

References:

1. Politolohichniy slovnyk: Navch. posib. dlia stud. vyshch. navch.zakl. / Za red.. M.F. Holovatoho, ta O.V. Antoniuka. K.: MAUP, 2005. 792 s.
2. Zakon Ukrainy «Pro osnovy natsionalnoi bezpeky Ukrainy» Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy. № 39. 26.09.2003.
3. Stratehiia natsionalnoi bezpeky Ukrainy. Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy vid 26 travnia 2015 roku № 287/2015.
4. Ekolohichna entsyklopediia: U 3-kh t. / Redkolehiia: A.V. Tolstoukhov (holovnyi redaktor) ta in. K.: TOV «Tsentr ekolohichnoi osvity ta informatsii», 2006. T.1. 432 s.
5. Khylyko M.I. Ekolohizatsiia polityky. K.: VADEKS, 2014. 344 s.
6. Iatsenko L.D. Ekolohichniy skladnyk natsionalnoi bezpeky: osnovni pokaznyky ta sposoby yikh dosiahnennia: analit. dop. K.: NISD, 2014. 52 s.
7. Zakon Ukrainy «Pro Osnovni zasady (stratehiu) derzhavnoi ekolohichnoi polityky Ukrainy na period do 2030 r. № 2697-VIII vid 28.02.2019 r. Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady. 2019 № 16 st. 70.
8. Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy «Pro tsili staloho rozvytku na period do 2030 roku» № 722/2019 vid 30.09.2019 / zakon.rada.gov.ua.

DOI 10.31558/2617-0248.2021.6.12

УДК 323.173:32.01

DEFINITION OF ETHNOPOLITICAL SEPARATISM AS A SOCIAL PHENOMENON

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7739-7232>

Khevturiani Amiran, Doctor of International Relations, Professor at Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Currently, the entire world community is entering a new era, which is characterized by the emergence of numerous and widespread phenomena and challenges of world civilization, such as international terrorism, progressive nationalism, religious intolerance, as well as increasingly persistent political separatism. The disintegration of a number of political states in Asia, Africa and Europe, the destructive potential of disintegration of peoples that have existed for a long time within the framework of a single statehood, give grounds to believe that political separatism goes beyond the framework of not only national, but also regional security, acquiring an increasingly international aspect. These separatist movements use not only peaceful demonstrations in their arsenal, but violent forms such as uprisings also carry terrorist threats.

Extremist acts in this context represent a form of realizing a separatist goal, acquiring more and more new forms and methods. Certain political, nationalist, religious organizations of a separatist orientation use violent methods.

The current political situation shows that separatism becomes a tool and means of struggle for subjects of political activity in the process of achieving their goals. At the same time, it turned out to be profitable for political organizations, movements and individual politicians to use extremism.

Numerous cases of world disorder, irresponsible attitude to manifestations of political – national separatism led to the fact that at present separatism has acquired a large-scale and all-encompassing character, and political conflicts are extremely violent, acting as extremism and terrorism. It is argued a necessary prerequisite for the stability of a polyethnic state is a more or less homogeneous cultural space, a common political culture, a single ideological dominant. Achieving just such a state will, apparently, be the most effective means of preventing separatism in multinational states.

Keywords: Separatism; secession; irredentism; regionalism; nationalism; federalism.

Хевтуріані А. Визначення етнополітичного сепаратизму як суспільного явища

В даний час все світове співтовариство вступає в нову еру, що характеризується появою численних викликів світовій цивілізації, таких як міжнародний тероризм, прогресуючий націоналізм, релігійна нетерпимість, а також все більш стійкий політичний сепаратизм. Дезінтеграційні процеси в низці політичних держав Азії, Африки та Європи, руйнівний потенціал відокремлення народів, що існували протягом тривалого часу в рамках єдиних держав, дають підстави вважати, що політичний сепаратизм виходить за рамки не лише національної, але й регіональної безпеки, набуваючи все більше міжнародного аспекту. Сепаратистські рухи використовують не тільки мирні демонстрації, але й насильницькі форми, такі як повстання та терористична загроза.

Екстремістські дії в цьому контексті являють собою форму реалізації сепаратистської мети, що набуває все нових і нових проявів і методів. Певні політичні, націоналістичні, релігійні організації сепаратистського спрямування використовують насильницькі методи.

