact, contemporary and efficient state governance marked by its most significant aspect – industrial policy. And one of the most important aims of modernization is ensuring such governance.

Unfortunately, we still lack industrial policy. We discuss the work, which should have been accomplished twenty years ago. (It is amazing, that in Russia we have to convince somebody in the necessity of industrial policy.) And what is more, industrial policy should be coordinated with economic, defense, social, regional, technological, educational and scientific policies. This is dictated by the systemic approach and by common sense. Perhaps, everything is all right? Regretfully, it is not at all. Crisis is interpreted as trial, as exam. The reaction of Russian economy to the first wave of the crisis in 2009 determined the appraisal of the liberal policy for the last twenty years, carried out in the country. This mark is “not satisfactory”. The present policy is the direct continuation of the policy, started by the government, headed by E. Gaidar for the years of shock reforms. Many people remember his words that science in Russia is inadequate and that all we need we would buy abroad. The project “Skolkovo” is the product of the same market illusions, of disbelief in national science and the complexes of the state inefficiency. But one should not share illusions about “purchase” of high tech. It is sufficient to recall that in 2009 Russia was denied in Germany to buy “Opel” and electronic firm “Infimum”. In contemporary world “duty is before friendship”.

The Russian economy is being guided by the same circle of people, as in the beginning of the catastrophic reforms of the 1990s. The typical person is A. Chubais. The privatization vouchers for the price of two “Volga”, the excellent successes of electric energy in Russia (quite known after catastrophe in Sayano-Shushenskaya hydroelectric station), great achievements of “Rosnano” give full

confidence in devastating success of project “Skolkovo”, being implemented by this “efficient manager”.

The GNP fell down by more than 8% in 2009 (the amount of railway cargoes diminished by 20%), which surpass American indexes more than twice and the world indexes – six times. But some countries not only survived the crisis but, on the contrary, advanced in the economic sphere. For the year of 2009, Brazil increased its GNP, while India raised it by 6%, and China raised its GNP by 8%. The different economic policy means different results. A. Kudrin, who has occupied the post of finance minister for ten years, commented the success of China in the following way: “I had a talk with Nobel Prize winner E. Felps. He said that the non-capitalist economy existed in China and that therefore the greater part of investments was made by the state. For the time of the crisis, when in all economies of the world the size of money decreased, this size was raised in China”. This is just the point! The people do not stick to the rule! Therefore they succeeded. We do everything “honestly” in a capitalist way, and the West approves us. But our results are much less.

Let us recall the president’s negative estimation of the RF governments’ activities. A great part of \$ 200 billion, allocated for “maintenance of liquidity” and “financial stabilization” did not reach the real sector of economy. But \$ 200 billion means 10 million jobs with monthly payment of 20 thousand rubles for three years. For the years of the crisis the number of dollar billionaires increased almost twice, and the support, given to “maintenance of liquidity”, was fruitful. The next wave of crisis will go on against the background of economic stagnation. The period of 2014–2015 will be marked by great social-political risks. It is high time to achieve results in economic development by convincing the political class of Russia to carry out the industrial strategy and policy.

Russia confronts the challenge of historical scale. Let us recall the Russian experience in modernization. The ideas of Peter I seem to be well known: for thirty years Russia should acquire western technologies and afterwards may turn its back. According to him, Russian industry could be able to produce canons, to construct ships, to build fortresses, to maintain, by contemporary wording, the defense complex at the level of the leading countries of that time. Modernization is a serious affair, which demands super-efforts of the people and of the elite. They exert these efforts according to the challenges, which threaten existence of society and state. Usually these perspectives are comprehended in time of the threat of war. The war against Sweden and Poltava battle was the exam for modernization in times of Peter I. Russia succeeded to pass this exam. The modernization in times of Lenin also had its clear orientations. For time of socialist construction there were solved the problems of industrialization, collectivization, and there was carried out the culture's revolution. Let us recall the slogan "Communism is the Soviet power plus electrification of the whole country". The realization of industrial policy, which demanded super-efforts of the Soviet people and which was carried out against the background of the world crisis, produced the wished results. The country was renovated and could withstand during the Great Patriotic War. The exam was passed.

At present, Russia confronts the large-scale problems, as in times of Peter and Lenin modernization. And again the geo-economic and geopolitical instability of the whole world system grows, accompanied by risks of big military conflicts, acute rivalry among old and new centers of force, of a new re-division of the world.

At the present time, the basis of industrial policy is the strategic prognosis, more exactly the technologies of projection of the future. The future is not pre-determined, and our present activities may raise

probability of realization of one of its options and diminish probability of realization of other options. For the past centuries, the significance of prevision and abilities of prognostication increased many times. For the last thirty years of the XX century, the scientific revolution took place in this field. It is connected with the theory of self-organization or with synergism, on the one side, and with great chances of computer modeling, on the other side. For the time of computers' existence the speed of their functioning increased by 100 billion times. The computer industry surpassed all other industries in terms of rapid progress. In the USA there exist over 50 brain centers charged with projection of the future as a whole and with alternative options of strategies of industrial development, in particular. About thirty national conferences, devoted to these problems, are held annually in the country. Japan, Germany, Finland, France and many other countries follow this way with confidence, basing on science's achievements for shaping their industrial and innovation policy.

There are two aspects of this significant work. On the one side, it shows orientation for the people, who take decisions at the state and regional level, at the level of biggest corporations. It shows the most probable consequences and risks of the taken decisions, the price of the choice of one or other alternative strategy. On the other side, public circles get this information and form the image of the desired future, of aims, dreams, priorities, different threats in mass consciousness. This circumstance allows the state to take advantage of the information's governance capacity and of reflexive governance of society. With regret, it should be admitted that in Russia they have not elaborated a serious and responsible attitude to its future (particularly, to the industrial future).

Projection of many technologies is based on the theory of great waves of economic conjuncture, created by prominent Russian scientist

N.D. Kondratyev (1892–1938). According to this theory, the systemic basis of economic crisis, wars, revolutions and geopolitical catastrophes is the replacement of some technological structures by other structures. Exactly this factor should be taken into account in formation and execution of industrial policy. The essence of this theory may be reduced as follows. The development of the world and of national economies is not a smooth and constant growth but the process of cycles and waves. Its cycles consist of the alternated phases of relatively high and relatively low tempos of the economic growth. The technological progress also goes on unevenly – the periods of rapid technological revolutions are changed for the periods of stagnation. The period of industrial revolution is followed by the cycles/waves and the corresponding technological structures.

I cycle (1803-1841-43) – textile factories, coal extraction.

II cycle (from 1844-51 to 1890-96) – coal extraction and ferrous metallurgy, construction of railways, steam engine.

III cycle (from 1891-96 to 1945-47) – basic engineering industry, electric energy, non-organic chemistry, production of steel and electric machines.

V cycle (from 1945-47 to 1981-83) – production of automobiles and other machines, chemical industry, oil refinery and internal combustion engines, mass production.

V cycle (from 1981-83 to 2018) – development of electronics, robotics, computational, laser and telecommunication technique.

VI cycle (from 2018 to 2060) – convergence of nano-, bio-, information and cognitive technologies.

The cycles of Kondratyev represent reality and were proved not once. On the basis of his calculations, he predicted the Great Depression of the 1930s. According to Kondratyev theory, exactly the present five-seven years represent the key period for Russia. Just at this

stage of the economic cycle the innovations and new methods are being searched and selected, and they will become the basis of industrial development for the next thirty years. This time should not be lost.

The technological successful development demands also an active use of humanitarian technologies. Society should comprehend and accept the changes, should actively participate in this process. The experience of Peter and Lenin modernization shows the significance of this factor. Peter had to create the empire and “to open the window to Europe”, Lenin had to create the Soviet Union and to propose a new type of way, to lay foundations of Soviet civilization. In this case industrial policy was linked with cultural, social, educational, scientific policy. And just in this respect our country confronts big problems. According to the sociological data, 97% of citizens of Russia do not think that in some or other way they have an impact on the adopted state decisions and are liable for them. Under these conditions, in the situation of confrontation between “we” and “they”, the chances for successful modernization of Russia, for new industrialization of the country are not great.

The industrial policy should be viewed not only as a whole process but also in terms of state measure taken for support of separate branches of economy, which usually made in developed countries. The corresponding legislative acts are adopted (one may recall the American law on “soldered vacuum”, directed to the support of miniaturization of electronic devices, which greatly stimulated development of the high-tech branch of economy). The question is that within different Kondratyev cycles the technologies differ, and they develop in different tempos. For instance, the aircraft industry, the atomic energy and TV developed rapidly. The air-transportation related to creation of the gigantic world infrastructure, and the computer industry demanded a much longer time to show their capacity.

The analysis for elaboration of industrial policy is very significant. At different stages of industrial development in a specific branch and macro-technology, the expected results and the measures of the state support should be different. These processes develop “in slow time”, much more slowly than the business cycle in the existing industries. In the first case the time means decades, in the second case – months and years. The first period of ten-fifteen years is devoted to fundamental research and creation of new knowledge, which shows new chances for economy, for rapid professional training. The state plays the main role in this sphere. And ten-fifteen years later will be used to transform the applied devices into new products, services and chances. In this case business plays an active role, supplementing state efforts and assuming obligations for development of new macro-technology. Further, for the following ten-fifteen years, the innovations are spread, technologies of mass production are modernized and the new methods penetrate all branches of economy, which become ready for it. At this stage, the Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation as well as business and big corporations play the decisive role.

It is worth recalling history in the XX and the XI centuries. The beginning of the XX century was marked by development of IV technological structure. Its locomotives were as follows: heavy machine building, metallurgy, big chemistry, automobile industry, aircraft industry and electric machines’ construction. The symbol of this economic epoch was mass production, conveyor. The change of the principal energy bearer occurred. The XIX century was the coal century, the XX century was the century of oil and electricity. The first and second world wars were perceived by many economists and historians, first of all, as the war of oil against coal. Stalin, rapidly developing military industry, foresaw that the Second World War

would be a war of engines. This prognosis was true. The essence of Stalin modernization was mastering of chances, provided by the IV technological structure. And the super-efforts on the part of the people and the elite were needed to achieve this task. Thanks to this achievement, the USSR took the upper hand in the Great Patriotic War and became a super power.

Since the 1990s, Russia, being involved in fruitless and destructive reforms, lost the V technological structure, which was developing since the 1970s. The locomotives-industries of this technological structure were computers, small chemical industry, telecommunications and electronics' industries, Internet. Japan, South Korea, "Pacific tigers" achieved successes on this wave of development. For the period from 2014 to 2018 the leading countries of the world will pass to the VI technological structure, when the locomotives will be, probably, as follows: bio-technologies, nano-technologies, new health care, robotics, high humanitarian technologies, large-scale systems of virtual reality, new natural resources use. The developed countries prepare for a big technological leap. Just this is the pivot of their economic policy.

It is necessary to examine the current crisis from this point of view. Its inner cause is not that "bad American chaps" accumulated mortgage credits and did not pay their debts. The question is not that the USA abuses the printing machine. The significance of these factors is evident, and it should not be questioned. The question is that the branches of the V structure have exhausted its capacity for development. They do not produce the former result. Actually, everybody has its mobile telephone. In Russia their number accounts for 180 million. The market is full. And a new created company will not change the situation either in the world or in Russia. The train has departed. Time and tide wait for no man.

The strategic task is set for the state, for the Russian science, education and industry – to catch the last car of the leaving train of the VI technological structure. At present, history decides, what countries and what regions will become sellers and what countries – buyers, who will be the leader and who will follow him, which countries and civilizations will go up and which ones will disappear from the historic arena. Russia should not lose this chance.

However, could the formulated task, connected with “the jump over a technological structure”, be achieved? Actually, Russia lacks the developed industry of the V structure. Is it possible in this case to create the industry, oriented to the VI structure? At the same time, not only the models, appraisals and prognoses but also the historic experience show that it is possible to do. Let us review from this point the countries, which are the analogues of Russia: Canada and South Korea, which for the 1970s mastered the V technological structure. Canada was satisfied with its place in the world and with close ties with American economy. Therefore the tempos of growth were not high, and the greater part of the GNP was spent for consumption. On the contrary, South Korea was aimed at the accelerated growth, at joining the group of developed countries, at the innovation break, connected with mastering of the VI technological structure. The example of South Korea is worth analyzing and discussing it. Some key points should be taken into account.

First, it is the efficient state policy, preventing export of capital and directing to development by businessmen of the high tech industry within the country.

Second, the determined purposeful state planning, making it possible to formulate and to carry out the adequate and efficient industrial policy.

