The Russian experience gives a ground for profound thinking and brings out three questions: about the alignment of liberalism and the process of individualization of public life in various cultural systems; about the essence and forms of manifestation of liberalism, about the real and false liberalism; about the alignment of liberalism and democracy. Thus the problem of Russian liberalism in its originality is of value for the world science.

Summing up I would like to add that the study of Russian liberal experience can have common scientific significance.

The study of conceptual transformation during the period of rapid social change, which we witness now in Russia, is extremely fascinating, though quite difficult methodologically. With these changes of political regime and collapse of official ideology we witness a symbolic void and a consequent urgent need for appropriate national ideology, as well as for popular political myth. Political parties and social movements are among the important factors inventing and legitimating frames that help people to construct or repair their political identity. They introduce new and old symbols to the public.

In the period of rapid social change new political symbolism emerge. Adoption of political concepts is typical for the period of Sattelzeit\(^1\). Transformation is a version of Sattelzeit, when continuity of the meanings are questioned by practical usage. This period forms opportunities for significant breaks in the already well-known meanings or the emergence of the new ones which are invented or introduced by social (or political) movements. Russian historians analyse how political concepts are transformed by a Sattelzeit, whether original senses are preserved or lost in the Russian usage\(^2\).

Political movements pick up terms and labels for their ideological stand from a number of possibilities, provided by protest repertoire. This repertoire, as well as the repertoire for collective action are not at all an endless list of appropriate symbols. Actually, there are only few available symbolic cliches that could serve as effective resources both for construction of collective identity of the movement (or a party) and for mobilization of supporters. The way how a concept or a symbol is being used by a movement, especially if there had been no stable tradition of its usage in the national political discourse before, becomes common usage. Thus we see how the carriers of the symbols symbolize the meanings, especially in the cases when a concept does not have a stable set of connotations and senses. We see how language becomes a subject of politics and how politics gives new meaning to the terms. As Kari Palonen justly observes: “A central experience for the student of conceptual history is the radical discontinuity in the use of concepts. We can speak of conceptual breaks in
the horizons of interpretation, in thematization of a concept and in the vocabularies used, in relations to reality references". In the current Russian discourse political symbols are changing their meanings. Words and concepts in Russian acquire meanings sometimes quite alien to those that are well-known in different cultural context. One can distinguish at least two factors that predetermine this distortion of meanings.

On the one hand, associations and connotations inspired by national usage of the concept form semantic prerequisites for the formation of new meanings. On the other hand contemporary carriers of the symbol are important factors of the re-conceptualization. They form clusters of associations that overlap original meaning, national connotations and in same cases forces them out.

It is quite an easygoing procedure to apply a new meaning to the symbol which is recently invented or has survived for a long time on the fringes of political discourse and lacks a stable agenda of thematization and meaning in a local context. Liberalism is one of the concepts that belongs to the group of ideas that recently have reappeared in the Russian political discourse. Together with the concept of democracy it is one of the key controversial concepts in the current Russian discourse. At present the leader of the Liberal Democratic Party of Russia (LDPR), Vladimir Zhirinovsky gives new features to the national face of "liberalism", and the radical reforms of Gregor Gaidar brought new interpretation to "democracy". This is an example of how democracy was reinterpreted in 1993-1994. "I put the word "Democrats" in inverted commas, because to compromise democracy in such a strong, irreversible and long term way as current Russian rulers have done, to knock out democracy in this way has not been performed by anyone... From these days on, common people will associate democracy with deceit, disruption, with professors who became beggars, and miners who did not want to get out of the mines".

In 1994 liberalism became one of the three most popular themes of intellectual political discourse together with such themes as the Russian idea and intelligentsia. There are several interpretations of liberalism in present political discourse in Russia (some of them oppose each other). One of the faces of contemporary Russian liberalism - radical liberalism - is associated with Gaidar's economic reforms that gave up "hypocritical and false task to regulate the relationship between citizens according to the principles of social justice". There exists also a version of social liberalism, which asserts that there is no necessary relation between liberalism and the economic principle of "laissez-faire".