Сучасна політична ситуація показує, що сепаратизм стає інструментом і засобом боротьби суб'єктів політичної діяльності в процесі досягнення своїх цілей. Водночас політичним організаціям, рухам та окремим політикам виявляється вигідним використовувати сепаратистський екстремізм.

Численні випадки порушення усталеного світового ладу, безвідповідальне ставлення до проявів політико-національного сепаратизму призвели до того, що в даний час сепаратизм набув масштабного і всеохоплюючого характеру, а політичні конфлікти є надзвичайно жорстокими, часто виступаючи у вигляді екстремізму та тероризму. Аргументовано, що необхідною передумовою стабільності поліетнічної держави є певною мірою однорідний культурний простір, спільна політична культура, єдина ідеологічна домінанта. Є очевидним, що досягнення такого стану стане найефективнішим засобом запобігання сепаратизму у багатонаціональних державах.

Ключові слова: сепаратизм, сецесія, іредентизм, регіоналізм, націоналізм, федералізм.

As for the definition of separatism itself as a phenomenon, a social process, there is no complete unity on this issue among researchers. Under the concept of "separatism" different researchers mean different phenomena. However, it should be noted that different researchers often mean different phenomena under the concept of "separatism". The question in this case is: should the terms "separatism" and "secession" be attributed to movements that set their main (and often the only) goal of leaving the ethno-federal system and creating their own national state formation, or can the scope of their application be expanded at the expense of those movements that claim to expand territorial autonomy, obtain a special status within a single state, strengthening your control over the occupied territory? According to a number of Western researchers and researchers, the term "separatism" can be interpreted quite broadly and can include those ethnic movements that put forward demands for wider regional autonomy within a single state. [1; 2, p. 27-43] According to this point of view, the separatists who demand complete separation and the creation of their own national state are simply in worse conditions in their ethno-federal system compared to other separatist groups in other states.

In addition to the above, there is a significant problem in defining the main approaches to explain the rise of separatism in the XX century. Most of the explanations for this phenomenon are somehow connected with nationalism. First, it is a question of whether each ethnic group should have its own state. In the case of a positive answer to this question, in such situations the rise of nationalism and national self-awareness will inevitably cause separatist sentiments if this group is part of the ethno-federal system. J. Kellas, briefly summarizing the main aspects of the theories of nationalism by K. Deutsch, M. Hechter, E. Gellner, E. Smith, concluded that based on these views, the rise of nationalism (and with it separatist sentiments) is a kind of reaction to modernization ... [3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8]. This phenomenon, according to the American researcher, is expressed in a reaction to the growth of inequality between the center and the periphery, cultural, economic and political differences that appear between them. It is also a reaction to the process of industrialization and the increasing role of the state in promoting this process, and besides this, "the decline of religion, the strengthening of the centralized state and the bureaucratic system, as well as the growing pressure of the industrial economy" [3, p. 39].

First of all, it is necessary to emphasize that separatism is inextricably linked with nationalism (this will be discussed in more detail in the next section). It could even be argued that separatism is unthinkable in itself, since it is part of nationalism. Separatist tendencies are observed in many modern multi-ethnic or multi-ethnic states. As a rule, these tendencies arise in those regions of the state where certain ethnic associations live compactly and believe that their rights are infringed upon in comparison with the rights of other ethnic groups. Local leaders appear who put forward appropriate arguments in favor of secession from the state. These arguments do not always stand up to criticism, but, nevertheless, they find fertile ground among the so-called offended ethnic groups. Nationalist theories and ideas are gradually being formed,

Therefore, in order to reveal the essence of separatism, it is necessary first of all to investigate the problem of nationalism. And this, in turn, requires an analysis of the concept of a nation.

Finding out the essence of a nation, especially in the modern era, is very, very difficult. Can all ethnic groups be considered nations? What is required for a given ethnos to turn into a nation?

Why, say, the French as an ethnos are a nation, but the Corsicans are not? Why are all Americans, regardless of their racial or ethnic background, one nation? The questions can be continued, but it makes no sense. One thing is clear: it is difficult to define a nation, but, nevertheless, there are a lot of definitions, many concepts of nations and national relations.

The famous German philosopher and sociologist Max Weber emphasized that a community of people is considered a nation when it is united or wants to unite in its own autonomous state. Although nation and state belong to different categories, they are equivalent. The state can exist only as long as it is able to use the solidarity feelings of the national community in support of its power. A nation, in turn, can maintain its identity only through the support and protection of the state.