Third, the super-efforts exerted for modernization. For a number of years, over 40% of the GNP was spent on creation of new industries. It is difficult to imagine such mobilizing regime of economic development. But it was done and produced good results. For some decades, the basic annual rates of economic growth surpassed 10% of the GNP.

Fourth, the outstripping investments in education, scientific research and engineering process design (NIOKR). For the period of modernization, Seoul occupied the first place in terms of per capita number of physicists.

Fifth, (probably, the key condition of the success), there were applied humanitarian, social-technological technologies of modernization, allowing to use the civilization's peculiarities and imperatives of traditional society and to abstain from westbound practice, from breaking centuries old notions and values. The vertical-integrated companies (cheboli) became the key factor of success. The fidelity to the clan and respect for the elders were transformed into corporate culture and loyalty to the firm, to its leadership.

The key lesson is as follows: the innovation break and modernization lack common formulae. They demand the foresight, dreams and hard work (super-efforts). Probably, the coming modernization in Russia will not be the exclusion. Within the framework of the research, headed by academicians V.A. Sadovnichy and A.A. Akayev, there was analyzed the branch industrial structure of the most successful countries (particularly, members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). It turned out that their branch structures were becoming closer in the course of development. It allowed the management to formulate "the rule of the fifth and of the half": The manufacturing industry should occupy 20% in the structure of contemporary economy, finance – 25%, services –

22%. The high tech sector should make 20% and the middle tech sector should account for 30% in the manufacturing industry. Therefore, the most important instrument of economic management is the industrial policy directed to the structural changes, resulting in optimal proportions for the main sectors of economy.

Such approaches became very popular during the first wave of the crisis. Not far ago, as good examples for imitation there were considered “empty” American and British economies characterized by their urge towards out-sorting, replacement of the whole industrial production abroad, while at present many prominent state officials and experts expressed the views that the crisis of 2009 had already provided them with two significant lessons. The faith in omnipotence of the market is a mistake. The markets, being important, are unable to replace the purposeful efficient state, particularly industrial, policy. Industrial and agricultural production, despite the level of development of “scientific knowledge”, should exist in the country, at least a part of it. It contributes to sustainability and balance of economy, given the coming crises.

At present, realism, specificity, national science as the national basis should be a needed feature of industrial policy. The example of Russia should be cited. Two thirds of the territory of Russia are occupied by permafrost. Russia is located in the zone of extreme geographic and geo-economic conditions. Hence, Russia is unable to take part in globalization processes “under common conditions”. Actually, the original sense of globalization perceives the processes, which provide for free flows of people, ideas, capitals, goods, information and technologies.

Under conditions of globalization, the traditional national industries will have to compete with Chinese, Malaysian, Indian and other producers and will inevitably lose. The cold winter temperature in

the main part of the country results in a very high level of energy consumption in the course of production (the chance to avoid heating of the factory is a great advantage in the competition), in great expenses for capital investment construction (walls in two bricks, the subterranean pipes). It is impossible to make cheaper the work force, you have to provide heat, warm cloths and good food for the labor force. Therefore not far from truth is the point of view, expressed by Margaret Thatcher, that under conditions of globalization the size of the population, living in Russia, will consist of 15 million, is justified in economic terms.

It is necessary to forget the idea that Russia may be “the energy guarantee” for Europe or Asia. It is significant that the cost of annual export of Russian oil accounts for \$ 60 billion, while the cost of arms export makes \$ 6 billion. At the same time, India exports computer software for the price of \$ 60 billion. Russia seems to replace India in the world produce of software, although it is not an adequate remark. The geographic conditions, excluding the role of Russia as “a rentier” and “an energy guarantee” were well described in the book, written by A.P. Parshev “Why Russia is not America”. The author’s experience as a lecturer in the Academy of State Service at the President of the RF shows that for many high officials, as usual, this conclusion remains a revelation. It means that the Russian realities condition Russia’s industrial and innovation policy. It should be the policy of high technology. Russia should produce it in a way unknown for others. And it should go with high tech and not with oil and gas to the world markets. Possessing one third of world mineral resources, Russia makes input into the world product, which accounts only for its 3%. Hence, Russia needs the accelerated economic growth.

Some industries of Russia have not yet achieved the level of the 1990s. Actually, twenty years were lost for industrial development. The

epoch of social stagnation should come to the end. Russia in order to get back on its feet and to have a historic chance needs modernization and efficient industrial policy. Industrial policy, like other vectors of national development, raises for the federal power, for elites, for regions, for all of us the same question:” Do we want to be or only to appear to be?” It is significant to determine it for ourselves, do we need the result or is it enough for us to find an excuse in Chernomyrdin way – “we wanted to get better results...”

Project “Skolkovo” is significant in this respect. In the beginning of 2010 it was planned to allocate 600 billion rubles for fourteen scientific cities (centers) in Russia, while for innovation complex “Skolkovo” the projected allocations account for 4.5 billion rubles. The scientific cities have much of what to be proud. For instance scientific city Koltsovo for seven years raised ten-times its payments to budgets of all levels. However, the ministry of education and science and some other authorities do not pay the needed attention to these centers, which might become locomotives of innovation development. The recent discussion of the centers’ problems in the city of Dubna showed it. Researchers, representatives of scientific institutions and local authorities of Sarov, Zelenograd, Obninsk, Koltsov, Dubna and others put the question: “What to do? Why is it impossible to use the existing laboratories, the trained personnel and capacity of prominent scientific centers of Russia? Why is it necessary to start again to build premises and to create innovation infrastructure?”

The explanations provided by V. Surkov, the leader of project “Skolkovo” and other officials related to the project did not clarify the issue. The project “Skolkovo” seems to resemble the exact copy of a not existing thing – “simulyakr” (the term, proposed by a known French philosopher). Skolkovo is presented as an official copy of “Silicon Valley”, which was founded in the specific economic,

technological and social spheres at the definite stage of economic development. And what succeeded in a certain situation may fail in some other situation: there will be no results, only appearance of them. Certainly, one wishes Skolkovo initiatives and other innovation projects great success.

One should mention the wrong idea, shared by some officials, that allocation of big sums of money is a guarantee of success. Big money may be useless and even destructive without the determined policy and purposeful strategy. The recent discussion of these problems at the innovation forum in the city of Obninsk (Kaluzhskaya region) showed that the federal officials consider as the principal indication of innovation success the amount of investments for innovation infrastructure. But money does not replace the purposeful industrial policy, social organization and self-organization, which is the must to achieve and not to imitate results. It is an illusion that “Skolkovo” will contribute to internal stability, will reassure over ten million scientific and technical intellectuals, who for the last twenty years were deprived of work and any perspective. This is a delusion; it is necessary to set great specific tasks and to work for their achievement.

The systemic approach, common sense and world experience shows that industrial policy and modernization are closely connected with the innovation and education policy. Russia has to enter a new technological structure, new reality. It will need researchers, inventors, organizers and businessmen, who work with the aim at the future. J. Shumpeter, an outstanding German economist, the founder of evolution economy, divided all economic agents to conservatives (90%) and innovators (10%). The first ones usually orient to keeping status quo, holding the share of the market. The second ones, as a rule, orient to radical changes, innovations and new economic branches, accelerated development. One of the main directions of industrial

policy is to give chance to innovators. The destiny of modernization project in Russia depends exactly on this factor.

The national innovation system is one of the key instruments for industrial development, for creation of the industry, which relates to the next technological structure. President of the RF V. Putin spoke about formation of this system as a strategic priority since 2001. The discussion of this matter recalls the words of Hodja Nasreddin, who mentioned that if you only speak about halva, your mouth will not be made sweet. The innovation system may be compared with a car, which needs the steering wheel, the engine, the wheels and the brakes. The existence of an innovation system depends on the exclusive circle of innovations' reproduction.

The main parts of the innovation system are worth being commented. The most significant function is monitoring, strategic prognosis and determination of the purpose. The significance of this bloc of functions is not less in capitalist economy than in socialist one. The USA, Japan, Finland, China are seriously pre-occupied with monitoring of scientific, information, industrial sphere, make prognoses of their development and on this basis construct their industrial and innovation policy. Actually, they perform an essential part of work, carried out by Gosplan. These structures may be arranged in different ways under different titles. But they should exist! Regretfully, at the present time Russia lacks such structures, which make prognoses and elaborate strategy of national industrial development at the state level with due account of scientific capacity. This fact was revealed by destiny of the known "Strategy 2020", which did not survive after the first wave of the crisis and was definitely forgotten.

At the same time, the strategic errors are accompanied by the most destructive consequences; as a rule, it is impossible to correct them at the lower levels of governance. The following example may be

cited. Recently some technological and innovation priorities were made public: efficiency and saving of economy, including elaboration of new types of fuel; nuclear, cosmic, medical and strategic information technologies.

Agreeing with the significance of all these vectors of development, it is necessary to say that all of them refer to the IV and the V technological structures. This period of development has been passed by the world and by Russia. And where are the vectors of development within the VI structure? Navigators have been used for a long time in the cars all over the world. This device would be useful in the cars in Russia as well. The strategic prognosis and monitoring is not a costly aspect of innovation, it is much cheaper comparing with all the rest. The question is not money but the subject of innovation development, which could be ready to become liable for decision of this task and for its practical realization.

The fundamental science, providing new ideas, and the perspective training of cadres (conditionally speaking, this block of innovation system costs 1 ruble) play the role of steering wheel. And a great concern is caused in this respect. The idea, expressed by the minister of education and supported by the president of the RF during their visit to MIFI, had a great impression on professors and researchers, namely: to reduce the number of higher education institutions in the RF from three thousand (with their branches) to two hundred, including fifty universities; to disperse budgetary expenses for science, creating competitors of the RAS, such as Kurchatov institute and the Higher School of Economics, making big investments in federal and innovation universities. As a rule, the “experiment” was started without previous wide discussion with scientists themselves, without determined aims, tasks, stages, expected results, analysis of related risks, broadly speaking “on the off-chance”. We wish the best, but the

experience of reforming Russian science and education provides us with no grounds for the success.

The applied science is the motive force of innovation engine. Just in this sphere (not in the academic sector) there goes generation of innovations, creation of tested models, new knowledge transforms in specific goods, services and chances. This block, conditionally speaking, costs 10 rubles. The applied science was mainly demolished for the 1990s. Many branch institutions disappeared after destruction of the industry system of economy's management. The issue of restoration of the applied science attracts little attention. But the vehicle will not move without engine.

The created tested models and new technologies should be produced at the mass consumption level and should be put to the market, taking part in rigid competition. This block conditionally costs 100 rubles. All over the world, the giant companies, possessing high tech, big transnational corporations carry out this work. The assistance, rendered by the state, often plays a decisive role at this level. However, for twenty years of reforms big high tech companies at the world level did not appear in Russia. Just this fact is a key problem of industrial policy in contemporary Russia. The machine will not move without engine. What is the result of absence of this block in innovation sector of Russian economy? It is the selling abroad of "raw resources" – scientific ideas, individual researchers and engineers. It should be said that Russian specialists play a great role in development of the Silicon Valley; however, there are no successful big Russian companies there. In other words, the alternative of the national innovation system is the work as employees (as a rule, very cheap) for the benefit of the countries and civilizations, possessing such systems. Evidently, the work made to foreign order and without significant interest of the state in development of the high tech capacity results in degradation of the

high technical potential of Russia and weakens national industry, which has to buy abroad the products, which were projected and constructed in Russia.

The next block is very cheap comparing with the preceding one, but it is needed at each stage of the innovation circle. This is an expertise system (connected with cognitive centers, mentioned below). Let us again put the question “To be or to seem?” The Silicon Valley is not only a group of many small firms, not also a good place for scientific research and production, not only a group of Nobel Prize winners, who visit this place from force of habit. It is first of all the flow of projects, ideas and proposals. (Emergence of these phenomena depends on the chance, given to inventors and researchers, to put them into practice. Economy should accept innovations.) Proceeding from this, one should come to the conclusion that in Russia the innovation activities must be raised at least up to the Soviet level – ten-fifteen times. In the Silicon Valley in average seven projects out of one thousand get support of venture foundations. The selection is very strict. But exactly this process makes it possible to reduce to the acceptable level the risks of investors, businessmen, business-angels, corporations and state structures, which make investments in certain technologies. The brake, proposed by expertise, is vitally needed.

