

Biographical Sketch: Dmitry Rogozin and Russian Nationalism

Mr. Ray Finch

Synopsis: Since the collapse of the USSR, Russia has struggled with developing a new national idea. The political and economic trauma of the 1990s discredited the idea of liberal democracy, and for the past decade Russian nationalism has become more prominent. While there are a number of Russian leaders who have been lifted up on this wave of nationalism (to include the current president, Vladimir Putin), few have been as successful in riding this surge as Russia's new Deputy Prime Minister in charge of the country's military-industrial complex, Dmitry Rogozin. This paper will briefly review Rogozin's biography, and in particular, the implications of his increasing political power for Russia and the United States.

The views expressed in FMSO publications and reports are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

Introduction

In Tolstoy's *War and Peace* the author argued that history is made less by individuals than by broad currents of social change. This great Russian novelist portrayed Napoleon as merely riding the very crest of a huge revolutionary wave that was crashing across Europe. This year Russia is celebrating the 200th anniversary of Napoleon's ill-timed invasion, with many events to commemorate how Russia defeated this 19th-century threat. Just like a century ago, when popular nationalism began to swell, Russian political leaders today will tap into (and perhaps manipulate) this victory for patriotic reasons.

The sense of Russian nationalism has come a long way since the 1990s, when it suffered a near-fatal blow after being wracked by economic collapse, internal conflict and humiliation at the demise of the USSR. For the past decade rising Russian nationalism has been a prominent topic for those who study the country. While there are a number of Russian leaders who have been lifted up on this wave of nationalism (to include the current president, Vladimir Putin), few have been as successful in riding this surge as Russia's new Deputy Prime Minister in charge of the country's military-industrial complex, Dmitry Rogozin. This paper will briefly review Rogozin's biography and, in particular, the implications of his increasing political power for Russia and the United States.

Basic Biography-Early Years

Dmitry Rogozin was born 21 December 1963 into a relatively well-to-do family in Moscow (Rogozin shares the same birth date as Joseph Stalin, a coincidence which he finds significant). Rogozin's father, Oleg Konstantinovich, was a former pilot and decorated Soviet general who worked in the aviation and arms industry as a highly educated engineer. His mother Tamara was a healthcare professional. His parents were part of the Soviet elite, and while Dmitry's formative years took place in the period some now refer to as an 'era of stagnation,' it was a rich and fruitful time for Rogozin and his family.¹

Though perhaps a bit precocious, Rogozin was a good student and excelled at foreign languages, rhetoric, and writing. He displayed considerable confidence both in the classroom and on the athletic field. At one time he had hoped to compete on the Soviet handball team in the Olympics. He is a big man (6'4", 225-250 lbs.), athletic, with a strong constitution. According to Rogozin, his family has a long and illustrious military history, stretching back to the foundations of the Russian state, and, naturally, his father wanted him to follow in his soldierly footsteps.² While Dmitry did complete a mandatory six-month tour while in uniform on the island of Cuba, he elected instead to focus on journalism, acting, and international relations.³ Perhaps even as a youth he felt destined to enter politics.

Prior to getting involved in politics, however, Rogozin briefly worked as a journalist, graduating in 1986 from Moscow State University. One should recall that journalism, like every other field in the USSR, was subordinate to Communist Party control. A key part of the training for Soviet journalists dealt with using propaganda and

how best to deliver the party's message. By the time Rogozin graduated in 1986, spreading the party's positive propaganda was increasingly difficult as the country began to lose some of its political and economic moorings. With greater access to information, it was hard to convince Soviet workers that their shortage economy represented the best of all possible worlds. When Gorbachev decided to use '*glasnost*' to help repair the decrepit system, journalists were allowed to expose some of the systemic rot.

The boundaries of Gorbachev's *glasnost*, however, were not well marked, and what would pass for openness (and praise) in Moscow might result in censure (and punishment) in the provinces. Rogozin recounted an incident when working as a student journalist in Novosibirsk, where he interviewed the chief of a fire department after a major fire. The chief's uncensored remarks were broadcast on the local TV station where Rogozin was working, without first removing the vulgar language. The local party boss saw this report and was about to punish the entire TV station, when Rogozin came up with a plan to edit out the foul language for later reports. The ruse worked, and Rogozin learned that the freedoms enjoyed in Moscow did not necessarily extend into the provinces, where local party bosses still ruled with an iron fist.⁴ His experience with Soviet journalism also impressed upon him the belief that there was no such thing as objective journalism, and as the Russian aphorism suggests, 'he who pays for the music orders the song.'

After this internship and graduation Rogozin tried to get a job as a reporter with the major Russian television station (ORT), but was unsuccessful. He began to explore other options. Reflecting the changing times, and as the USSR began to experiment with transforming its centralized, command economy, Rogozin went on to complete an

economics degree in 1988. Armed now with strong communication, information management or journalism, and an understanding of economics, he entered into one of the most vibrant growth industries of the late 1980s in the USSR: politics.

Prior to 1991 the Communist Party was still the only political game in town, and the young and ambitious Rogozin was looking to punch as many career tickets as possible. So alongside his tinkering with journalism and economics, Rogozin became involved in politics within the leadership of the Komsomol (Young Communists League), though he never formally entered the party. Besides personal contacts and organizational skills, he gained an appreciation for the ruthless nature of politics.

Family connections have helped Rogozin's political career. While still in college he married Tatiana Serebryakova, the daughter of a formerly high-ranking KGB general. Rogozin claimed that initially he thought this connection might help him find employment with this agency. Unfortunately for Rogozin, to discourage nepotism legislation was enacted prior to their marriage which precluded family members from applying to the KGB. Still, Rogozin now had a high-level patron within the power ministries (*siloviki*) who could provide both career guidance and a certain amount of protection. Rogozin may be a talented politician, but it is doubtful that he would have reached national prominence without this family tie. Indeed, his father-in-law's connection to the KGB/FSB might be part of the secret to Rogozin's political longevity and advancement.⁵

Perhaps because of family ties to the security organs, in the late 1980s Rogozin accompanied Soviet youth groups when they went abroad. His mission was to help spread the positive socialist message and to make sure other young people behaved

properly. Rogozin recounts an incident from 1989, when some of his comrades from the Baltic countries began to criticize the Soviet Motherland at a conference in Paris. Ever the patriot, Rogozin was deeply affronted at this betrayal and, according to his own account, expelled the Baltic students from the hotel where they were staying (going so far as to throw one of the ingrates down the stairs).⁶ Though he would later claim that he never professed communist beliefs, Rogozin was willing to defend the USSR from such traitors (and travel and draw a salary working for this youth organization).

This incident reflects an important point in Rogozin's ideology. Forms of government and political systems come and go, but the 'Motherland' remains unchangeable; whether led by tsar, general secretary or president, Russian citizens must be ever-prepared to defend, fight and die for their country. This is especially true when writing revisionist history to bolster one's political capital, of which Rogozin is a master.

From 1990-92 Rogozin worked for an organization inaccurately titled the "Russian-American University." From the few published reports, this organization had very little to do with education and more with amassing a motley collection of proposed joint-projects designed to promote greater cooperation between the former Cold War adversaries. Its primary function was likely to generate revenue for those impoverished workers formerly employed with the huge Soviet think-tank industry (and Western consultants who jumped on the post-Cold War project bonanza). It may have served as a front organization for the Soviet/Russian secret services, but in the confusion and chaos of that period it was almost impossible to delineate private, business, and government interests. Still, using his position, Rogozin was able to travel and make some important contacts within the newly-formed Russian government.

During this turbulent period of political and economic uncertainty, Rogozin continued to demonstrate flexibility and keen political talents. His decision not to join the Communist Party and strike out instead in a nationalist direction is indicative of his political sixth sense. He clearly understood that much of the ideological void left after the collapse of communism would be filled with various forms of Russian nationalism, and for the past 20 years he has been at the forefront of organizing political parties and blocs based on the idea of remembering, restoring and perhaps expanding Russian greatness.