The strangest image of Russian liberalism, however, is the LDPR and its leader Zhirinovsky. In this paper, first, I would like to give examples of the discontinuity of the usage of the term liberalism in Russian history in general. Second, I will concentrate on one of the versions of the interpretation of this symbol, which seems to be quite inappropriate to the "original" usage of the concept. I argue that you cannot call the usage of the concept in political context true or false, right or wrong. Whether you like it or not, political transformation and cultural ground form opportunities for new meanings that are tested and approved by the carriers of the symbols i.e. political (social) movements and their leaders. Symbols and concepts are "Vieldeutig" which gives an opportunity for actualization of this or that interpretation under certain conjuncture of context factors.

Understanding Russian Liberalism

One of the first definitions of liberalism in Russia can be found in the Explanatory Dictionary by V. Dahl, published in Russia in 1861: "A liberal is a politically free-minded person, who is thinking and acting willfully, who wishes for a greater freedom for the people and self-management". Later traditional liberalism, as formulated by Dahl, transformed into liberalism as a political and philosophical concept. I omit here the development of Russian liberal thought in the 19th Century and in the beginning of the 20th Century. I believe professor Vladimir Pastukhov makes this statement in his article "Liberalism in Russia: History and Contemporaneity".

I would like only to emphasize that liberalism in the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th Centuries was an elitist conception, that was not wide-spread among the common people. In the Communist ideology, liberalism turned to be a label depicting the internal and external enemies of the Bolsheviks. In the first edition of the Soviet Encyclopedia the historical essay about Liberalism states: "The main indicator of being a liberal in Russia after the reforms of the 1860's was by no chance a program, but tactics - a preference for the legal methods of political struggle rather than radical (revolutionary) ones".

In the 1860's and the 1870's under the influence of the Narodniki (populist) movement, all the adherents of political opposition to the regime were called liberal. Lenin emphasized that Russian liberals strived to liberate Russia from above without the dissolution of the monarchy, the landowning system or the power of landowners in Russia, stimulating them only to make concessions to the spirit of the time. Liberals restricted themselves to the struggle for reforms, for the rights, that is they restricted themselves to the sharing of power between the landowners and the bourgeoisie. Between the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917 liberalism was acting as an opposing force in the State Duma that facilitated Stolypin's policy by propaganda of the constitutional illusions. A famous collection of the "Landmarks" articles was considered at the time to be a manifesto of
Russian liberalism. Lenin has called these articles “an encyclopedia of political apostasy (defection)”. In this book Russian liberalism started to have a nationalist orientation, and gave ideological justification to the imperialist programmes of the Russian bourgeoisie, which committed with Czarism in preserving the idea of Great Russia.11

After the October Revolution in 1917 the political phenomenology of Russian liberalism was totally substituted to the philosophical meaning of the concept. Liberalism became associated with the betrayal of the interests of the working people. This negative connotation was reinforced by the institutionalization of Lenin’s paradigm of criticizing liberalism and by the fact that the members of the liberal parties formed the ranks of the anti-revolutionary White Guards during the Civil War in Russia (1917-1920). “during the Civil War liberals gravitated towards betrayal and high treason, appealing for the help of the interventionists, they made deals on the enslavement of the Russian people by the Western European capital”.12

One of the important aspects of the meaning of liberalism in Russia is that of being an uncertain, moderate, ready for compromise reformer. Constitutionally oriented liberals were natural opposers to radical revolutionaries. The revolutionary combat ideology of Communism treated a reformer, an adherent of gradual social change, as the main foe. “The struggle with liberals was considered by the Bolsheviks to be the necessary precondition for the revolutionary and democratic education of the masses”13. Speaking about Western liberals the Soviet official sources emphasized in 1938: “The liberal bourgeoisie in France revealed its enmity toward consequent democracy already in the movement of 1789-1793” or “Liberals did not and do not carry the consequent struggle with aggression of the fascist and military-fascists states (Japan, Italy and Nazi-Germany)”14.