It is worth recalling the All-Union organization of inventors and rationalizers, the industries’ conferences, the follow-up of these ventures, when some ministries succeeded to arrange expertise. The mechanisms of settling this issue existed in the USSR. They may be different in contemporary Russia. But they should exist. Otherwise, they will only seem to be. A part of profits, received in the course of realization of innovated goods, services, chances should be invested in the system of education and in scientific research. To a large extent, the reverse connection depends not on the input of specific problems,

solved by industrial policy, but on the favorable attitude of individual bureaucrats or on conjuncture interests.

But, probably, the situation is not as bad as it seems to be? There are foundations, grants, lots, competitions and innovation forums. The situation is not bad, it is much worse. It is necessary to take into account the objective data for the sake of appraisal of the situation. Some data relate to industry. In the countries-leaders of the contemporary world the share of innovated products accounts for 60%, while in Russia it makes 5%. The World Intellectual Property Organization (VOIS) made public the number of international patents, received in 2009, namely 155900. Five leaders in terms of inventors are as follows: the USA (over 45000 patents), Japan, Germany, South Korea and China. Russia occupies the twenty third rate in the world (569 patents, which makes 0.36% of the world index). It is three times less than the number of patents, registered by Japanese firm Panasonic (1891 patent) or Chinese firm Huawei Technologies (1847 patents). Russia occupies on the world innovation map the place, which is ten times less than its input into the global general product (3%) It means that it is necessary to raise ten times the innovation activities in Russia.

In which spheres there were received the main quantity of patents? They are as follows: information technologies and computers (12560), pharmaceuticals (12200), medical technologies (12091), electric machines (11393), digital communication (10452), telecommunication (9343). As it is evident, the main spheres of invention activities correspond to the V technological structure, which, in essence, is lacked by Russia. Hence, the reciprocal connection between industrial and innovation policy. The best stimulus for innovations is the existence of the corresponding industries and vice versa – the complex of inventions, discoveries, patents and people, who are ready to put all this

into practice; thus, all this creates new horizons for the corresponding branch of industry.

Due to the first wave of the crisis the world innovation sphere underwent a terrible ordeal. For instance, in 2009 the number of patents, registered by American citizens decreased by 10%, comparing with the index for 2008. At the same time, in this period the number of registered patents rose by 30% in China and declined in Russia by 29.1%. The innovation system rather lacks than exists in Russia. Probably, much would have to be started from scratch.

A special remark should be made about the people. In the sphere of industrial policy training of cadres is closely connected with education. Let us recall the words of “iron chancellor” Otto Bismark that a schoolteacher wins the war.

For the last twenty years, the sphere of education became subject to total reformation, namely program of information conversion, humanization, Internet and development of humanitarian science. For the last years, the education reforms were carried out by the gauges of the Higher School of Economics (rector Ya.I. Kuzminov, scientific leader E.G. Yasin). One of the last innovations is as follows: the passage from “culture of usefulness to culture of dignity”, the rigid fulfillment of the imperatives of Bologna convention, which treats Russia in a way all alike, annihilation of the national system of education and introduction of system “bachelor-master”, introduction of the united state exam (EGE).

The results of the reform speak for themselves. According to UNESCO, the amount of bribes in Russian higher education institutions surpassed \$ 500 million. In 2008, about 25% of Russian students could not cope with the mathematics test and get at least satisfactory mark, which demanded elementary knowledge. The reforms of the education system in Russia attained the level of a

significant threat to national security. The same question appeared – to be or to seem to be. The results of EGE exams were not made public and were not discussed. It is not a surprise that we came away none the wiser.

But, probably, the most significant is something else. According to sociologists, over 40% of Russian citizens express censure on EGE. The discussions, arranged in the State Duma and in the Public Chamber, showed the destructive effect of such reform. However, minister A.A.Fursenko succeeds to ignore it and to continue realization of ideas of the Higher School of Economics – the principle “money follow students”, higher payment for education, withdrawal of the state from the sphere of education, wide introduction of the test system, the passage from training of specialists to the system “bachelor-master” as a realization of Bologna Convention’s principles, west wide direction of education... What should be done to reach the people, making decisions?

The usual system is being replaced by “colonial education”, using definition of prominent philosopher and sociologist A.A. Zinoviev. And we all are unable to correct it. Probably, the same dangers exist for industrial policy and modernization of Russia. Some officials and ministries are not engaged in realization of the adopted decisions but move to the opposite direction. The management chaos and social autism appear. It is worth seeing what purposes are being pursued by the leader in the innovation sphere – the USA. The USA sets for itself the clear and exact tasks. J. Bush and his predecessor adopted big expensive programs, which cost billions of US dollars, providing for teaching pupils in secondary school to read and to calculate well. In 2009, B. Obama proclaimed the national education initiative with the aim: American students should get first rate places in international competitions in physics and mathematics (at present, at

the competitions on these subjects Chinese students get the upper hand with certainty). According to the view, expressed by B. Obama, just the country, which sends the best students in mathematics and physics to the international competitions, will rule the world in twenty years. At present, American colleagues study thoroughly the organization of physical-mathematical olympiads in the USSR, translate the corresponding text-books, make orders to Russian teachers and professors, to programmers. They go to this direction, while we move backwards. They are going upwards, we are going downwards...

One more principal remark concerning industrial policy should be made. The participation of Russia in the process of globalization may be rather limited and be based on the analysis of not only of advantages but also threats and risks related to this process. It is worth taking into account the historic contents of globalization. In the beginning of the XX century, before the First World War, globalization did not yield to the present process in its level. The significant direction of industrial policy should be extension of internal market. Russia should provide food, medical care, heating, education and defense for itself. Nobody else will solve these problems. Our country has great traditions in this respect. Let us recall the words of prominent diplomat A.M. Gorchakov (1798–1883): “Russia concentrates on itself”. Exactly this political course, which determined for decades the vector of development of the country and its industrial policy, fully justified itself. Russia may not become a guarantor in the field of energy either for the West or the East. Therefore modernization of the country should determine and put into life other directions of development. Let us recall the words of great scientist in the field of chemistry D.I. Mendeleev: to burn oil is as unwisely as heat a stove with assignations. It is more reasonable at the present time, when Russia occupies the second place in the world in terms of extraction of oil and

the seventh place in the terms of discovered and proved oil fields. The forced development of Russian oil goes on at the expense of the reserves, which should have been given to the generations of our children and grandchildren.

There were examples in history of new Russia, when the policy of the state allowed country to recover rapidly after the hard default of 1998. This policy was realized brilliantly by the government, headed by E.M. Primakov-Yu.D. Maslyukov. The radical reduction of import made national producers raise quickly the industrial output. Yu.D. Maslyukov, a former chairman of the committee for industry of the State Duma (1913–2010), repeatedly appealed for realism and pragmatism in economic and industrial development. The efficient and successful strategies and technologies should not be thrown away. Actually, for the sake of modernization, elaboration and carrying out its industrial policy Russia needs the State Planning Committee, the State Committee for Supply, the State Committees for Prices, the State Committee for Science and Technique of new generation, which use modern governance strategies, systems of support of taking decisions, methods of computer modeling and prognoses. The existing state apparatus is inefficient. It copes with difficulties with the tasks of current management, becomes helpless in the period of crises and stagnation, is unable to realize the tasks of national modernization. Probably, we need another contour of state governance, oriented to the dictatorship of development, to solving strategic aims under conditions of rigid resources' limitations and lack of time.

To the author's mind, the destiny of Russian modernization will be determined exactly at the regional level. Only sixteen subjects of the RF possess oil and gas. Many regions confronted the problems of depopulation and de-industrialization. For instance, for the period from 1991 to 2008 the population of the Far East diminished by 1.5 million

people (20%), while the population of Russia diminished for this period of time by 4%). Given this trend, the population of the region will account for not more than 4.5 million people by the year of 2050.

Geographers see signs of passage from the rule-forward-note to the point type of territorial location of productive forces in a great part of Russia. The planned resettlement from mono-cities will result in the loss of the developed territory. Therefore it is very important to ensure at the regional level the efficient regional governance oriented to the distant perspective. The regional innovation system, industrial and social-economic policy are the must.

There are three industries, which need a special attention. Primarily, it is industry of the defense complex. This sphere determines the type of innovations. A great number of high technologies of vital importance for present life were created originally for production of arms. It is not a surprise- just in this sphere the ratio price/quality may be big.(even a small advantage in comparison with the arms of a probable enemy may turn out to be significant.) At present, the defense budget of the USA surpasses the expenses of all other countries of the world taken together. One of the aims of these super-expenses is the technological reconstruction of high tech industry, the forced development of innovation sector of economy, the assimilation of chances of the VI technological structure. The number of patents, received by American citizens in 2009, shows big success of such strategy. Just therefore, the most important aspect, which deserves attention, is the transfer of technologies and cadres from the sphere of defense industry to the civil sector of economy (the lack of efficient mechanisms of such transfer became one of the reasons of the defeat of the Soviet Union in “cold war”). In the course of reforms, carried out by minister of defense of the RF A.E. Serdyukov, the rapid reduction of the total number of military forces of Russia is going on. According to

the plans of the reform, by 2012, the quantity of land forces should be reduced about ten times, of the air-force – twice, of the navy – twice and of the strategic rocket forces – one and a half. The military science, military education and military health care were devastated. On the eve of the reform, in terms of conventional forces the ration between Russia and NATO was 1/60.

Alexander III used to say that there were two allies of Russia: its army and navy. Without great exaggeration, it is possible to say that Russia has neither army nor navy and that only its nuclear rocket shield ensures its sovereignty. There are significant problems in the defense complex. It is reflected in the inclination of officials to import of arms. The helicopters-carriers are planned for purchase in France, flying apparatuses without pilots –in Israel, rifles – in England and pistols – in Italy. Paraphrasing the known wisdom, one may say that the people, who do not want to feed its military-industrial complex, will nourish the alien one.

Hence, the evident conclusion – the armed forces, reduced to a dangerous level in the course of modernization, should rearm rapidly by means of national arms, produced on the basis of achievements of the VI technological structure.

One of the key directions of industrial policy is ensuring security and governance to avoid emergencies and technical men made catastrophes. These activities are not only humane but also advantageous for society as a whole. The world experience shows that every ruble, invested in the prognosis and prevention of emergencies, allows to save from 10 to 1000 rubles, which otherwise should have been invested in liquidation or alleviation of the consequences of disasters. Since 1994, the world community took the course directed to monitoring, prognosis and prevention of natural, men made accidents and catastrophes. In the year of 2000, scientists of some institutions and

a number of high officials of the ministry for emergencies prepared and published monograph “Governing Risk. Risk. Sustainable Development. Synergy”. It contained description of the strategy for raising the level of security in the technical sphere and the analysis of a danger of inert development of the technical sphere. In 2002, the scientific community made the proposal to establish the national system of scientific monitoring of dangerous phenomena and processes in the natural, technical and social spheres. The project, having passed many confirmation notes, was stopped at the level of the government of the RF.

The analysis of the Russian industry shows that the critical point has been passed in several branches. The wear level of the basic funds is very high, the lack of investments is evident, the wave of technical catastrophes started, while scientist made warnings about it more than ten years ago. About 50 thousand dangerous objects and about 5 thousand very dangerous objects exist on the Russian territory. The technical accidents and catastrophes may become a reality, resulting in hundred thousands victims. Ensuring industrial security is a high priority matter in Russia. Emergent actions should be taken for this sake. The accidents in Sayano-Shushenskaya hydroelectric station and in Rospadskaya colliery are known to everybody; they show that such catastrophe may be prevented, if monitoring is not ignored. Liquidation of consequences of both catastrophes demands about 40 billion rubles, paid from the federal budget. In other words, the owners of dangerous objects are not able to exploit industrial objects and to insure them.

It should be recalled that the president of the RF set the task – the efficient governance of the country within the existing borders. It demands industrial development of many regions of Russia, including Siberia, the North and the Far East. It should be a priority of industrial development of Russia. The residents of these regions, the

businessmen, living and coming there, should have a clear perspective and enjoy the government support. Criminality should be placed in the rigid limits. Benefits, programs of accessible housing, many other measures for this sake should be considered as an integral part of the project aimed at modernization of the country. In his time, prominent statesman S.Yu. Vitte made a great input in construction of railways, the Trans-Siberian railway. It was a great project of the XIX century. Probably exactly this project allowed Russia to keep vast territories of the Far East, Chukotka, Kamchatka. Academician N.N. Moiseyev, an outstanding mathematician and philosopher, considered that Russia emerged on the way “from Varangians to Greeks”, while consolidation of new Russia would go on “on the way from Englishmen to Japanese”. Under his guidance, the work was carried out to extend the most important resource of Russia – the North Sea Way. The attitude to the vast Russian territory, located on the other side of Urals, should be changed. It is not “a treasure”, which may be opened and closed, if it is not needed. It is not “a bridge”, since it is not convenient to live near a bridge. It should be a house for millions of people, and it should be a well made, safe and native place. This imperative demands a corresponding infrastructure and developed industries. The transport routes should be the instruments of development and the subject to active use in the course of modernization.