Rogozin's Politics in the 1990s

Rogozin's political career thus far can be roughly divided into two phases: opposition to the pro-Western policies of Gorbachev and Yeltsin, and a mostly supportive approach toward the "Russia getting off her knees" rhetoric of the Putin/Medvedev administrations. This division is very rough, for, depending on the audience, Rogozin has a chameleon-like quality to change into different patriotic colors. Just as the Russian flag has three colors, so Rogozin can be a red ardent nationalist for those who advocate "Russia for Russians"; a blue chauvinist for those who long to restore Russia's great power status; and a white patriot who declares that Russia is an international power, destined to help maintain global peace.

According to Rogozin's many published accounts, he has not been a mere observer of Russia's post-communist transformation, but has played an important role in nearly every one of the key events the country has passed through over the past 20 years. During the 1990s he labored to keep the country from falling apart, protecting Russian citizens in the 'near-abroad' (former republics of the USSR), and reminding the Russian

people of their long and distinguished heritage amidst the crime, corruption and political uncertainty of this ‘wild decade.’ In Rogozin’s account, just like in the past the West not only took advantage of Russian weakness to strengthen its position on the global stage, but was also partially responsible for this collapse.

August 1991; September-October 1993

In August 1991 Rogozin helped to rally Russians who were defending the White House against those who wanted to prolong Communist Party rule. He described how he was working on his draft of the new union treaty when he heard that conservative members of the Politburo tried to seize power. (He never explains why he was working on such a treaty.) Using an old French press credential from his journalist days, he managed to enter Yeltsin’s stronghold in the Russian government building, and soon found himself on the balcony where Yeltsin and others were addressing the crowds. Mistaken for one of the speakers, he was given the microphone and made an emotional speech about the necessity of defending the Motherland. Rogozin claimed that this event was a spark of destiny, and that from this time forward he knew that he was destined to be a politician.⁷

Rogozin’s reaction to the failed coup attempt of August 1991 and subsequent dissolution of the USSR also illustrates some of his core political beliefs. Having lost faith in the Marxist-Leninist cause, the party bureaucrats around Gorbachev were more interested in getting their piece of the Soviet pie than in genuine concern for the people or the country. P.77 Like the other republic leaders, ‘opportunists’ like Yeltsin merely used ethnic nationalism to strengthen their political (and economic) positions. These leaders (and the lackeys who surrounded them) used the elastic concept of *perestroika* to transfer

the wealth and property of the Soviet workers' state into their own accounts. Having little appreciation of Russia's long, glorious history, these opportunistic leaders (unlike Rogozin) were not really interested in the fate of the people or Motherland.⁸

Other than perhaps using greater repressive measures, Rogozin has not been explicit in describing what he would have done to preserve the Soviet Union, or at least a 'Greater Russia.' But that has not been the point of his frequent political criticism. Exploiting the sense of loss and humiliation that many Russians have felt at the loss of their superpower status, while also maintaining that Russia needed its own independent state, he has developed a formula to extract maximum political capital from contradictory positions. In his political theology Russia can be great, large and independent; autocratic, yet democratic; ethnically pure, yet diverse; friend of the West, but also a foe.

In recounting the events of the autumn of 1993 (when Yeltsin forcefully disbanded the Russian parliament or Duma), Rogozin displayed not only his adept political maneuvering, but also his revisionist historian credentials. In his retelling of this historical chapter, he created an alternate universe which conveniently revolves around him.⁹ According to Rogozin, Yeltsin decided to employ force against the recalcitrant parliament out of fear that they had the grounds to impeach him. Not surprisingly, these fears were predicated upon a resolution sponsored by Rogozin in 1992, which claimed that the dissolution of the USSR had been carried out illegally, and those responsible for the collapse (Yeltsin and his entourage) were subject to criminal prosecution. Fearing this resolution, Yeltsin was, according to Rogozin, forced to take steps to dissolve the parliament.

Rogozin was at home on the fateful evening (21 September 1993) when Yeltsin signed the order dissolving the Duma, and he rushed to the parliament building to support his fellow deputies. Alas, before he arrived, Duma-nominated 'president' Rutskoi had already made a handful of fatal decisions. If only Rutskoi had consulted with Rogozin he would have learned that appointing new candidates to the power ministries, i.e., Army, Internal Forces, Federal Security Service, etc., would certainly push the current ministers into the Yeltsin camp. The same mistake was made in plans to replace the powerful mayor of Moscow. Even though, according to Rogozin, the Duma deputies had the law and the people on their side, they weakened their chances by rashly appointing new individuals to these key leadership positions.

While presumably helping to argue the Duma's case before the Russian people, Rogozin visited the Ostankino media tower in late September 1993. This radio/TV tower is a key communication hub for all of Russia, and would be a prime target for the opposition in winning over the hearts and minds of the people. While there Rogozin noticed that Russian special forces had already begun to prepare defensive positions in and around the media complex. Rogozin passed this valuable intelligence to his comrades within the Duma, but it apparently failed to restrain the hotheads who unsuccessfully tried to seize this media objective on 3 October. He suggests that those who led this attack were either managed or provoked by the Yeltsin team to legitimize the Kremlin's subsequent use of military force to dissolve the Duma. There is no end to Rogozin's conspiracy theories.

Unlike August 1991, when Rogozin claimed to be at the very center of the political firestorm, on the day that Yeltsin opened fire with tanks to dislodge the people's

deputies (4 October 1993) Rogozin was at home suffering from the flu. According to his account, it was only this timely sickness that prevented him from sharing the fate of his fearless friends within the Duma. He would later question whether he would have had the courage to shoot back at the Russian soldiers who were shelling the parliament. Much better, he later reasoned, to attack those who gave the orders to open fire on the people's representatives.

As in other episodes from his life, Rogozin's later interpretation of this event reveals much about his world-view. Ever one to smell a Western conspiracy, Rogozin has recently suggested a theory whereby the events of the autumn of 1993 were a natural extension of the US plan to weaken Russia. In Rogozin's conspiratorial universe Yeltsin, in addition to his fear of being impeached, was, along with other 'traitors,' in the employ of the US; by helping to tear apart the Soviet Union in 1991 they were merely following Washington's orders. The US was supposedly fearful that their meddling would become common knowledge, so Washington again forced Yeltsin to act, dissolving the Duma in late September 1993. Believing that Rogozin's accusatory legislation might become enacted and lead to his ouster, Yeltsin ultimately enlisted the Russian military to destroy the Duma.

But US involvement in Rogozin's conspiracy theory lurks deeper and even more nefariously. Russian soldiers were naturally reluctant to open fire upon their elected representatives that cool October morning in 1993. Someone or something had to provoke them into using their tanks to fire upon the innocent and law-abiding Duma deputies. Not surprisingly, foreign snipers, conveniently located on top of the American embassy in Moscow, began to shoot Russian soldiers in the back to provoke their anger

and retaliation. As proof of this spurious allegation, Rogozin provides a transcript of an interview p. 169 with the deputy commander of the airborne forces from a later Duma-sponsored investigation into the events of 3-4 October 1993. In the report the Russian officer claims that his unit took significant casualties (5 KIA, 18 WIA) while moving a portion of his unit back to the brigade location near the Duma. The commander claims that the firing came from the roof of the American embassy and from the bell-tower at the Hotel Mir. Because of the danger of civilian losses, this Russian commander forbade returning fire against the embassy.

Such historical revisionism is usually confined to the fringes or among extreme elements of the Russian infosphere. This damaging and accusatory account, however, was written when Rogozin was serving as Russia's representative to NATO, in 2010. Like many of his other inflammatory statements, Rogozin has included enough qualifiers and suppositions to avoid direct accusation. Nevertheless, his message is clear. Avoiding specific facts, his purpose is to plant the seed of doubt and to reinforce anti-Western beliefs. This account speaks volumes both about Rogozin's paranoia (his belief that there is an ever-present Western plot to weaken Russia), and to the levels to which he is prepared to stoop in order to gain political support.

