Adult Development Theory and Political Analysis: An Integral Account of Social and Political Change in Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia

Elke Fein[1]

Abstract: I propose a reading of social, political and discursive change in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia which is inspired by an integral, above all developmental perspective. In view of explaining Russia's current political trajectory, I make several arguments. First, I claim that Russian politics are still to a large extent determined by the effects of a threefold crisis of sense-making. Neither the collapse of the Soviet empire, nor the question of how to define democratic government nor the lack of a resilient national identity have so far been resolved and re-appropriated in a transformative manner. Second, I try to show how this affects various aspects and dimensions of Russian politics. Third, I engage in a brief overview of a number of adult development models, asking to what extent and how the characteristics of consciousness development, particular stage characteristics, and the general logics and dynamics of successful and unsuccessful development these models describe can be helpful to the analysis of Russian politics. Also, I discuss their compatibility and parallels with discourse theory and analysis as an increasingly popular methodology in Russian Studies. Of the developmental models reviewed, the theory of political development by Stephen Chilton and the self-protective action logic in Susanne Cook-Greuter's model of self and identity development are particularly relevant for my purpose. On these grounds, it is argued that since Vladimir Putin's taking office as Russian president and later prime-minister, politics and (official) political discourse have increasingly come to follow self-protective action logics as conceived by Susanne Cook-Greuter. This diagnosis, which could either be understood as a regression or as a realignment of internal and external dimensions of political development, can be explained as a reaction to Russia's crisis of identity followed by a loss of internal stability and international influence connected to the dislocations mentioned above.

Keywords: Adult development theory, complexity, development, discourse analysis, discourse theory, dislocation, identity, levels of consciousness, Russia, self-protective stage, social science.

Introduction: Whither Russia?

Social scientists dealing with the process of regime transformation in post-Soviet Russia are increasingly struck by what in many respects looks like a move "backwards," towards illiberalism and authoritarianism. Almost ten years after Vladimir Putin's advent to power as Russian president and now prime minister, however strong and stable the regime might appear,

[1] Dr. Elke Fein is a social and political scientist at the Universities of Freiburg (Germany) and Basel (Switzerland) where she teaches Eastern European History, political science and academic writing. She is co-founder and managing director of the Institute for Integral Studies (IFIS, www.ifis-freiburg.de) in Freiburg. Contact: fein@uni-freiburg.de.

liberal democracy seems to be more unlikely than ever before in the whole period of post-Soviet transformation. Even though democracy, modernization, and the rule of law have constantly been part of the official political language in Russia during the past two decades, all of these terms currently have to be interpreted through specific discursive frames such as the discourses of Eurasianism or of "sovereign democracy," claiming that Russia was a civilization of its own and either must not copy western ideas, standards, and institutions or could not afford this kind of "luxury." Even though some observers still hope that president Medvedev could eventually "emancipate" the country from the most illiberal aspects of Putin's heritage, it remains unclear for the time being in which direction Russia's transformation is heading. So how can this political and cultural trajectory be explained? And how could we (that is both academic observers and political actors inside and outside Russia) possibly come up with constructive strategies to deal with these developments on a political level?

The following reflections are based on my almost 15 years of personal and academic preoccupation with political and cultural developments in Russia, during which I took a special interest in Russia's way of relating to its Soviet past after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Born and socialized in Germany, my main focus of interest has always been the connection between Russia's political development and her ways of dealing with the country's non-democratic and totalitarian experiences of the 20th century. Having gained increasing familiarity with integral, and, in particular, developmental approaches during the past years, it seems a fascinating and challenging endeavour to combine the two research trajectories, which the following contribution attempts to do.

In this article, I claim that Russian politics are still to a significant extent determined by the after-effects of the largely non-digested, multi-dimensional crisis of sense-making (dislocation) connected to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, influencing many aspects of socioeconomic, political, and cultural life, and discussed in the first part of the article. Since the impacts of emotionally "undigested" experiences of dislocation[2] tend to manifest themselves in largely unreflected, subconscious mechanisms (Mitscherlich, 1967; Schwan, 1997), a significant section of my article is devoted to reviewing theories of consciousness as a device for inquiring into the realm of these invisible, yet powerful spheres, in order to make visible at least some of their workings and logics. On these grounds, I would like to propose a theory about where Russian politics and society are in this regard and why. On the basis of structural models of adult development (such as those of Piaget, Neo-Piagetian approaches to the development of political culture, and in particular Susanne Cook-Greuter's model of self-development), supporting meta-perspectives on social and cultural change, I would like to propose a more integral way of explaining social and political change in post-Soviet Russia.

Besides, I argue that developmental theories show multiple parallels to and compatibilities with well-established social science theories and methods, namely discourse theory and analysis, while at the same time transcending the overall outlook of the latter, discussed in the second part of the article. Affording interesting new perspectives on current developments in contemporary Russia, they could therefore enrich sociological and discourse analytical accounts of the deeper, structural levels and mechanisms of cultural and discursive change.

---

[2] A term coined by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe in their discourse theory (see below), meaning crisis of sense-making on a larger, collective (cultural) level.

Thus, my overall aim in this article is twofold: first, to summarize and review basic concepts and assumptions of some developmental approaches in order to discuss their value for political analysis of societies in transition in general and their parallels with and analytical "surplus value" for discourse theory and analysis, especially in the tradition of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, in particular. Second, I propose an integrally informed account of political and cultural change in post-Soviet Russia on the basis of an adult developmental theory perspective, covered in the third part of the article.

Dislocation and Politics in Transitional Russia

At the beginning of post-Soviet Russian history was a fundamental, at least threefold dislocation (crisis of sense-making), the scope and implications of which probably still have not been fully grasped or integrated by a significant number of either the leading political actors or the majority of the Russian population.

The dislocation of the Bolshevik Soviet state ideology (1), a long and subtle process which began in the early 1960s, subsequently lead to a steady erosion of power of the Soviet model of leadership and rule (2) during the 1970s and 80s and culminated in the collapse of the Soviet Union (3) in result of Gorbachev's politics of Perestroika. A glance at post-Soviet Russia's social and political trajectory during the past two decades shows that none of these three dimensions of what was probably the most important dislocation of the second half of the 20th century has so far been fully re-appropriated politically, culturally, and emotionally.

During the 1990s, the most decisive experience for the majority of the population was that of chaos and lack of leadership in the realm of political organization, and of social and economic degradation, in result of which ideas like democracy, freedom, and market economy were strongly delegitimized. This made it easier for political actors to declare these ideas to be western inventions, foreign and hostile to Russia.

Now, during the past ten years, the country has rather experienced what looks like a move back towards Soviet habits and patterns of political thought and action in many regards. While ideology, for example, has indeed been officially banned from state politics by Russia's 1993 constitution, the government under Putin has made increasing efforts to regain control over public and cultural realms through control of the media, campaigns against critical literature, and attempts to regain hegemony over the construction of historical truth (Mommsen & Nußberger, 2007). This includes a revaluation of Stalinism and mourning the end of the Soviet Union. In this context, it is not surprising that a balanced, unemotional national debate about how to evaluate and which lessons to learn from the Soviet experience has so far been difficult. At heart, only with regard to the collapse of the Union has the political class begun to engage in an open, nationwide debate about which consequences should be drawn from it. This debate, however, is mostly characterized by geopolitical logics of strategic influence and interest rather than by engaging in a more thorough and outright inventory of the situation. On these grounds, it seems that official political Russia is making only the very first steps of a long and probably difficult process of re-appropriating the dislocative experience connected to the end of the Soviet era.

Dislocations as Chances for Political Transformation, Development and Cultural Growth

By re-appropriation, I mean the socio-political and psychologico-cultural process of de-identifying with a *subjective* or *intersubjective* experience through gradually turning it into an *object* of perception and reflection. Developmental researchers in the tradition of Robert Kegan (1982/1991) have described this psychological process as taking a critical distance towards what was taken for granted before, so that it gradually becomes visible as a separate object which the (collective) subject can relate to, reflect about or learn from. Growth, according to Kegan, always includes a process of de-identification, differentiation, and of unhinging out of a former embeddedness, which he calls decentering (losing an old centre of the self) – and of a subsequent recentering around a new system of (inter-) subjective balance. According to Kegan, "development is defined by creating objects (a process of differentiation) and relating to them (a process of integration)," so that on each new level, the projected ambivalence diminishes and we concede to the world a bit more identity of its own. With each new level, the individual thus perceives the world a little more as an entity that is different from and independent of him or her self (Kegan, 1982/1991, pp. 55, 95, 112, 140).

For our topic here, this means that only if such a critical, objectifying distance has been established, can experiences be reflexively re-appropriated, their invisible power be dissolved, and they themselves eventually be integrated on a higher level of learning, development, and being. If, in contrast, a distance of de-identification, differentiation, and objectivation is not taken, the experience in question is likely to continue to exercise power over the (inter-) subjective perception of self and identity; in other words, the memory and the logics of reasoning and interpretation connected to it continue to determine thinking and action as the only available construction of the real (see Wilber, 2006). It is therefore plausible that the deeper a traumatic or the more radical a dislocative experience, the more time, psychic energy, and strength it takes to go through the process of transformation, de-identification, and critical re-appropriation.[3] Transformation is thus conceived here as a substantive *vertical* development in the sense of a qualitative learning and growth process, making critical and constructive use of experiences by transcending and including them into broader, more complex, more differentiated and thus more adequate new solutions, worldviews, orders of reasoning and conceptions of one's own self as opposed to mere (*horizontal*) "change."[4] Understood in this way, the empirically observed solutions/worldviews/orders of reasoning and self-conceptions can be analyzed qualitatively, focusing on their degree of complexity, and on evidence of their re-appropriating and integrating past experiences. This analysis can make use of the categories provided by adult development theories as proposed in the next part of this paper.

---

[3] See Schwan (1997) and Markus Wehner (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung's former correspondent in Moscow) who wrote that Russia was "a country without memory. To confront the past could reduce the certitude to be on the right track. German Vergangenheitsbewaeltigung appears as a masochistic act, foreign to the Russians. Their past is too cruel and too close" (Markus Wehner: Hauptsache frei. Russland feiert, egal was, warum und wie, aber am liebsten im Mai, in: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 4.5.2002).

[4] See Kegan 1982/1991, pp. 118 and 121. This is in line with Stephen Chilton's discussion of the term development (Chilton 1988a), see below.

Political Culture

Developmental complexity, however, is not merely a relevant category for analyzing public discourse[5] and culture but can also be applied to other factors of political analysis like economic and institutional change or the behaviour of political elites. While an integral approach is bound to take into account all of these dimensions at an equal rate, analyzing political culture appears to be a particularly pertinent strategy in contexts of instability and transition. Since culture is where peoples' understanding of their behaviour becomes visible, the cultural system in some sense "mediates the micro-macro relationship" of individual systems of belief and action on the one hand, and the social system on the other. Because changes in the cultural system (as part of the internal realm in Wilber's terms) are for the most part closely related with factors from the external realm, the study of political change, according to Chilton, must start with the cultural system (Chilton, 1988b, pp. 141ff.,154).

