

INEVITABLE RADICALIZATION OF TREATMENT



ANDREY FURSOV
is a Russian historian, sociologist,
and publicist. He is also the direc-
tor of the Russian Research Center
at the Moscow Humanitarian
University

Exclusively for RJ

“Russia is ill” — this is a euphemism that has been masking the condition of the country since the eighties. This is the condition of the decomposition of the late post-Soviet society and this process has been in the self-replicating decomposition stage since the nineties.

The supremacy of the social decomposition process over that of social organization has led to the accumulation of the results of labor in all of society by a narrow group of elite without contributing something new to the system. This is the major basis and cause of corruption, of the collapse of the social sphere, and of other social illnesses. With the depletion of resources that were accumulated in the Soviet times, the present neo-liberal order is certainly approaching the state of a cold civil war. In another tragic farce form and in other global conditions, the post-Soviet Russia, as it appears, is repeating the logic of its development in the beginning of the 20th century. It was also said at the beginning of the 20th century that Russia was ill, and marked the emergence of self-proclaimed doctors of different caliber, ranging from Stolypin to Kerensky. The methods of “treatment” that they used

brought the country to catastrophe, which was overcome by transforming it into the USSR. Through the patently defective form of Lenin, crushing international socialists under Stalin, and creating a viable society with the means of industrialization and collectivization, this society was sustained for half a century, which is quite a long time given the standards of the 20th century.

Today, it is as if Russia has returned to the beginning of the last century. However, today the figure of Stalin has become a symbol of hope for the future for many people, and they view a harsh course as a method for resolving their problems. Miserable attempts aimed at “de-stalinization” inevitably demonstrate their counter-productivity, because social problems cannot be resolved by propagandistic and ideological manipulations. Social problems can be resolved only by social reconstruction, and **Stalin’s popularity, which continues to grow, clearly indicates what kind of social reconstruction and what sort of doctors the society is expecting.** The only remaining hope is that the real doctors will be therapists rather than surgeons, though the bitter truth is that the more advanced an illness is, the more radical the treatment methods tend to be. ■

LIBERAL POLICIES HAVE OUTLIVED THEIR PURPOSE



PETER W. SCHULZE
is a professor of Political Science
at Gottingen University

Exclusively for RJ

With the exception of Transparency International, nearly all international agencies that publish ratings on different countries meeting the standards of democratic society are of dubious origin, often representing right wing or extremely dogmatic liberal forces, like the Heritage Foundation of the US. The international expert community, especially in Europe, is not impressed by their presentations. The same is true for the yearly assessment conducted by the US Congress on the standards of democratic and human rights in other countries. Yet another case is the verdicts of the Council of Europe, the OSCE, and the International Court of Justice.

If such organizations prescribe ‘coercive treatment’ in the form of interventions I do not know how it can be in line with international law. Such interventions can only be legalized by the UN or mandated by the UN to other regional organizations, like NATO, the EU, the SCO, etc. Furthermore, a military intervention is only possible in the form of self-defense of another country. Other forms of intervention are possi-

ble and not really covered by international law, and it is the OSCE that deals with such forms of intervention, albeit not very efficiently. Unfortunately, there are no real and clear borderlines set out.

Liberal policies have outlived their purpose. They were, to a certain degree, necessary in the past to interrupt big governments, big labor, and the monopoly of big parties. However, they were never fully applied in Europe apart from the UK. If you look at the situation of the liberals in Germany or Russia today, it is clear that they are a marginal force and will remain so for the near future. They cannot give answers to our social needs and problems of restructuring the relation between state and society.

Of course, the emergence of some non-western system of assessment of democratic development is totally hypothetical. We will not learn from an Asian model of society very much because it goes against our sociopolitical and cultural tradition. The economic sphere, however, is different: here different laws are at work that need to be respected — especially competition and the free access to markets. ■