Chechnya 1994-96

If the US was one of the chief villains in the events of October 1993, there were numerous others involved in the first Chechen War (1994-96). In recounting this painful chapter from recent Russian history, Rogozin portrays this conflict as yet another attempt by both domestic and foreign scoundrels to weaken Mother Rus. From Rogozin's perspective, the thuggish Chechen leadership under President Dudayev merely mimicked

the equally criminal behavior of the Yeltsin clan. The war was a natural consequence of the same self-serving conduct which led to the dissolution of the USSR, where political leaders used conflict to strengthen their positions.

Rogozin had no love and little respect for Chechen leaders like Dudayev who advocated a greater degree of autonomy. Rogozin's attitude toward the Chechens mirrors that of Russian General Alexander Yermolov, who first subdued this people in the 19th century. Rogozin was indignant when recalling how ethnic Russians/Slavs were forced to leave the republic after the Chechens took administrative control of the province in the early 1990s, and that the Yeltsin government did nothing to protect its citizens. He claims that the naïve (and perhaps colluding) West sided with the 'freedom fighters' of Chechnya against Russia, but were apparently indifferent to the sufferings of the ethnic Slavs who once lived in this region.

In Rogozin's version of events, the 1994-96 conflict, had less to do with a fight for Chechen independence than with outside interference, criminality, and domestic Russian politics (the latter two difficult to distinguish). The Chechen leadership, aided by Western and Middle Eastern governments, proved much more adept in promoting its side of the conflict to the global audience. The dishonest portrayal of big, bad, repressive Russia violently suppressing the independence aspirations of the freedom-loving Chechen people was paid for by thugs and spies. Rogozin also maintained that many Russian political and military leaders exploited this conflict for personal gain. The leadership profited, while the common soldier and people suffered.¹⁰

Rogozin described how the Russian media at this time were a battleground in the fight for Kremlin control, and therefore, the anti-Russian perspective also grew pervasive

among the domestic TV audience. Yeltsin's opponents could presumably gain political points by exposing the indiscriminate violence and poorly trained/equipped Russian military. Rogozin argued that instead of reminding its Russian audience of the soldier's sacrifice, the perfidy of the Chechen people (e.g., how they sided with the Nazis in WW II, their criminality, or their ethnic cleansing of ethnic Slavs under Gorbachev and Yeltsin), Russian media openly criticized the often heavy hand of the poorly trained and ill-equipped military.

The Chechen separatists did not just receive moral support from abroad; according to Rogozin, foreign countries sent funding, equipment, and personnel to stymie Russia's attempt to restore order to this region. While he wrote that foreign intervention and meddling helped to prolong the fight, Rogozin saves his most virulent criticism for those within the Yeltsin administration. He supports the 'stab-in-the-back' theory which claims that the Russian military could have handily defeated these Chechen terrorists had it not been for the scheming politicians back in Moscow.

Ever the patriot, Rogozin has problems explaining how this relatively small group of separatists was able to damage the mighty Russian military so effectively. Similar to the events of August 1991 or October 1993, Rogozin suggests that a 'certain, interested third party,' which would profit from a destabilized North Caucasus, helped to tilt the scales in the separatists' favor. According to Rogozin, this mysterious third party (read U.S.) is ever intent upon weakening Russia so it can gain access to Caspian oil, to traffic in weapons and drugs, and expand its geopolitical influence.¹¹

Rogozin describes in detail how General Alexander Lebed, his former comrade-patriot, was exploited to first help get Yeltsin elected in June 1996, and was then

dispatched to Chechnya to end the conflict (much to the chagrin of the military). He claims to have warned the general of the dangers of cooperating with the unscrupulous Kremlin politicians, and how they would merely dismiss him after they used his services. Rogozin, presumably, would have continued the fight, though he fails to describe how he would have achieved victory. Rogozin claims that this incident with Lebed (betraying the Motherland to score political points) helped to sever the relationship between these two ambitious nationalist-politicians.¹²

Besides foreign meddling, corrupt Russian officials, to include some generals, also played roles in the Russian defeat in 1996. Rogozin claims that the conflict ended only because it was more profitable for these corrupt leaders to siphon off money and assets if the fighting stopped. When the war ended Rogozin promised that he would pursue justice against those Chechen criminals and Russian officials who had provoked, stoked, and profited from this conflict.

After the August 1996 Khasayurt ceasefire agreement was signed (formally stopping the conflict between Russia and Chechnya for five years), Rogozin describes an excursion he made to the region in October. The objective of the trip was to search for young Russian women from Budyennovsk who had been allegedly kidnapped by Chechen fighters a year earlier, when Chechen fighters had seized the town's hospital in exchange for a ceasefire pledge. During this October 1996 trip Chechen leaders revealed to Rogozin how easy it had been for them to acquire weapons and ammunition from Russian officials. Rogozin also described a chance encounter with the Arab terrorist Khattab, and how Rogozin nearly exploded when this bearded renegade criticized Russia. On his way back out of the region, Rogozin debriefed Russian military officers on what

he had seen. He was nearly assassinated (or so he claims) when the military helicopter on which he was scheduled to depart was shot down.¹³

Rogozin's views toward Chechnya have changed over the past twenty years. After the war ended in 1996 he suggested that Russia ought to consider fencing off and isolating the region from the rest of the Northern Caucasus. He argued that it would take too much Russian investment to restore Chechnya, and that much of this funding was sure to be stolen. Rogozin's attitude changed after the latest conflict (1999-2008) and the arrival of Putin as president. Echoing his patron, he now maintains that Chechnya is an integral part of the Motherland. Rogozin has had to learn to walk a fine line between condemning Chechen separatists and praising the Chechen people and their culture. His attitude has now evolved into that of a generous benefactor: Russia has spared no expense in bringing civilization and order into this lawless region.¹⁴

Rogozin and Serbia

If the West was only marginally involved in the Chechen conflict, it was the prime instigator in the wars that tore apart Yugoslavia in the 1990s. Indeed, according to Rogozin's reasoning, had not Russia possessed nuclear weapons, it would have likely suffered the same fate as Yugoslavia. He maintains that the West (and the US in particular) was responsible for advocating sovereignty among Yugoslavia's constituent republics, thwarting attempts by Serbia, Russia's orthodox ally, to hold the country together. As the fighting escalated, Rogozin charges that the US encouraged leaders in Bosnia and Croatia to team up against Serbia, supplying them with weapons and training.

Serbia appealed to Russia for equal assistance, but under the pro-Western and weak Yeltsin government, Russia was officially unwilling to help its orthodox brethren in

the Balkans. Unofficially, however, Slavic volunteers from Russia (to include Rogozin) and other orthodox countries made their way to the region to fight on the Serb side in quasi-militia units like the ‘tsar’s wolves.’ Rogozin describes meeting with Serbian leaders during the fighting and listening to their request that Russia merely show moral support by air-dropping empty crates near Serbian positions. Such a stunt would supposedly lift the spirits of the Serbian soldiers. Rogozin expressed his indignation that the Yeltsin government was too weak even to make this gesture of support.¹⁵

Rogozin has often used the conflict in Yugoslavia and subsequent US/NATO involvement as ‘proof’ of the pernicious nature of the West and the dangers of the unipolar model of global governance. He maintains that if Russia had been strong enough to counterbalance Washington’s dictate, the conflict would not have been so protracted and violent, the Serbs would not have borne the brunt of the blame, and a unified Yugoslavia would presumably still exist.

Echoing the indignation of other Russian leaders, Rogozin was outraged when in 1999, NATO employed military force against Serbian forces in Kosovo without a UN mandate. This was proof positive for Rogozin that the security structures established after WW II were no longer viable, and that military force had again become the ultimate arbiter in global governance. That the US/NATO would expand the conflict into Serbia proper, killing innocent civilians and foreigners, was clear evidence of a hegemon without restraints. According to Rogozin, Russia owes it to global security to maintain a robust military to protect both its interest and those of the planet by counterbalancing the US.