In the work of the modern German researcher W. Altermatt, a lot of attention is also paid to the theoretical issues of the nation. He believes that the problem of the nation has been discussed for many centuries. There are different theories of nations, different definitions, numerous arguments are given in favor of one theory or another, but in fact, none of them is unsatisfactory.

W. Altermatt believes that two concepts of the nation can be distinguished: the first concept connects the concept of a nation with the state, and the second with culture. "For the state-national school, France and Great Britain, the United States and Switzerland serve as an example of states correlated with history. After national revolutions in each of these countries, the nation is understood by them as a community of citizens who are equal before the law regardless of social status, origin, language or religion. In contrast to the state-national interpretation, the cultural-national interpretation of the concept "nation" refers mainly to Germany and Italy. There was no state as such, and a sense of shared belonging was based on language and culture" [9, p. 38].

A different approach to the problem is based on the point of view according to which the weakening of the state leads to the growth of separatist sentiments. P. Hirst and G. Thompson argue that with "the decline of central government national minorities and regions can defend their autonomy with less fear ...". Sometimes the weakening of the state is associated with the process of globalization. Thus, for example, R. Börbach expressed the idea that on the periphery "governments are significantly weakened due to the fact that international capital imposes its own conditions on them" [10, p. 19]. Thus, according to this point of view, as long as the state is strong enough, this circumstance will restrain nationalist and separatist movements.

Some researchers directly put forward the thesis that globalization has a more direct impact on separatism than only through the weakening of the state. For example, E. Cvetkovic and D. Kellner argue that "there is a significant rise in subcultures of resistance, which are trying to preserve specific forms of culture and society in opposition to globalization and homogenization", which, in turn, are supported by central governments. [11, p. 9] These authors do not insist that globalization was the only reason for such a powerful upsurge of the separatist movement in the world, although they are sure that it played an important role here.

Among other things, a number of researchers note the following circumstance. In their opinion, the state, in order to avoid or resolve ethnic conflict, sometimes resorts to such practices as using separatism as a tool to create an ethnically more homogeneous community and prevent further disintegration of the state. T. Sisk, for example, pointed out that "more than ever before, the temptation of an ethnically homogeneous state – our country for our people – is viewed by many ethnic groups as a worthy way out of a situation in which they cannot coexist with other groups in a single state". [12, p. 1] Also McGary and O'Leary identified "division and / or secession (self-determination)" as a mechanism for

Speaking directly about separatism, one important circumstance should be noted. Whenever and wherever a separatist movement manifests itself, its appearance is primarily due to internal politics in the ethno-federal state, relations between ethnic groups and regions within the state. However, if this kind of movement manages to achieve its goals, i.e. to secede from the ethno-federal system and create their own state entity, this is largely due to international politics, the balance of forces and interests operating mainly outside the given state. Thus, secession is located at the junction of domestic and international politics, however, in most cases, manifestations of separatism are explained by reasons arising from the internal ethnopolitics of the state [1, p. 230]

However, there is an exception to this rule. It manifests itself in the case when an ethnic group predisposed to separatism does not carry out secession, since this would most likely lead not to the creation of its own national state, but to joining another, most often neighboring, state, which would be a part of even less desirable than staying in the former state. Such cases occur when the state border divides the population belonging to the same ethnic group. D. Horowitz gives examples of such cases that took place in Asian countries: the Baluchs and Pathans living in Pakistan, despite the separatist aspirations among them, were aware of the fact that that in case of secession from Pakistan, they could be annexed to Iran and Afghanistan, respectively, which did not suit them at all. This provision emphasizes that under certain conditions, the separatist tendencies generated by the internal ethnopolitics of the state can be stopped in the event of a worse prospect, which is possible in the event of secession.

Ethnic separatism is essentially an ethno-territorial conflict, which is based on the desire of an ethnic group to stand out from the common state, which is perceived by its representatives as a state formation of another ethnic group. Separatism is usually subdivided into three main categories: 1) secession, which implies secession from a single state and the creation of its own independent national state; 2) irredentism – separation from one state for the purpose of joining another; 3) enosis – separation from the state for the purpose of joining a state with a single ethnic population. It is worth considering the fact that the most frequent manifestation of separatism is secession, the other two options are extremely rare and are in addition to the first.

