

Societal, Institutional, Intellectual Layers of Russian IR and Russian Public Diplomacy in Eurasia

Marina Lebedeva, Yulia Nikitina, Ekaterina Koldunova
Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO), Moscow, Russia

The purpose of this paper is to use the Waever's model and its further development to analyze the development of international relations (IR) studies in Russia at the end of the 20th century. Russian IR went through an important transformation due to the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) as a state and the collapse of the state ideology. The international context for Russia changed from hostile attitudes of the West in early 1980s to cautious attitudes after Gorbachev's reforms and finally, the end of the Cold War in 1990. After 1991, Russia tried to become a member of the Western democratic community, but the results were mixed since the West, in Russian view, used Russian weakness of early 1990s to establish a unipolar world order (United States plus its allies). The beginning of 1990s marked a new stage in the study of IR in Russia on the basis different from Marxist-Leninist ideology, which dominated during the Soviet era. Western IR studies became available in Russia as a result of "openness", which led to drastic changes in the content of IR courses and textbooks. Institutional changes, such as budgetary deficit and poor funding of research and higher education also contributed to the shifts in IR teaching, while political science was just developing in early 1990s as an independent field of studies.

Keywords: Russian IR, Russian Public Diplomacy, Institution

Socio-political Changes

In Russian historiography, 1986 is described as a shift in the Soviet foreign policy. During the 1986-1991, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) jointly with the United States tried to transform a confrontational model of bipolarity into a cooperative one (Bordachev, 2003). Gorbachev's "New Political Thinking" doctrine presented new approaches to international security (Meyer, 1988; Snyder, 1988).

The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) Vienna Meeting, which started in 1986, had a major influence on the Soviet domestic debates about democratization and human rights. Perestroika and Glasnost were announced in 1987. All these domestic and foreign policy developments led to the institutionalized recognition of political science as an independent field of study in 1989: Most departments of scientific communism were transformed into departments of political science. The Soviet Political Science Association, created in 1960 and reorganized into the Russian Political Science Association in December 1991,

Marina Lebedeva, Chairman, Professor. The Head of World Politics Department, Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO), Scientific and Methodological Council of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation for Political Science, Moscow, Russia.

Yulia Nikitina, PhD in Political Science, associate professor at the School of World Political Processes, Moscow, Russia.

Ekaterina Koldunova, Deputy Dean at School of Political Affairs and Associate Professor at the Department of Asian and African Studies, MGIMO-University. Moscow, Russia.

had to organize professional trainings for representatives of these new departments about what political science was (Vorobyev, 2004).

By late 1980s, the Soviet Union abandoned its “limited sovereignty” doctrine towards the socialist countries of Central and Eastern Europe, which led to the wave of velvet revolutions and the reunification of two German republics in 1990. The end of the Cold War was proclaimed in the CSCE Paris Charter in 1990. The Warsaw Pact Organization and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance were dismantled in 1991. The Soviet Union collapsed in December 1991. In the IR field, Gorbachev’s cooperation with the West and the idea of creation of a “common European home” led to the establishment of the Institute of Europe within the Soviet Academy of Science system in 1987. Before this date, European studies were ideologized and separated into two subfields: studies of the Western capitalist Europe and of the Eastern socialist Europe. In 1992, the Association of European Studies was created to unite experts in this field.

After the collapse of the USSR, Russia inherited its status of the nuclear superpower and the permanent seat in the United Nation Security Council (UNSC), which were considered to be two main attributes of a great power. However, painful domestic political and economic reforms and the need to fight against separatism did not allow Russia feeling as a real great power. In public consciousness, the late 1980s and the 1990s are the time of glasnost’ and freedom of speech combined with very poor economic development and decrease of political stability.

Poor economic performance of Russia in the 1990s led to underfunding of higher education system, thus, most active members of the academia either left universities for business (Tyulin, 2005) or tried to combine as many academic and research positions as possible to get a decent revenue. In the 1990s, new enrollments were rare (in general, the prestige of the academia and scientific research drastically fell), that is why currently in IR and political science, there is a generation gap: Most of the professors are currently in their late 50s and more senior, while the next generation is in their late 20s and mid-30s. Foreign funding became available in the 1990s, but it was reserved only for English-speakers, who were not that numerous at that time.

As to the topics of academic research, democratic transition was the most popular in political science. However, most experts would describe Russian political regime of the 1990s as a hybrid regime and not a democracy (Melville, 1999; Shevtsova, 2000).