Political Culture as Mediator of Micro and Macro: An Example from Russia

As an example illustrating both the complexity of public reasoning and its interdependence with political, cultural, and institutional change (in other words, interior and exterior structural variables and conditions of political development) let me briefly refer to a previous study on Russia's dealing with its Soviet past (Fein, 2007). Through a discourse analysis (in the tradition of Foucault and Laclau/Mouffe) of the so-called CPSU-trial between Yeltsin and the former communist party at Russia's Constitutional Court in 1992, I could demonstrate that the discursive struggle for hegemony about the Soviet past had important consequences not only for the re-definition of Russia's discursive regime on a more general level, but also for the development of attitudes, political behaviour, and for the working of political institutions in the following years. In a nutshell, my analysis brought forward two interesting and connected insights, first with regard to structural developmental complexity, and second, with regard to the relation between interior and exterior determinants of political development. As to the first aspect, it was most stunning that although Yeltsin's team had all the archival evidence to prove that the CPSU systematically violated both the constitution and its own law, the discourse voiced by the communist camp still "won the game" – and that this was due less to legal and judicial arguments, but more to a discourse based on a specific type of moral and even emotional reasoning. Their arguments involved putting goals above means, ideological conformism above individual freedom and legal responsibility, faith in communist dogma above the requirement of critically questioning alleged "truths" in the face of a contradicting reality.[6] By sanctioning this

---

[5] The term "discourse" is understood here as a "differential ensemble of signifying sequences" giving meaning to our speech acts, thoughts and actions, while this meaning is constantly renegotiated (see Torfing, 1999, pp. 84-85). However, discourses try to stabilize meaning and signifying orders at least temporarily and thus, to establish an intersubjectively binding order of knowledge within a social whole (see Keller, 2004, p. 7).

[6] To name only some of their successful discursive strategies, the communists presented themselves as "victims of history" who were not to be blamed for the outcomes of communist rule because, firstly, the communist idea itself was humanistic ("we always wanted the best"), thus claiming that the violent excesses of Soviet history were only unintended side-effects. Goals, in other words, were placed above means. Secondly, they argued that the so-called "simple communists" could not be held responsible for the deeds of the Party leadership, since the former had nothing but a very general idea of what the latter

kind of reasoning as a legally valid option, the Court de facto rehabilitated – and thereby made hegemonic – the cognitive patterns, values, and attitudes of a rather egocentric, partly conformist, partly self-protective discourse.

The political aftermath of this ambivalent "founding myth" of post-Soviet Russia made clear that this had far-reaching impacts. Besides showing the difficulties that official Russia had to come to terms with, with regard to its Soviet past, this outcome also affected fundamental political issues, such as the dominant conception of democracy/political rule and national identity (see discussion below) and thus the overall direction of reform. For with a largely self-referential, self-protective discourse based on an attitude of victimization coming out as the de facto winner of the discursive struggle, more developed discursive positions were marginalized and lost legitimacy. On the level of political identity, this created a serious problem for the official "Democratic Russia," since even though its leadership still preached democratic change, it had lost an important source for legitimating this change. With the communist past and its vague, "user-defined" notions of justice and democracy rehabilitated, why should the country need any other kind of democratization at all? So, even without gaining complete political hegemony itself, the partly conformist, partly self-protective discourse voiced in the context of the trial in 1992, along with its system of metaphors, images, and cognitive frames, successfully prevented more self-reflexive, that is, more complex (more differentiated and integrative) and as such, more developed and more "mature" political and psychological logics, practices and positions (such as taking responsibility for one's history, coming to terms with past experiences and traumas and discussing possibilities of reconciliation and reparation) from defining the horizon of meaning. And of course, this immediately affected the functioning of politics on a larger scale.

The second aspect of my analysis therefore concerns the impacts of the discursive hegemony sanctioned by the Court on political correctness, political behaviour, and institutional logics until today. In sum, the "paralysis" of official political discourse on Soviet history between past and future ("like a lift stuck between two floors") increasingly came to paralyze political development altogether. Since there was no consensus among the leading actors and elites about the value of the democratic institutions introduced by Russia's first elected president, and thus, about the rules of the political game, formal institutions came to be devaluated in favour of unofficial and extra-constitutional practices of organization and policy making (Shevtsova, 1999, 2003).

This finding is in line with Chilton's (1988a, p. 110) account of political development, holding social development to be dependent on "a nation's widespread recognition of its own culture's ambiguities and contradictions," and cognitive development to "occur only when the reasoner finds and resolves ambiguities and contradictions within her own cognitive structure." In contrast, the majority of Russia's elite either did not perceive an ambiguity at all or lacked the inner strength and/or potential to overcome self-protective logics and frameworks of reasoning through more complex and integrative ones. From a developmental perspective, this evidence can be conceived either as a way of defending a particular system of meaning and action against a more complex reality (Kegan, 1982/1991, p. 225), or as a regression to a less complex and

---

was doing. Thirdly, the communists asked the Court to recognize the "positive sides of history," thereby demanding, again, to be freed from responsibility.

therefore less demanding level of political existence. This evaluation depends on how the situation in the Soviet Union is assessed. Anyway, the system that came out of the 1992 compromise can be described as a mixture of stage 2 and stage 3 arrangements as described in Chilton's work further below (Table 2), namely patron-client-relations, clientelism, barter, or "blat." Similar mechanisms have in fact been identified as widespread phenomena by political analysts of both Soviet and post-Soviet Russia (Pleines, 1998, 2005; Ledeneva, 1999, 2000; Lehmbruch, 2005; Schröder, 1998; Volkov 2005).

In a more general sense, my example therefore shows that institutions can function only according to the level of developmental complexity of cognitive structures and habits available to the subjects who sustain them. Even if there are proponents of more complex practices and rationalities within the respective society, yet outside of the institutions in question, the latter are likely to adopt their functioning to the dominant level of development. My study thus confirms Chilton's statement that "unless the institution's structure is preserved by people at the appropriate stage, the institution will regress to less developed forms" (Chilton 1988a, p. 88). The following section outlines several adult development theories that appear particularly valuable for analyzing political and cultural transition in general and for discourse analysis in particular.

Adult Development Theories for Discourse and Political Analysis

> *Nations, as well as individuals, can be categorized according to their level of existence.*
> *– Clare Graves, 1974*

Quite obviously, the assumption of levels of development has interesting consequences not only for psychological theorizing but also for cultural and political analysis and for policy making in general. With regard to my example above, even psychological lay people would probably agree that self-reflexive efforts to confront past crimes and traumas constitute a more complex, more differentiated and thus more developed way of dealing with a criminal and traumatizing past than trying to whitewash, repress, or relativize it, for example by setting it off against the "positive sides of history" or by denying or avoiding questions of responsibility. The theory of developmental complexity underlying this claim is inspired by decades of developmental psychological research and can draw on a wide range of well-established, field-tested empirical knowledge, both from developmental psychology of the individual, such as of Jean Piaget, Lawrence Kohlberg, Robert Kegan, Abraham Maslow, Jane Loevinger, Susanne Cook-Greuter, and from pioneers of developmental approaches to (political) culture such as Jean Gebser, Clare Graves, Jürgen Habermas, Shawn Rosenberg, Stephen Chilton and Dana Ward. Their findings are supported also by more traditional research of cultural change such as that of Ronald Inglehart (1977) or Paul H. Ray and Ruth Anderson (2000).

While most of the developmental researchers have focused on a specific aspect or dimension of development, such as cognition, morals, self-identity, values, and needs, due to different interests and assumptions concerning the importance and relationship between these dimensions, they seem to indicate more or less stable and inherently consistent structures of development.

Furthermore, at least Kohlberg's model has been tested in different cultures with empirical research supporting an intercultural validity of its levels or stages.[7]

Developmental Approaches and Analysis of Post-Soviet Russian Politics

Being unable to do justice to the variety of research that has already been done in the field, I shall limit myself in this article to a brief review of some of those approaches that appear most fundamental to my own research.

Piagetian developmental psychology of individual cognition

Most fundamental per se, and as a source for many of the more recent developmental approaches is Jean Piaget's model of the development of cognition which he called a "genetic epistemology" (Piaget, 1970). The model concerned "with both the formation and the meaning of knowledge" (Piaget, 1970, pp. 12-13) distinguishes four major levels (sensorimotor, pre-operational, concrete-operational and formal-operational), characterized by a successive decrease of egocentrism and, in turn, by a more developed capacity of abstraction and of integrating more perspectives into one's outlook on the world as development proceeds. Originally stemming from Piaget's observation of children's cognitive development, his findings have proved to be valid and applicable to adults as well. Empirical evidence shows again and again that the fourth stage, classically identified with the cognition of the "mature adult human being," is not reached by a significant number of average adults during their lifetime.

Piaget's genetic epistemology is a basic reference in the field, since the general structure and "quality of reasoning exist independently of the object of thought" (Rosenberg, 1988a, p. 89); in other words, because cognition is at the basis of all other dimensions of consciousness development and, in result, of that of more practically relevant interaction capacities such as moral thinking, self-identity, values and reasoning.

Perspectives on social and cultural development

Early concepts of cultural development using categories of hierarchical complexity (see Commons & Richards, 1984) include those of Jean Gebser, Clare Graves, and Jürgen Habermas. Jean Gebser in his master work *Ursprung und Gegenwart* (1949) has given a phenomenological account of "traces of unfolding consciousness in culture," identifying five subsequent structures of consciousness, each of which continues to operate in the context of the next higher one as development proceeds. Clare Graves (1970, 1974), inspired by his colleague Abraham Maslow at Union College in Schenectady (N.Y.), theorized that in interaction of internal neuronal systems with external conditions humans develop new bio-psycho-social coping systems to solve their changing existential problems. He believed these evolving coping systems ("levels of existence") and their underlying motivations to manifest as (mostly subconscious) value systems at the individual, societal, and species levels.[8]

---

[7] For a review of cross-cultural tests of Piagetian theories in general, see Dasen (1977). Also see: Edwards (1975), Kohlberg (1981), Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer (1984), Nisan & Kohlberg (1984), Weinreich (1977).

Jürgen Habermas (e.g., 1976, 1981, 1983) is famous for his reading of social and cultural history as a process of increasing emancipation from preconventional/archaic and conventional/traditional to more rational structures of thinking and acting in the course of social and cultural modernization and "enlightenment." Habermas draws, amongst others, on the developmental psychologies of Piaget and Kohlberg and on evolutionary accounts of social organisation and of the history of law. All of these sources can only be mentioned here without a more thorough discussion. An overview of their models and stages is given later in Table 4.

Neo-Piagetian approaches to reasoning, cognition, and political development

Despite his unquestioned merits, Piaget has also been criticized for underestimating the role of social environments in the individual's construction of meaning (Rosenberg 1988a, p. 89). As a consequence, Neo-Piagetian researchers such as Shawn W. Rosenberg, Dana Ward and Stephen Chilton have focused on both the social and political implications of Piaget's levels of cognition and on the role of what Robert Kegan (1982/1991) has called the "embedding cultures" of each level of development. Rosenberg is mainly cited for his model of reasoning structures, especially designed for analysing political reasoning. As such, the three stages identified by him when analyzing political discourse are of particular interest here.