At present, the rapidly growing process of globalization is marked by “covering with asphalt” of economic, cultural and social space of the “third world” countries. Under the banner of “western direction” there forms “a multi-stories world”, there goes degradation of social-economic systems, there grows their primitivism. Many countries, which thirty years ago were considered as developing countries, now are regarded as “lost” countries. On the other side, the investments in a number of countries of the semi-peripheral sector of

the world economic system (Brazil, India and China) became more profitable, than the countries related to the kernel of the world system. And what is more, like in case of South Korea, preservation and adaptation of their own culture, senses and values, of their ways of life to new realities become not the hindrance but the condition of successful social-technological modernization.

If the XIX century could be called the century of geopolitics, the XX century – the century of geo-economy, the new century, probably, will become a century of geo-culture. The rivalry will go on in the information space, in the sphere of purports and values, in the field of projects of the future and perceptions of probable and wished notions. In this respect, the western civilization confronted serious problems. The tradition of Protestantism, founded by Martin Luther played, according Max Weber and other outstanding sociologists, the most important role in formation of capitalism. And just now it confronts big systemic contradictions. Individualism, the cult of consumption, great development of virtual reality, life of today – the symbols of post-modernism – correspond to the facts of present realities less and less and lose their attractiveness.

The evident example of it is the attitude to the future. Probably, the symbol of our epoch – the conception of sustainable development (if the whole world lives according to the standards of California, the discovered reserves of natural resources of the Earth will be enough for three-five years, given the existing technologies). On the other side, as the classics of liberal economic think, we should not express concern about future generations, since they are not able to take care of us. The other example is intellectual property. It simply does not fit the traditional liberal conception of property. The world makes a step to “economy of attention”. It becomes unclear, who will pay whom: the

person, who attracted attention to his product, or the person, whose attention was attracted to it.

The discussions on civilizations, ethnoses, peoples traditionally are concentrated on the common nature of language, cultural and moral norms, on the common character of historic destiny and territory. However, the level and characteristic of social self-organization and type of life are not less significant. It may be clarified by two simple examples. After Russian default of 1998 many western experts estimated in fifteen-twenty years the time of economy's return to the previous stage of development after the hardest strike (which liquidated a great part of the middle-size business in Russia). Contrary to their prognoses, the economic restoration occurred amazingly fast. Some sociologists explain it by the type of self-organization, which is different and not characteristic for western society. The latter type is connected with existence in society of the so-called domens – the non-formal groups from five to thirty people (sometimes they consist of relatives, sometimes of friends or officials of the same company). In case of problems, experienced by a member of such small group, the whole domen strives for rendering him assistance and accepts these problems as its own).

The centuries-long life under conditions of “social atomization” in many western countries (“every one for himself, only God for all of us”) engendered also its algorithms of social governance and its legislation, as well as mainly – its own type of ideology and man. Certainly, the social non-sustainability in atomized society (which resemble those studied by static physics). The key achievements of European science clearly gave evidence of it. The elementary essence, laying foundation of political economy of Marx, is the commodity (the use value alienated from producer). The foundation of the theory of Darwin and of further theoretical constructions is the heredity, changes

and selection, connected with competition. (At the same time, cooperation, mutual adaptation, symbiosis, as many biologists think today, play not a lesser role than competition. As a whole, biocenosis is perceived as not only a set of types, related in the way “predator – pray”, but a complicated system with a multitude of positive and negative reverse connections. As one of the sections of synergy asserts, this complexity is the theory of self-organization, which explains the multitude of evolution phenomena.)

The world of Russia is often called as civilization of the North. Life for many centuries in the zone of risky agriculture in time of permanent military threat formed its communal type self-organization (probably, closely connected with present domens) and its own attitude to life. The imperatives “common is above personal”, “spiritual is above material”, “justice is above law”, “future is more important than present and past”, natural for our civilization, are alien for western world outlook. The social non-sustainability is different! If western society sooner is a “gas” of atoms – individuals, Russian world may be compared with the complicated nerve cells’ network, where the complicated and different ties among elements impart integrity and new qualities to the object (like ties among brain cells – neurons transform the aggregate into a qualitatively something new).

Briefly speaking, the basis of western society is liberal ideology, shaped for centuries-long rigid public struggle, the thoroughly developed system of legislation (let us recall famous “what is not forbidden by law, is allowed to do”). In Russia many oral moral norms are the matter of primacy, and therefore it would be natural for society with complexity of its ties to become the basis of ideology. Discussing modernization, it would be unwisely and fruitlessly to separate one its sphere or aspect. The integral systemic view is a must. The basis for this view is provided with the theory of technosenoses, elaborated

recently by American researchers L.G. Badalyan and V.F. Krivorotov. The technosenos is perceived as the integrity of natural-climatic zone, mastered by society, its resources (including one of the main – energy bearers), used technologies, integrity of public relations and institutions, technologies of governance and production (in a sense, it is dissemination of V.I. Vernadski's ideas in the sphere of social systems). Each successful civilization, being in the forefront, finds out its own original method of mastering the natural climatic zone, “indigestible” ones within the framework of the previous way of life. For instance, in the end of the XIX century the territory of the contemporary USA was considered the space, which demanded the hardest work for its mastering. However, the railways (later highways), panel-shield houses, financial technologies for financing implementation of projects for transforming a vast country into a flourishing paradise for a short time, made possible discover the way of life which is adequate to this reality.

In the course of modernization, Russia should solve this task. It is not a secret that for the last twenty years of Russian reforms one out of five residents in Siberia left for the European part of the country. People leave the North, the Far East, Kamchatka and Chukotka. It is a sign of geopolitical and geo-economic trouble.

In the normal situation the people should be satisfied with their way of living and the place, where they live, with their perspectives and with perspectives of their children. Just this factor is one of the main criteria of success of modernization. It should be done in our Fatherland to ensure the future for Russia.

“Druzhba narodov”, M., 2010, N 9, p. 117–187.

Tatyana Litvinova,

candidate of political sciences (Institute of Sociology
of the RAS)

“INFORMATION JIHAD”

IN GLOBAL NETWORK

Internet is a heterogeneous environment, where it is possible to disseminate any information, including materials with appeals for violating integrity of the Russian Federation, undermining state security, creating illegal armed formations and committing terrorist acts. All these materials are subject to restriction under the Federal law of 25 July 2002 (N 114) “On Counteraction against Extremist Activities”, which forbids their publication and dissemination.

Since the start in September 1999 of the counter-terrorist operation in Chechnya separatists went underground, making Internet the channel of their propaganda. The main features of Internet – accessibility and lack of censure of the located information – let extensive chances for unimpeded propaganda of separatism and religious extremism. All these Internet resources carry out their work from abroad and have international domains “.com”, “.org”, “.info” and others. The most known sites are as follows: “Ichkeria”, “Chechenpress”, “Kavkaz-center”, “Kavkaz-monitor”, “Jamaat “Shariat”, “Kavkazan Haamash”. The extremists themselves call their activities in Internet “information jihad”, and, if one believes the material, located in site “Kavkaz-center”, their propaganda is directed to over 3 million users of the network.

The information, presented below, analyzes the style and methods of extremist propaganda and describes the problems in the way of counteractions against “information jihad” in Internet.

In October 2007, the separatists’ sites published the declaration of Doku Umarov (Abu Usman), the leader of Chechen fighters, on

creation of Imarat (Emirate) of the Caucasus. He proclaimed himself as emir of the Caucasus and declared jihad against Russia. This declaration signified actual liquidation of the Chechen Republic Ichkeria (CRI) and resulted in split of the “Chechen resistance”.

The supporters of the secular CRI publish their appeals in sites “Ichkeria.info” and “Thechechenpress.com”, while the adepts of the idea of creation of an Islamic state on the territory of the Caucasus carry out their propaganda work via resources “Kavkaz-center”, “Kavkaz-monitor”, “Jamaat “Shariat”, “Kavkazan Hamaash” and others. The split of the “Chechen resistance” was the outcome of A. Maskhadov’s death, of the last legitimate, in eyes of the international community, president of the CRI, and was also the result of the conflict, started before his death, between adepts of traditional Islam and supporters of its radical trend – wahhabism.

Both movements claim for the role of descendants of Dudayev-Maskhadov CRI and upbraid each other for apostasy. The supporters of secular Ichkeria, independent of Russia, compete between themselves, which is reflected in materials, published in Internet. Site “Ichkeria.info” publishes reports of the so- called “telephone government” of the Chechen Republic Ichkeria headed by Ahyad Idigov. For the period of 1993–1997, he was the chairman of Dudayev parliament of the CRI, further was the deputy of the republican parliament in time of presidency of A. Maskhadov; at present, he lives abroad and signs the materials, published in Internet, as a plenipotentiary representative of the CRI parliament abroad.

In its turn, “Chechenpress.com” is the tribune of supporters of “prime minister of Ichkeria” Akhmed Zakhayev, who since 2001 has been subject to international search for accusation of terrorism; In 2003 he got political asylum in Great Britain.

The Internet resources demonstrate greater unity of Imarat supporters, in contrast to “secular leaders”, which is explained, to the author’s mind, by the higher integrating capacity of Islam, which is being used as an ideological basis of struggle against Russia.

Before the detailed analysis of the style and methods of extremist propaganda, it is worth making an external description of the sites of supporters of separation of the North Caucasus from Russia. Practically, all analyzed Internet resources contain the following sections: “Umma” (news about Islamic world), “Kavkaz”, “News”, “Analysis”, “Press”. Although most sites have the news section, their main aim consists rather in ideological correction of information. The extremists not only question the correctness of the information, coming from Russian sources, but also try to popularize the adopted by them geographic names marked by clearly ideological shade. This method is actively used in current news reports from the republics of the RF in the North Caucasus, which are named by separatists as vilayats (provinces); for instance – vilayat Nohchich (Chechnya), united vilayat Kabarda, Balkaria and Karachai.

It is significant to make the analysis of symbols and methods of self-presentation, used by fighters of “information jihad”. The extremist sites contain photos of amirs (commanders of fighters) and sheikhs (spiritual leaders), as well as their appeals and declarations.

It is worth further analyzing in extremist sites the key agents (persons, notions, themes), used in propaganda. The published texts are characterized by non-conventional meaning of some words and symbols. As the agents are often used the Islamic terms, such as “jihad” (diligence on the way of the Most High), “mudjaheds” (fighters), “Murtads” (apostates), “kafirs” (unfaithful). However, the new proposed meanings do not definitely correspond to the traditional definitions: the separatists name as jihad the war, which they declared

to Russia and the western world, fighters are called mudjaheds, Muslims, working in law enforcement bodies in the republics of the North Caucasus, are named murtadams. The separatists' meanings impart the corresponding ideological appraisal to activities of separatists, creating for them the image of martyrs and upholders of faith, while their enemies are described as unfaithful and "national traitors". The agents, who belong to the party, hostile to separatists, are qualified in a very negative way and are given humiliating characteristics.

One of the widely used methods of the separatist propaganda is the outrageous lie relating to history. The myth is being spread about a many-centuries ceaseless war of the Caucasian peoples against Russia. The other device is the distortion of historic facts.

One other repeatedly used method is hyperbolizing of negative features and failures of the enemy. Russia is intentionally presented in an unattractive way. The sites "Kavkaz-center", "Kavkaz-monitor" and "Kavkaz Haamash" contain articles under the titles "Russian economy on the eve of collapse", "Russia: all signs of civilization decline". The activities of law enforcement bodies in the North Caucasus are presented as the terrorist acts against peaceful population, the information is being spread on lost people, and "marionette militia men" are declared to be responsible for it.

Thus, the new reality is being formed due to "information jihad" in Internet: falsification of facts, popularization of adopted by separatists' geographic names, use of "hatred language", which forms the virtual world of Imarat in the Caucasus, located outside legal, cultural and information sphere of the RF. Rhetoric of the separatists represents a significant danger, since the mentioned Internet sites are accessible for the youth of the North Caucasus. It is possible to stress some difficulties in the struggle against "information jihad".