In IR, the content of studies continued to be concentrated on history of diplomacy but without any ideological explanations for the decisions taken. Apart from the inherited seat in the UNSC, Russia did not quickly gain membership in other prestigious international clubs, like G7 or the World Trade Organization (WTO). Thus, most studies in IR field were still about strategic security or Russian relations with North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Studies of the UN or other multilateral organizations developed mostly in the field of international security. Globalization studies became popular in late 1990s, but mostly from an economic perspective and in relation to the process of Russian accession to the WTO.

Generally, for Russia, the first half of the 1990s was the period of weakness, explained by unconditional concessions to the West made by Russia in order to become a part of the Western democratic community. The second half of the 1990s brought disillusionment and a turn towards Russian national interests, including more attention towards China and India as international partners. However, in area studies, the US and Europe were most popular choice among scholars and students until mid-2000s, while China and even Eurasian region remained at the outskirts of mainstream academic and practical research.

Institutional Configurations and Changes

In the 1990s, Russian IR experienced budgetary cuts, but it was the general trend in the higher education system and the system of government-sponsored think tanks within the Russian Academy of Science (e.g., Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Institute of the US and Canada, and many others). The institutes affiliated with the Russian Academy of Science had to survive by renting their properties to business companies in the 1990s and early 2000s. Government support and government grants returned to these institutes only by mid-2000s.

In 1990s, first Russian and foreign grant foundations started their activities in Russia. The development of IR studies in Russian regions has become possible largely thanks to grant support (A. P. Tsygankov & P. A. Tsygankov, 2005). Non-state research centers specializing in IR started appearing in Russia. Usually, these centers were quite small in size and consisted of three to five researchers, simultaneously affiliated with some other institutions, mainly universities or institutes of the Academy of Science.

In the late 1980s-early 1990s, studies in international relations became in demand at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Scientific Coordination Center was established as one of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs's department in order to cooperate with national IR research institutions (Pohlebkin, 1992).

The development of political science contributed to the development of organizational forms of IR studies in Russia. In 1999, the Russian International Studies Association (RISA) was founded, which created an opportunity for IR scholars all over Russia to meet bi-annually at the RISA Conventions to exchange the results of their studies. Another opportunity for IR scholars to meet is at the Conventions of the Russian Political Studies Association, where an important number of panels is usually devoted to IR topics as well.

In the 1990s, there was a rise of IR programs in Russian universities beyond Moscow and subsequent decentralization of IR teaching with new schools emerging in Saint Petersburg, Nizhny Novgorod, Kazan, Yekaterinburg, Novosibirsk, Tomsk, Vladivostok, and some other Russian cities. Academically, these schools mainly emulated the experience of Moscow universities (primarily of Moscow State Institute of International Relations) adopting the structure and content of the education programs in IR. At the same time, since there was an overproduction of graduates with IR diplomas, so a large number of graduates would not be enrolled in government structures, regional universities tried to find some specific approaches, which would add to the competitiveness of their schools both in Russia and internationally. Thus, they established international partnerships and tried to reach out to the international IR community. This internationalization led to greater diversification in the pedagogical philosophies and training methods creating a kind of regional specialization of some non-metropolitan universities. Thus, for example, Kazan' Federal University has built strong connections with the university in the Islamic world while the Far Eastern Federal University focused on the IR aspects of it Asia-Pacific studies.

However, this trend of internationalization and specialization was not supported by government funding. What is more, the internal competitiveness of different IR schools in Russia has been curbed by a low domestic mobility of IR researchers. In terms of academic mobility and joint projects, Russian universities mostly cooperate with foreign universities rather than with each other. Since mid-2000s Russian government-sponsored granting foundations suggest a number of grants aimed at increasing domestic mobility, but this is a rather recent trend.

Since 1990s, the number of Russian academic IR journals significantly increased. Later, some of them have been included into the databases Scopus, WoS, and ERIH plus. However, almost all of international relations journals in Russia are published either by the universities or by institutes of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and the authors are usually mainly from the institution, which published this journal. Thus, in Russia, only very few academic journals (e.g., *Polis* in political science field and *Mezhdunarodnye Protsessy* [International Trends] in IR) are truly national platforms for discussion (Istomin & Baykov, 2013).