Table 1. Rosenberg's Levels of Political Reasoning

Stage Name[a]	General Stage Description
Systematic	Context-aware, search for systematic relationships between phenomena; able to reflect subjective and objective conditions of phenomena and their relationships; high ability of abstract classification and theory-building
Linear	Causal thinking, search for unidirectional causal explanations; understanding is based on concrete experiences rather than on reflection; able to build abstract categories based on experiences, limited ability to make generalizations
Sequential	Concrete, proximate perception and understanding; absence of abstract thinking; able to perceive and describe sequences of events without grasping general patterns, causes or interrelations between them

Note: Compiled on the basis of Rosenberg (1988a).
[a] Listed from more complex to less complex stages.

The empirical case studies exploring ways of political reasoning as conducted by Rosenberg and others on the basis of this typology confirm the importance of structural differences in thinking and argumentation independently of a particular content (Rosenberg 1988a; Winterstein, 2005).[9]

---

[8] Practitioners drawing on Graves like Don Beck and Christopher Cowan hold Graves' cultural stage model to be applicable to conflict resolution in communities, cities, movements, ethnicities, entire countries, as well as defined populations and cultural regions. See: http://ja-jp.facebook.com/note.php?note_id=123355875206.
[9] For analyzing political reasoning, the integrative complexity model also has to be mentioned. Developed in the 1960s, it has been applied extensively in empirical studies on political psychology, focusing on the cognitive integration of competing perspectives. Influenced by Piaget, it is not grounded in a normative

Scott Karl Winterstein, a pupil of Rosenberg, has distinguished four structural levels of discourse in his dissertation (Winterstein, 2005) based on Rosenberg's and other typologies. His model is primarily oriented towards analyzing oral interpersonal face-to-face communications though (which he basically does through simulation experiments) and is therefore more difficult to use for political analysis.

One of the most elaborated Neo-Piagetian theories of political development was proposed by Stephen Chilton (Chilton 1988a, 1988b, 1991 and Rosenberg, Ward, & Chilton, 1988). Motivated by the experience of the USA's failure to "import" their model of democracy to Vietnam, Chilton engages in a thorough and systematic discussion of concepts and dynamics of political development including a criticism of those proposed by mainstream political science. He argues that the term "development" makes no sense without a normative notion of "higher" stages of development as psychologically being better integrated, philosophically more moral, and therefore also morally "better:" "To say that one form of society is better than another is to say that if its members recognize the difference, they will try to create the better and not the worse" (Chilton 1988a, p. 12, 14).

Chilton has come up with what he calls a "speculative classification of social forms" (Table 2) in which he associates ideal-typical social institutions with each stage of Kohlberg's moral and interpersonal development scale. He argues, first, that politics is always connected to moral reasoning and evaluation and that therefore "any theory of political development must contain a psychological theory of moral reasoning (Chilton 1988b, p. 159). Because according to Chilton, "the criteria for the goodness of a political culture are the same as those for the goodness of an individual's moral reasoning... we can fairly say that for a political culture to be more developed is in fact for it to be better" (Chilton 1988b, p. 157). Second, Chilton claims that the social institutions brought forward by each stage of development are content-independent universal structures, and that therefore "different cultures *can* develop along different developmental paths – of different *content*, that is, *but not of different structure*" (Chilton 1988a, p. 104; emphasis added). His classification, referred to earlier, will be helpful in the analysis of Russian politics.

Finally, Chilton's and his colleagues' considerations about the dynamics of and the relation between social and political development processes are of great interest to my own analysis. Chilton insists that "a society" must neither be regarded as an organism which develops as a whole nor its development be conceived simply "in proportion to the average level of its members' development" (Chilton 1988b, p. 128). Rather, he stresses the importance of subcultures as "cultural analogues of cognitive developmental decalages" and as a sign of ongoing transition (Chilton 1988a, p. 93). He therefore also focuses on the potential differences between the average level of development and the level from which a society is ruled. Based on an analysis of social interaction as the basis of both individual moral and of political culture development, he urges for a subtle consideration of the specifics of individual and cultural developmental dynamics.

---

model of development though and does not analyze the structure of reasoning or the character of the epistemological self. Rather, its adherents point out that although an important analytical category, high integrative complexity is neither "inherently desirable", nor is it "more moral, more perceptive, or more likely to lead to successful solutions" (Suedfeld, cited in Jordan, 2000, pp. 10-11). See also Suedfeld (1994), Suedfeld & Tetlock (1977, 1992), and Wallace, Suedfeld, & Thachuk (1993).

Table 2. Chilton's "Speculative Classification of Social Forms"

	Kohlberg's Descriptive Stage Title	Interpersonal Relations/ Forms of Influence	Associated Social Institutions
6	Universal ethical principles (second-order Golden Rule)	*Satyagraha; agape*; undistorted communicative action; mutual care	(none currently known)
5	Prior rights and social contract or utility	Mutual respect; rational debate, fair competition, and scientific testing	Democracies protecting civil rights and liberties; due process; capitalist market economies; "normal science"
4	Social system and conscience maintenance ("law and order")	Mutual support of moral system	Modern army; bureaucracy; fascism; tyranny of majority rule; absolutism
3	Mutual interpersonal expectations, relationships and conformity (the concrete Golden Rule)	Friendship; *compadrazgo*; romantic or courtly love	Medieval towns; social patronage or client system; late-medieval aristocracy; estates (*Staende*); dualistic *Staendestaat*; corporatism
2	Individual instrumental purpose and exchange ("what's in it for me?")	Barter and trading; deterrence by revenge; bribery; corve labor; prebend; curses; feudal fealty and vassalage	Early feudal system; exchange patronage systems; tax farming; hostages
1	Punishment and obedience ("Might makes right")	Domination; physical compulsion; threats; seizure by force; extortion	Pecking order; slavery; prison and other total institutions

Note: Reproduced from Chilton (1988a, pp. 43, 68), with permission of Stephen Chilton © 1988. Available at http://www.d.umn.edu/~schilton/Articles/DPD.html.

Even if cultures in some regards appear more flexible in their development due to the dynamics of their social and cultural composition and subcultural decalages,

> Stage skipping is not possible when a culture first develops to a specific stage. Just as each cognitive stage must build on the one before, each new level of culture must grow out of the one immediately previous. No matter what the cognitive levels of the individuals are in the society, they would appear to need time to work out the practical social problems of one level of development before proceeding to the next.

> One can imagine, however, that stage skipping would be possible in certain other circumstances. If a culture were conquered by a two-stage-lower culture and were shortly thereafter freed, the first culture would be able to spring back to its original stage. The longer the second culture's domination lasted, however, the less likely such a return would be: children would increasingly orient to the new culture and would be unsure how to relate in the old culture; and the changes accumulating with the new regime would make the exact restoration of the old regime ever less appropriate. (Chilton 1988a, p. 97)

The following considerations are immediately applicable to Russian and Soviet history. Even if, according to Chilton, societies, for example after a revolutionary or foreign take-over, they

…cannot go back(wards) and pretend that (previous upward; EF) changes have not taken place … political cultures can regress if the average adult moral reasoning stage declines, because then fewer higher-stage people are there to support the previous high levels and more lower-stage people fail to understand it. (Chilton 1988a, pp. 95, 97)

This relationship is further elaborated by Rosenberg who adds that

extreme inequalities of power have the same effect on adult's ability to role-play. That is, if socialized in the context of subordination, particularly when that subordination includes little peer interaction, adults will exhibit little ability to role-play, with all consequences, including unilateral respect for authority. Environmental opportunities for role-playing are very much dependent upon power relations. (…) The greater the disparities of power and the fewer the available roles in a society, the fewer the incentives and the more difficult it becomes to step outside one's own particular position. (Rosenberg, 1988a, p. 170)

At the same time, high levels of morality would be necessary to challenge authority.

Since the primary purpose of this article is to apply these and other selected insights of adult development theory to the analysis of Russian politics, a more detailed and systematic literature review regarding this issue has to be postponed for another article.

Kegan's Subject-Object Logics and the Epistemological Self

While some characteristics may differ between individual and collective/political development, the basic subject-object mechanism of differentiation (decentering) and integration (recentering on a higher level) as described by Kegan is the same in both cases.[10] As the previous section has already made clear, neo-Piagetian approaches for the most part do not limit themselves to cognition properly speaking, but build their theorizing on cross-relations between cognition and other dimensions of development, above all moral reasoning and the development of self and/or identity. The later is important to be included as a widespread element of post-Soviet political discourse in Russia.

While Piaget insisted that "there are not two processes of development, one cognitive and one affective; there are not two separate psychic functions, and not two forms of objects: all objects are cognitive and affective at the same time" (as quoted in Kegan 1982/1991, p. 120), Kegan remarks that Piaget did not fully measure up to this claim in his own work. Kegan has therefore put the main focus of his own research on the development of the ego or (epistemological) self as "that who speaks and/or acts," holding that "every step/every stage can be viewed as the result of a single, fundamental process of development" (Kegan, 1982/1991, p. 106). This has immediate relevance to our understanding of processes of dislocation and transition in the course of which not only complex reasoning but also self-images and identities are often severely shattered. A fine summary of Kegan's stage model is given by Jordan (2000).

---

[10] The most abstract model of development is the general stage model (Editor's note: General stage model was an earlier name; it is now titled the model of hierarchic complexity) by Michael L. Commons and Francis A. Richards (1984) which is also increasingly being applied to political analysis (Commons & Goodheart, 2007; Ross, 2007; Ross & Commons, 2008).

For our purpose, Kegan furthermore provides a powerful support of the interrelatedness of inner psychic and interpersonal reconstructions in that he stresses the crucial role of "embedding cultures" for development – and failing development. Similar to Chilton, he strongly pleads in favour of viewing personal psychological and socio-political development jointly. He calls separating them "a result of theories the basic concepts of which are too narrowly framed" (Kegan, 1982/1991, pp. 134, 283).

Susanne Cook-Greuter's action logics

Finally, my account of Russian politics draws heavily on Susanne Cook-Greuter's concept of action logics, an advancement and differentiation of Jane Loevinger's model of self development (Table 3). Cook-Greuter's central interest is in ego or self-development or in "how human beings respond to life" (Cook-Greuter, 1990, p. 79). Similar to Kegan, she views self-development as composed of several strongly interrelated components (operative/behavioural, affective, and cognitive): "Each stage emerges from a synthesis of doing, being, and thinking" (Cook-Greuter, 1990, pp. 80, 85). Similar to Kegan, Rosenberg, Chilton and Ward, she sees the human individual as an essentially social being dependent on a "human context," since both meaning-making and meaning-maintenance are possible only within a socio-cultural community (Cook-Greuter, 1990, p. 81).

As self and identity are largely communicated through language Cook-Greuter measures both of them by an elaborated sentence completion test (SCT) in which, as a matter of fact, the social context can sometimes induce individuals to respond lower than their usual level with regard to issues which put them into emotional stress or in order to avoid uncomfortable answers. This problem can be avoided by discourse analytical uses, that is, by applying Cook-Greuter's stage model and scaling method to text and interview material.