During the period of Soviet rule a negative assessment of liberalism prevailed. Both internal and foreign liberals were considered to be enemies of the Communists and enemies of the true consequent democracy. During Perestroika, under the changing political opportunities, the positive meaning of Liberalism started to be revived. Revival of liberalism in the discourse was one of the features of opposition to the previously dominant Communist ideology. Both Russian nationalists and democrats turned to the origins of Russian liberal tradition. The “Landmarks” collection was republished and the questions raised in the book as early as 1909 were reconsidered. The Western liberal tradition prevailed in the radical democratic discourse, where the works of Hajek became textbooks for the adherents of radical reforms of the Soviet economic system (Democratic Union). However, no party or other political organization of the Perestroika period contained in its name the word “liberal”. Only as late as 1990 did the Liberal Democratic Party, led by Zhirinovsky, chose this symbol for its name, pretending to become a carrier of liberalism in Russia.

The first Congress of the LDP took place in the Soviet Union on 31st March, 1990. The party was established right after the removal of the 6th Article of the Soviet Constitution declaring the political monopoly of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). The name of the party was chosen from the repertoire of symbols that could be interpreted as anti-Communist and nominated the generic protest of pro-democratic orientation. By that time such well-known organizations as the Democratic Union, the democratic platform of the CPSU, had already occupied the word “democracy” for their symbolism. National-patriotic slogans were of very low mobilization capacity during Perestroika.15 The word liberal was not used in the label of any party and it did not have any negative connotation for the population that opposed anti-liberal and antidemocratic rhetoric of the Communists. The combination of liberalism and democracy in the name not only sounded “beautiful”, but also mobilized people. It asserted the general orientation to the reforms and the anti-Communist stand of the organization.

The LDPR

Currently the membership of the LDPR is approximately one hundred thousand people. The LDPR received 24% of the votes in the State Duma elections of December, 1991. The main factors of the election victory were: critique of the government reforms and the political course after the #1400 Degree of September, 1993 that split the democrats, the ideological resonance to popular nationalism in appeal to the lost might of Russia, and the abasement of national pride and ethnic conflicts.

The leader of the party, Vladimir Volfovich Zhirinovsky, was born in 1946, in Alma-Ata (Kazakhstan), where he lived until he was 18 years of age. He is the sixth child in his family. He has mentioned several times in interviews and his memoirs that Russians in the republics, such as Kazakhstan, had been used as service-people for the aborigines who concentrated resources, including land in their own hands. In 1964 he left for Moscow, and graduated from the Institute of Eastern Languages. His second diploma is in Legal Studies. Since the start of Perestroika Zhirinovsky tried to be a leader of various organizations. Once he made an attempt to become the head of the Jewish Cultural Society in Moscow. He was also seen at the Constitutional meeting of the Democratic Union (the radical democratic organization which was the first to declare itself a party). In June 1991 he was a nominee in the presidential elections and received 7.8% of the votes, i.e. approximately 6 million votes, and was in third place. His main slogan in the elections was: “If I was the president I would feed
this country in 72 hours”.

The main achievement of the LDPR in the State Duma, as Zhirinovsky claims himself, is the amnesty granted for the political prisoners i.e. the participants of the coup of August, 1991 and the coup of October, 1993. Recently (In spring, 1994) the Attorney General charged Zhirinovsky with a case related to the military propaganda Zhirinovsky has in his book “The Last Thrust to the South”. Zhirinovsky has contacts with the ultraright activists of Germany (the German Peoples’ Union) and with Serbian nationalists. The LDPR is a member of the Liberal International.

The LDPR programme states: “the purpose of the LDPR is to build up such conditions in the country that the free accomplishment of the creative capacities of people that reside in the country, for the careful usage of natural resources of our country”. “The programme of the LDPR is a programme of development of our society in accordance with its own demands without any intervention from the outside”. “On the emblem of our party are the historical borders of Russia, the main principles of our party: Freedom and Law. Neither the emblem, nor the main principles will change”. “For us the territory of our state is crucial. Give us back the historical borders of our country and its name - this is the only thing we want. But do not overthrow anything, do not break or destroy monuments and state symbols and do not move the state borders. This will be ended by war. The war is coming, unfortunately. Small nations may object to me, they will argue that they also want to have their own states, I will answer: You had to think about it several centuries ago. Let us look at the Great Tatar nation. It was necessary to think about the preservation of the Tatar-Mongol state, when you belonged to the great state of Chinggis Khan, Batyi and Mamaj. You did not succeed. Only Mongolia was left. So this is your historical motherland. The same with the Germans. Normal democracy is to be achieved only through a strong state, in a weak state agony, anarchy and leap-frog start”.