In 1970-1980's, the idea of a systemic approach for understanding international relations as a dynamic integrity, influenced by the Marxist-Leninist paradigm, was actively defended and promoted in the Soviet Union (Tyulin, 1997). The 1990s appear like a period of a full-scale crisis in the social sciences in Russia: The old, Marxist-Leninist paradigm became outdated just overnight. Given this, the aim of Russian international relation studies at that time was to learn and adopt what the Western IR has already proposed to the international intellectual community. Pavel Tsygankov (1996) was one of the first who gave the description and analysis of the main IR theories in Russia. However, this trend was not supported by any government granting. Most milestone IR books published by Western scholars are not translated into Russian are exactly because of the lack of special funding. Alexei Bogaturov (2000) described the 1990s as a decade dominated by "the assimilation paradigm". He saw, nevertheless, some prospects for the IR studies in Russia in building-up the body of the international knowledge by adding to it the explanations of non-Western realities, which the Western-originated theories could not provide. In 2000s, some Russian scholars started developing a special Russian approach to IR to make up for the seeming deficiencies of the Western theories; however, these attempts raised some skepticism (Alekseeva & Lebedeva, 2016).

At the same time, in late 1990s, a number of other national intellectual IR schools emerged, for example, focused on the studies of the World Politics phenomena as a complex politics of states, inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), and non-states actors, which is changing the political organization of the world (Lebedeva, 2003). Interest towards world politics (global trends rather than inter-state relations) research is explained by the desire to overcome a domination of historic and diplomatic approaches in studying and teaching IR in Russia in the 1990s.

Since the mid-1990s when Russia's ambition became an integral part of the West did not materialize, a theme of a desired world order, which will most likely take a multipolar shape, became one of the constant research avenues (Primakov, 2002; Torkunov & Simonia, 2015). The system of interstate relations is also considered as a part of political organization of the world (Lebedeva & Marchetti, 2016). At the same time, Russian IR intellectual community debated such topics as a the way the world order would be evolving after the collapse of the USSR, what role different types of states and regionalist blocks would play in it, how should Russia react to the regional integration trends (Butorina, 2011; Nikitina, 2009; Shakleina, 2012).

The regionalist trend in IR, its role of regionalism in the transformation of the international system became yet another topic of theoretical and empirical analysis (Voskressenski, 2017). One more constant research areas constitute the studies of Russian foreign policy, the search of balance between the West and other Russian foreign policy regional priorities (Tsygankov, 2010; Sergunin, 2016; Koldunova, 2015) as well as new, for example, digital, dimensions of World Politics (Krutskikh, Biryukov, & Zinovyeva, 2010).

Generally, Russia after 1991 went through a stage with changes at all three levels: socio-political, institutional, and at the level of debates. Changes at the socio-political level led to institutionalization of political science as an independent field of research, while IR already had an important institutional basis, but

mostly in Moscow. After the collapse of the USSR, IR studies spread to other regions of Russia with a certain degree of specialization among universities and research institutes, however, this did not lead to higher competition in the field within Russia, because of low domestic mobility and because competitive regional universities preferred cooperation with foreign partners. In the 1990s, there was a clear lack of government research grants. Along with budget cuts in the educational sphere, it led to a generation gap of IR researchers. Opening of the “iron curtain” and lack of research funding for new research projects made IR scholars in the 1990s concentrate on the already existing Western academic literature, which was adapted to the Russian realities. The situation started to improve in the 2000s, when Russian IR got more support from the Russian government. Thus, the major driving factors for Russia in the 1990s were socio-political and institutional levels, while most of the internal debates followed in 2000s.

The Importance of Central Asia Region¹

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the Central Asian region was on the periphery of the Russian research interest. The main attention was focused on the post-Soviet states of the European part of the former USSR and the Caucasus. However, in recent years, Central Asia is increasingly attracting the attention of Russian politicians and researchers. There are many reasons for that. Firstly, it is the geopolitical position of the region connecting Europe and Asia. A number of infrastructure projects in Central Asia are discussed now in different fields: transport, particularly railways and roads (Turaeva, 2014; Podberezkina, 2015), pipeline, and others. Political aspects of trade and relations (Safranchuk, 2015), Russia’s interests in the region (Naumkin, 2013), and other issues are also analyzed.

Secondly, the region is rich in mineral resources, which of course, attracts the attention. Thirdly, the security problem is quite acute in the region. The problem generates the presence of the boundary with unstable Afghanistan, through which there is drug trafficking and spread of extremist ideas. Ethnic conflicts within the region also threaten internal and international security. Given the importance of the region and its economic potential, the European Union in 2007 adopts the EU Strategy towards Central Asia² and updates it in June 2015.