Primarily, the legal problems should be mentioned. The federal law N 114 on the counteractions against extremist activities determines liability for the extremist activities of legal entities and mass media, provides for the chance to suspend activities of extremist organizations by legal action aimed at its prohibition and liquidation. The law introduced as well the institution of prohibition of unregistered organizations, involved in extremist activities. However, due to one of specifics of Internet – the uncontrolled presentation of information – these norms are “toothless” in relation of disseminators of extremist materials in the network.

One of the significant changes, made in the federal law N 114 in July 2006, was the following addition to article 15: “The author of published, audio-, audio-visual and other materials (works), destined for public use and possessing at least one of characteristic features, provided by article 1 of the present federal law, is acknowledged to be the person, carrying out extremist activities and being liable according to the legislation of the Russian Federation”. Thus, the individual liability is recognized, if the author of subversive materials has been found out. However, in practice it is rather difficult to institute proceedings against the author of an article with extremist content: the authorship should be determined, the person should be found, the article’s expertise should be made and, finally, the case should be examined by court. In July 2007, the federal law N 211 “ On Amendments in Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation in Relation to Perfection of State Governance in the Sphere of Counteraction against Extremism” entered into force. Article 13 of the amended law provided for the following: creating and placing in Internet in the sites of the organs of justice and in the sites of mass media of the federal list of extremist materials, forbidden by law.

In April 2008, the Office of General Prosecutor of the RF took the initiative and proposed, as required by law, to limit access of Russian users to Internet sites with extremist content, i. e. to put into effect for the Internet resources the same rules, which exist for mass media. Following the publication of the list of extremist sites in the official site of the federal service in the sphere of justice, all Russian providers will be liable to block access to such sites for the period of one moth.

However, most objectionable materials are placed in the servers, geographically located outside Russia, i.e. outside the Russian jurisdiction. The attempts to influence somehow foreign providers via their governments by directions of cooperation in struggle against international terrorism, as a rule, lead to nothing. According to S. Karapetyan, chief of principal department of international legal cooperation of the Office of the General Prosecutor of the RF, for the period from 2007 to September 2009 the Office of the General Prosecutor of the RF sent to the law enforcement bodies and judicial organs 43 notifications relating to 148 resources with extremist materials. However, the received responses contained information of only 5 resources with references to discrepancy between the notification and the national legislation. And what is more, the extremists in their sites presented as their victory the refusal of the government of Sweden, in response to the notification of Office of the General Prosecutor of the RF, to render legal assistance and to find the author of articles, published in site “Kavkaz-center”.

The second problem of the counteraction against propaganda of separatism and extremism in Internet concerns its technical aspect. The technical means aimed at blocking access of undesirable information to users of the network are applied with success in a number of countries. No such technical means of blockage have been used in our country.

There exists an informal practice of braking undesirable sites. For instance, site Kavkaz.org was broken not once by hackers, and a view was expressed that it was done with approval of Russian authorities. Russian users lack technical means to prevent the review of subversive materials at home or in office (if the employer does not put its filters in the working network, although the social and not extremist sites more often become subject to prohibition).

In this connection, not so much the imposed ban on reading such materials, as the need of critical acquaintance with content of these sites acquires urgent significance; therefore the third problem of counteractions against extremist propaganda consists in its ideological aspect. In their materials the champions of separation of the North Caucasus from Russia use the historic ties between ethnic and religious phenomena, manipulate with national self-consciousness.

With regret one should say that at the state level there is no adequate alternative to the similar influence on people, there is no ideology, uniting all Russian citizens, in spite of their ethnic and religious views. In this connection, formation of inter-ethnic and inter-confessional tolerance, of culture of consent and peace, propaganda of social justice, equality and brotherhood of peoples should become a significant component in the struggle against ethnic separatism and religious extremism. All this is impossible to realize, if social-economic measures are not carried out. According to the Russian Statistical Agency, in spring of 2010 the level of unemployment in Ingushetia made 50.8% of the population at the age from 15 to 72 years; in Chechnya the number of registered unemployed people of the same age groups accounted for 41.8% of the population. The existing social-economic problems, unemployment, social instability and complicated criminal situation create advantageous environment for dissemination of separatist ideas.

Thus, counteraction against propaganda of ethnic separatism and religious extremism in the global network is connected with the legal, technical, ideological and social-economic significant difficulties. As the efficient measures of struggle against “information jihad” may become the exposure of false rhetoric of extremists, the active national state policy directed to leveling of social-economic indexes of the republic in the North Caucasus, At the same time, a more active use and wise combination of legislative and technical means acquires a special urgency.

“Vlast”, M., 2010, N 9, p. 116–120.

Georgy Rudov,
candidate of political sciences
RUSSIA – CENTRAL ASIA
AND REDICAL ISLAM

Many scientists consider Russia as a significant Eurasian state, adducing adequate evidence and substantiation. Given 143 million people of the whole population of Russia, its Muslim part accounts for the amount of 15–20 million people. Islam is professed by almost 40 indigenous peoples of Russia, and the Muslim population is characterized by its poly-ethnic and multi-cultural composition. According to Ravil Gainutdin, the Chairman of Council of Muftis of Russia, there are three groups of Muslims with due account of the region of settlement: Siberia and the Far East, the central regions of the RF (Volga Basin, Ural, Moscow, Black Earth Zone and others) and the North Caucasus. One should not ignore the fact that five states of the Central Asia, professing mainly Islam, are located along the borders of the RF.

Over 30 million people out of 50 million people in the Central Asian republics profess Islam. For the years of the Soviet period, Islam in the CA was infringed and isolated from the rest Islamic world; the disintegration of the USSR promoted creation of more active relations with neighboring states with Muslim population. Exactly independence of the CA states and abolition of the state control over the religious sphere determined a special interest of peoples to their national religion and to history of Islam. Therefore the period of the 1990s is named the epoch of “Islamic rebirth” in these countries. The leadership of the CA countries does not simply pays a particular attention to spiritual enlightenment of the peoples, but is also interested in the atmosphere when they regard themselves as Muslims. However, this readership in any case does not want and is not ready to share power with religious organizations and their different trends aspiring for a high rank in public and political life of the country.

In Soviet times, over 40 various officially recognized religious trends and sects performed their functions. Orthodox Christianity with due account of the number of its adepts was regarded as the most significant confession, while Islam occupied the second place. For the 1940s, for the sake of coordination of religious life of Muslims there were organized four spiritual departments of Muslims: the Middle Asia and Kazakhstan with the center in Tashkent, the European part of the USSR and Siberia with the center in Ufa, the North Caucasus with the center in Buinaksk and the Trans-Caucasus with the center in Baku. The Spiritual Department of Muslims of the Middle Asia and Kazakhstan had its representative offices in all five republics of the region, headed by muftis nominated by the Center. Certainly, at that time many mullas performed their functions outside the competence of Spiritual Departments; as a sign of protest against the official position of these religious centers they often took self-dependent actions aimed

at dissemination of Islamic views. One may say that just they carried out the main work in order to protect religious self-consciousness of believers. In Soviet times, in Kazakstan, for example, there existed 63 mosques, while at preset their number surpassed 5 thousand; in Kirghizstan the number of mosques increased from 200 to more than 2 thousand; in Uzbekistan the number of mosques was raised enormously.

At the same time, the Central Asia should not be regarded as a homogeneous political and social-cultural common entity. Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and the Fergana valley represent one group of territories, Kazakhstan without southern regions and the northern part of Kirghizstan – the other group, Turkmenistan is the different entity. But they have much in common.

One should not overestimate and at the same time underestimate certain noted changes in terms of popularization and dissemination of Islam in the CA. Islam and its role in the contemporary world attained global significance. Some attempts were and are made to connect Islam with world terrorism, to declare Islam to be the main source of this evil. At the same time, it should not be ignored that in epoch of globalization in contemporary Islamic communities there take place two different but mutually connected processes. In the course of elaboration of ways of struggle against religious extremism and actual terrorism one should always take into account some founding directions, projecting them to the situation in terms of Muslim factor's influence in Russia itself. Reviewing approaches of different researchers, it is necessary to take into account the following factors: political Islam, i.e. use of Islam for political purposes with the aim of the statehood's restructure; radical Islam, i.e. hostility to deviations from Islamic norms in public life; Islamic extremism – militant hostility to deviations from these norms;

terrorism itself as criminal activities against foundations of the secular state and the constitutional order in the country.

A. Malashenko makes the following comment: “Islamists are not visible so much in Russian Volga Basin, Ural and Siberia, The territory of their activities is restricted and their popularity is much less noticeable than in the North Caucasus. Russian cities, which, unlike Europe, lack “Muslim quarters”, even by appearance do not fit to dissemination of Islamic radicalism. For the end of the 1990s, the Islamists seemed to have no chances for consolidation among Russian Tatars and Bashkirs. However, in the beginning of the XXI century it turned out that Islamic radicals had reserves. The graduates from Arabic education institutions, having come back to their Motherland, were able to settle and to consolidate several dozens mosques with groups of the radical youth. They succeeded to arrange ties with Caucasian adepts and to establish contacts with groups from the Central Asia, first of all with “Hizb ut-Tahrir”...Further, Islamists split traditional Islam, having opposed to the habitual for Russian Muslims mashabs – Khanafism and Shafiism, as well as to Tarikatism in the North Caucasus, the other, close to Khanbalist type “wahhaby Islam”. The opposition between traditional Islam and Islamists took place everywhere. Apart from the North Caucasus, where it acquired extreme forms, including armed clashes, this opposition was marked in Tatarstan, Bashkortostan, Astrakhan, Volgograd and other regions”.

In this connection, the declaration, made by D. Medvedev in December 2007 during his visit to Tatarstan at the meeting with professors of higher educational institutions and of representatives of Islamic communities, seems to be significant: “In such multi-confessional and multi-national country like Russia the closest attention should be paid to spiritual education... It is evident that the dialogue between religion and culture is the indispensable condition of unity of

the Russian nation, of public consent, sovereignty... All world religions are based on fundamental values of justice and clemency, and no world religion has anything common with attempts to present people for religious or national reasons”.

The two different but interconnected processes go on in contemporary Islamic communities. The first process is marked by formation of global Islamic political system, the second one presents the cultural (civilization) challenge of Islam to westbound movement and consumerism, caused by globalization and the accompanied factors. Actually, globalization results in conflicting development of cultures and civilizations. The human societies always confronted alien cultures; however, exactly the epoch of globalization engenders a previously unknown level of multicultural and heterogeneous structure of society, which turns out to be a new challenge to traditional societies. The rapid process of renaissance of Islam and return to traditional foundations accompanies the pressure of the West not only in the CA countries but also in the whole Islamic world and is manifested in conversion to the fundamental bases of religion, to “pure Islam”, to the search for an answer to the challenges of the present time in the past knowledge, based on Islam, about the world. These two directions do not contradict each other and proceed from one significant principle – firmness and immutability of Holy Koran and of foundations of religion. There exist only different methods of achievement of the main task – to preserve and to consolidate the situation of the Muslim community both in the region and in the whole world.

*“Kraya dugi nestabilnosti: Balkany-Tsentralnaya Aziya”,
M., 2010, p. 214–218.*

Kamaludin Gadjiev,
political scientist
**WILL AZERBAIJAN BECOME
SECOND KUWAIT?**

Azerbaijan plays the key role in apportionment of forces in the South Caucasus and around the Caspian Sea. It not only possesses big hydrocarbon resources but also occupies an advantageous place in the transportation route of oil and gas shipment to the western direction from the territory of the Caspian Basin. Therefore after disintegration of the USSR Azerbaijan occupied the most advantageous position comparing with two other states in the South Caucasus.

In the middle of the 1990s, since the time of conclusion of the so-called “contracts of the century” new investments were made in the country, new jobs appeared not only in the oil sphere but also in a number of other branches of economy. The mere fact of coming to the country of western companies was significant not only in economic terms but also had the colossal moral-psychological importance, since it raised aspirations of people for rapid rebirth of economy, consolidation of new Azerbaijani statehood, achievement of social-political stability. One should also note the fact that the biggest world companies, having made big investments in development of hydrocarbon deposits, actually became the lobbyists of Azerbaijan’s interests on the world arena. According to the existing information, since 2006 the amount of extracted oil in Azerbaijan reached the record – 30 million tons, and for the following period the amounts of oil production constantly augmented. Given high prices of oil in the world market, the rise of oil extraction resulted in rapid rise of incomes in the state budget.