Table 3. Cook-Greuter's Action Logics

Stage #	Stage names	Description of stage characteristics
6	Unitary (Ironist)	Aware of ego formation, self as construct/in transformation; different paradigms compared; beginning ego transcendence; self in flux; transpersonal self
5/6	Construct-aware (Alchemist)	System of sub-personalities: coherent self-identity, permanent core elf across time
5	Autonomous (Strategist)	Different selves at different times, several sub-personalities, relativity of self-sense
4/5	Individualistic (Individualist)	Self as system of roles; clusters of traits with past and future; prototype personality
4	Conscientious (Achiever)	Clusters of attributes, simple traits; beginning introspection; separate personhood
3/4	Self-conscious (Expert/technician)	Several external features; simple roles; rudimentary internal states
3	Conformist/rule-oriented (Diplomat)	Single external feature; beginning comparisons

Stage #	Stage names	Description of stage characteristics
2/3	Self-protective (Opportunist)	Basis dichotomies; single, concrete feature; minimal self description*
2	Impulsive	Rudimentary self-labelling (physical), crude dichotomies
1	Symbiotic	Confused, confounded
0	Pre-social	Autistic, undifferentiated

Taken from: Cook-Greuter (1990, p. 104; 2007).
* The self-protective stage is described in more detail below.

Readers who are primarily interested in my reading of Russian politics can skip the following section and jump immediately to the third part of the article.

Parallels with Discourse Theory and Other Methodological Considerations

In his review of four developmental frameworks and their value for geopolitical analysis, Thomas Jordan has provided a comparative discussion of the main methodological approaches used in the field (Jordan, 2000, section 4). As geopolitical research follows similar trajectories to my own, I refer to Jordan's overview here. As the most important methodologies to inquire into structures of development in the social and political sciences, he specifies the following.

1. Interviews, either as rather open (but then highly skill-dependant) subject-object interviews (used by Kegan and associates) or as more standardized "Kohlberg-type interviews" where the participant is asked to reason about a particular moral dilemma; Jordan was also experimenting with subject-object interviews via e-mail.
2. Sentence completion tests (SCT, used by Loevinger, Cook-Greuter and others).
3. Simulations in real life contexts (used by Winterstein) or controlled experiments.
4. Text analysis, applicable to both published texts like newspaper articles, official statements, declarations etc. And to transcribed speech and interview material (used by Rosenberg, Chilton and the integrative complexity research).

In line with Jordan, I hold a mixed approach (both in theoretical and methodological regard) to be most adequate to analyzing Russian politics. While interviews and SCT, as compared to text analysis, are very sophisticated and focused instruments allowing rather deep insights into reasoning logics, due to the possibility of probing (SCTs are therefore often combined with interviews), they also have disadvantages. Just like simulations, both are by definition limited to populations agreeing either to respond to interview questions or to fill out the SCT form. Text analysis, in contrast, has the advantage of operating independently of the consent of the subjects of research, and thereby avoids selective results and situationally determined fake behaviour. Especially in simulations, participants sometimes also either have difficulties to play roles they are not identified with or tend to avoid uneasy issues. Another advantage of analyzing existing textual material is the possibility to include high-level decision makers who would otherwise not be available for clinical interviewing (Jordan, 2000). The last point seems particularly important in view of analyzing Russian politics.

Among the strategies of text analysis, discourse analysis has an explicit interest in identifying structures of reasoning. And among discourse theoretical perspectives, those inspired by Foucault's theory of power appear particularly adequate for social and political analysis because of their interest in the social implications of hegemonic constructions and definitions of truth. Therefore, I will now look at how discourse theory and analysis can profitably be connected with or adapted to theories of development.

In view of parallels between discourse and developmental theory, four aspects appear relevant: first, the open character of both discursive change and development; second the relation between structures and content of reasoning; third, the conception of multiple levels of development or discourses competing for hegemony within the same society; and fourth, the role of crisis of sense-making as central triggers of change.

The Open Character of Change and/or Development

What many of the developmental approaches in the tradition of Piaget have in common is their notion of human consciousness "as an open, constantly evolving system" of unfolding complexity, "a system which proceeds by quantum jumps from one (more or less; EF) steady state system to the next through a hierarchy of ordered systems." As articulated here by Clare Graves, "the psychology of the mature human being is an emergent, oscillating, spiralling process marked by progressive subordination of older, lower-order behaviour systems to newer, higher-order systems as man's existential problems change" (Graves, 1974, p. 72).

Here, we have a first parallel to discourse theory. Similar to adult development theorists who reject the idea of an end of development called the "mature human being," discourse theory as understood by post-structuralist and Foucauldian theorists like Laclau and Mouffe[11] also incorporates the idea of discourse as an "open, constantly evolving system." The posit that humans have an "*ever* emergent" personality able to go through potentially infinite processes of learning thus coincides with the discourse theoretical assumption that discourses are able to, and actually do, permanently adopt their capacities of problem solving and symbolic sense-making to the respective problems and challenges by gradually integrating new information and novel ideas.

A difference, however, is that developmentalists conceive of the levels they found in their empirical data as *vertical* stages of *growing complexity*, instead of as *horizontal* types of mere pluralist *difference*. Since on each new level, the individual is able to take a wider, more complex perspective than on the previous level (see my use of the term re-appropriation below), later cognitive/identity/values frames include earlier ones, whereas on earlier, less complex stages, the options of the more complex levels are not available. This also implies that while "at any given level, an individual exhibits the behaviour and values characteristic of people at that level, a person who is centralized at a lower level cannot even understand people who are at a higher level"

---

[11] For a more detailed introduction please confer Butler, Laclau, & Zizek (2000), Keller (2004), Kerchner & Schneider (2005), Laclau (1990, 1994, 2002), Laclau & Mouffe (2000), Torfing (1999).

(Chilton, 1988a, p. 82), whereas this is not true the other way round.[12] This, I claim, could be an interesting research trajectory to be included in the analysis of discursive power struggles.

The Relation between Structures and Content of Reasoning

While discourse theory in the tradition of Foucault, as a constructivist perspective, similar to developmental theories focuses on the theoretical conditions, social mechanisms, and structural characteristics of discursive struggles and change, it has so far not provided—and not tried to provide—a framework for describing or explaining the (potential) evolution of empirical discourses in a qualitative way; that is, of increasing or decreasing structural complexity. One reason for this may be that post-structuralist discourse theory as a product of postmodern, constructivist anti-essentialism (often implicitly) implies a certain relativism, and therefore tends to operate mainly on the *horizontal* level. This is true both for its interest in substantive and in structural phenomena. In other words, it observes empirical discourses, compares and analyzes their content and interior structures, as well as the strategies put forward by them in their struggle for hegemony over other discourses. As a formal, anti-essentialist theory however, discourse theory does not assume or look for qualitative hierarchies and distinguishing factors other than that of successfully or not successfully gaining discursive hegemony.[13]

At this point, adult development perspectives offer additional insights by distinguishing more or less complex forms and patterns of reasoning related to consciousness (cognitive, moral, identity, etc.) and cultural development. Their interest being in formal, structural characteristics (*how* does the person think or argue? *How* do they do what they do? *How* do they believe that which they do believe) rather than in substantive positions (which values does someone have, what does the person think/feel/need or do?), instruments for analyzing structural logics and dispositions focus on vertical and horizontal aspects at the same time.

For discourse analysis, this means that the same discursive position can be asserted by people at different levels of reasoning and argumentation – with very different results. It also means that you can talk about the same topic both from various (*horizontal*) discursive positions and from different (*vertical*) levels of perception, reasoning, and argumentation. For example, going to war can be justified by either pre-conventional reasoning (arguing that this might benefit one's own economic or security interests) or by post-conventional reasoning (arguing that one had to defend certain general principles such as protecting human rights). At the same time, the universal

---

[12] Chilton more specifically argues that because reasoners are "to some degree susceptible to guidance by +1 reasoners," it is adequate for political leaders to "reason up to two stages above many of their followers. They must reason no more than one stage above the attentive public" which, in turn, "must reason no more than one stage above the inattentive public, if its members wish to remain opinion leaders" (Chilton, 1988a, p. 82).

[13] The only exception I can see is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) with its pretension to be critical of power structures in an emancipatory sense. CDA claims that its own emancipatory perspective is a "better," "more truthful" or more adequate strategy to picture and eventually change social and political reality than that of the discourses it analyses. Similar hierarchical assumptions are sometimes inherent also in other discourse analytical research agendas, implicitly holding post-materialistic attitudes to be more "advanced" or desirable than materialistic ones, for example. In a developmental research design as proposed here, in contrast, these distinctions are explicitly spelled out and put into the centre of research.

principle of human rights can also be used as a post-conventional argument against going to war (since killing people is a clear violation of their rights).

Multiple Levels of Development or Discourses Competing within the Same Society

Similar to developmental perspectives where multiple levels of development are likely to be found *within* the same social or cultural realm (see Chilton below), in Laclau/Mouffe's conception of discourse, the social is a realm of undecidability, which is never fully closed. This is why discourses always compete for defining the "empty spaces of meaning" through "decidable hegemonic articulations" (Torfing, 1999, p. 103). So in both concepts, discursive (and other) forms of competition over meaning-making are perceived as being at the heart of most conflicts for political and discursive hegemony.[14]

Since "an individual, a company or a whole society can positively react only to those laws and ethical rules, steering principles, motivational impulses and educational schemes which are consistent with their actual level of existence" (Beck & Cowan, 1996/2007, p. 31), this also helps to explain why and how certain discourses become hegemonic in a given context by defining the "dominant horizon of social orientation and action" (Torfing, 1999, p. 101) while others, however rational, intelligent, reasonable, or progressive they might appear from the outside, fail in that particular social or cultural context.[15] One of the most interesting questions therefore is: How are consciousness development and discursive change motivated and triggered and how do they occur?

The Role of Crisis of Sense-Making as Trigger of Change

Further strong and important parallels and compatibilities between human development and discourse theories, especially in the tradition of Laclau and Mouffe, concern their analysis of successful, that is, transformative or integrative development and of regressions, even though discourse theory, for the most part, does not theorize this distinction. Developmental theorists—at least the normative approaches presented here—agree that every individual starts his or her developmental journey at "level one"[16] and can then either move on upwards step by step to more complex, more differentiated levels, or stay where they are. The unfolding of new stages in line with their respective frames and systems of meaning and reasoning normally happens as a slow and steady process of learning, due to changed impulses, experiences and context factors. In an ideal scenario, the capacities of cognition, perception, reasoning, and problem solving grow with the complexity of problems, challenges, and circumstances, provided appropriate embedding cultures are in place. Successful development can then be perceived as a dynamic, spiral-like broadening of horizons, encouraged by individual experiences and social impulses.

---

[14] In contrast, for example, to Huntington's thesis of whole cultures competing with one another, it stresses the coexistence of various levels of existence, thought and action within each culture.

[15] Considered that collectivities can change the dominant mode or level of their discourse quite easily if their social and cultural composition – or that of their leadership – changes, it becomes clear that discourses, even though they have a certain dynamic of their own, are not fully independent of the consciousness of their bearers.

[16] In Piaget's terms: sensorimotor, in Kegan: first order consciousness, with Cook-Greuter: pre-social/symbiotic etc.