In addition, as mentioned above, there is no common approach to whether to consider movements in ethnoregions that put forward demands for the expansion of autonomy within a single state as separatism, and whether the disintegration of colonial empires, as well as states such as the USSR and Yugoslavia. As for the first provision, here, in our opinion, the term "separatism" is inappropriate, since it does not reflect the essence of the phenomenon. Decentralization of the country to one degree or another does not necessarily lead to manifestations of separatism and the separation of any ethno-territories. Problems with civil integration of certain regions arise in many countries, but demands for secession are not heard everywhere. Here, in our opinion, more appropriate would

be the categories of decentralization or (in some cases) regionalization in domestic relations, which in essence does not lead to the disintegration of a single state, economic and legal space. In addition, it is worth clarifying the use of the concepts of separatism and secession. In the dissertation, separatism is understood as a socio-political movement, a trend whose purpose is secession, that is, the exit of an ethnoregion from a single state and the creation of its own national state formation.

Also here it is necessary to distinguish separatism as the separation of one territory from a single state and the disintegration of the state, when practically all parts of the former single space become independent states. The disintegration of a state may well begin with the demands of one or a number of ethnic groups for secession; nevertheless, the satisfaction of these requirements in one way or another does not lead directly to the complete disintegration of a single state. A striking example of this is the history of the collapse of the USSR, which began with the demands of the Baltic republics to secede from the Union. If a new union treaty was signed, to which 9 out of 15 union republics had agreed by August 1991, the unified state would have been preserved in a transformed form; the republics that did not sign the treaty would actually have committed secession by doing so. As a result, after the failed speech of the State Emergency Committee,

A similar example is demonstrated by the history of the collapse of the Yugoslav Federation. The only exception in this case is the position of the international community, the most active representatives of which, as well as a number of international organizations, immediately began to take a very active part in the process of the disintegration of the ethno-federal system of Yugoslavia. A special conference on the peaceful settlement of the conflict was convened, the participants of which appealed to the international arbitration court with a request to determine the legality of the separation of parts of the union republics from a single state. The court identified the SFRY as a federation in the process of disintegration. By virtue of this definition, the court concluded that new states can be formed within the former republican borders, but not any others.

Among the problems arising as a result of the intensification of the separatist movement in the ethno-federal system, it is necessary to single out the so-called mutual separatism, which extremely complicates the settlement of the conflict. In other words, separatism in one region can lead to the emergence of secession movements in other parts of the federation. Among other things, in a situation where we can observe sequentially emerging foci of separatism (or threats of their emergence), the task of the central government of the ethno-federal system becomes much more complicated on the way of searching for a possible solution to the situation while maintaining the general status quo. Attempts by the federal authorities, by fulfilling part of the requirements of the national elite and the population of a potentially separatist region or by providing them with certain advantages,

Such attempts to satisfy certain demands of various ethnic groups in order to prevent the development of parallel separatism are far from always successful. In addition, one should not forget that groups that have embarked on the path of secession have another feature that can catalyze separatist processes in adjacent territories – the demonstration effect of their own example. Of course, the example of one movement cannot create separatist sentiments where they do not exist at all [1, p. 279]. However, the strength of the movement, if supported from the outside, can nudge other separatists into action, convincing them that success is likely.

As noted above, one of the main issues in connection with the secession is the problem of ethnic minorities in the hotel areas. In this regard, it is appropriate to cite the opinion of D. Horowitz, who considers the general rule of separatist movements that "... groups enjoying the right to self-determination form states with ethnic characteristics that exclude minorities. The main focus is on the origin. " It should be added that, moreover, sometimes ethnic groups that have separated either as a result of secession or during the disintegration of the federation try to make the territory of their national state ethnically pure, free from the presence of national minorities.

In this regard, it is necessary to highlight another important aspect related to the problem of ethnic separatism. We are talking about the process of militarization of the ethnic conflict and its transition to the stage of open armed confrontation between the parties. The military component is both a resource and a target of ethnic conflict. Military power can play different roles in ethnic conflict. The use of military force can help establish control over the conflict region.

In the event that, in a conflict based on demands for secession of one of the ethnic groups, the army includes representatives of various ethnic and confessional groups, then this circumstance may well become the cause of a protracted conflict. It is worth considering the fact that ethnopolitical and ethnoterritorial conflicts based on separatism, much more often than other conflicts, lead to an armed struggle. In addition, the formation of separatists, in case of impossibility of providing organized resistance to the army and the police, switch to the tactics of terrorism, which significantly complicates the process of resolving the conflict, since with each terrorist act the parties become more violent and the ability for productive dialogue decreases.