It should be said that economic capacity of Azerbaijan by all means is not reduced only to the oil resources. The expertise estimates the potential reserves of gold in Azerbaijan by the size exceeding 1000

tons, which surpasses the known reserves of gold in Georgia and Armenia, taken together. The gold refining enterprise has been projected in the republic. The reorganization and modernization of industries, connected with energy, as well as of big oil-chemical complexes is going on with assistance rendered by the European Union. Great export potential of Azerbaijan is connected with agricultural-industrial capacity. In Azerbaijan, the complex of significant strategic reforms has been elaborated in the agricultural sector, which in the aggregate are summoned to extend its chances independently to meet its demands in food-stuffs, to create conditions for development of grain market, of perfection of agricultural credits' system etc. The republic is able to succeed in achieving production of sufficient amount of grain, sugar and tea. Tourists may bring a rather big inflow of hard currency.

The boom in the construction sphere, marked before the crisis, shows improvement in the economic situation in the republic. The state demonstrated its readiness to provide financial support to construction of the railway Baku-Tbilisi-Kars. Since 2003, 520 thousand jobs have been created in the country. But the authorities have not yet been able to solve the problem of unemployment and to liquidate poverty.

Azerbaijan aspires also for using its big transit capacity. The so-called Caucasian transport corridor, which in a great part is laid across the republic's territory, may transform Azerbaijan into one of regional centers of international trade and re-export. Evidently, the cooperation of western countries in the sphere of transport communications acquires a rising significance in this context.

The incomes received by transportation of the energy resources to world markets became the main source of economic growth. According to the data of the state custom-house, submitted to agency "Interfacs-Azerbaijan", in 2008 the foreign trade turnover of Azerbaijan

made the astronomic for this country amount of \$ 54 billion 919 million 697.3 thousand with positive balance of \$ 40 billion, which surpasses many times the index for 2007. The export made \$ 47 billion 756 million 229.4 thousand (rise in 7.8 times), the import accounted for \$ 7 billion 163 million 467,9 thousand. The structure of export was as follows: 92.49% - crude oil, 4.3% - fuel oil, 0.48% - ferrous metals and products, 0.45% - vegetables, 0.26% - vegetable and fat oils and others. In 2008, the export was distributed as follows: Italy - 42.25% of the whole amount of export, the USA – 12.59%, Israel – 7.55%, India – 5.09%, France – 4.86%; the import of Azerbaijan was apportioned in the following way: Russia – 18.83%, Turkey – 11.27%, Germany – 8.36%, Ukraine – 7.92%, PRC – 6.68% and Great Britain – 5.39%. As it is seen from this data, the lion's part of the export consists of crude oil.

The country gets more than 75% of state incomes from oil, and 20% – at the expense of trade, customs and other trade taxes, while only 5% are received from agriculture and industry. The oil factor determines the main vectors of internal and foreign policy of Azerbaijan. One should not ignore the fact that exactly the so-called oil diplomacy promoted the interest of the world community to Azerbaijan. In this respect, both foreign and internal policy of Azerbaijan are liable to the conjuncture deviations of prices for this raw material in world markets and to the course of negotiations on the choice of routes for shipment of hydrocarbon resources and the corresponding financial support.

Given all these marked achievements, it turned out to be impossible to make Azerbaijan become second Kuwait, as G.Aliyev often said. As soon as it became evident that prognoses of fantastic amounts of discovered and not discovered deposits of hydrocarbons do not correspond totally to the actual situation, the original euphoria

disappeared. As vice-president of company "Shell" G.Graham said, this region was not "a new Persian Gulf", but Caspian oil fields are quite comparable with the reserves of the Northern Sea. These reserves are significant and actually may be used for efficient economic development of Azerbaijan.

The social and economic situation in Azerbaijan is aggravated by corruption and arbitrary rule of state officials. To the view of many observers, corruption covered all law enforcement bodies and threatens national security. The actual merging of power and property is one of the factors, which have negative impact on the social-economic situation. Former president's G. Aliyev son- I. Aliyev, as the first vice-president of the state oil company of Azerbaijan, kept under his control oil industry of the republic. Journalist I. Guseinova remarked in this respect: "It is common knowledge in Azerbaijan and abroad that the Aliyevs family possesses oil and the whole related business. Just due to this fact the president 10 years ago nominated his only son to the post of vice-president of the State Oil Company of the RA (GNKAR). For the last two years, exactly therefore Geydar Aliyev exerted all his forces to lead his son to power after himself". In the same spirit the opposition newspaper "Eni Musavat", citing some sources, noted: "The property and the real estate, which belonged to Geydar Aliyev, are estimated in \$ 24 billion, which belonged to his son Ilham – \$ 11 billion, his daughter Sevil – \$ 13 billion". As Russian magazine "Expert" remarked, today it is impossible to distinguish the Aliyevs' private property from the state property".

However, not only oil gives profit to this family. As marked "Monitor-weekly" and newspaper "Novoe Vremya", the whole oil business is owned by people of this clan. G. Aliyev's brother Jalal is considered as the richest person in Azerbaijan. However, even the opposition press does not evaluate his riches. He made convicted

several newspapers for reports on his villas in Great Britain and Turkey, on filling fuel stations, expensive houses, on a fashionable hotel in Azerbaijan etc. Commenting these facts, they joke or seriously speak about emergence in the world market of new oil giant, titled conditionally “Aliyev and Sons”. In November 1998, some opposition newspapers published lists of state officials and G. Aliyev’s close relatives, who possess big real estate in 25 countries of the world for the sum of \$ 700 million. The conditions are created often for businessmen, when success of business depends on personal relations with the presidential and other power structures. Favoritism, nepotism, close relationship, distribution of various benefits and, consequently, embezzlement of national property became inseparable attributes of social and economic life of the country.

All this makes us agree with one of the observers, who compared the republic with “a beggar sitting on the throne”. Actually, scanty pensions and wages of many Azerbaijanis, emigration and departure to Russia in search of a living seem to be absurd near the brimming over “oil fountain”.

The analysis of the existing situation does not provide us with arguments for a definite positive or negative appraisal of both the essence and the character of the present regime in Azerbaijan, as well as of its conformity with some or other models of the state-political system. A brief analysis of the situation in Azerbaijan should be made in order to comprehend correctly this problem. The proclamation of the contemporary independent Azerbaijan was accompanied with the known tragic events, which could not help leaving their deep imprint in the main directions and characteristic of transformation processes in all national spheres of public and political life. For that period, the processes, going on in Karabakh and the adjacent sphere, had a great impact on tempos and characteristic of the developing national

movement in Azerbaijan, which finally resulted in proclamation of independence. These processes and their results, as well as the troubles of political struggle in Azerbaijan in the end of the 1980s –the beginning of the 1990s have been widely discussed in the national scientific literature. In this context, it is sufficient to mention that the first president – A. Elchibey and his team came to power under the slogans of Panturkism and establishment of closest inter-state relations with Turkey, consolidation of independence of Azerbaijan and the position of all conceivable great distance from Russia, solving Karabakh problem for the benefit of Azerbaijan by September 1992 and others.

After G. Aliyev coming to power, the political course of Azerbaijan, including foreign policy, became liable to certain changes. Azerbaijan joined the CIS, the one-sided Turkish orientation was corrected and some steps were taken to restore certain ties with Russia and to diversify international relations of the country. Gradually, the forces, which promoted disassembly of all ties, connecting Azerbaijan with Russia, having accomplished their task, rather quickly either left definitely the political arena or stepped aside, having liberated the place for G. Aliyev and his team. But one should give them the credit for preparing conditions to transform Azerbaijan into de facto and de jure an independent state.

The present authorities of Azerbaijan not without reason consider as their greatest service ensuring public-political independence. Although the opposition tries to question successes of the existing regime, the present authorities actually succeeded to stabilize social and political situation in the country. The main part of the citizens, irrespective of their political orientation, size of property etc., associate these real and fictitious successes with personality of late president G. Aliyev and of the present state power. Leaving aside the ways and

means used for achievement of these successes, it is needed to admit that as a whole G. Aliyev succeeded to pacify the ethnic-national movement of Talush and Lezgin peoples and to avoid division of the country, balancing on the brink of war, to secure a truce (very shaky, though) with Armenia, to liquidate all attempts (real and imaginary) of forceful pressure against the powers on the part of some or other political groups. With determination he removed the military opposition from political arena.

In this respect, one should give G. Aliyev first of all the credit of consolidation of unorganized and super-politicized law enforcement bodies, however, fixing them completely as a service for the benefit of his regime. By the time of his coming to power, the national demoralized army, actually defeated in Karabakh war, was unable to perform its main functions for protection of the state against internal and external threats. Given a deficit of needed financial means and resources, G. Aliyev concentrated the efforts in forming and strengthening armed national forces, which make now 56 thousand regular servicemen and 7 thousand body guards. The rise of oil incomes contributed to the growth of defense expenses, primarily for strengthening armed forces. According to the existing data, for the last five years the military expenses of Azerbaijan increased more than ten times, and the defense budget surpassed \$ 2 billion in 2008. However, Azerbaijan does not have its own military-industrial infrastructure, capable to provide its army with the needed arms and explosives. Not counting two air force repair centers and two enterprises, producing parts to radio-electronic and rocket technique, the military industry actually does not exist in Azerbaijan.

At present, the president of the country concentrates all real power in his hands. He is the unique significant personality in the system of state governance in charge of taking decisions on all

important issues. The regime is characterized by clan, paternalist client-patron features. Since 1993 the representatives of “Nakhichevan” clan of Aliyev have occupied the leading position in the power structures after expulsion of A. Elchibey and his team, of the so-called “Baku”, “Gyandzha” and “Karabakh” clans. Therefore it is not a surprise that the division of powers and other democratic principles and norms, proclaimed in the constitution of the country, in many respects remain pure declarations. Milli Majilis, the government and other organs of governance are kept under complete control of the president and have not entrenched as independent organs, which adequately represent interests of the country’s population. The same may be said about the judicial power.

However, the analysis of the main points of the Aliyevs regime’s characteristics allows making the conclusion, that by the present time a peculiar system of the inherited authoritarian power with elements of eastern type has consolidated in Azerbaijan. In August 2003, G. Aliyev, probably seeing his ailing condition, nominated his son I. Aliyev to the post of chairman of the government with the perspective to become a candidate to the post of the president at the elections in October of the same year; evidently I. Aliyev easily got the upper hand at the elections. On 15 October 2008, he was re-elected to this post, getting 88.73% of votes. None of his rivals could overcome the barrier of 3%. In December 2008, Milli Majilis of Azerbaijan voted for abrogation of the article in the constitution, which limited the period of presidential office by one person to only two terms in succession. Evidently, the Constitutional Court of Azerbaijan expressed the positive opinion on the act for referendum concerning this issue. Commenting this decision, director of the Institute for Peace and Democracy Leila Yunus said in her interview to BBC: “It would be more correct to fix the lifelong term in office for Ilham Aliyev or for the Aliyevs family,

since we lack elections and imitation of democratic elections exists by us”.

*“Kavkazski uzal v geopoliticheskikh prioritetah Rossii”,
M., 2010, p. 153–181.*

M. Akulova,
cand. of sciences (philosophy)
**THE WORLD DEMOCRACY
AND TAJIKISTAN**

The world democracy exists as conflictive integrity consisting of many parts. These are the countries of the world democracy in America, Europe, so-called sovereign democracy of the Russian Federation, the different alliances of some countries in Europe, the new states of EU and NATO and so on. At the same time the world democracy under reservations also includes the CIS countries, the countries of Central Asia being officially voted democratic though sometimes the politicians, for example, of USA and the other countries name the countries of Central Asia as authoritarian regimes or even dictatorships in their analytical notes. Often many countries name them as hydrides being the democratic moments and authoritarianism and also half-authoritarian regimes in the analytical literature. Having the first romantic hopes for near democratization the political elite of the world democracy was enthusiastic: coming mass transfer to democracy seemed to be inevitable. M. Lipman writes that “it concerns not only a communist block. Beginning from the last quarter of XX century a political regime relaxation affected in varying degree about thousands countries. It began from the right-wing dictatorship fall in Spain, Portugal and Greece and then in Latin American countries the elective civil power changed the army juntas; in the middle of 80-ss

authoritarian regimes in the South-East Asia were relaxed and then velvet and non-velvet revolutions came in the Eastern Europe and the USSR dissolution came next but during the last years one notes some relaxation of the political mores in the South of Africa and even somewhere in the Middle East”.

In spite of geopolitical feuding and contradiction which like a shadow continue feuding of the cold war dividing it into the West and the East; nevertheless there was some progress in transformation of societies and states to a formal democracy in the world beginning with the USSR dissolution. “But only 20 countries among this thousand, – M. Lipman writes, – can boast about democratic achievements. These are, in particular, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and also Estonia and Slovenia, Chili and Taiwan. Slovakia, Mexico, Brazil, Philippines, the South Korea and some others continue move to democracy”.