Rogozin was a vocal critic against attempts by the West to prosecute Serbian political and military leaders for their role in sparking conflict in Yugoslavia. Rogozin maintained that this had been a civil war and that all sides had been guilty of violence. Appealing to Russia's religious ties to Serbia, Rogozin accused the West of deliberately labeling the Orthodox Serbs as the aggressor. He argued that Serbian leaders like Slobodan Milosevic would never receive a fair trial in a war crimes tribunal at The Hague.

Often, Rogozin's rhetoric would get in front of the facts. When street protests had forced Serbian leader Milosevic to step down from power in the fall of 2000, Rogozin claimed that Serbian special forces would have intervened to support Milosevic (and perhaps spark a new civil war) had not the Russian authorities gotten involved. This was pure fantasy, designed largely for domestic consumption and to portray Russia as the faithful friend of Orthodox Serbia.¹⁶

Rogozin-Mostly Faithful Friend of Putin

In the late summer of 1999 Rogozin, like the rest of Russia, was worried and uncertain about the future of the country. Russia had just gone through a devastating banking crisis and the increasingly erratic Yeltsin appeared to be losing control. There was a struggle among the various Kremlin clans over who would become the next leader. Presidential elections were scheduled for March 2000, and many feared a succession crisis. Rogozin's attempts to form a wide coalition of patriotic-themed parties to participate in the upcoming elections had failed after he broke off with Yuri Luzhkov, the powerful mayor of Moscow and one-time presidential hopeful. The situation in the country appeared to be nearing a breaking point when hostilities flared up again in the

Northern Caucasus in August-September 1999, and a series of mysterious explosions occurred in Moscow and other Russian cities.

According to Rogozin's later accounts, Putin's appearance and rise to presidential power was like a dream come true. Here was someone who ascribed to Rogozin's belief in the idea of restoring Russia's greatness. Russia would get back up off her knees after the humiliation of the Yeltsin years. Rogozin had just completed his timely doctoral thesis, *Problems of Russian National Security in the 21st Century*, where he identified the need for a strong national leader.

Reviewing his statements from that period, one gets the impression that Rogozin might have been privy to certain high-level plans. For instance, the normally loquacious and accusatory Rogozin was strangely mute regarding finding the culprits responsible for the murderous apartment bombings in Moscow in the fall of 1999 that helped to propel Putin to national prominence. One might have presumed that Rogozin would have displayed the same curiosity regarding these apartment bombings as he did after the October 1993 Duma disaster. However, instead of questioning the new tactics of the new Kremlin leader, he supported the official version of events and Prime Minister Putin's desire to wipe out the Chechen scum blamed for the explosions.¹⁷

For all of his many faults and blunders, there was a genuine (though, perhaps, corrupt and ineffective) political plurality under President Yeltsin. Policymaking under Yeltsin was shady and closely tied to those who had access to former Soviet property and/or money, but there had been some limited choice among candidates. However, as most Russians had seen their living standards dramatically decline during the unfair redistribution of wealth of the 1990s, it was easy to understand why many lost faith in

this dirty form of democracy. “They are all crooks,” was a popular refrain from that period. Hence, there was very little protest as President Putin began to create his ‘power vertical’ and re-impose Kremlin control over the political process. Of course there could be ‘opposition parties’ in the Putin-run political system, but they would all follow orders from the Kremlin. Those political leaders who tried to maintain some sort of genuine independence were soon marginalized and/or prosecuted.

Understanding the essence of the Putin power vertical in Russia is central in figuring out Rogozin’s political maneuvering over the past decade. Rogozin has thrived (although there have been a few missteps) because he clearly understood who was in control and whom he had to please. He was well situated to advance in this system. He shared much of the nationalist sentiment of his chief patron, had the ‘scientific credentials’ to prove his political and national security expertise, had family connections that allowed him access to valuable information, and had learned from his previous mistakes. To advance his career he was willing to subordinate his political ambitions. He would follow orders carefully, loudly trumpet his successes, and bide his time until conditions were favorable for advancement (most of the time).

When Putin was appointed heir-apparent in December 1999, the Kremlin was seriously beholden to a group of oligarchs who had acquired the crown jewels of the former Soviet empire. With their immense wealth these new Russian business leaders were able to buy influence within both the Kremlin administration and the Duma. One of Putin’s first initiatives was to draw a Kremlin-friendly line between business and politics, warning the oligarchs to remain outside of the political sphere. However, Kremlin officials (particularly the *siloviki* or power ministers close to Putin) were permitted to

snatch up prime pieces of business and property. Putin demonstrated his preferences by ignoring the aggressive acquisitions of the *siloviki* and exiling or imprisoning those business leaders who failed to comply or submit. Thus, Putin successfully removed the one alternative source of power which had sprung up during the 1990s, and the structure of the unitary state was set to be re-established.

In what was now termed ‘sovereign democracy,’ the Kremlin began to control, co-opt, or at least manage all the players on the political spectrum. There were, of course, a handful of genuine opposition candidates, but deprived of media coverage and restricted by ever more draconian registration requirements, they were marginalized to the fringes of Russian politics. If a Russian candidate wanted to participate in politics under Putin, he/she had to agree to play by the Kremlin rules. And nearly all of the big name Russian politicians complied, soon earning the awkward title of the ‘loyal opposition.’ Leaders like Communist Gennadiy Zuyganov or the (anything but) Liberal Democrat Vladimir Zhirinovsky would serve as Potemkin opposition candidates to Putin. They could criticize and pontificate, campaign and complain, but in the end they knew that Putin would be calling the shots and would support his position.¹⁸

Possessing intelligence and ambition and sharing many of the same great-Russian aspirations (or at least the rhetoric) as Putin, Rogozin quickly understood how political competition would be managed. And with his nationalist credentials, Rogozin soon discovered that Putin might be interested in employing some of his services. Having been elected to the Duma in 1997 and 1999 after waving his nationalist rhetoric, Rogozin would be used by Putin over the next decade as a Kremlin-approved, nationalist mouthpiece. Like the outspoken, anti-Western Zhirinovsky, Rogozin’s unending

commentary could serve to test the waters on various policies and perhaps remind Russia's neighbors that the country could move in a more aggressive direction.

This latter point is crucial to fully understand the role that Rogozin has played over the past decade. After the collapse of the Soviet Union there was considerable debate as to whether Russia was at last forsaking its autocratic ways and joining the modern democratic West. Some say the debate ended in 1993, when Yeltsin undemocratically dissolved the Russian parliament. Since then, Russia has maintained the façade of democracy, but real power has remained in the Kremlin. As a substitute for a political system built on a popular mandate, a search began for a new national idea. Since then, various proposals have been put forward, but the ones that find the best traction are some variation of nationalism and Russia's return as a great power. As a politician who has written and spoken extensively on this topic, Rogozin has been able to 'prove' that he has a concrete plan to restore Russia's greatness. He has helped to shape Russia's post-Soviet identity.

A key component in Rogozin's nationalist strategy is the need for a handy external enemy. Any domestic shortfall, weakness, or problem can be excused by the perceived need to defend against an imaginary foreign threat. Exploiting a half-century of rabid Soviet propaganda, Rogozin became an expert in using the specter of NATO aggression to rally the faithful. For instance, in 2001 Rogozin was at the forefront in warning of the dangers to European security should the Baltic countries (Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia) join NATO. Ever mindful of his Russian compatriots living in the Baltic countries, he was confident that these countries would never become members of this Western alliance. While he recommended that Russia work jointly with NATO in

providing security to this region, he was also willing to threaten Baltic leaders with military force should they join NATO.¹⁹

While still a Duma deputy in 2000, Rogozin had been selected to lead the representative committee for Russian interests, especially vis-à-vis Chechnya, at the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly (PACE). For nearly two years his chief mission was to explain to these European diplomats that Russia knew what it was doing in Chechnya and that the Chechen ‘freedom fighters’ were not quite as noble as some Westerners would suggest. He did not condone Russian war crimes, but he reminded the assembly that there were equal or worse atrocities on the Chechen side. He suggested that Russia was once again defending civilization from anarchy, and if Europe did not support Russia they too would feel the terrorists’ wrath.²⁰