Other countries although did not develop such strategic documents, but they are actively involved in the interaction with the countries of the region, offering an integrated development project. The USA, for example, in 2015 has raised the question of the revision of the strategy toward the Central Asia, referring in this case not a specific document but a strategic line³.

For Russia, the Central Asian region is a specific one. First of all, it is its near abroad. The highest number of migrants comes to Russia to work from Central Asia. The region has largely retained the Russian language; it is home to a large number (according to various estimates from 5 to 7 million.) of Russian compatriots.

From the point of view of development of integration processes, the states of the Central Asia are included in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), and Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). Kazakhstan (since its foundation) and Kyrgyzstan (since 2015) are members of Eurasian Economic Union.

¹ The paper is prepared by the grant from RFH # 15-37-11128.

² The EU and Central Asia: Strategy for a New Partnership, Document 10113/07, Brussels, 31 May (endorsed by the EU Council Presidency Conclusions of the Brussels European Council, 21-22 June 2007). Council of the European Union, 2007.

³ U.S. Reassesses Central Asia Strategy. Available at: <http://www.rferl.org/content/central-asia-us-reassess-strategy/26911854.html>.

Russia is well aware of how important the Central Asia is. Moreover, it is possible that the weakening of ties between Russia and Central Asian states in the future may lead to the fact that it will be replaced by extremist forces. In this case, Russia is not only narrows the possibilities to influence the region, but also the region would be destabilized and will cause problems for Russia and other countries.

Awareness of the importance of Central Asia to Russia is reflected in the Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation in 2013, which states that “the primary objectives are to neutralize these threats emanating from Afghanistan, preventing the destabilization of the situation in Central Asia and the Caucasus” (Putiny, 2013p.16). In a number of other Russian documents and materials, the special role of this region is also noted. Russian experts give the similar estimates highlighting the necessity of using soft power regarding the Central Asia. It is emphasized that in Central Asia “Russian language, Russian culture and Russian-speaking information spaces should be seen as comparable by importance with economic or military-political instrument for the realization of Russian interests” (Naumkin, 2013, p. 48).

Russia has a certain advantage over other countries in the application of soft power and public diplomacy in Central Asia. Firstly, the Central Asian region is included in the integration processes in the post-Soviet space, and therefore, the interaction is more closely than in other countries that are outside the region. Secondly, Russian language is still widespread in Central Asia, although the scope of its use becomes narrow. Thirdly, there are relations with Russia, due to kinship and friendship relations, as well as professional interaction. At the same time, however, there are limitations because of the Soviet past is not always and not all perceived positively. In addition, immediately after the collapse of the USSR Russia has lost an interest in Central Asia, which immediately led to a narrowing of its influence in the region. Although this interest was recovered, the time was lost.

In general, it appears that the potential benefits for Russia is still more than for most other external participants.

As Nye (2008) noted, due to the development of civil society soft power will be realized intensively through public diplomacy. A special role in public diplomacy belongs to various funds, universities, and the media. In this way, Russia goes, opening on the territory of Central Asia, various funds and engaging in cooperation in higher education.

Russian Foundations and NGOs in Central Asia

Among Russian non-governmental organization (NGOs), there are two types of organizations. Firstly, there are organizations which headquarters are located in Russia. They often work closely with the relevant governmental agencies, such as *Rossotrudnichestvo*. Secondly, there are organizations of compatriots or so-called NGOs with Russian component registered at a local level (Lebedeva, Borishpolec, Ivanova, & Chepurina, 2016).

The first type of NGOs includes, for example, the foundation named by Gorchakov, which pays considerable attention to Central Asia, in particular for descriptions and reports from Central Asia. In early January 2014, to the corresponding request was received 488 articles prepared by the Fund or for the Fund, while on Europe—676, USA—760, and the APR—23⁴.

⁴ Fond publichnojdiplomatiiim. A.M. Gorchakova. PublikaciipoCentral'nojAzii. [Elektronnyjresurs]. Rezhimostupa: <http://gorchakovfund.ru/search/?searchid=2070088&text=%D1%86%D0%B5%D0%BD%D1%82%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BD%D0%B0%D1%8F%20%D0%90%D0%B7%D0%B8%D1%8F&web=0>.