Ad interim approximately 80 countries were on the point of directing towards democracy but soon they hold up: backward motion to dictatorship (like in Uzbekistan or Turkmenistan) is seldom but democratic achievements aren’t great”.

The American politician T. Karozers describes such regimes in the following way: “A political process is somehow democratic as there is a relative freedom of actions for opposition parties and independent civil society and also regular elections and democratic constitution. But at the same time... the citizen rights are presented badly; their political activity is insignificant and practically is limited by a participation in elections; state power often violate the law, election legitimacy is doubtful, the citizen trust for state institutions is at a very low level but the state itself isn’t effective. So, we can say that a world is divided not only into democracy civilization and non-democratic countries but also into democracy civilization and the countries being differed in their regime character from totalitarianism and authoritarianism up to half-

authoritarianism proclaiming democracy building, i.e. formally democratic.

Tajikistan officially identifies itself as a legal, secular, democratic and social state based on its Constitution. However, it isn't officially a reason to number the country among the world of advanced democracy. Considering itself as the country of democracy Tajikistan distinguishes itself from the countries of Euro-Atlantic region as the country not having advanced form of democracy. The most important arguments for the ideologists of official Dushanbe are the facts of centuries-old development of democracy in Europe and America.

Nevertheless, a constitutional declaration of democracy in Tajikistan and the intention to build its advanced forms in the country give ground to speak about correlation of the world democracy and Tajikistan as the whole and its part taking into account, of course, the qualitative difference between the whole and its part. There emerged the problem in Europe on its attitude towards the countries of Central Asia and the CIS countries during the period of becoming independent of the post-soviet area countries and one decided to include them into the European process in the system of Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. This resolution was dictated, in all probability, to begin approaching of non-communist post-soviet area with Euro-Atlantic region concerning the security problems in order not to distance the CIS countries from Europe and to preserve the countries of Central Asia from slipping into unpredictable relations with non-democratic world – the Islamic world and China. A. Malashenko in his book “How are we to democratize Islam?” writes: “Absolute external control over the situation within the Moslem ummah and also its isolation and parallel development with the West are impossible. The idea of convergence being once popular and used to a socialist camp is more productive here which was also considered as a way to secure

itself against communism aggression”. These words are completely applied to Tajikistan where the population is the Moslems having the Islamic mentality and culture.

Democracy by the way of democratic solving of state and social problems is the way Tajikistan follows. As a whole the peace was developed in the country all around based on democracy principles. For example, it concerns interethnic relations in the country and international relations in the world when we mean the Tajikistan policy.

In Tajikistan the Uzbeks, the Kirghiz, the Turkmen, the Russians and the Russian –speaking and the other nationalities live together with the Tajik. The relations between the Tajik and the Uzbeks are also based on admission of the national-cultural interests of the Uzbeks in Tajikistan on the base of the Constitution. The languages and culture of the national minorities in Tajikistan aren’t infringed upon but are freely developed. The state language using in the office work is a measure of the state language protection not being something more vigorous in comparison with the other countries. The Uzbek children go to the Uzbek schools and learn the native language and there is a cultural-national community of the Uzbeks. The interests of the different regions are taken into account in the interregional relations with the national interest priority.

In Tajikistan the population is represented not only by the regions and the different nationalities but also by the different confessions, political groupings – the communists, the Islamists, the different democrats, the atheists and the ethnic Moslems, the Tajik, the Uzbeks, the Kirghiz, the Russians and the Russian-speaking, the Turkmen and the others. Having this diversity one should build such relations which would exclude extremism and extreme. The unity of diversity is achieved on the base of the country Constitution protecting the relations from infringement. One built all these various relations

during the peace establishing in Tajikistan and these relations correspond to the democratic Constitution of Tajikistan according to the legal law. In order not to strain relations between Tajikistan and Uzbekistan one built up these relations in such a way in order not to interfere with the relations between the Tajik and the Uzbeks in Uzbekistan but the government of Uzbekistan doesn't interfere with the relations between the Uzbeks and the Tajik in Tajikistan.

Under these conditions the Tajik feat is one-sided respecting the Uzbek rights in Tajikistan unlike respecting the Tajik rights in Uzbekistan based on the Constitution of Tajikistan. One can't observe non-admissible extremes in Tajikistan according to the principles of peaceful democratic process. The important ground of the existing moments and fragments of democracy in Tajikistan is the principle enunciated by the President of Tajikistan, E. Rakhmon that nobody has the right to dictate his way of living and behavior for the others by force if they don't proceed from the human values and democratic rights and laws.

It's the important principle and so the country's internal policy and the political forces are peaceful. The Islamists, the communists, the democrats adhere to their own way of living and behavior of the democratic countries. One can also notice this principle in the citizen figures of Tajikistan: there are people in the yashmak, there is the youth without it but nobody makes the others being unlike them as the object of persecution; everybody lives peacefully.

Today the world democracy as the integrity uses the results of the peaceful principles of supreme power in Tajikistan but for the present doesn't set up these principles as the norms of the international law. The president's principle could be included into the international legal documents even if in Asia. In this case authoritarianism and half-authoritarianism's influence was weakened in many countries. Policy

democratization in the West is to be associated with the problems of its geopolitical beginning. If it's impossible as soon as possible then the problems of geo-policy beginning are to the foreground.

Tajikistan being a proclaimed part of the world democracy is in the space of this policy of the West which refused from immediate democratization of its regime in the name of the strategic advantages for some time owing to this half-authoritarian regime in the struggle against the Afgan taliby. The success in this walk of life, i.e. taliby's repression, gives USA and NATO a possibility to advance policy of the Anaconda's Ring against Russia and China and half-authoritarian states in Central Asia.

In the ratio of the whole and its part meaning the democratic world as the integrity and Tajikistan one should dwell on the issue such as freedom dimension. What is freedom and what is it for this world? Many scientific studies devoted to freedom problem pay attention to freedom dimension asking a question: freedom from somebody and from what and freedom for somebody and freedom for which purpose? It's a fundamental dimension of any liberation movement including mass movement and the political mass and a personality. The problem concerning freedom from what and somebody and freedom for something and somebody was also solved in the Tajik events of 90-ss of the last century. For the forces nationally tinged it was the problem on freedom for the nation development, the cultural development, the Tajik language protection from its supplanting from the official sphere. For the religious forces it was the problem on freedom from the state atheism and religion protection from the elimination Islam policy from the people life. For the democrats it was the problem on freedom from totalitarianism. But all the named forces sought to be free from the mentioned points. However, there were substantial differences concerning future problem. Everybody would like to have freedom of

conscience as freedom from the state atheism but those who wanted freedom for the political Islam of the radical persuasion leading to a religious statehood were only in the depths of the religious forces. Of course, the freedom of conscience giving freedom for religion and the half-religious way of living and atheism depending on personal liberty was out of the question in such perspective.

Outstanding characteristics of democracy became more distinct in modern Tajikistan: the basics of legal statehood are being built and foundations of the civil society are established; authorities is voted and changed at the high and the local levels; there are mechanisms of indirect democracy (referendums) and there is a system of division of powers in the state; the main rights of a person are guaranteed (freedom of conscience, word, meetings, organizations and etc.); officially legal agencies aren't dependent of the executive authority; there is no leading ideology and political party; there emerges a free and competitive market having various forms of property; there is external independence (political and ideological) of mass communication and information media.

So, the country is in the power space of the world democracy and all the non-democratic forces have to take it into consideration adopting a democratic constitution and a formal democracy at least at the level of declarations. But this official democracy contains actual democratic structures and spheres one can't deny.

*“Sovremennye gumanitarnye issledovaniya”,
M., 2010, N3, p. 265–269.*

G. Rudov,

cand. of political sciences

TURKEY'S AND IRAN'S ROLE

IN CENTRAL ASIA AND STABILITY PROBLEMS

Turkey being the important strategic partner and the faithful ally of USA carries out active policy in the countries of Central Asia. USA considers Turkey in the region, first of all, as a balance to Russia and in perspective – to China and also being concerned about ideological and political expansion of Iran in the countries of Central Asia and as the ideological representative of the West's policy in Central Asia. Nevertheless, USA not only challenges a possibility to establish the Great Turkestan the idea is ideated by the concrete circles in Turkey. In particular, such approach was used in Washington's attitude towards the regional Union of the countries of Central Asia being formalized on 4 January 1994 in Tashkent. This idea was discussed beginning from 1992 during visiting the Moslem republics of the former USSR of the late president of Turkey T. Ozala and the then state secretary of USA J. Baker. USA agreed to recognize Turkey as “regional super-state” the sphere of the interests the so-called new Turkestan can be included into. According to the political establishment of USA the integration process development according to this scenario would be attractive by two reasons:

First of all, USA would find a way to appease the Islamic states especially the population being set against America and the Islamists themselves attaching the new countries of Central Asia to the Turkish model where according to their opinion a problem on the Moslem state establishing is relatively successfully solved possessing a strong secular “democratic” emphasis;

Secondly, such variant of the problem solving would be based on the objective reasons: on the natural tendency to so-called revival of the common historical past of the Turkic language –speaking peoples and

there would be no keen anxiety and protest from the party of Russia and the Christian world.

However, USA run too far in their policy of the Moslem people contrasting to the Christian world in the region: one shouldn't forget that the Turkish regime having all its achievements is "cemented" by the soldiers but coming to power of the united Islamic radicals in this country would mean USA's policy failure. So, USA's support for the Central Asian countries' ambitions based on panturkism must be limited: one has already passed an opinion that they should concentrate not on Central Asia but just on Turkey being more important partner for USA.

USA continues encouraging Turkey's activity in the region, first of al, concerning energy supply transportation. To some extent it's caused by the reasons of domestic-policy (complex situation in Turkey, a possibility of the clerical force strengthening, the pro-western orientation weakening) and geo-strategic (considering Turkey as one of the reliable allies of USA in Euro-Atlantic cooperation and also in NATO and attempts to make Ankara as the key state in the region) bearer of Washington's policy. Turkey itself after the USSR dissolution assigned primary importance to the supranational Turkic economic are establishing, the united regional energy system and a system of energy supply transportation, a regional bank development, visa-free moving of the citizens and capitals and the common language for the Turkic states. These proposals were made during the first summit of the Turkic language-speaking the CIS-states and Turkey in Ankara on 30-31 October 1992 (there were 7 such summits). However, the leaders of the Turkic republics mildly declined Turkey's proposals on multilateral cooperation having signed only documents at bilateral level and the Ankara declaration which provided for a cooperation in culture, education, language, security, economy and law only in general terms.

One should note that the leaders of the new independent states thought about Turkey's initiatives cautiously. So, the president of Kazakhstan N. Nazarbaev expressed a thought that the relation developing based on ethno-language factors promote not closer relations but people separation so one should develop civilized relations based on mutual respect and state independence. So, there was official negative reaction for the Turkish leadership statements concerning "the Turkish-language speaking empire from the Adriatic Sea to the Great Chinese wall" establishing. The leaders of the post-soviet Turkish-language speaking republics have no desire to be under patronage of "the elder brother in Turkey". Then one also found out economic weak point of Turkey being not capable of its promise fulfilling on financial and economic assistance for these states. As a result, Ankara had to correct its policy with respect to these states concentrating on concrete projects (first of all, on oil-pipeline Baku-Tbilisi-Jeikhan) and bilateral relation developing. As a whole the concrete expectations of the countries of Central Asia concerning benefits owing the cooperation with the Country of the morning star weren't satisfied to a great extent. Nevertheless, Turkey continues to be a very attractive partner for the region countries what is caused by such factors as a language, ethnic and religious closeness; a combination of temporal power with the western system for state establishing and the traditional Islam; the success in the economic development (at the beginning of their statehood making the countries of Central Asia tried to use the Turkish model of the development); developed relations with USA and the West as a whole and the impact in the Moslem world.

However, it would be very simple to see Turkey as a bearer of USA's policy in the region. Ankara has its own economic interests (in the sphere of export, contracts works for the building companies, business activity of the Turkish companies) it supports with concrete

measures, first of all, representing itself as “the elder brother” all over the Turkish world having united the new states of Central Asia and Caucasus and propagating the ideas of K. Ataturk and the common “Turkish house”. Turkey invested more than 1 milliard dollars in economy of the region countries of Central Asia and Azerbaijan, opened the doors of its institutions for the thousands of the students from the region countries, assists financially the mosques, the religious schools, the Moslem cultural centers, opened and is inclined to open future joint institutions not only in capitals but in provinces more often (Osh-in Kyrgyzstan, Turkestan – in Kazakhstan, the Fergana valley – in Uzbekistan).