As argued earlier by Chilton, the process of development is similar on the social and cultural levels, at least when cultures first acquire a particular level. In less ideal cases, however, things might as well go wrong, especially at the borderlines (turning points) to each next higher level. If, for some reason, aspects of the previous level are not fully integrated into the next more complex level, the person might develop pathologies at that particular turning point. Here again, theorists of political development have come up with similar scenarios on the collective, cultural level. If social development happens through internal or external crisis or shocks, instead of steady evolution, the society in question might not be able to integrate the extent of new complexity through regular differentiation. In this case, it is likely to follow the opposed scenario of decreasing complexity by stepping back to less complex, but in turn more familiar and thus psychologically more secure levels of subsistence in search for easy answers and emotional reassurance. Such regressions therefore often include the identification of scapegoats and the rejection of responsibility.

Similar to developmental psychology, Laclau and Mouffe (2000) hold crisis of sense-making (dislocations) to be the central triggers of social and discursive change, rendering necessary new (in developmental terms), more complex discourses in order to cognitively organize and symbolically frame the problems or events which the old dominant discourses were not able to integrate any more. An example would be the (partial) dislocation of the neo-liberal growth model in result of the oil crisis in the 1970s, followed by a more radical questioning of the limits of growth and a growing interest in ecological issues, or the discursive struggle leading to a delegitimization and eventual end to apartheid in South Africa. Laclau and Mouffe even consider dislocations to be inherent parts (or at least possibilities) of any discourse, since in an essentially contingent social realm, they argue, discursive identities are never fully closed (Laclau, 1990).

Thus, both cognitive frames and discourses are likely to change with the social circumstances, experiences, and challenges they are confronted with. However, compared to Laclau and Mouffe's rather formal theory of discursive change which does not systematically deal with the question of complexity, sophistication, and sustainability of discursive sense-making strategies, adult development theories put an additional focus on the *direction of change* on a vertical axis of complexity. This appears to be particularly relevant for analyzing the situation in contexts of transition like that in Russia. In sum, developmental psychology perspectives either go beyond or provide a theoretical grounding for what at least part of discourse analysis is already doing. They thus help to explain that the more complex the challenges, the more complex the cognitive frames, coping mechanisms, and sense-making-strategies have to be in order to internally cope with, to discursively frame and to externally solve the respective problems satisfactorily – and this means: sustainably.

If, in contrast, the (ideal) trajectory of differentiation and integration is not taken for some reason, both individuals and (their) discourses seek to solve their new problems either with the strategies currently available to them or by (often panic-stricken) resorting to previous, less complex and thus, less demanding strategies in order to avoid chaos, dis-integration, or loss of identity. My claim is that this is roughly what is happening in post-Soviet Russia.

Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia Viewed from an Integral, Developmental Perspective

From a perspective of adult development theory, politics and political discourse in Russia can be analyzed not only horizontally, that is, as different ideological positions competing for discursive and political hegemony, but also vertically, as different cognitive, self or value structures competing for cultural hegemony in a broader sense. In this respect, I agree with Jordan's strategy to assume various dimensions of consciousness as equally relevant basic units of analysis rather than limiting the analysis to one single model and/or method (Jordan, 2000, p. 29). In any of these dimensions and research trajectories, an integral analysis focussing on developmental dynamics would try to answer at least the following questions:

– Which developmental stage (of cognition, self, identity, reasoning or action) do particular utterances, arguments or practices operate on? Which of the typical structural logics and patterns frame discursive utterances and political positions?
– On which level of developmental complexity is the dominant mode of discourse and political action located? And what level is the respective collective ruled on?
– What do the interaction processes between discourses look like?
– What use is made of dislocations? Are they consciously used for upward developments or do they rather result in downward regressions? Do discourses rather tend to gain or to lose developmental complexity?

The following section is guided by these questions, making reference to the categories offered by the approaches introduced in the second part of this article. On this basis, I will discuss to what extent the three non-digested aspects of dislocation mentioned above (collapse of the Soviet state, ideology, and system of political power) are still influential with regard to the three central corresponding issues on the social and political agenda of post-Soviet Russia: international status, national identity, and political power/democratic rule. In any of these issues, the transformation of politics and political discourse can be conceived as a function of how and to what extent the experiences of Soviet times have been re-appropriated: in other words, integrated into individual and cultural sense-making. And in any of them, such re-appropriation has so far been very limited. Rather, I claim that self-protective logics of reasoning and action have come to function as a strategy to avoid a more differentiated confrontation with the after-effects of these dislocations and with the Soviet past in general, at least during the past ten years.

In view of explaining political development and change in post-Soviet Russia, a preliminary account of developmental dynamics in the Soviet Union is indispensable. Together with the character and consequences of post-Soviet transition, it can help to explain why Russian politics "took refuge" in a self-protective logic of sense-making. Making solid claims about empirical cognitive, cultural, self/identity and value structures and their dynamics in Soviet and post-Soviet politics and society would require a larger research project[17] which is why the following considerations should be regarded primarily as intuitive, integrally informed "educated guesses."

---

[17] Even though the levels identified by adult development research across cultures and time can be considered as solid and reliable analytical categories, their unfailing identification in a concrete data set requires a high amount of schooling and experience. For a critical discussion of models, metrics and measurement in developmental psychology research see Stein and Heikkinen (2009).

A Developmental Reading of Social and Cultural Dynamics in Soviet and Post-Soviet History and Society

The Soviet regime, even though it made appeal to modern, universalist values such as social and political justice, equality, and solidarity, and drew its legitimacy to a large extent from these values—which is why, by the way, it was admired as a moral ideal by an impressive number of western intellectuals—was organized quite hierarchically. Ideally speaking, it was an absolutistic regime ruled by truth and dogma (See Table 2). While striving to overcome traditional Russia's Orthodox culture, it replaced it with a new tradition, communist orthodoxy. So even though the Bolshevik leaders were promoting universalist values and huge modernization projects, the brutality with which they cracked down on opponents to their new and often-changing orthodoxy clearly indicates that they were not operating on the basis of world-centric values themselves (see Table 4), but as an ideological dictatorship, or, in the case of Stalinism, simply a dictatorship of pure personal power. In the categories of Chilton, it would thus have to be located roughly between levels 2 and 4.

In fact, the question if or to what extent the Soviet regime can be explained as a specific example of modernity and/or modernization has been an object of ongoing debate among scholars of Soviet history.[18] On the one hand, the "modernist group" (Stephen Kotkin and others) holds that the Bolshevik project was a typical outcome of modernist thought and the Soviet experience thus an alternative, independent type of modernity.[19] On the other hand, the "neo-traditionalist group" around Sheila Fitzpatrick

> does not deny that the Soviet Union in its way was modern, but [rather stresses] the "archa-izing" phenomena that were also a part of Stalinism: petitioning, patron-client networks, the ubiquity of other kinds of personal ties like *blat*, ascribed status categories, "court" politics in the Kremlin, the mystification of power and its projection through display, and so on. (Fox, 2006, pp. 535-536)

Similarly, Jörg Baberowski in his brilliant inaugural lecture explains the origins and character of violence in Stalinism by the Georgian clan culture which, as it were, was the embedding culture within which Stalin was socialized, and which in the Gebser/Graves/Habermas-scale (see Table 4, on p. 114 as Appendix) would comply with the archaic or magic levels.

So in this regard, the Bolshevik modernization project, even though it did change in character during the second half of Soviet history, clearly remained a selective one in that it did not allow for "enlightened criticism" and basic freedoms in the realm of political culture and consciousness. Stefan Plaggenborg (2006) in his recent study on Soviet modernity has traced back this important choice in early Bolshevik history to the controversy between Lenin and

---

[18] See, for example Fox (2006), Hoffmann and Kotsonis (2000) and the conference "Geheimnis und Gewalt. Zur Ambivalenz der stalinistischen Moderne" in Freiburg (FRIAS), 30./31.1.2009.

[19] According to Fox (2006, p. 36), Shmuel N. Eisenstadt's concept of multiple modernities "has not yet been explicitly ebraced by proponents of Russian/Soviet modernity" though.

Bogdanov.[20] He sees this conflict as an indicator of the "status of modernity of Lenin's thinking, mental habitus," and his categories of argumentation, even though he does not explicitly use categories of hierarchical complexity to support this (Plaggenborg, 2006, pp. 49-51). In result of Lenin's radical position gaining hegemony, the Soviet leadership fought any thinking that was more complex or more critical than what their own orthodoxy allowed, just as it fought the traditional Orthodox culture itself, instead of overcoming traditional value structures through integrating them into more differentiated ones.

Later, when the CPSU's monopoly of truth began to gradually lose its legitimacy in the 1970s and 80s, this was due, on the one hand, to the regime's inability to meet its own claims vis-à-vis its population. Instead of social and political justice, the country had experienced extended periods of arbitrary terror and repressions, instead of equality and solidarity, a deep social cleavage between the political elite and ordinary citizens, and relative backwardness in many fields instead of the promised high standard of living. At the same time, the cultural and political models of modern western civilizations which then had already begun to transcend modernity with post-modern values and cultural practices (Inglehart, 1977, 2003; Ray & Anderson, 2000) were increasingly perceived as economically and politically superior and therefore as attractive alternatives. Yet, from a developmental perspective, the crucial problem is that modern (i.e., individualistic, rational, multiplistic) and postmodern (i.e., reflexive, relativistic, pluralist, and post-materialistic) value structures cannot be adopted like an ideology, but have to develop in a process of transcending and integrating all previous, less complex levels of thinking, existence, and motivation. As integral perspectives stress, "in order for higher levels of civilization to be maintained, the enduring contributions of the earlier stages must be in place and functioning" (McIntosh, 2007, p. 47).[21] In Russia, however, with traditional Orthodox culture largely destroyed and communist orthodoxy experienced as a forced, illegitimate, and (at least in some respects) less complex substitute, there was hardly any basis left from which a more integrative and thus more sustainable modern value-structure could emerge on a broader social basis. If to infer from the scarce data on Soviet consciousness, culture, and society, the average attitude towards politics in the Soviet Union was most probably either conformist or self-protective (in Cook-Greuter's terms), and thus below a "conscientious" traditionalism, whereas Cook-Greuter's "individualistic," "autonomous," or higher levels of development were presumably very rare in the average population. This, in any case, might be one reason why liberal reformers had a difficult time after 1991.

For the first few years of the Yeltsin era, there was indeed a certain consensus with regard to "modern" or even postmodern values like peaceful conflict resolution, banning state ideologies, and promoting individual rights and freedoms, which is why there was hope that Russia might take the path of liberal and democratic transformation. However, these values did not seem to be

---

[20] Aleksandr Bogdanov was a thoughtful and, in today's terms post-modern or even integral philosopher interested in the conditions and dynamics of human knowledge and awareness. He rejected the possibility of objective and timeless truth and pleaded in favour of transcending the dualism of spirit and matter through what he called an "empiriomonizm", i.e., socially organized complexes of experience. See Plaggenborg (2006, chapter 2) and Plaggenborg and Soboleva (2008).