In terms of practical activities in Central Asia, in Russia are mostly oriented structures, such as the Foundation “Russian world” and Rossotrudnichestvo, which are focusing on the development of Russian language and on the work with compatriots. The Foundation “Russian world” has its centers and offices in Central Asia. Their task is to promote the Russian language and Russian culture in foreign countries. The map presented on the Foundation’s website shows that the number of such centers and offices is relatively small at present: Kazakhstan has three Russian centers; Kyrgyzstan—two Russian centers and one Cabinet of the Russian world; Tajikistan has one Russian Center; Uzbekistan has four Cabinets of the Russian world; Turkmenistan has no one. For comparison, in Mongolia, where Russian compatriots are much less there are one Russian center and three Cabinets of the Russian world, as well as in South Korea. Czech Republic has one Russian center and four Cabinets of the Russian world⁵.

Certainly, it is impossible to determine the influence by the amount of Russian centers in this or that country. There are various factors affecting the opening of offices and agencies, including the needs, the position of local authorities, financial considerations, etc. Nevertheless, to a certain extent, these data reflect the reality.

Rossotrudnichestvo has its offices in all five Central Asian states. In Kazakhstan, Rossotrudnichestvo has its representations in two cities: Almaty and Astana. The agency meets compatriots in the region⁶, working with partners, contributes to the development of humanitarian cooperation⁷ and cooperation in the field of higher education⁸, etc.

Higher Education as an Instrument of Soft Power in the Region

Higher education is the area that offers great opportunities for the implementation of soft power of the state in general (Nye, 2004) and of Russia in particular (Lebedeva, 2009; Torkunov, 2012). This area with serious potential soft power is the factor of influence in the international arena. The provision of higher education services to citizens of foreign states, international inter-university cooperation projects, learning a foreign language, joint research projects—all these can increase the attractiveness of the image of the state, and to strengthen inter-country communication at both levels: the elite level and among the mass of the population.

The European experience of integration of the last decade, namely, for the integration of the Baltic countries into the Bologna process in the early 2000s shows that closer ties in higher education contributed to the strengthening of integration processes in other spheres (Nikiforov, 2010).

Training of foreign students means participation in shaping of political, economic, technical, and other elites of foreign countries. In 1990, the Soviet Union had an enrollment of 126.5 thousands of foreign students, representing 10.8% of all foreign students in the world⁹. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the number of foreign students in Russia has decreased, due partly to a decrease in the territory, and with it universities. In the

⁵ Fond “Russkiymir”. Russkiecentrykabinety. [Jelektronnyjresurs]. Rezhimostupa: <http://www.russkiymir.ru/russkiymir/ru/rucenter/>.

⁶ See for example: Regional’najakonferencijasootchestvennikovCentral’nojAzii. [Jelektronnyjresurs]. Rezhimostupa: <http://rs.gov.ru/node/27287>.

⁷ Uzbekistan iRossijarazvivajutgumanitarnoesotrudnichestvo. [Jelektronnyjresurs]. Rezhimostupa: <http://www.12news.uz/news/2013/12/26/%D1%83%D0%B7%D0%B1%D0%B5%D0%BA%D0%B8%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B0%D0%BD-%D0%B8-%D1%80%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%81%D0%B8%D1%8F-%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%B7%D0%B2%D0%B8%D0%B2%D0%B0%D1%8E%D1%82-%D0%B3%D1%83%D0%BC%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%B8/>.

⁸ Doklad o rezul’tatahdejatel’nosti Rossotrudnichestvaporealizaciivozlozhennyhnanegopolnomochij v 2012 g.S. 12. [Jelektronnyjresurs]. Rezhimostupa: http://rs.gov.ru/sites/rs.gov.ru/files/otchet_2012.pdf.

⁹ Jeksportobrazovatel’nyhslug v sistemevysshhegoobrazovanija Rossijskoj Federacii. Ministerstvoobrazovanijainauki Rossijskoj Federacii. [Jelektronnyjresurs]. Rezhimostupa: <http://www.russia.edu.ru/information/analit/1300/>.

mid-2000s, in Russia, there have been positive changes in the field of higher education, in particular, the increase in the number of foreign students. However, the number of students from Central Asian countries remains relatively small (Vlasov, 2013).

However, students from Central Asian states can come to the branches of Russian universities, particularly in the branches of Moscow State University, which is in Astana and Dushanbe. Set up joint universities. Such university is the Kyrgyz-Russian Slavic University named by Yeltsin simultaneous running by Russia and Kyrgyzstan.

Another possibility for students from Central Asia to get acquainted with the system of higher education in Russia is a network of universities of the CIS and the SCO. CIS network University includes higher educational institutions from Central Asian States of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan. The Network University of the SCO Central Asian countries included the universities of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan.