“And once again about the geopolitical factor. This factor is a main and crucial one. For Russia is situated geographically on the junction of two continents - Europe and Asia. Civilization as it is well-known developed mainly in Southern and Western Europe and in South-Eastern Asia. We are in the middle. That is why the vast territory of Russia always needed a different political regime from Western Europe. It would be an ideal variant if the Russian Empire would be preserved. Somebody does not like the word “empire”. I like it very much: it is a normal good word. Even today - Great Britain is an Empire, Sweden is an Empire, Japan is an Empire. They have a King or an Emperor; they have multiparty parliaments and a spectre of political forces ranging from the right to the left”. “We hail that in 1975 in Helsinki all the state borders were affirmed. Then why in 1991 did they decided to break the Russian borders. The reason is the same that in 1917 there was a revolution in Russia. A strong mighty state does not correspond to the interests of certain political forces, mainly the Americans and some Western European and Far-Eastern countries. If a state is mighty and strong no one will stutter about debatable territories, for in international policy the basis for strength are mighty armed forces and patriotically minded diplomats”.

“National separatists have to calm down. In our country national divisions are impossible. In this case, it will be necessary to create one hundred states that will always be envious of each other. Russia did not conquer, Russia liberated, stretched a hand of help. Do not demand freedom now, after we have invested billions of roubles into your economy, After thousands of Russians were buried there, after we poured rivers of sweat, building up industry there. Now you do not need this, if you became a part of the state - it is over. Forget forever about separation from Russia. If you want self-identification in the cultural sphere - please, you are welcome.”

The main principles of the LDPR as formulated in its program are: “A multiparty system, a multilayer economy, a law and order state, the restoration of Russia with the 1977 borders, a presidential republic, the substitution of the national territorial division of Russian federation by the administrative division that was the fact in the Russian Empire. The main content of the programme: The Russian republic has to be a presidential republic. Though a multiparty system is guaranteed by the constitution, the specificity of the country makes it necessary to establish the rule of one party, as well as the members of the government and the majority in the Parliament. This unification will make it possible to rule the country that is characterized by the hard climate with prolonged winters, a multinational population belonging to different religious confessions, and its geopolitical position. Russia is and always has been surrounded by enemies. From the North now the Estonians challenge the border, from the West the Poles. The south is hostile territory where Muslim people live”.

“Every country that has a common border with Russia is challenging the legitimacy of its border. This is the reason why Russia has to reinforce its military might and to consolidate its military-industrial complex. Russia has to be restored in the borders of 1977. It is necessary because the Empire for Russians is not a luxury, but a means of existence among the surrounding enemies. Nations that were the members of the Russian Empire cannot survive without her”. Peter the Great reflects Zhirinovsky’s political sympathies in Russian history. The texts of the Russian historian Miljukov are published in the newspaper “Liberal”. Zhirinovsky’s programme deploys plans of confusion for people on the territory of Russia under the condition of the dominance of the
Russian language, Russian ruble and the dominance of the Russian Armed Forces. He says: “Part of the population, unfortunately, will perish during this transformation”.17

The Ideology of the LDPR

There are two approaches to the analysis of the ideology of the LDPR in contemporary Russian discourse. According to the first position, the LDPR has nothing liberal in its programme, on the contrary it is a pseudo-liberal party. The second position considers that the LDPR and Zhirinovsky himself, as the leader of the party, give examples of the Russian national ‘soil’ liberalism, where extreme nationalism is looked upon as a precondition of the reinforcement of liberal values.

Let us consider the arguments of the first position. A content analysis of the texts and speeches given by Zhirinovsky reveals that he rejects liberal reforms in Russia (privatisation and conversion). He focuses on the negative consequences of these reforms for the Russian people and suggests a cure: the return to the past of the Great and Mighty Russia, even by means of violence and seizure of new territories. He threatens to punish the separatist elements and declares that under his rule the disintegration of a unified Russia through separatist appeals will be considered as a severe crime. The Eurasian philosophy founded upon the geopolitical position of Russia becomes the starting point of the foreign policy of the LDPR.