His warnings were seemingly verified after the 9-11 attacks, and, echoing Putin, Rogozin soon called for a joint Russian-US response to fight terror. Like others in the Kremlin, Rogozin placed Chechen separatists in the camp with extreme Islamic fundamentalists. In the Global War on Terrorism, Russia and the US would team up to defeat this evil. There were limits, however, to the depth of this cooperation. In 2002, when US authorities began to work independently with Georgian leaders to eliminate a possible terrorist threat in the Pankisi Gorge, which stretches from Chechnya into Georgia, Russian officials became alarmed. Rogozin warned that such an operation could result in American soldiers inadvertently fighting Russian soldiers who were after the same militants. Much better for the US, in Rogozin’s view, to recognize Russia’s privileged sphere of influence and let Russian forces deal with this threat.²¹

Rogozin was a vocal opponent of US plans to use force against Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq. Besides concern over how this conflict would affect Russian oil interests in Iraq, he was worried about what type of precedence such an attack might establish. If the US felt that it could identify any country as belonging to 'an axis of evil,' and then use its formidable military power to remove the regime (without first gaining UN approval), what would stop leaders in Washington from toppling other countries, e.g., Russia? Indeed, Rogozin had planned to meet with Iraqi leaders to ascertain their compliance with UN disarmament mandates shortly before the war began. After the fighting started Rogozin labeled the leaders in Washington as 'bullies' and suggested that Russia must condemn the insolent US aggression.²²

If naked armed force was now the arbiter in global governance, Rogozin soon hinted that Russia could use a similar logic in removing leaders it deemed a threat. In May 2003 Rogozin threatened the leadership in Turkmenistan that Russia might resort to force to protect the rights of Russian citizens living there. As a pretext for aggressive action, Rogozin suggested that the Turkmen government had been supporting the Taliban. Rogozin's threat, however, was predicated less on Turkmen-Taliban relations or how the few remaining Russians were being treated, and more on Russian business interests tied to Turkmen gas. Rogozin's threats ceased once a new Kremlin-friendly contract was signed.²³

Rodina

About the same time in 2003, probably following Kremlin directions, Rogozin formed a new, mildly nationalist party called *Rodina* (Motherland). Although presidential elections were still a year away, Kremlin officials wanted to divide up the

electorate to ensure an easy Putin victory. Rodina and Rogozin would ensure that the fires of Russian nationalism would remain well regulated.

As a Kremlin project, *Rodina* was also used as an attack dog and trial balloon, where Kremlin strategists could use the party to intimidate rivals and see what policies resonated best with the *narod* (populace). After Mikhail Khodorkovsky, Russia's richest man, was arrested in the fall of 2003, Rodina began to advocate greater control over Russia's wealthy oligarchs. At the same time, the party also spoke out strongly against illegal immigration, claiming that these migrants, mostly from Central Asia and the Caucasus, posed a national security threat. While Rogozin may have believed that these platforms strengthened *Rodina*, they were actually designed to test the waters, siphon off votes from other parties, and distract the electorate.

In late 2003 and 2004, after popular protests led to political change in Georgia and Ukraine, Rogozin likely felt a surge in genuine popular nationalism. As the head of his own nationalist party, Rogozin may have believed that like his one-time friends, Mikhail Saakashvili in Georgia and Viktor Yushchenko in Ukraine, he too could ride popular protest into power. Despite Kremlin reservations, Rogozin initially supported both of these new leaders. He would soon discover, however, the limits of both Russian nationalism and his independence.

In the beginning of 2005 the Kremlin had enacted unpopular legislation which would monetize Soviet-era benefits. For instance, instead of a disabled veteran receiving a free transportation pass, he would receive a ruble equivalent for this privilege. Having been shortchanged by their government in the past, many Russians, particularly the elderly, protested against this legislation. Sensing, perhaps, that here was an issue that

could propel him to prominence, Rogozin apparently decided to move in an unscripted direction. With a handful of other *Rodina* leaders, Rogozin went on a hunger strike to protest against this legislation. In February 2005 Rogozin claimed that *Rodina* was ‘no longer the president’s special task force.’²⁴

Was Rogozin being sincere? The depth of political obfuscation in modern Russia is beyond measure, and this chapter of Rogozin’s ‘independent stance’ might have been part of the master plan. Regardless, the Kremlin did soften the monetization legislation, but it was a pyrrhic victory for Rogozin. He was permitted to act as an independent politician, but the Kremlin soon began to weaken *Rodina* with an array of administrative and legal weapons.

Rodina was in a relatively strong position as the Moscow Duma elections approached in the fall of 2005. If the party made a strong showing in Moscow, they would presumably do well in the national Duma elections scheduled the following spring. Trying to capitalize on the growing anti-immigration sentiment among many Muscovites, Rogozin and his party developed what they believed were effective TV ads. In retrospect, it appears that the Kremlin was giving him just enough nationalist rope to hang himself.

In one infamous campaign commercial from this period, *Rodina* exploited many of the illegal immigrant stereotypes. As the commercial begins, Caucasian music is playing. Several Caucasians are sitting on a bench in a courtyard eating watermelon; pieces of watermelon skin are scattered around them. A blonde, Slavic-looking woman is walking past them with a pram. There is a close-up of the pram wheels running over the pieces of skin. ‘They’re coming in swarms!’ grumbles one of the Caucasians, the other

keeps littering the ground with watermelon skin. Suddenly, Rogozin and Popov (another Rodina candidate) appear, wearing raincoats.

Rogozin (sternly says): Pick this up. Clear this away.
Popov (grabbing one of the Caucasians by the shoulder): Do you understand Russian?
*An off-screen voice: 'Let us purge our city!'*²⁵

While popular among many, the commercial was deemed racist, and Rogozin and his party were charged with inciting ethnic hatred. While formal charges were never pressed, *Rodina* was removed from the Moscow Duma election ballot and Rogozin was sent into PR exile. His party and political prospects in shambles, Rogozin described how he was shunned by Kremlin insiders, who now treated him like a leper.²⁶

Never one to let an opportunity pass, however, Rogozin used this period of isolation to continue writing his political manifesto. In this memoir/partisan tract, *Enemy of the People*, Rogozin spells out his recipe for restoring Russia's greatness. The title alone serves as an apt metaphor for this text. Rogozin claims that he is an 'enemy' to the corrupt system which had developed in Russia since the collapse of the USSR, and he recommends returning to the discipline of the centralized Stalinist state. In his self-serving, revisionist history, Rogozin walks the fine line between criticizing the Russian bureaucracy and praising Putin.²⁷

Rogozin argues that Putin's real convictions actually align with the patriotic opposition. They both believe in restoring Russia's greatness by renationalizing key industries and aggressively working to solve the country's demographic decline. Rogozin echoes Putin that the collapse of the Soviet Union was the greatest geopolitical disaster of the 20th century, and that the country needs to get back off its knees after the humiliation of the 1990s. While this extended campaign speech may be short on concrete

proposals, it is long in great-power rhetoric, reminding readers of Russia's glorious history.

Even though Rogozin claimed this volume was a bestseller, he did not believe he was destined to be a writer, and soon returned to the political scene. In late 2007 he was working in Rostov-on-Don, where he was helping in the defense of two Ministry of Internal Affairs soldiers who had been charged with war crimes during the Chechen conflict. For a nationalist politician like Rogozin, such a trial could be a PR-chauvinist goldmine. Regardless of the tenuous peace in Chechnya, as one approached the border of the Northern Caucasus, ethnic tensions were high in many of the Russian towns, e.g., Rostov. Rogozin claimed that he had helped to pay for the soldiers' defense, and, presumably in return, could exploit any political capital from such generosity.²⁸

Rogozin as Russia's Representative to NATO

Whether his strategy worked, Rogozin soon received a call from Putin, offering him the position of Russia's representative to NATO, a formal office for which had been created in 1997 with the Russia-Founding Act, but which had never been more than a token representation. Russia had been given no real say in NATO decision making. After 9-11, in 2002, the NATO-Russian Council (NRC) was created, designed to 'build trust and overcome the Cold War legacy,' but this too became more of a formality than a genuine forum for mutual discussion. Today, there are some 50 Russians assigned to NATO (half civilian, half military), but again, many Russians feel (especially during Rogozin's tenure) that there is no real mechanism for including Russia in NATO's decision-making process.²⁹

Having just recently explained his independence from the Kremlin, Rogozin had to employ his best rhetorical skills to justify his acceptance of the NATO position. In a note to his party faithful Rogozin stated that even though his party (*Rodina*) did not always get along with the party in power, when the real 'Rodina' calls, he must obey: "When at this critical time for our country, when we are determining the path Russia will take, and we have the opportunity to regain our status as a great power, Patriots are not able to merely stand aside."³⁰

For many, Rogozin's appointment came as a surprise, interpreting his assignment as an affront to the West and a sign of a more aggressive Russian foreign policy. Examining, however, the events surrounding his selection, it becomes clear why Putin would appoint an avowed nationalist to represent Russia at NATO.