The idea of the network University that allows students from participating universities to study at the University partner seems fruitful. Moreover, Russia is situated both in Europe and in Asia, faced the challenge of a potential gap of educational space. Russian universities located in the European part, focused largely on the European space for higher education, while the universities of the Asian part of Russia—on the Asia-Pacific region. Network of universities of SCO and CIS in this situation would be a good “adapters” connecting both educational space and absorbing the positive aspects of each. In general, the problem of network universities is how in practice this idea will be implemented. Deepening cooperation in the field of education is not only a good potential for development of cooperation between the universities, but also to improve relations between the states as a whole as well as for the development of integration processes in the post-Soviet space.

Nevertheless, according to some experts, today Russia despite the long tradition of providing educational services to people from Central Asia, is still inferior in this area of the USA and Europe (Naumkin, 2013; Vlasov, 2013)

The Russian Strategy in the Implementation of Soft Power by the Tools of PublicDiplomacy

Russia is aware the importance of the Central Asian region and aims with the help of soft power to influence in the region. However, it is difficult to speak of a holistic strategy of Russian use of soft power through public diplomacy in Central Asia. The Russian strategy of using soft power is rather some actions in various fields.

In addition, it should be noted that the practice of implementation of the Russian soft power does not always correspond to the understanding that investing in this concept J. Nye (this is well illustrated by the example of Central Asia). Often soft power refers to the effect of any non-force methods, but not attractiveness. It seems that the emphasis on attractiveness opens up great opportunities for influence.

However, it is necessary to develop a strategy and to determine, firstly, what for soft power is implemented (what are short term and long term goals?). Secondly, the group that will be targeted primarily soft power should be chosen. Thirdly, to assess what for these groups can be attractive and how this attraction can be demonstrated. At the same time, of course, it is important to consider what is doing other actors in the region through soft power.

Currently, Russia set the task of working with the Russian-speaking audience of Central Asia. The USA largely focuses on Internet technologies (it is primarily youth audience). USA and EU also focus on a variety of programs including environmental and health protection. China seeks to exert influence through official channels, focusing on language and culture. EU and China used soft power in many ways for the realization of economic interests.

In addition, Russia prefers more “quick” results instead of long-term prospects. Hence the lack of attention paid to higher education including the need not only to invite students from Central Asia to study in Russian universities, but also to send to the region of Russian students, including exchange, as the USA and Turkey do it. It should be noted that educational programs can be used not only for long-term purposes in order to shape values, attitudes as well as the establishment of a political elite, but also they have some short-term demonstration effect associated with the improvement of the image of the state which providing it. Thus, Kubyshkin, and Tsvetkova(2013) gave an example of activation of educational activity of the USA in Bosnia in the mid-1990’s, when the country “was covered by American programs of civic education”(Naumkin, 2013; Vlasov, 2013)This had a positive effect on the formation of the image of the USA in Bosnia.

Conclusion

From the article we can see the better coordination of implementation of projects between official agencies (embassies and consulates of the Russian Federation in the countries of the region, the offices of “Rossotrudnichestvo”) and NGOs (offices and centers of the “Russian world” and others) and their coverage in the media. Dolinsky (2013) noted that for the development of public diplomacy in Russia it is necessary to create and adopt a national strategy; to found a coordinating body (or give an existing Agency with these functions more fully) and to develop criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of activities in this area. The coordinating body should focus on coordination and not to act as a “higher court”. It should also serve as a resource, allowing all participants (including NGOs, who are often excluded from coordination [Aall, 2013]), to share information, and technology. In order to make programs and projects implemented by Russia in Central Asia understandable for the people of the region, the greater representation in the local media field is needed (Lebedeva et al., 2016).

References

- Aall, P. (2013). Building interests, relationships, and capacity. In C. A. Crocker, F.O. Hampson, and P. Aall (Eds.), *Managing conflict in a world adrift* (pp. 409-427). Wash., D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Alekseeva T.A., & Lebedeva M.M. (2016). Chtoproiskhodit s teoriejmezhdunarodnyhotnoshenij. *Polis. Politicheskieissledovaniya*, (1), 29-43. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.17976/jpps/2016.01.03>
- Bogaturov, A. (2000). Desiat let paradigmyosvoeniia (Ten years of the assimilation paradigm). *Pro et Contra*, 5(1), 195-201.
- Bogaturov, A. (2007). Tri pokoleniyavneshnepoliticheskikh doktrin Rossii (Three generations of Russian foreign policy doctrines). *Mezhdunarodnye Protssesy*, 5(1).
- Bordachev, T. (2003). *Scientific-Educational Forum on International Relations institute of world Economy and International Relations of the Rasstate University of Humanities systemic History of International Relations 1918-2003, Raspad Yaltinsko-Potsdamskogoporyadka (Chapter 11)*. The book was published with the support of the MacArthur Foundation, Moscow.
- Butorina, O. (Ed.) (2011). *Evropeyskayaintegratsiya* (European integration). Moscow: Delovaya Literature.
- Dolinskij, A. (2013). *Publichnajadiplomatijadljabiznesa, NKO i universitetov*. Moscow: RSMD. Retrieved from http://russiancouncil.ru/inner/?id_4=2399#top-content/.

- Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation (1993). Approved by order of the President of the Russian Federation of April 23, 1993.
- Gantman, V.I. (Ed.) (1976). *Sovremennye burzhuaznyye teorii mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Granier, F., & Gagmann, J. (2016). Sites of knowledge (re-)production. *Institutional Sociology of International Relations Scholarship International Studies Review*, 18(2), 17-21. Retrieved from <http://isr.oxfordjournals.org/content/18/2/333>.
- Istomin Igor, A., & Baykov Andrey, A. (2013). Comparative characteristics of domestic and foreign magazines. *International Processes*, 13(2), 114-140. Retrieved from <http://www.intertrends.ru/forty-fist/Istomin.pdf>.
- Koldunova, E. (2015). Russia as a Euro-Pacific power: Dilemmas of Russian foreign policy decision-making. *International Relations*, 29(3), 378-394.
- Krutskikh, A., Biryukov, A., & Zinovyeva, E. (2010). *Innovatsionnye napravleniya sovremennye mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii* (Innovative directions of contemporary international relations). Moscow: Aspect Press.
- Kubyshev, A.I., & Cvetkova, N.A. (2013). *Publichnaya diplomatiya SShA*. Moscow: Aspect Press.
- Lebedeva, M. (2003). *Mirovaya politika* (World politics). Moscow: Aspect Press.
- Lebedeva, M.M. (2009). For Zh. Vyssheobrazovaniya kak potentsial "mjagkoj sily" Rossii. *Vestnik MGIMO*, (4), 200-220.
- Lebedeva, M.M., Borishpolec, K.P., Ivanova, N.A., & Chepurina, M.A. (2016). *Central'naja Azija: Social'no-gumanitarnoe izmerenie*. Aspect Press, Moscow.
- Lebedeva, M., & Marchetti, R. (2016). Middle East instability and the decline of the Westphalian system. *Valdai Discussion Club Report*. Retrieved from <http://valdaiclub.com/files/11789/>.
- Melville, A. (1999). *Demokraticheskiy tranzit: Teoretiko-metodologicheskie i prikladnye aspekty* (Democratic transition: Theoretical-methodological and applied aspects). Moscow: Moskovskii Obshchestvennyi Nauchnyi Fond.
- Meyer, S. (1988). The sources and prospects of Gorbachev's new political thinking on security. *International Security*, 13(2), 164-163.
- Naumkin, V.V. (2013). *I dr. Interesy Rossii v Central'noj Azii: sodержanie, perspektivy, ogranichiteli*. Moscow: RSMD. Retrieved from http://russiancouncil.ru/common/upload/RIAC_Central_Asia.pdf.
- Naumkin, V. V. (2013). *Interesy Rossii V Central'noj Azii: sodержanie, perspektivy, ogranichiteli*. Moscow: Speckniga.
- Nikiforov, N.E. (2010). Politicheskie aspekty Bolonskogo processa v Latvii, Litve, Jestonii (Dissertatsiya na soiskaniye stepenikand. polit. nauk., MGIMO, Moscow).
- Nikitina, Y. (2009). *ODKB i SHOS: Modeli regionalizma v sfere bezopasnosti* (The CSTO and the SCO: Models of regionalism in the security sphere). Moscow, Navona.
- Nye, J. (2004). *Soft power and higher education*. Retrieved from <http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/FFP0502S.pdf>.
- Nye, J. (2008). Public diplomacy and soft power. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 94-109.
- Podberezkina, O. A. (2015). *Jevoljucijaznachenijamezhdunarodnykh transportnykh koridorov v mirovoj politike na primere Rossii* (Dissertatsiya kand. polit. nauk, Moscow State Institute of International Relations [MGIMO], Moscow).
- Pohlebkin, W. V. (1992). *Foreign policy of Russia, the Soviet Union and Russia for 1000 years: names, dates and facts* (Directory, Vol. I). Moscow: International Relations.
- President of Russia (2008). *Foreign policy concept of the Russian federation*. Retrieved from <http://en.kremlin.ru/supplement/4116>, Moscow.
- Primakov, Y. (2002). *Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya na kanune XXI veka: Problemy, perspektivy* (International relations on the eve of the XXI century: Problems, prospects). In T. Shakleina (Ed.), *Vneshnyaya politika i bezopasnost' sovremennoy Rossii* (Foreign policy and national security of contemporary Russia), 1, 193-203. Moscow.
- Putin, V. (2007). *Speech and the following discussion at the Munich Conference on security policy*. Retrieved from <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/24034>, Moscow.
- Putinyan, V. V. (2013). *KoncepcijavneshnejpolitikiRossijskojFederacii.UtverzhdenaPrezidentomRossijskojFederacii*. Retrieved from http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/0/6D84DDEDEDBF7DA644257B160051BF7F, Moscow.
- Safranchuk, I. (2015). Globalizatsiya v golovah. *Central'naja AzijaiEvrazijskaja integratsiya. Rossiya v Global'noj Politike*, 13(1), 120-126.
- Sergunin, A. (2016). *Explaining Russian foreign policy behavior: Theory and practice*. Stuttgart: Ibidem-Verlag.
- Shakleina, T. (2012). *Rossiia i SShA v mirovoj politike* (Russia and the USA in the world politics). Moscow: Aspect Press.
- Shevtsova, L. (2000). Can electoral autocracy survive? *Journal of Democracy*, 11(3), 36-38.