If Turkey enters the EU it will be more attractive for the region; it continues helping the Turkic-language speaking countries in the sphere of culture, religion and education. The countries’ inclination to Turkey is no doubt advantageously for Washington because the Russian and the Iranian impact forcing out in the region by Turkey is the strategic problem. The liaison USA-Turkey is negatively taken in Moscow where one negatively thinks practically about all constituents of the Turkish policy over the CIS countries’ are. One should note that, however, there are real perspectives to develop cooperation between Russia and Turkey in the different fields (Turkey is one of the important trade-economic partners of Russia) including a contradiction to threats in the sphere of security in Central Asian region. With all reserves the Turkish factor is the important resource for USA’s policy in Central Asia and Washington promotes the expansion of all spheres of Ankara cooperation in the region in every way. However, in spite of the world policy hegemony’s support Turkey faces with concrete difficulties in Central Asia though the Turkish model of the development continues to be attractive for the leaders of the most countries in the region. The problem is that the economic problems of

Central Asia are too great and complex for Ankara so the other regional players have the real chances in its turn. On the whole in spite of Turkey's activity including the military field of cooperation its attempts to be as the outpost of the Western influence especially to neutralize the potential sources of instability have clear-cut borders in the region.

Iran is one more important player in the region in spite of the fact that Teheran has not yet formulated its relations with the states of Central Asia. According to some political leaders Iran had the greatest chances to strengthen its impact in Tajikistan based on ethnic and cultural closeness with this state. But the active support of the Tajik Islamists and "democratic" leaders during the blood events in May-November 1992 in Tajikistan was the reason of anti-Iranian sentiment increasing among the republic population. Iran's actions caused a strong concern of the other countries in Central Asia having seen a prototype of the Islamic fundamentalism of the Iranian type in the Islamic parties acting inside the country oriented only at the political power seizure in the country. Moreover, the leadership of the region states was being convinced that the Iranian model of the statehood development is hardly to be a sample for Central Asia because of the events taking place in Iran itself. The events of 1990-s in Central Asia made Iran changing its policy with respect to independent states of the region: more realist and pragmatic features became peculiar to this policy. The Iranian diplomacy expressed its concern about the event development in Tajikistan standing for peaceful settlement of the Tajik conflict. Iran placed its territory at the negotiation participants' disposal and besides announced about non-interference into domestic affairs of Tajikistan and other countries of this region made efforts to develop its economic relations with these states. So, the agreements were concluded between Uzbekistan and Iran on relation developing in the agricultural field, transport, oil production and processing, building,

pharmaceutics and banking. Teheran suggested Turkmenistan its help to enter the world market of gas and cotton. Nevertheless, the relations of Central Asian states with Iran are far from being ideal. That is the result of irresistible feeling of mutual disbelief and concern. From the other hand, Iran's economic potential doesn't allow it dictating its terms to the region countries. Besides, Iran's threat to repatriate 500 thousands of the Afghan refugees can destabilize the situation in the north-west of Afghanistan.

Iran seeking to be the leading regional force tries to attach the countries of Central Asia using transit-transport connections, their dependence on road infrastructure, access to ports and pipelines passing via Iran's territory as a method of influence. At the same time Teheran's attempts to interfere into domestic affairs of some states of Central Asia cause a negative reaction there; the ruling regimes of these countries act circumspectly on USA and the West with respect to Iran. Iran opposing to aggressive policy of USA tries to conduct a course to establish and develop good neighborhood in Central Asia, to use its geographic neighboring as maximum as possible suggesting Central Asian countries transport corridors via its territory, oil and gas pipelines building to the ports of the Persian Gulf. The Iranian diplomacy promotes to peaceful settlement of domestic conflicts in Tajikistan and Afghanistan as far as possible. One should note that those states will no doubt have influence in the region that will be able to make a substantial contribution in its economic development and security and stability providing.

*“Kraya dugi nestabilnosti: Balkany – Tsentralnaya Aziya”,
M., 2010, p. 219-225*

CONTENTS OF “RUSSIA AND THE MOSLEM WORLD” BULLETIN FOR 2010 № 1(211)–12(222)

№ 1

President D.A. Medvedev. Has the new course shown signs of its existence?; *Abaz Osmayev.* Religious factor in life of the Chechen Republic; *Vladimir Galitsky.* Radicalization of Islam in the south of Russia; *I. Fedorovskaya.* The contemporary political situation in Azerbaijan; *Sergey Markedonov.* The Caucasian priorities in the foreign policy of Kazakhstan; *Sanobar Shermatova.* Moscow and Tashkent: causes of “particular” impediments; *Irina Dubovitskaya.* The role of the Russian language on the Middle Asia territory: the view from Tajikistan; *Rashid Abdullo.* Central Asia integration – who is to profit from it?; *Aleksei Malashenko.* Blind alleys of integration in Central Asia.

№ 2

Darya Khalturina, Svetlana Kobzeva. The geopolitical perspectives of Russia under conditions of social-demographic crisis; *V. Zorin, A. Rudakov.* Problems of counteraction against challenges of religious extremism in Russia; *Liliya Sagitova.* Islam in post-Soviet Tatarstan; *Naima Neflyasheva.* Islam in Adygeya: from tradition to modernization; *Kaflan Khanbabayev, R. Mamarayev.* Islamization of Dagestan: myth or reality?; *Kamaludin Gajiev.* The Caucasus between unity and fragmentation; *N. Miller.* The Caspian region: problems and perspectives; *Ochil Zakhidov.* About geopolitical priorities of modern Tajikistan.

№ 3

A. Buttaeva. Russia, Islam and globalization; *A. Yunusova.* Inculcation of radical ideological trends in mass consciousness of Muslims in Russia; *Pavel Svyatenkov.* Chechnya: the point of vulnerability for Russia; *Khizri Adziyev, Nariman Gasanov.* The Russian problem in the Republic of Dagestan; *V. Panin.* The role of Azerbaijan in the USA policy in the Caucasus; *N. Fedulova.* Russia and the countries of the Central Asia; *Vladimir Dergachev.* The burning hot borders of the Middle East.

№ 4

Does the national elite exist in Russia? (by materials of “the Round Table” in the magazine “Moskva”); *R. Mukhametov.* The national interests of Russia over the post-Soviet area; *R. Sharipova.* The Islamic renaissance in Tatarstan: Problems and perspectives; *R. German.* Politicization of the non-political component in the system of Russian geopolitics in the North Caucasus; *Esbosyn Smagulov.* Participation of ethnic and religious groups in political life of Kazakhstan; *E. Abdullaev.* The Russian language: The life after death; The language, policy and a society in modern Uzbekistan.

№ 5

M. Urnov. One should seek terms and conditions of destabilization in elites in Russia; *E. Korolyova.* Islam and Orthodoxy in Russia: cooperation or clash?; *S. Berezhnoy.* On politicization of Muslim associations in the South of Russia; *Alexey Malashenko.* Losing the Caucasus; *Kaflan Khanbabayev.* The Islamic radical elite in Dagestan; *Ildar Mavlyautdinov.* The labor ethics of Islam in Tatarstan; *Aleksandr Baranov.* Globalization in the space of the Caspian region since the outset of the XXI century; *R. Mukhametov.* The national

interests of Russia in the post-Soviet Middle Asia; *D. Fayzullayev*. The USA – the Central Asia: the shipment point or springboard?

№ 6

N. Shmelev. Russia's modernization problem: State role; *A. Yunusova*. Islam in Russia; *G. Klochkov*. The internal reasons of the ethnic-political conflicts in the south of Russia; *Z. Dzarakhova*. Ingushetia on the eve of the XX-XXI centuries: ethnic-political and geopolitical realities; *Saltanat Ermakhanova*. Modernization of society in Kazakhstan: stimuli and barriers; *Andrey Bolshakov*. The mutual relations of Kirghizstan with the republics of the post-Soviet Central Asia; *Elena Ionova*. The impact of external factors on relations between Russia and Turkmenistan; *E. Kuzmina*. The peculiarities of the internal political and the international situation in the Central Asia.

№ 7

Oleg Mikhailyonok. The national sovereignty and the Russian federalism; *G. Murklinskaya*. The counteraction against the contemporary threats in the south of Russia; *V. Chernous*. The civilization-cultural dialogue in the Caucasus – the basis of regional stability; *P. Karabushenko*. The elites and ethnic conflicts in the geopolitical space of “the Great Caspian region”; *N. Krasnobaeva*. Religious situation in the Eastern-Kazakhstan oblast; *Askar Akayev*. Kirghizstan: Have the expectations come true?; *Z. Dadabaeva*. Tajikistan: Potential of frontier cooperation.

№ 8

“Contamination” by modernization. (Editorial column of magazine “Peace and Politics”); *Nikolay Shmelev, Valentin Fedorov*. Russia – the West: The conception of limited requital (the opinion of economists); *M. Vagabov*. The Islamic factor in contemporary geopolitics; *Kemal Argon*. Strategies for interreligious and inter-Muslim dialogue:

a proposed methodology; *Nikolay Medvedev*. What impedes the ethnic-political stability in the North Caucasus?; *Z. Ashimova*. Kazakhstan in the system of integration processes in Central Asia; *S. Chernyavsky*. The Russian priorities in Central Asia.

№ 9

N. Baranov. Zigzags of the post-Soviet Russian statehood; *Vladimir Semyonov*. The anti-extremist activities of Muslim religious organizations in the Volga Basin; *V. Kolosov*. Russian geopolitical discourse on the North Caucasus and public opinion; *L. Timofeenko*. Turkmenistan: route diversification of energy resource export; *Nurbek Atakanov*. Water and energetic problems in Central Asia; *Sulaimon Shokhzoda*. Security mechanisms in the Central Asia.

№ 10

V. Inosemtsev. Modernization of Russia and globalization; *Irina Orlova*. Ethnicity advance in historic science in the post-Soviet space; *K. Landa, S. Alibekova*. Contemporary terrorism in the Caspian region; *Saltanat Ermakhanova*. Socio-cultural characteristic properties of Kazakhstan's population; *Ch. Koichumanova*. History of the political movement forming in Kyrgyzstan; *Khalimakhon Khushkadamova*. Family and marital relations in the post-Soviet Tajikistan; *S. Luzyanin*. Russia and China in the Central Asia: competition or cooperation?

№ 11

A. Serapina. The impact of corruption on political processes in contemporary Russia; *N. Ivanov, N. Kiryushina, A. Rudakov, S. Ustinkin*. The activities on the territory of Russia of foreign non-governmental religious-political organizations; *A. Salagayev, S. Sergeyev, L. Luchsheva*. The cultural and religious situation in

contemporary Tatarstan; *Yu. Dorokhov*. The Islamic extremism in the North Caucasus (Dagestan as an example); *B. Kitinov*. Religion in geopolitics of the Caspian region states; *Saltanat Ermakhanova*. Modernization of Kazakhstan: in search of its own model of social-cultural development.

№ 12

Georgy Malinetsky. Projection of the future and modernization of Russia; *Tatyana Litvinova*. “Information jihad” in global network; *Georgy Rudov*. Russia–Central Asia and radical Islam; *Kamaludin Gadjiev*. Will Azerbaijan become second Kuwait?; *M. Akulova*. The world democracy and Tajikistan; *G. Rudov*. Turkey’s and Iran’s role in Central Asia and stability problems.

**РОССИЯ
И
МУСУЛЬМАНСКИЙ МИР
2010 – 12 (222)**

Научно-информационный бюллетень

**Содержит материалы по текущим политическим,
социальным и религиозным вопросам**

Гигиеническое заключение
№ 77.99.6.953.П.5008.8.99 от 23.08.1999 г.
Подписано к печати 23/XI-2010 г. Формат 60х84/16
Бум. офсетная № 1. Печать офсетная. Свободная цена
Усл. печ. л. 4,75 Уч.-изд. л. 4,4
Тираж 300 экз. Заказ № 190

**Институт научной информации по общественным наукам РАН,
Нахимовский проспект, д. 51/21,
Москва, В-418, ГСП-7, 117997**

**Отдел маркетинга и распространения информационных изданий
Тел/ Факс (499) 120-4514
E-mail: market @INION.ru**

**E-mail: ani-2000@list.ru
(по вопросам распространения изданий)**

Отпечатано в типографии ИНИОН РАН
Нахимовский пр-кт, д. 51/21
Москва В-418, ГСП-7, 117997
042(02)9