By late 2007 Putin had already selected Dmitry Medvedev as caretaker president for the 2008 election. While Medvedev represented a more liberal domestic policy, Russian foreign policy had by, necessity, become more strident and conservative. As in the past, the Kremlin's political legitimacy would be based more on its ability to protect against foreign threats than on a genuine popular mandate, even though Putin certainly had the approval of most Russian voters.

An essential element of the Kremlin's political strategy has been built upon the notion that the west (and perhaps China) is intent upon gaining access to Russia's rich natural resources. The rich, materialist West needs these resources to maintain its wealthy standard of living. As 'proved' in other countries, using sophisticated information technologies, the West will weaken Russia by fomenting popular revolt, overthrow the government, and place a Western-friendly regime in its stead. Russia must

resist this insidious plot with her own brand of ‘sovereign’ or ‘managed’ democracy. If not the sole author of this strategy, Rogozin had become one of its chief heralds.

Whether the Putin administration actually believed its own propaganda is a matter of conjecture. The ‘colored revolutions’ in Georgia and Ukraine had certainly gained its attention. By late 2007, however, much of the revolutionary rhetoric had faded. Plans at the Bucharest Summit in April 2008 to possibly extend to Georgia and Ukraine a Membership Action Plan (MAP) to join NATO, were likely more of a driving factor for the Kremlin.³¹ If the Russian leadership was to glean political profit from portraying the West as an enemy, than it ultimately had to take actions to demonstrate this resolve. Appointing Rogozin was one such step.

By late 2007, with fossil fuel prices at record highs, Russia felt greater confidence in flexing its geopolitical muscle. Moreover, with the US and many NATO countries increasingly bogged down in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Russian leadership felt more comfortable using Rogozin as an outspoken, quasi-foreign minister. He relished the opportunity to assert this position.

From a Russian nationalist perspective, Rogozin’s tenure at NATO was an unqualified success. He hit the ground with his mouth running, and, regardless of the issue, he never missed a chance to criticize the Alliance and defend Russian policy. For instance, when many countries in the Alliance recognized the independence of Kosovo in early 2008, Rogozin warned ominously both of the dangerous precedent such recognition would establish and the perils in allowing an Islamist state in Europe’s backyard.

Rogozin enjoyed sharing his anti-immigrant rhetoric with his NATO colleagues, warning his European audience that they were losing their ethnic identity by allowing a

foreign influx into their countries. These immigrants were weakening the social fabric of European countries. He used a similar argument to describe how NATO enlargement had enfeebled the Alliance. Inviting smaller, less advanced countries into the bloc had watered down NATO's military capabilities.³²

The high point of Rogozin's service at NATO was certainly his performance during and after the Russian-Georgian conflict in August 2008. Vacationing in Italy when the shooting began, he rushed back to Brussels and, understanding the necessity of effective information operations, for the next ten days worked to broadcast the Russian side of the story. Putting his extensive media skills to use, he was a tireless, one-man Russian PR agency, granting dozens of interviews and commentary to 'set the record straight.'³³

In revealing the truth of the Georgian perfidy in starting this conflict, Rogozin later described how he helped to prevent WW III from breaking out. This local conflict might have expanded had not Rogozin revealed the truth to the NATO members regarding who had fired the first shots. Russian forces had merely responded to Georgian armed aggression. Indeed, Russia had to act forcefully to stop the Georgian 'genocide' of South Ossetia and possibly Abkhazia, and NATO had no cause to interfere.

With grave indignation Rogozin recounted how on 12 August (with the fighting almost over) an American colonel working at NATO informed the Russian representative that NATO had decided to send in airborne forces into Georgia. Rogozin immediately tried to verify this report, only to learn that no such decision had been made. Rogozin angrily concluded his report with the hope that this US officer was punished for his provocation.³⁴

Alongside his role during the August 2008 conflict, Rogozin would likely place the non-accession of Ukraine and Georgia into the Alliance as one of his top achievements. Russia had drawn a red line and NATO had not dared to step over it. While certainly not deserving all the credit, Rogozin had worked diligently to remove this discussion item from the NATO agenda.

Rogozin was less successful in stopping US/NATO plans to install portions of a ballistic missile defense system in Europe. Since the US pulled out of the ABM treaty in 2002, Rogozin has been a vociferous critic of Washington's plan to create a missile shield. He does not believe that the system is designed to protect against a 'rogue' state like Iran from firing a missile into Europe. In Rogozin's reasoning, shared by many Russians, the ultimate fielding of this system could weaken or neutralize Russia's land-based strategic nuclear missile retaliatory capability.

Despite the bombast and often harsh rhetoric, Rogozin has helped to develop some new areas of NATO-Russia cooperation, e.g., logistics, combating terrorism, search-and-rescue at sea, counter-piracy, theatre missile defense and military academic exchanges.³⁵ With one eye, however, watching Russian domestic politics, Rogozin could not afford to be seen as a genuine 'ally' of the West.

All things considered, Rogozin's tenure at NATO did little to strengthen the relationship between Russia and the Alliance. Domestic political considerations took precedence over genuine dialogue, and since the Kremlin leadership continues to derive political legitimacy from its perceived ability to protect Russia from the Alliance, greater cooperation may have never been Rogozin's mission. While Rogozin provided plenty of fodder for pundits and journalists, his recalcitrance, constant criticism, and selective

interpretation of events made cooperation nearly impossible. Rogozin repeatedly claimed that Russia is a European country, and that NATO is a Cold War relic. Today's Europe needs to develop a new security architecture where Russia is an integral partner, and perhaps where the US has less of a say.

Rogozin's Ascent within the Kremlin

With the approach of the end President Medvedev's term in May 2012, Russia again prepared for political change. During the summer of 2011 there had been considerable speculation whether Medvedev might be selected as the Kremlin's choice for a second, longer (6-year) term. These rumors were quashed in September 2011, when Prime Minister Putin announced that the tandem (Medvedev and Putin) was swapping jobs. Of course, the country would go through the formal election process, but there was no doubt Putin would be returning for a third term as Russia's president.

Rogozin might still be serving in Brussels had not large street demonstrations occurred after the disputed Duma elections in November 2011. The Russian electorate was also upset at the faux-democracy advocated by Putin. In what appeared to be a move to siphon off some of the nationalist anger, in December 2011 Rogozin was relieved of his NATO position and was appointed as a Deputy Prime Minister in charge of Russia's military-industrial complex.

As the presidential election approached, there was some speculation that Rogozin would be nominated as the new Defense Minister, replacing the unpopular (at least among some of the Russian military) Anatoliy Serdyukov. While Russia has no tradition of Bonapartism, this proximity to the military levers of power may have been a cause for concern, and Rogozin was never offered the job. Better to place Rogozin in charge of an

area which appeared to be hopeless and impervious to reform. Rogozin had written extensively on national security, strategy and military reform. Moreover, for the past two decades he had been clamoring of the need to rebuild Russia's military strength; let him now see if he could pull it off.