- Snyder, J. (1988). The Gorbachev Revolution: A waning of Soviet expansionism? *International Security*, 12 (Winter 1987-1988), 93-131.
- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation (2013). *Foreign policy concept of the Russian federation*. Retrieved from http://www.mid.ru/en/foreign_policy/official_documents/-/asset_publisher/CptlCk6BZ29/content/id/122186.
- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation (2016). *Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation (approved by President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin on November 30, 2016)*. Retrieved from http://www.mid.ru/en/foreign_policy/official_documents/-/asset_publisher/CptlCk6BZ29/content/id/2542248.
- Torkunov, A.V. (2012). Obrazovanie kak instrument "mjagkojsily" vovneshnejpolitike Rossii. *Vestnik MGIMO*, (4), 85-93. Moscow.
- Torkunov, A., & Simonia, N. (2015). Novyimirovoyporyadok: Bipolyarnosti k mnogopolyusnosti (New world order: From bipolarity to multipolarity). *Polis. PoliticheskijeIssledovaniya*, (3), 27-37. Moscow.
- Tsygankov, A. (2010). *Russia's foreign policy: Change and continuity in national identity*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Tsygankov, A. P., & Tsygankov, P. A. (2005). *Russian science of international relations: New directions*. Moscow: Per Se.
- Tsygankov, P. (1996). *International relations*. Moscow: Novaya Shkola. (in Russian)
- Turaeva, M. O. (2014). *Transportnaja infrastruktura stran Central'noj Azii v uslovijah sovremennoj regionalizacii: Doklad*. Retrieved from http://inecon.org/docs/Turaeva_paper_2014.pdf, Moscow.
- Tyulin, I. G. (1997). The study of international relations in Russia: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Cosmopolis Almanac*, 18-28.
- Tyulin, I. G. (2005). Institutional dimension of Russian science of international relations. In A. P. Tsygankov and P. A. Tsygankov (Eds.), *Russian science of international relations: New directions* (pp. 49-67). Moscow: Per Se.
- Vlasov, A. (2013). *Rossijai Central'naja Azija: upushhennyje vozmozhnosti i novye perspektivy*. Moscow: Rossijskij sovet pomezhdunarodnym delam (RSMD). Retrieved from http://russiancouncil.ru/inner/?id_4=1392#top.
- Vorobyev, D. (2004). Razvitie politologicheskogo soobshchestva v postsovetskoy Rossii (Development of political science community in post-Soviet Russia). *Polis. Politicheskije issledovaniya*, (6), 151-161.
- Voskressenski, A. D. (2017). *Non-Western theories of international relations: Conceptualizing world regional studies*. Cham: Springer.
- Waever, O. (1998). The sociology of a not so international discipline: American and European developments in international relations. *International Organization*, 52(4), 687-727.