It should be noted that for a state that has separatist movements on its territory, the decision to "divorce" is extremely difficult. In any case, the state will resist the secession of any part of it, fearing the domino effect that may follow after the precedent of a successful secession, especially if the focus is on a large ethno-federal system. In this case, a lot depends on how strong the system is. As A. Prazauskas noted, "the strength of multinational formations and the limits of effective communication between groups depend on the nature of sociocultural differences. Their depth and incompatibility of value systems is the main reason for the instability of many multi-ethnic states and all formations of the imperial type." [13, p. 38] Here it is quite possible to agree that that the higher the degree of ethnic

heterogeneity of the state, the more problematic it becomes the formation of common values, social norms, institutions, [13, p. 39] which, in turn, determines the attitude of a number of the least integrated ethnic groups to the state as to an alien system that does not possess all the attributes of legitimacy in relation to these ethnic groups.

Based on this, a necessary prerequisite for the stability of a polyethnic state is a more or less homogeneous cultural space, a common political culture, a single ideological dominant. Achieving just such a state will, apparently, be the most effective means of preventing separatism in multinational states.

References:

1. Horowitz D. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley, 1985.
2. Henkin S. Separatism v Rossii – pozadi ili vperedi? // *Pro et Contra*. 1997. T.2. №1. P. 27-43.
3. Kellas J. *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*. New York, 1991. P. 39-49.
4. Deutsch K, *Nationalism and Social Communication*. Cambridge, 1953;
5. Hechter M. *International Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966*. Berkley, 1975.
6. Hechter M. *The Dynamics of Secession* // *Acta Sociologica*. 1992. – Vol.35. P. 270-271.
7. Gellner E. *Nacii i nacionalizm*. M., 1991.
8. Smith A. *The Ethnic Origin of Nations*. Oxford, 1986; Smith A. *National Identity*. London, 1991.
9. Al'termatt U. *Jetnonacionalizm v Evrope*. M., 2000. С.38.
10. Burbach R, Nunez O, Kagarlitsky O. *Globalization and its Discontents, The Rise of Postmodern Socialisms*. London, 1997. P. 19.
11. Cvetkovich A, Kellner D. *Introduction: Thinking Global and Local* // A. Cvetkovich, D. Kellner, eds. *Articulating the Global and the Local Globalization and Cultural Studies*. Boulder, 1997. P. 9.
12. Sisk T. *Power Sharing and International Mediation in Ethnic Conflicts*. Washington, D.C., 1996.
13. Prazauskas A. *Slagaemye gosudarstvennogo edinstva* // *Pro et Contra*. T.2. №1. 1997. С. 38.

Бібліографічний список:

1. Horowitz D. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley, 1985.
2. Хенкин С. Сепаратизм в России – позади или впереди? // *Pro et Contra*. 1997. Т.2. №1. С. 27-43.
3. Kellas J. *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*. New York, 1991. P. 39-49.
4. Deutsch K, *Nationalism and Social Communication*. Cambridge, 1953;
5. Hechter M. *International Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966*. Berkley, 1975.
6. Hechter M. *The Dynamics of Secession* // *Acta Sociologica*. 1992. – Vol.35. P. 270-271.
7. Геллнер Э. *Нации и национализм*. М., 1991.
8. Smith A. *The Ethnic Origin of Nations*. Oxford, 1986; Smith A. *National Identity*. London, 1991.
9. Альтерматт Урс. *Этнонационализм в Европе*. М., 2000. С.38.
10. Burbach R, Nunez O, Kagarlitsky O. *Globalization and its Discontents, The Rise of Postmodern Socialisms*. London, 1997. P. 19.
11. Cvetkovich A, Kellner D. *Introduction: Thinking Global and Local* // A. Cvetkovich, D. Kellner, eds. *Articulating the Global and the Local Globalization and Cultural Studies*. Boulder, 1997. P. 9.
12. Sisk T. *Power Sharing and International Mediation in Ethnic Conflicts*. Washington, D.C., 1996.
13. Празиускас А. *Слагаемые государственного единства* // *Pro et Contra*. Т.2. №1. 1997. С. 38.