Zhirinovsky writes: “I started to work out my own geopolitical conception. I do not want it to be called after myself, for instance the Zhirinovsky Formula. But the last thrust to the South, an exit for Russia to the shores of the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea - those are real tasks for saving the Russian nation. This will actually be the last partition of the world, and it has to be carried out in the regime of shock therapy, suddenly, quickly and efficiently.”

A content analysis has shown that from the 6930 words of interview text given by Zhirinovsky before the elections, 25% had a meaning of war, violence, threat, jeopardy and humiliation. His image for a desirable future for Russia is an authoritarian regime with the monopoly of executive power, where in the villages decisions will be made by Starostas, in the cities by governors, and on the national level by the president. He wants only these four steps to represent the executive hierarchy and demands severe subordination. According to the conclusion by experts, Zhirinovsky was seen during the elections as the defender of the people who paid the larger cost for reforms, a vote for Zhirinovsky was a rejection of the elite that had carried out the reforms.18

Adjectives depicting Zhirinovsky in the Russian press today are as follows: A Fascist, ultra-nationalist, ultra-right, populist, hysterical. “Zhirinovsky means war”, “Zhirinovsky is Hitler of the 1929 pattern”, adventurer, political clown, crazy, insane, liberalissimus, extremist, “a leader of the war-party”. These extreme positions, I believe, overlook the important problem of meaning construction in Russian political context today, and oversimplifies the issue. According to the second position, the LDPR is a liberal party in its Russian version. There are certain elements of liberalism in Zhirinovsky’s programme. By political convictions, Zhirinovsky is a liberal-democrat, adherent of an authoritarian regime, both in domestic and international policy. The basis of the LDPR party programme is formed from the documents of the Swiss Liberal Democratic Party. As history shows, on the initial phase of transition to the bourgeois forms of property, liberal parties consolidate with broad popular masses which suffered from absolutism and from the absence of democratic freedoms; that is how the victory of the LDPR can be explained.”19

In the electoral programme of 1993 the LDPR announced its anti-Communist reformist character, peaceful tactics in the domestic policy, and agitated for the Constitution. A resurrection of the Greater Russia in the borders of 1977, defence of the ideas of social justice were declared to be the main purpose of the party. These slogans are very attractive for many Russian citizens, though I do not believe they correspond to the however diverse Western image of liberalism. The period in Russia when liberals were in power was extremely short (March-October, 1917) which is one of the reasons why contemporary Russian liberalism is somewhat comical one. As one of the experts noted: the specificity of our historical development translated this classical political and philosophical concept (Liberalism) into the language of our native aspens. Our liberalism today has some features of Pinochet and some features of Hussein. The members of the LDPR in their speeches always missed their step.

Private property and constitutional abiding were considered to be the paroles of domestic liberalism - They are present in the programme of the LDPR, as well as in the programme of every reformist party. Zhirinovsky’s party, which won the 12th December 1993 elections, during its election campaign did not give up its liberal ideology, on the contrary it emphasized it. Even the most extreme statement of the LDPR’s programme was substantiated by the liberal idea of the defence of minority rights, taking into account that Russians became minorities in the former republics of the USSR.20 The liberal ideas were combined with the ideology of authoritarianism and extreme nationalism, with barely hidden anti-Western xenophobia.

The opposite meaning of liberal is something weak and uncertain in decisions; the style of Zhirinovsky does not correspond to this image. Now Russian liberalism is authoritarian and nationalist. The rhetoric of Zhirinovsky gives
a new meaning not only to the term “liberalism”, but also to other concepts as well, such as national-socialism, authoritarianism and democracy. His argument is clear “Russia does not need the tutors of democracy. We have our own standards and we will not allow the West to experiment with Russia anymore”. Let me give examples how the LDPR’s ideologists interpret the terms “democracy” and “authoritarianism”. We are all in favour of democracy. But we are against the destruction of the great millenium country under this slogan. Zhirinovsky considered an authoritarian regime to be the most relevant for Russia, that means a strong executive power with one president as head of the country and a legislative body in the form of the State Duma, which is constituted from competent, patriotically-minded people. The basis for the word authoritarian is authority (the Russian word authority does not mean power, but the term is usually used to depict a person or an institution which is respected by the population). That means that a person of authority is a man that has influence and acknowledgment. Authoritarian rule is opposite to dictatorship. It is based on law and demands law abiding from everyone without exception. It is this interpretation of the authoritarian rule that Zhirinovsky keeps in his mind when he says: “I am for an authoritarian regime”.