[21] Also: "Countries, governments, and cultures must move through each of the stages of development sequentially. Each stage must be achieved, and failure to recognize this may be a major contributing factor to the rise of terrorism and crime in a society" (Commons & Goodheart, 2007, p. 91).

rooted firmly enough to prevent strong contrarious, lower level mental habits and continuities from regaining power over the formal liberal and democratic institutions introduced by the first Russian president (see my example presented in the first part of this article). Without a sufficiently broad basis of higher level, for example conscientious or individualist consciousness supporting them, it is no surprise that at least part of Russia's social and political institutions were eventually re-adapted to the (less complex) centre of gravity of public consciousness and political discourse. Concerning present-day Russia, social scientists and politicians therefore almost in unison speak of a return to previous modes and habits of rule (Mommsen, 2006; Shevtsova, 2003), even though many of them continue to have difficulties categorizing them conceptually.[22]

If we take the late Soviet Union to have been a weak stage 4 absolutistic regime (with all the limits of this diagnosis, due to pressure from above, eroding legitimacy etc.), a developmental perspective would probably find elements of regression in post-Soviet politics. An alternative interpretation would be to assume simply a realignment of consciousness, habitual political practices and institutions on the next lower, more familiar and thus more secure level. What makes such an analysis tricky however, is that important elements of modernity and post-modernity are indeed part of everyday life in today's Russia have even been radicalized (for example in the form of the Manchester capitalism of the 1990s or the cosmopolitan lifestyles of large parts of Russia's upper class). In this respect, I would claim that a developmental perspective could highlight that notwithstanding both persistent efforts to modernize the country in order to prepare it for the challenges of a globalized world and a social elite that has caught up with and even overtaken the average western citizen in a material sense, modern and postmodern values and logics have neither become the dominant structures of public reasoning nor of political action on a larger scale. Sustainable post-conventional action logics, for example, would also include post-materialist and other post-conventional values, such as critical self-reflection, putting higher weight on good relationships and inner growth as compared to material goods, increasing feelings of empathy, tolerance, and respect for other cultures, social and political minorities and even the rights and dignity of political opponents (see Table 4). The basically materialistic, hedonistic lifestyle of a privileged elite lacking a visible notion of civic virtues, common welfare, and social and political justice can at best be classified as a rather selective and superficial, and therefore non-sustainable, "unhealthy" modernism, if not simply egocentric opportunism. Moreover, their dealing of rights and liberties against stability and prosperity may rather be explained by self-protective logics which seem to be the driving mechanism behind many social and political dynamics in Putinist (and Medvedevian) Russia.[23] Before illustrating this in more detail, let us take a closer look at Cook-Greuter's stage description.

The Self-Protective Action Logic by Cook-Greuter

Susanne Cook-Greuter (2007, pp. 9-11) describes the self-protective stage as follows.

---

[22] Margarethe Wiest reviews the debate about if Russia should be called an authoritarian regime, see: http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2006-09-08-wiest-de.html.

[23] This is not to say that more complex action logics are completely absent. In contrast, Russia's old human rights movement, for example, as well as its constantly being ignored by the government, shows an important subcultural decalage.

Self-protective people see the world only from the perspective of their own needs and wants. They are as yet incapable of insight into themselves or others in a psychological sense. This is why they are generally wary of others' intentions and assume the worst. Everything to them is a war of wills, and life a zero-sum game. Their 'I win, you lose' mentality inevitably causes friction and hurt feelings wherever they go, especially with others at more conventional stages. In turn, others experience self-protective people often as manipulative and exploitative, because in their perspective, the only way one can get what one wants is by controlling others and protecting oneself.

Self-protective adults are careful to maintain their essentially fragile selves which are not yet 'separate adult selves,' but synonymous with one's will, ideas, wishes. Therefore, this stage also has only a rudimentary notion of others as separate people or of conscious social interaction. 'If I understand what others are after, I can better manipulate them to get what I want,' so they think. Conversely, they assume that if others knew what you wanted, they would have power over you. Consequently, they need to resist the will of others, to test their limits and to assert their own control. Moreover, self-respect is experienced in relation to the amount of control one can achieve in opposition to others. The self may be felt as having two sides, an inner real self, and an outer self or 'a false face' in order to protect oneself.

Self-protective individuals often think they are the odd person out. They feel isolated, but do not know how to relate to others differently. 'It's always me against the rest.' This creates a self-perpetuating dynamic of very low trust and hyper-vigilance. This is why persons at this level often '*get into trouble.*' Trouble happens inadvertently when you cross a boundary. Self-protective folks try to look out for trouble and then to avoid its consequences. Rather, when they lose a test of will, or overstep a boundary, they see the cause as outside themselves, getting frustrated and tending to show free-flowing anger and hostility. Others are to blame, never oneself.

Self-protective people do not understand subtle human interactions that are not based on power. Their relationships with others are volatile. Friendships blow up easily. Feelings are externalized and projected outward. We see little expression or reflection on their own emotions both because of a lack of insight as well as for self-protection. Showing weakness of any kind is dangerous. "The more others know about me, the more they can take advantage of me." Their own anger towards the world is projected outward, and others are experienced as angry all the time. For self-protective persons, the world therefore is a hostile, dangerous place where cleverness and grabbing opportunities are necessary for survival. Hence, self-protective people also have an expedient morality. Rules are recognized, but only followed for immediate advantage or to avoid punishment. Actions are only bad, if one is caught and punished. When caught, they are shameless and show little remorse. They do not feel responsible for failure or trouble they cause because they do not yet understand the connection between action and consequences, that is, linear causality. Blaming others for one's shortcomings is a way to protect oneself. Self-protective people are also called opportunistic because of their self-serving attitude as well

as for their nose for opportunities and their energy to go after what they want without reflection or delay. (Cook-Greuter, 2007, pp. 9-11) [24]

The political impacts and functioning of this action logic shall now be illustrated with respect to the three fields of dislocation mentioned above.

The Foreign Politics of Strength and International Status

While the Yeltsin era had been largely characterized by a lack—or loss—of cultural identity, due to the numerous forced political and symbolic compromises with the old elites mentioned earlier and to unconvincing attempts to restore the country's internal stability and position in world politics, international status has been a major field of activity—and of success—of President Putin as compared to his predecessor. With the loss of the Soviet empire continuing to be a deep wound within post-Soviet political consciousness, the re-strengthening of Russia's status as a great power and global player has been one of the most important foundations of Putin's popularity in the Russian public.[25] It is perceived as giving Russians back the national pride and respect they deserve and had been lacking so bitterly throughout the 1990s. This restoration of Russia's power and status was based, first, on the country's largely successful economic development during the past years, and second, on a foreign policy discourse increasingly returning to a power-based geo- and "realpolitik," that is, a thinking in spheres of geopolitical, economic, and cultural influence, necessarily competing with the spheres of influence of others.[26]

While the European Union's agreements with former Soviet republics, for example, are perceived as attempts to enlarge Europe's influence, and therefore constructed as a threat to Russia's position and interests, Russia's foreign policy actively tries to maintain and enlarge its own sphere of influence, particularly in the former republics of the Soviet Union. This so-called "near abroad" is considered as a zone of "privileged interest" where Russia claims a legitimate right to exercise power and control.[27] While those of the neighbouring former Soviet republics which have meanwhile become members of the European Union therefore view Russian foreign politics with great suspicion, urging for more "proportional answers" by the EU,[28] some of those who have simply become independent states have even come to experience hot conflicts with the "New Russia" due to this self-image.

---

[24] Quotes drawn and compiled from Cook-Greuter (2007, pp. 9-11).

[25] See for example the survey data published regularly in the online-digest „Russland-Analysen" by the Forschungsstelle Osteuropa (Bremen; URL: http://www.forschungsstelle.uni-bremen.de). It remains to be seen to what extent the government's poor performance during the current financial crisis downgrades this rating.

[26] Swedish foreign minister Carl Bildt recently called this „old concepts of power, domination and spheres of influence", with power and influence conceived as the power to impose one's will and/or ideas onto others. „Wir brauchen eine Ost-Partnerschaft", interview with Carl Bildt in: F.A.Z., 1.9.2008. Even more concisely, Condoleezza Rice speaks of a „19th century Russia" exercising pressure onto free nations. „Transatlantische Einigkeit gegenüber Russland", in: F.A.Z., 24.9.2008.

[27] See Ruprecht Polenz: Von Russland annektiert, F.A.Z., 2.10.2008.

28 See „Sikorski droht Russland. Für ‚proportionale Antwort' auf nächste Grenzverletzung", F.A.Z., 21.11.2008.

Viewed from a developmental perspective, Russia's foreign politics under Putin and Medvedev, as compared to Soviet foreign politics, have changed mainly in that they are not ideological any more, for example in their definition of enemies and adversaries. However, the question arises, in which direction their logic of political action has moved on a vertical scale.

Martin Müller has recently published a discourse analytical account of Russian foreign policy discourse as observed at MGIMO, Moscow's elite State Institute of International Relations. Using Laclau/Mouffe's methodology, Müller finds that to be a "respected and influential, independent actor in world politics (with) a prospering economy, and (playing) a leading role in the post-Soviet states" is the main driving force of Russia's geopolitical identity – or quest for identity. For he argues that the quest for national grandeur is caused by a "constitutive lack (or blockage) of identity" caused by fear of a potential weak Russia (Müller, 2009, p. 218).

Since in this attempt to strengthen Russia's own position of power and control[29] dramatic gestures, alleged threats, conspiracy theories, images of the enemy, and even the use of illegitimate violence continue to be important means, as if in compensation for the geopolitical power lost with the Soviet empire, I argue that the logic behind this reasoning and behaviour is a self-protective, compensatory one.

This also becomes visible in a certain tendency to make others responsible for problems and conflicts while escaping debates about Russia's own shortcomings and mistakes (for example in the Georgian conflict or, until most recently, with regard to Katyn). So indeed, Russia's foreign politics seems to perceive and construct the world solely through the lens of Russian needs and wishes[30] instead of taking more complex perspectives, accepting own weaknesses or showing empathy. Moreover, a less self-defensive attitude towards the countries of Russia's "near abroad" would imply a more self-critical attitude, the preparation to admit past mistakes and trespasses and to eventually come to terms with them, in other words to critically re-appropriate and emotionally integrate the collapse of the Soviet Union and its imperial relation towards neighbouring states. According to Cook-Greuter however, due to hurt feelings of security or to unconfronted angst and trauma, the self-protective identity is usually too weak to allow a similar, more differentiated behaviour. Consequently, these issues would necessarily have to be addressed in order to allow for upward development.

Domestic Politics and Political Rule

In domestic politics, President Yeltsin's rule was equally characterized by a rather weak performance. His inability to implement a large part of his own reform agenda was due both to multiple arrangements with the opposition and to his personal instability and increasing alcoholism. In this respect, Putin also set powerful contrary landmarks, beginning with his image of a strong, healthy, and sexy sportsman. During his years in office as president and now prime minister, a largely power-based logic of behaviour and political interaction has equally been

---

[29] See Michael Ludwig: „Ablehnung einkalkuliert. Das Konzept einer ‚neuen Sicherheitsarchitektur' des russischen Präsidenten", in: F.A.Z., 6.11.2008 and: „Moskau will sich nicht ‚umzingeln' lassen", in: F.A.Z., 7.11.2008.