Some of Putin's campaign statements prior to his re-election dealt with the necessity of continuing the reform of Russia's armed forces and foreign policy, and strengthening the military capabilities of the country. If one did not know better, these statements could have been written by Rogozin. Huge numbers were proposed (20 trillion rubles for defense modernization through 2020), which certainly helped Putin to secure the vote of the military and the approximately 3 million Russians working in defense-related industries. When in September 2011 Medvedev's Finance Minister Alexei Kudrin had suggested that such defense largesse might cripple the state budget, he was duly fired.³⁶ Both Medvedev and Putin commented that it was unpatriotic to question greater defense expenditures.

On paper, at least, Rogozin now has the will, resources and opportunity to restore Russia's military strength. Since his appointment he has embarked on a fact-finding mission to better ascertain the overall condition of Russia's defense-related industry and research institutes. He has created commissions staffed by representatives from Russian think tanks, media, industry and the military to help develop a strategy.³⁷

While too early to draw any final assessment, Rogozin has already encountered significant challenges in reviving and modernizing Russia's military-industrial complex. First and foremost, he has inherited a mess, and just getting a handle on what viable factories and research institutes remain in the inventory has been a formidable task.

While a small percentage has been able to thrive and adapt to market conditions, many have declined and/or remain dependent upon filling defense orders for equipment that is no longer needed.

Trained personnel is another serious obstacle. Over the past 20 years many of Russia's best and brightest in the technical fields have emigrated abroad. The Russian education system has also lost much of its technological luster, and except for the elite schools, there has been little capital investment in research and development. Much of the cadre within defense-related research institutes is nearing retirement, and replacing them with qualified personnel will be a challenge.

To concentrate talent and resources Rogozin has proposed establishing either a Russian version of DARPA and/or a 'military silicon valley.' During the Medvedev presidency 'modernization' became one of the favorite Kremlin buzzwords. There were plans to modernize key sectors of the Russian economy, and these, in turn, would help to modernize the entire country. Rogozin has suggested that such a process might also work for the military-industrial complex.

Rogozin has also discovered, however, that developing a sound military strategy does not always align with political reality. Cold-War-era strategic bombers or ranks of heavy tanks may not be the best tools to fight a future enemy, but their construction can certainly provide employment today. Since assuming his new position Rogozin has already had to retract statements regarding why Russia's military has no need for old Russian-produced equipment. A significant portion of Russian defense expenditures through 2020 may go toward rebuilding and streamlining the military-industrial complex and keeping segments of the population gainfully employed.

Implications for the US

Rogozin's appointment to a high-level defense position within the Russian government carries a number of implications for US security in this region of the world. Just as his appointment as Russia's NATO ambassador reflected a more confrontational approach to the Alliance, so his assignment to rebuild Russia's military-industrial complex portends a more aggressive foreign policy. Disdainful of liberal democracy, Rogozin's *realpolitik* worldview is based upon Russia's perceived need to defend against a foreign threat, one that is defined as anything which might harm Russia's interests.

In Rogozin's reasoning, as a great power Russia has legitimate interests beyond its borders. Besides the millions of ethnic Russians residing in the republics of the former USSR, history has impressed upon Russian leaders to measure their neighbor's military strength not by intentions but by capabilities. NATO, the US, and China may harbor no aggressive intentions today, but greater military capabilities may change their approach tomorrow.

In responding to these threats, Rogozin will not make the same mistake his father's generation made during the Cold War. On numerous occasions Rogozin has recounted how his father grew frustrated with the shortsighted and wasteful strategy of the politburo, who mistakenly believed that the USSR had to maintain weapon parity with the West. This strategic overkill, particularly after Reagan threatened to field a 'star-wars' system, helped to bankrupt the USSR, which, in turn, led to popular protest and ultimate dissolution. His father had argued that 'one well-aimed bullet' could be as effective a deterrent as 1,000 machine guns.³⁸ Rogozin will likely adopt a similar asymmetrical approach to deter future threats.

Just prior to being assigned to his new position within the Kremlin, Rogozin gave a long interview where he described some of his accomplishments at NATO and his political plans for the future. When directly asked prior to Putin's successful re-election whether he wanted to become Russia's next president, Rogozin responded by saying, no, he was not yet ready. He was still too young (48), and he needed to get more experience before he would be ready to handle the presidency. The fact that both Putin and Medvedev had handled the position at a younger age was somehow not relevant, and he knew the correct way to answer this question.

As it stands now, Putin could likely serve as Russia's sovereign until 2024. While there are any number of variables which might cut his reign short, should fossil fuel prices remain high, the Kremlin may have adequate funding to continue to strengthen their sovereign form of democracy. A key component of this political system is the belief in a foreign threat and a robust and combat-ready military to counter this danger. Russian nationalist politician Dmitry Rogozin will play a major role in rebuilding Russia's military might, perhaps one day commanding these forces.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in FMSO publications and reports are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

Notes

¹ Dmitrii Rogozin, *Vrag Naroda* (Moskva: Algoritm, 2006). Dmitrii Rogozin, *Āstreby Mira: Dnevnik Russkogo Posla* (Moskva: Al'pina Non-fikshn, 2010). Dmitrii Rogozin, *Baron Zholtok: Istorīa Odnoī*

Rossii (Moskva: Veche, 2011). Rogozin has made something of an industry of elaborating on his own biography, and has written a number of works designed to make sure that his side of the story makes it into history. These are three of the most recent. I tried to corroborate key facts and have noted any discrepancies with other published sources.

² Dmitrii Rogozin, *Baron Zholtok: Istoriia Odnoi Rossii* (Moskva: Veche, 2011). See also: Николай Силаев, "Урок прикладной журналистики." *Профиль* 14.332 (2003). Rogozin has written a 'historical' family tree, in which he traces his lineage back to the very founding of Rus. In this quasi-myth/history, he describes the long line of warriors in the Rogozin family who have fought to defend Mother Rus.

³ Rogozin, *IAstreby Mira*, 39-40. Just what Rogozin was doing on the island of Cuba for six months is not altogether clear. He claims to have been on some sort of internship, but he states that 'higher headquarters' forgot about him while he was in Cuba, and he used the time to write two long papers; one about US information operations against the Cubans and the other dealing with French defense policies. In his book *IAstreby Mira* [Peacehawk] he includes a photo of himself in a military uniform, with a caption 'at a military exercise prior to being sent to Cuba (Kovrov, Vladimir Region, July 1985).'

⁴ Rogozin, *IAstreby Mira*, 35-38.

⁵ Rogozin, *IAstreby Mira*, 39-42. For a long time, Russian politics have been based on connections. His KGB General father-in-law has certainly helped him navigate the Byzantine ladder of political power.

⁶ Rogozin, *IAstreby Mira*, 43-52. Rogozin also describes how these young Soviet youth were ripe for recruitment by the western spy agencies, which in turn plays into one of his favorite themes: the eternal nefarious plan of the west to weaken Russia.

⁷ Rogozin, *IAstreby Mira*, 68-72.

⁸ Rogozin, *IAstreby Mira*, 77-78.

⁹ Rogozin, *IAstreby Mira*, 155-74. This chapter is central in understanding how Rogozin's mind works. He has a good excuse for any possible error, and where he doesn't, he is willing to create his own version of reality. Doubly troubling (at least for a westerner), that he would write this provoking trash while serving in a high-level position. Such conspiratorial thoughts may be common within the Kremlin.

¹⁰ Rogozin, *IAstreby Mira*, 178-98.

¹¹ Dmitrii Rogozin, *Rossia Mezhdu Mirom I Voinoi* (Moskva: Kongress Russkikh Obshchin, 1998), 165.

¹² Rogozin, *IAstreby Mira*, 199-211. Rogozin describes his relationship with General Lebed and how painful it was for him to discover that this Russian officer placed personal ambitions above that of the motherland.

¹³ Rogozin, *IAstreby Mira*, 210-15.

¹⁴ For an updated view of how Rogozin views Russia's relations with Chechnya and the North Caucasus, listen or read the interview he gave in October 2011 to the Echo Moscow radio station. Available at: <http://www.echo.msk.ru/programs/interception/822691-echo/>

¹⁵ Rogozin, *IAstreby Mira*, 220-37.