Below I give an example of the way how Zhirinovsky rehabilitates national-socialism. “National-socialism,” - he argues, “has nothing in common with Hitlerism. Hitler discredited national-socialist ideas. A national-socialist does not need world dominance, he will not measure the skull of a neighbour of different nationality, he does not need wars.” This argument can be inverted and addressed towards the liberal-democrats themselves. Now Russia could give a rare example when liberalism becomes a xenophobic, national-extremist and politically aggressive doctrine. Unfortunately, one of the versions of liberalism will be associated with Zhirinovsky and his party.

After the 1993 elections it was common in the democratic press in Russia to call the LDPR a fascist party. Let us look at the objection of “liberal democrats”: “Fascism is a national concept. It is the case when a person belonging to some nation is striving to show its superiority to subdue other people who belong, according to his view, to the lower nations. Is it possible to apply anything from this to the Russian people? Absolutely not. On the contrary, Russians were the most downtrodden, the most exploited nation in the Soviet Union; it is the same now. Russians are humiliated in many ways: they are called occupants, migrants, drunks, slaggards, etc. However, were it not Russians who supported all the union’s republics? Now it becomes obvious, without Russia in those republics it is death and breakdown, hunger and cold. Russians are turned out from all the neighbouring countries, they are offended, humiliat-ed, transformed into second class people.”

On his appeal to youth Zhirinovsky writes: “Once again we return to the heroic and failure pages of our history. It is a great potential. It is a great basis that will help to cheer up a younger generation today, will help them not to drown in chewing gum, Pepsi-Cola, to remain on the national ground, on the ground of Russian industry, culture, language, spirit, church, science and art. Young Russians, I want to see your proud look. We will rule our country ourselves without any help from the outside, without the “good” advice of foreign friends. Russia has again to be a superpower. Young Russians - the fate of Russia is in your hands.”

We see how in Russia nowadays the symbols of Liberalism have become associated with a right-wing, conservative, aggressive, nationalistic and xenophobic ideology, which wants to mobilize chauvinistic empire ambitions and relative deprivation of the Russian population in the period of rapid social change. This shift of meaning for symbols is understandable if we keep in mind that liberalism was an elitist ideology in Russia and its popular political image was just the opposite to the one it had in the elite. Elitist liberalism in contemporary Russia recently has started its struggle with Zhirinovsky’s version. Education and relearning of meaning was started by the Liberal Faction of the State Duma, headed by the former Minister of Finances, Boris Fedorov and the leader of the Party of Economic Freedom, Irina Khokomada. The struggle for symbols has been launched. Not to be mixed with liberals in the Duma Zhirinovsky’s party was renamed “Liberal-Democratic Party of Zhirinovsky”.
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HOW ESTONIA MET THE IDEA AND PRINCIPLES OF LIBERALISM

Preliminary remarks

A completely new understanding of the relations between the individual and statehood began forming after the French Revolution, which led to the development of a strong individual, capable of chancing social order and circumstances, destroying estate boundaries, establishing social organization and institutions in a new way, and to express the will of democratically captured minds. Individuals, nations and states began to be perceived as distinct subjects. Frontiers of states were brought into accordance with the territories of the nation. In other words, Europe had achieved modernity. By what way and by how much did a small country such as Estonia go along with these processes of renewal? Estonia had at that same time divided into two provinces of the Russian Empire, as well as into four Ritterschafts of the Baltic-German nobility, where serfdom for ethnic Estonians was abolished thirty years after the beginning of the French Revolution, and where the transition into an elementary free market fell into the period between the wave of revolutions of 1848 and the setting up of the Paris Commune in Europe. The national awakening of native Estonians was paralleled by the establishment of unified Greater German Empire in the West and the storming growth of Slavophile feelings in the East.

Estonians are late-comers to the European political stage. National consolidation began in the 1860-70’s, a wider politicization of the society at the turn of the 20th Century and independent statehood was reached only as a result of the First World War. Development of liberalism operated on a differ-
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