[30] See for example Reinhard Veser: „Positiver Geist bei Georgien-Gesprächen", F.A.Z., 19.12.2008.

implemented vis-à-vis internal critics and competitors who tend to be perceived as inherently hostile and to be made responsible for all kinds of problems. Since 2000, the domestic regime has increasingly taken the shape of an authoritarian and personalized rule of power again. Born of self-protective opportunism, it consequently regards liberal and democratic rights and practices—the meaning of which it does not seem to understand—as unnecessary and even dangerous to its own survival. Within a self-protective world perception, and reasoning, the gradual cutting back or even complete abolishment of many of the (allowedly badly functioning) liberal institutions introduced under Yeltsin, in order to stabilize the (Putinist) state and the power of its leaders, for example by restricting public criticism of the government or by curtailing the chances for political opposition, appears as a logical strategy.

To what extent was the Soviet experience re-appropriated in this field? While Yeltsin's efforts to build up a democratic Russia were driven, at least in the beginning, by his explicit wish to overcome and transcend Soviet political legacies of centralist power by more sophisticated, more liberal, and more complex modes of rule (the success of which truly is another story) the current connotations of the term "democracy" (such as "sovereign democracy" and "vertical of power") rather point in the opposite direction on the developmental scale (Mommsen, 2006; Schulze, 2007). Putin himself has not only started his first presidential term with calling the collapse of the Soviet Union "the greatest tragedy of the 20th century."[31] He has also repeatedly voiced that extensive liberal rights were a luxury Russia could not afford.[32]

In fact, threats to social and political stability indeed constitute a social bugaboo after the experience of the chronic instability of the Yeltsin era. This is a reason why Putin's strategy of stabilizing the status quo is not only supported by a majority of the population and elites (see Rjabov, 2004), but also thought necessary by some external observers. To them, the fact that there is a more or less stable political order apparently is more important than the fact that this order is not based on a social consensus about how to define democratic government.

However, dealing rights and freedoms against (the promise of) stability and prosperity is a clear indicator of either self-protective or conformist logics dominating political and social dynamics. So, here again, what we observe (subject to more thorough study) seems to be either inertia or regression, to some extent reiterating Soviet logics and legacies (bread and stability versus politically "good conduct"), rather than a vertical transformation based on a critical re-appropriation of past habits of political rule and social interaction.

National Identity and Self-Image

Finally, the quest for national identity touches the heart of the problem of dislocation and national trauma. Since in former times, Russian identity had either been closely linked with the Soviet project or, before that, based on Orthodox culture plus Russia's status of an imperial power, the end of the Soviet Union has often been made responsible for Russia's complete loss of identity (de Keghel, 2006). Despite multiple efforts undertaken by the government, no clear positive vision of a new national identity emerged during most of the Yeltsin era. The (however

---

[31] See, for example, http://www.owep.de/2006_1_wehner.php.

[32] For example reported in: Robert G. Darst, Jane I. Dawson: Global denken, lokal endlagern? Russland und das Problem des Atommülls, in: Osteuropa 4 (2006):221-234, here: 231.

selective) reconstruction of certain elements of pre-Soviet history (eventually compatible with a more modern path of development) can also be regarded as an indication of Russia's search for "good traditions" which could compensate for the loss of a "mature" traditional consciousness (McIntosh, 2007) and allow for constructing positive continuities.

In the field of symbolic politics, Putin, in turn, has tried to establish a "Soviet-post-Soviet mixed identity," combining, for example, the tsarist flag with the music of the Soviet national anthem which was given a new, more neutral patriotic wording (de Keghel, 2006, 2008). The eclectic mixture of Soviet, pre-, and post-Soviet symbols is apparently welcomed by a majority of the population, but persistently rejected by the tiny group of liberal democrats and former dissidents who are being increasingly marginalized by the regime. Anyhow, Putin's Soviet-post-Soviet mixed identity is itself rather a self-protective than an integrative, transformative project, since it is not based on an open confrontation with Soviet history and some form of public political coming to terms with the past. On the contrary, Putin's eclecticist identity politics apparently serve as a strategy to protect the collective self from the challenge of losing face in a more thorough, more differentiated and thus more demanding process of a self-critical national re-appropriation of the past. It is therefore not surprising that national identity has been an ongoing, ever-present issue of debate since the collapse of the Soviet Union. With Soviet ideology dislocated but many of the cognitive and political logics of Soviet times "alive and kicking" (above all conformism and self-protection), how could a new, post-Soviet identity possibly develop, and what could it look like?

In the last resort, no substantial new identity (going beyond the rather airy images of power and national strength) is likely to emerge unless a number of uncomfortable questions and memories are addressed, and re-appropriated by society as a whole in a transformative way: that is, through facing the multi-dimensional political, structural, cultural, and emotional legacies of Soviet rule. This probably would have to include first and foremost questions of guilt and responsibility towards Russia's own citizens and neighbouring states (see Schwan, 1997), as well as of (at least symbolic) compensation of the traumas suffered by millions of Russian and other victims of the Soviet regime. Given the huge dimension of this task,[33] the present tendencies to dissociate and repress "that which prevents the closure of one's identity" (in Laclau & Mouffe's terms) through what could be called a regression of the average mode of discourse to a strikingly low level is well understandable. However, as we saw earlier, "societies cannot go back and pretend that changes have not taken place" (Chilton 1988a, p. 95). Breaking out of the self-chosen prison of regression would therefore require an integrative transformation, transcending the currently dominant self-protective, self-defensive logics by wider horizons and deeper (self-) understanding – and, to achieve this, more political courage and the right kind of support.

According to Cook-Greuter, the appropriate way to support self-protective individuals would be to give them respect and, at the same time, to set clear boundaries (including immediate sanctions for trespassing). This would encourage them to let go of their fear for their self-identity and to move forward to observe general rules – the main challenge of the next higher stage in her model. For those concerned, this would mean to connect their self-image and identity no longer

---

[33] Remember Markus Wehner's comment, the Soviet past was „too horrible and too close" to be dealt with in the „German way" (footnote 2).

to winning power games and playing ego theatre, but to being a "good member of…" the international community, for example. Moreover, applied uses of adult development theory not only provide strategies to encourage and assist upward development. Adult development theory might also allow insights into why western politics continue to have difficulties with implementing a similar strategy towards Russia. To discuss these political implications in more depth, however, goes beyond both the pretensions and the limits of this article.[34]

Conclusion and Future Prospects:
An Integral Theory about Where Russia Is, and Why

In this article, I have discussed current cultural and political developments in post-Soviet Russia from an angle of several adult developmental theory perspectives. Starting with the observation that even though democratic institutions are in place, they seem to function according to non-democratic logics, I have made several arguments. I claim that Russian politics are still to a large extent determined by the effects of a crisis of sense-making connected to the collapse of the Soviet empire, the question of how to define democratic government, and the lack of a resilient national identity. Neither of these dislocations has so far been resolved and re-appropriated in a transformative manner. To substantiate this argument, I have presented categories and analytical frameworks from various models of adult development, describing general characteristics of consciousness development, particular stage characteristics, and general dynamics and logics of successful and unsuccessful cultural and political development. Of these sources, the developmental logic as described by Stephen Chilton and the self-protective action logic conceived by Susanne Cook-Greuter are particularly relevant to the analysis of Russian politics. I have then also raised some methodological questions which a more systematic empirical study would have to consider. I discussed possible connections of developmental approaches with discourse theory and analysis, a research perspective which is increasingly used in Russian studies. In the last section, I have given a brief account of developmental dynamics in the Soviet Union, followed by a more detailed outline of how self-protective logics are at work and functioning in various areas of Russian politics.

In a nutshell, I suggest that the "regression" of the dominant action logic of Russian politics to a self-protective level is, on the one hand, a reaction to Russia's failure to reach and materialize a mature and "healthy" traditionalism (Chilton's stage 4) in the Soviet Union (which wanted to achieve socialist modernity not by transcending but by destroying pre-Soviet traditions). On the other hand, self-protection is also a strategy of the current regime to avoid critical self-reflection, putting into question dear habits and privileges, and taking over responsibility for past mistakes and crimes committed in the name of the Soviet regime. Unfortunately, this also means avoiding a more thorough, that is, more than just technological, and a more integrative cultural and political transformation. Now, if this diagnosis ultimately is to be explained as a regression or as a realignment of politics and the underlying patterns of consciousness development depends on how we assess the situation in the Soviet Union. If we regard the latter as a ("reduced") stage 4 culture, it would be a regression, if we regard it as a stage 2/3 culture with a stage 4 façade, we would have a mere realignment of inner and outer phenomena.

---

[34] For more ideas on this, see Commons & Goodheart (2007), Ross & Commons (2008), and Müller (2009).

While the regime currently in place seems to enjoy the support of large sections of the population, preferring stability and prosperity to liberty and democracy, the question still arises what all those interested in Russia eventually moving upward on the scale of development could do to encourage and support this. Besides accepting where Russia stands in a developmental perspective and why, the most promising strategy for external partners would be to give Russia much honest respect where it deserves it, and to clearly point out limits of tolerance where it threatens to trespass them. The fact that most western actors, for the time being, fall short of consequently implementing this simple strategy probably has to do with their own developmental trajectories.

References

Beck, D.E. & Cowan, C.C. (1996). Spiral dynamics: mastering values, leadership, and change. Blackwell. German Version: Spiral Dynamics. Leadership, Werte und Wandel. Eine Landkarte für Business und Gesellschaft im 20. Jahrhundert. Bielefeld: Kamphausen 2007.

Butler, J., Laclau, E., & Zizek, S. (2000). *Contingency, hegemony, universality*. Contemporary dialogues on the left. London: Verso.

Chilton, S. (1988a). Defining political development. Boulder & London: Lynne Rienner Publishers. Available at http://www.d.umn.edu/~schilton/Articles/DPD.html

Chilton, S. (1988b). A Piagetian Developmental Theory of Political Institutions. In Rosenberg, S.W., Ward, D., & Chilton, S. Political reasoning and cognition. A Piagetian view, (pp. 127-160). Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Chilton, S. (1991). Grounding political development. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Commons, M. L. & Goodheart, E. A. (2007). Consider stages of development in preventing terrorism: does government building fail and terrorism result when developmental stages of governance are skipped? In: Journal of Adult Development, 14(3-4), 91-111.

Commons, M.L. & Richards, F.A., (Eds.). (1984). Beyond formal operations: late adolescent and adult cognitive development. New York: Praeger.

Cook-Greuter, S. (2007). Ego development: Nine levels of increasing embrace, update. Available at http://www.cook-greuter.com/.

Cook-Greuter, S. (1990). Maps for living: Ego-development stages from symbiosis to conscious universal embeddedness. In: M.L. Commons, C. Armon, L. Kohlberg, F.A. Richards, T.A. Grotzer, & J.D. Sinnott, (Eds.), Adult development, 2, Models and methods in the study of adolescent and adult thought (79-104). New York: Praeger.

Dasen, P. (1977). Piagetian psychology: Cross-cultural contributions. New York: Halstead Press.