¹⁶ A Yugoslav Army Spokesman Refutes Rogozin. Belgrade Tanjug. Belgrade, Serbia, 17 Nov. 2000. Radio. Transcript.

¹⁷ "Duma Deputies Refuse to View Controversial Video on Terrorist Bombings." *RIA Novosti* [Moscow] 15 Mar 2002. Interesting to note, that in 2002, when Duma deputies had the opportunity to see a film which accused the FSB of being the masterminds of the autumn 1999 explosions which catapulted Putin's popularity, Rogozin was adamant that the movie should not be seen.

¹⁸ Andrew Wilson, *Virtual Politics: Faking Democracy in the Post-Soviet World* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2005). Mr. Wilson provides a structural understanding of the current system. To thoroughly describe the nature of modern Russian politics is beyond the scope of this paper. There are numerous good sources

which analyze this topic in detail. For a recent good review of five of the latest books on Russian politics, see: http://scholar.princeton.edu/kotkin/files/tls_article_-_sticking_power_-_march_2_2012.pdf

¹⁹ "Russian Parliament Official Says Estonian NATO Bid to Ruin Relations." *Radio BNS*. Baltic News Agency, Tallinn, Estonia, 16 Feb. 2001. Radio. Transcript.

²⁰ "Senior Russian MP Accuses PACE of Supporting 'extremists' in Chechnya." *RIA Novosti* [Moscow] 23 Jan. 2002.

²¹ "Senior MP Says Georgian President Should Identify Allies." *NTV Mir*. NTV. Moscow, Russia, 28 Feb. 2002. Television. Transcript.

²² "The Americans Are Behaving Insolently." *Vremya Novostey* [Moscow] 21 Mar. 2003.

²³ Oleg Panfilov, "Russia's Turkmen Headache." *Nezavisimaya Gazeta* [Moscow] 28 May 2003: 2.

²⁴ A. S. Titkov, *Party Number Four: Rodina, Whence and Why?* (Moscow: Panorama Centre, 2006), 49-55.

²⁵ *Rodina Political Ad in Moscow*. Rodina, 12 Nov. 2005. Web. 05 Aug. 2012.
<<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=3099518788417181683>>.

²⁶ Rogozin, *ĬAstreby Mira*, 392-393.

²⁷ Dmitriĭ Rogozin, *Vrag Naroda* (Moskva: Algoritm, 2006).

²⁸ Rogozin, *ĬAstreby Mira*, 394-395.

²⁹ Julianne Smith, "The NATO-Russia Relationship." *Center for Strategic and International Studies* (2008) Also available on-line at: http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/081110_smith_natorussia_web.pdf

Provides a brief synopsis of the relationship.

³⁰ Rogozin, *ĬAstreby Mira*, 396.

³¹ Paul Gallis, "The NATO Summit at Bucharest, 2008." [Http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22847.pdf](http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22847.pdf). Congressional Rsch Svc, n.d. Web. 5 Aug. 2012.

³² Rogozin, *ĬAstreby Mira*, 398.

³³ Rogozin, *ĬAstreby Mira*, 420-29. This is another excellent chapter that illustrates both Rogozin's selective use of history, but also his masterful performance on the information front.

³⁴ Rogozin, *ĬAstreby Mira*, 424-25.

³⁵ "NATO - North Atlantic Treaty Organization." *NATO*. N.p., n.d. Web. 05 Aug. 2012.
<http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_50090.htm>. For a list of current areas of cooperation between Russia and NATO.

³⁶ Lyudmila Alexandrova, "Kudrin, Dismissed from All Posts, Offers His Own Plan for Preventing New Crisis Wave." *ITAR-TASS* [Moscow] 18 Oct. 2011: Available at: <http://www.itar-tass.com/en/c39/250177.html>

³⁷ "Russia May Set Up Defense Research Agency." *RIA Novosti*. N.p., 15 Feb. 2012. Web. 4 Aug. 2012.
<http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20120215/171333183.html>.

³⁸ Rogozin, *ĬAstreby Mira*, 17-25.

Works Cited

- Силаев, Николай. "Урок прикладной журналистики." *Профиль* 14.332 (2003): n. pag. Print.
- Alexandrova, Lyudmila. "Kudrin, Dismissed from All Posts, Offers His Own Plan for Preventing New Crisis Wave." *ITAR-TASS* [Moscow] 18 Oct. 2011: n. pag. Print.
- "The Americans Are Behaving Insolently." *Vremya Novostey* [Moscow] 21 Mar. 2003: n. pag. Print.
- "Duma Deputies Refuse to View Controversial Video on Terrorist Bombings." *RIA Novosti* [Moscow] 15 Mar. 2002: n. pag. Print.
- Forsberg, Tuomas. "Russia's Relationship with NATO: A Qualitative Change or Old Wine in New Bottles?" *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 21.3 (2005): 332-53. Print.
- Gallis, Paul. "The NATO Summit at Bucharest, 2008." [Http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22847.pdf](http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22847.pdf). Congressional Rsch Svc, n.d. Web. 5 Aug. 2012.
- "NATO - North Atlantic Treaty Organization." *NATO*. N.p., n.d. Web. 05 Aug. 2012. <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_50090.htm>.
- Panfilov, Oleg. "Russia's Turkmen Headache." *Nezavisimaya Gazeta* [Moscow] 28 May 2003: 2. Print.
- Plater-Zyberk, Henry. "Ambassador Rogozin on NATO, Peace and the World." *Defence Academy of the United Kingdom* (2011): n. pag. Print.
- "Rodina Political Ad in Moscow." *Rodina Political Ad in Moscow*. Rodina, 12 Nov. 2005. Web. 05 Aug. 2012. <<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=3099518788417181683>>.
- Rogozin, Dmitriĭ. *Baron Zholtok: Istoriia Odnoi Rossii*. Moskva: Veche, 2011. Print.
- Rogozin, Dmitriĭ. *ĖAstreby Mira: Dnevnik Russkogo Posla*. Moskva: Al'pina Non-fikshn, 2010. Print.
- Rogozin, Dmitriĭ. *NATO Tochka Ru*. Moskva: ĖKSMO, 2009. Print.
- Rogozin, Dmitriĭ. *Rossiiā Mezhdū Mirom I Voĭnoĭ*. Moskva: Kongress Russkikh Obshchin, 1998. Print.
- Rogozin, Dmitriĭ. *Vrag Naroda*. Moskva: Algoritm, 2006. Print.
- Rogozin, Dmitry. "The Americans Are Behaving Insolently." *Vremya Novostey* [Moscow] 21 Mar. 2003: 3. Print.
- Rogozin. "Web Page-Rogozin." [Http://oborona.gov.ru/](http://oborona.gov.ru/). Russian Government, n.d. Web. 04 Aug. 2012. <<http://oborona.gov.ru/>>.
- "Russia May Set Up Defense Research Agency." *RIA Novosti*. N.p., 15 Feb. 2012. Web. 4 Aug. 2012. <http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20120215/171333183.html>.

-
- "Russian Parliament Official Says Estonian NATO Bid to Ruin Relations." *Radio BNS*. Baltic News Agency, Tallinn, Estonia, 16 Feb. 2001. Radio. Transcript.
- "Senior MP Says Georgian President Should Identify Allies." *NTV Mir*. NTV. Moscow, Russia, 28 Feb. 2002. Television. Transcript.
- "Senior Russian MP Accuses PACE of Supporting 'extremists' in Chechnya." *RIA Novosti* [Moscow] 23 Jan. 2002: n. pag. Print.
- Smith, Julianne. "The NATO-Russia Relationship." *Center for Strategic and International Studies* (2008): n. pag. Print.
- Titkov, A. S. *Party Number Four: Rodina, Whence and Why?* Moscow: Panorama Centre, 2006. Print.
- Wilson, Andrew. *Virtual Politics: Faking Democracy in the Post-Soviet World*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2005. Print.
- A Yugoslav Army Spokesman Refuted on*. Belgrade Tanjug. Belgrade, Serbia, 17 Nov. 2000. Radio. Transcript.