De Keghel, I. (2008). Die Staatssymbolik des neuen Russland. Traditionen - Integrationsstrategien – Identitätsdiskurse. Hamburg/Münster: LIT.

De Keghel, I. (2006). Die Rekonstruktion der vorsowjetischen Geschichte. Identitätskurse im neuen Russland. Hamburg/Münster: LIT.

Edwards, C. (1975). Societal Complexity and Moral Development: A Kenyan study. Ethos, 3, 451-486.

Fein, E. (2007). Rußlands langsamer Abschied von der Vergangenheit. Der KPdSU-Prozeß vor dem Russischen Verfassungsgericht (1992) als geschichtspolitische Weichenstellung: Ein diskursanalytischer Beitrag zur politischen Soziologie der Transformation. Würzburg: Ergon.

Fox, M.D. (2006). Multiple modernities vs. neo-traditionalism: On recent debates in Russian and Soviet history. Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas, 54.

Gebser, J. (1949/1986). The ever-present origin. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press.

Graves, C.W. (1974). Human nature prepares for a momentous leap. The Futurist, April, 72-87.

Graves, C.W. (1970). Levels of existence: An open system theory of values. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, November.

Habermas, J. (1976). Zur Rekonstruktion des Historischen Materialismus, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Habermas, J. (1983). Moralbewußtsein und kommunikatives Handeln, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Habermas, J. (1981). Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns, Band 1 and 2, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Hoffmann, D.L. & Kotsonis, Y., (Eds.). (2000). Russian modernity: Politics, knowledge, practices. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Inglehart, R. (1977). *The silent revolution*: Changing values and political styles among western publics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Inglehart, R., (Ed.). (2003). *Human values and social change*: Findings from the values surveys. Leiden: Brill.

Jordan, T. (2000). Structures of geopolitical reasoning. Outline of a constructive-developmental approach. Occasional Papers 1998:9. Kulturgeografiska Institutionen, Handelshögskolan, Göteborgs Universitet. Available at: http://www.perspectus.se/tjordan/

Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Harvard University Press. – German Version: Die Entwicklungsstufen des Selbst. Fortschritte und Krisen im menschlichen Leben. Eichstätt: Brönner & Daentler (1991).

Keller, R. (2004). Diskursforschung. Eine Einführung für SozialwissenschaftlerInnen. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Kerchner, B. & Schneider, S., (Eds.). (2005). Foucault: Diskursanalyse der Politik. Eine Einführung. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). Essays on moral development, *1*: The philosophy of moral development. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kohlberg, L., Levine, C. & Hewer, A. (1984). The current form of the theory. In Kohlberg, L.: Essays on Moral Development, II: The psychology of moral development. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Laclau, E. (2002). *Emanzipation und Differenz*. Wien: Turia + Kant.

Laclau, E. (1994). *The making of political identities*. London: Verso.

Laclau, E. (1990). *New reflections on the revolution of our time*. London: Verso.

Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (2000). *Hegemonie und radikale Demokratie. Z*ur Dekonstruktion des Marxismus. Wien: Passagen.

Ledeneva, A.V., (Ed.). (2000). *Economic crime in Russia*. The Hague (u.a.): Kluwer Law International.

Ledeneva, A.V. (1999). *Russia's economy of favours*: Blat, networking and informal exchange. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Lehmbruch, B. (2005). Staat, Markt und Schwarzmarkt. Überlebensstrategien rußländischer Behörden. In: Schattenspiele. Informelle Politik im Osten Europas, Osteuropa, 55, 109-120.

McIntosh, S. (2007). *Integral consciousness and the future of evolution. H*ow the integral worldview is transforming politics, culture, and spirituality. St. Paul, Minnesota: Paragon House.

Mitscherlich, A. (1967). *Die Unfähigkeit zu trauern*: Grundlagen kollektiven Verhaltens. München: Piper

Mommsen, M. (2006). Surkows „Souveräne Demokratie"– Formel für einen russischen Sonderweg?, Rußland-Analyse Nr. 114 (20.10.2006), Bremen: Forschungsstelle Osteuropa.

Mommsen, M. & Nußberger, A. (2007). Das System Putin: gelenkte Demokratie und politische Justiz in Russland. München: Beck.

Müller, M. (2009). Making treat power identities in Russia. An ethnographic discourse analysis of education at a Russian elite university. Münster: LIT-Verlag.

Nisan, M., & Kohlberg, L. (1984). Cultural universality of moral judgement stages: A longitudinal study in Turkey. In Kohlberg, Essays on Moral Development (pp. 582-593). San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Piaget, J. (1970). Genetic epistemology. New York: W.W. Norton.

Plaggenborg, S. (2006). *Experiment Moderne* – der sowjetische Weg. Frankfurt/Main, New York: Campus.

Plaggenborg, S. & Soboleva, M., (Eds.). (2008). *Alexander Boddanov. Theoretiker für das 20. Jahrhundert*. München: Verlag Otto Sagner.

Pleines, H. (2005). Informelle Einflussnahme und Demokratie. Wirtschaftsakteure in Russland und der Ukraine. In: Schattenspiele. Informelle Politik im Osten Europas, Osteuropa, 55, 99-108.

Pleines, H. (1998). *Korruption und Kriminalität im russischen Bankensektor*. Köln: Bundesinstitut für Ostwissenschaftliche und Internationale Studien.

Ray, P. & Anderson, S. R. (2000). The cultural creatives: How 50 million people are changing the world. New York: Harmony Books.

Rjabov, A.W. (2004). Russland am Scheideweg zwischen Stabilität und Modernisierung. In G. Gorzka & Schulze, P.W., (Eds.), Wohin steuert Russland unter Putin? Der autoritäre Weg in die Demokratie (pp.17-31). Frankfurt/New York: Campus.

Rosenberg, S. (1988a). Types of Thought and Forms of Political Reasoning: A Neo-Piagetian Analysis. In Rosenberg, S.W., Ward, D., & Chilton, S. Political reasoning and cognition. A Piagetian view. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Rosenberg, S., Ward, D., & Chilton, S. (1988). Political Reasoning and Cognition. A Piagetian View. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Ross, S.N. (2007). The case for developmental methodologies in democratization. Journal of Adult Development, 14, 80-90.

Ross, S.N. & Commons, M.L. (2008). Applying hierarchical complexity to political development. World Futures: The Journal of General Evolution, 64(5-7), 480-497.

Schröder, H.-H. (1998). *Jelzin und die „Oligarchen"*: über die Rolle von Kapitalgruppen in der russischen Politik (1993 - Juli 1998). Köln: Bundesinstitut für Ostwissenschaftliche und Internationale Studien.

Schulze, P.W. (2007). Souveräne Demokratie: Kampfbegriff oder Hilfskonstruktion für einen eigenständigen Entwicklungsweg? Die ideologische Offensive des Vladislav Surkov. In: Buhbe, M./Gorzka, G., (Eds.). Russland heute. Rezentralisierung des Staates unter Putin, Wiesbaden: VS, 293-311.

Schwan, G. (1997). Politik und Schuld: Die zerstörerische Macht des Schweigens. Frankfurt: Fischer.

Schewzowa, L. (2001). Das neue Rußland. Von Jelzin zu Putin. In Höhmann, H.H./Schröder, H.H., (Eds.), Rußland unter neuer Führung. Politik, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft am Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts, Münster: Agenda-Verlag, 33-43.

Shevtsova, L. (2003). Putin's Russia. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Shevtsova, L. (1999). Yeltsin's Russia. Myths and Reality. Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Suedfeld, P. (1994). President Clinton's policy dilemmas: A cognitive analysis. Political Psychology, 15(2), 337-349.

Suedfeld, P. &Tetlock, P. E. (1992). Psychological advice about political decision making: Heuristics, biases, and cognitive defects. In P. Suedfeld & P. Tetlock, (Eds.), Psychology and Social Policy, (pp. 51-70). New York: Hemisphere Publishing.

Suedfeld, P. & Tetlock, P. E. (1977). Integrative complexity of communications in international crises. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 21, 169-184.

Stein, Z. & Heikkinen, K. (2009). Models, Metrics, and Measurement in Developmental Psychology. Integral Review, 5(1).

Torfing, J. (1999). New theories of discourse. Laclau, Mouffe and Žižek. Oxford: Blackwell.

Volkov, V. (2005). Jenseits der Gerichte. Warum die Gesetze nicht so funktionieren, wie sie sollen. In: Schattenspiele. Informelle Politik im Osten Europas, Osteuropa, 55, 75-84.

Wallace, M. D., Suedfeld, P., & Thachuk, K. L. (1993). Political rhetoric of leaders under stress in the Gulf crisis. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 37(1), 94-107.

Weinreich, H. (1977). Some consequences of replicating Kohlberg's original moral development study on a British sample. Journal of Moral Education, 7, 32-39.

Wilber, K. (2006). *Integral spirituality - A startling new role for religion in the modern and postmodern world.* Integral Books.

Winterstein, S.K. (2005). Cognition and communication: A theory of discourse structures. Dissertation. University of California, Irvine.

Table 4: Stages of cultural and value development and some of their basic political implications*

Jean Gebser (1949)	Jürgen Habermas (1976)	Thinking & existence	Clare Graves (1974) Values	Motivation	Primary focus & scope of dominant perspective	Primary logics governing foreign politics	Notions of (national) identity	Notions of democracy
integral	global world citizen, existential	systemic, cognitive	accepting existence	existential self-worth	**cosmocentric**, knowledge, inclusion, being, growth & creativity	encouraging growth and development of cultures and individuals on any level	element of self-knowledge	becomes increasingly secondary; new (more smooth and substantial) modes of rule & organization
		relativistic personalistic	Community	love affiliation	pluralistic, personalistic, post-materialistic, **universalistic**, harmony with all humans	fostering human rights and peaceful conflict resolution globally	loses importance and national basis	becomes more substantial: means to establish/guarantee justice and equality
mental	modern, rational, reflexive	multiplistic materialistic	scientism materialism	independence adequacy competence	materialistic, scientific, rational, **world-centric** (understanding systemic mechanisms)	fostering liberal values in politics and economy wherever possible	trans-national cooperation, community of values, constitutional patriotism	formal: rule of law and of (the majority of) the people
mythic	conventional, traditional, imperialistic developed high cultures	saintly absolutistic sociocentric	sacrifice salvation	order meaning security	conventional, **sociocentric**, absolutistic	often imperialistic (based on culture or ideology)	holy community of origin/language/ culture etc., lead by wise leader(s)	dictatorship/rule of truth and dogma
magic	early conventions, early state, archaic high cultures	egocentric magic-animistic	exploitation power	(psychological) survival	**ethnocentric**, interest-based	sometimes imperialistic (based on culture)	clan-based	what family or clan hold it to be
archaic	pre-conventional morals	autistic	safety	assurance	**Egocentric**	power-based, geopolitical spheres of influence	national interest ~ soil & power	unnecessary, dictatorship of strong & powerful leader

Note: The stages of the three theorists on the left of the table are not interchangeable! Alignments are due to graphic imperfection!

* The categories in the four columns on the right are my own interpretation of some political implications of the most central levels of development.