

ETHNOCULTURAL FACTORS OF NATIONAL SECURITY IN MODERN RUSSIA IN TERMS OF NEW GEOPOLITICAL CHALLENGES IN THE BLACK SEA REGION

I. Yurchenko

*Institute of socio-economic and humanities research of Southern scientific center RAS;
Rostov-on-Don. Professor of Kuban state university. Krasnodar, Russian Federation
science-almanac@mail.ru*

An attempt to prove dependence of national security protection problem solution of Russian state from the ethnocultural character factors influence with consideration of Black Sea region specificity is undertaken in the article. New geopolitical challenges are analyzed in the context of Crimea and Russia reunion and the new united South Federal district formation, problems of ethnocultural identities politicization, phenomena emersion of “hybrid wars” (“wars for identity, wars of memory” and etc.) Ethnocultural factors of the Black Sea region development, where socially-political processes are developed under the constant influence of globalization risks, situated under careful attention of the South scientific centre researchers RAS, about what empirical data of sociological monitoring, various proprietary materials and other actual information, received in the consequence of expeditions can speak.

In the context of the Black Sea region geopolitics always represents extremely significant strategic centre. Unstable and various migration directions induce disbelief spread of an old population, anxious and uncertainty feeling in preservation of existing economic and sociocultural order, customs and traditions. Cultural, language, confessional mosaic of polytechnic polysynthetic society requires rational way searching of interethnic and inter-confessional conflicts prevention. Four subjects of the Federation can be referred to Russian Black Sea region: Krasnodar region, Republic of Crimea, Sevastopol city and the Republic of Adygeya. In the process of Crimea and Russia reunion the new phenomena appear in the political field of interaction in the areal of Black Sea region governments.

The problems of ethnical, religious, linguistic, sociocultural mosaic, manifesting in a complex and conflict identity induce a special interest, and that is why an integrated situation analysis of ethnocultural factors of Russian Federation national security supplying at the regional level is required. Socially mutual relations between dominate ethnical groups and minorities can become strained in the result of informative-psychological technologies influence using in the context of Washington geopolitical appetencies, allotting itself a role of stability guarantee in the whole world. “Hybrid wars”, which are conducted against the row of states with a goal of separatism activation, radical nationalism, confrontation induction of ethnical groups for domination, are used on the basis of utmost “Russophobia” manifestation, radicalism and extremism at these territories. Danger decrease of Russian culture influence preserves in the separate regions of the Black Sea region, especially difficult integrated into the unite civilizational space of Russia.

The real boundaries narrowing of Russian influence in the Black Sea in the post-Soviet period led to emergence of the new challenges and threats for the regional security, that required to produce tactics of effective response to arising situations, and introduction of serious additions and corrections to the political strategy of Russian state, rejection from stereotypes in interaction with political players. It is necessary to speak about other threats and challenges of internal and external character for national security of modern Russian state in the Black Sea region that actualizes a systemic situational political analysis and conflictological expertise of the Black Sea region development.

Key words: ethno-cultural factors, geopolitical challenges, national security, the Black Sea region, “hybrid war”, the politicization of ethnic and cultural identity, the administrative-territorial division.

Ethnocultural development factors of the Black Sea region, where socially-political processes advance under the constant influence of globalization risks and destructive intervention from the side of geopolitical competitors are considered to be the important fundamental supposition and condition of national security of RF. The Black Sea areal always differed with instability, as “locating between Europe, Russia and the countries of Middle East, this region appears to be a certain buffer zone between various cultures and civilizations” [8, p.127]. Politicization of ethnocultural identity was especially activated in the course of Crimea and Russia reunion, in the result of new phenomena appearing in the interaction political field in the areal of the Black Sea region states. Crimea and Sevastopol became the epicentrum of geopolitical strains, but nowadays unification of federal districts (Crimean and South) into the unite SFD conditions the formation of the new regional political space configuration. And that is why the ethnocultural factors complex situation analysis of Russian Federation national security supplying at the regional level is required. In the

context of the administrative-territorial division 4 subjects of Federation should be included into Russian Black Sea region: Krasnodar region, Republic of Crimea, Sevastopol city and the Republic of Adygeya. One can speak about similarity of natural and climatic and resource characteristics with sufficient part of convention: this topic is for a separate research. And the problems of ethnical, religious, linguistic, sociocultural mosaic, manifesting in the complex and conflict identity are the most significant from the viewpoint of security supplying in the cross-border region, protection of national interests, strength and integrity of Russian nationhood under the conditions of military threats increase in the South direction. Cultural, language, confessional mosaic of modern society requires rational way search of interethnic and inter-confessional conflicts prevention with an orientation to the solution of the post-Soviet epoch problem – preservation of Russian ethnocultural identity, spiritual recovery of ethnos national selfconsciousness, composing the basic mass of the country population, and also conditions supplying for the development of all nations, living on the territory of Russian state. However sociocultural relations in the subjects of Federation traditionally representing priority-oriented development of Russian culture, and appearing to be in the period of post-Soviet conflict opposition of large geopolitical and geoeconomic players in the situation of cardinal world order transformation and extension of the world systemic crises at the boundary lines of war collisions in Georgia in August 2008 and civil war in Ukraine in 2014-2016., are appeared to be in the situation of construct isolation, aggressive anti-Russian disinformation. Artificial creation of economic difficulties and using of ethno-confessional, socially-political, economic problems by the opponents of Russia for enmity fomentation and conflicts escalation under the influences of unequal territories development and ethno-confessional diversity of social communities on the post-Soviet field are considered to be the basic reasons of extremely “Russophobia” manifestation, radicalism and extremism on these territories. Development fundamental problems of Russia south regions and elaboration of development scenarios of the whole macroregion are in the centre of the South scientific centre researches of the Russian Academy of Sciences [6]. The expeditions results, social monitoring data, various proprietary materials and other actual information are widely used as an empirical basis for researches.

In the context of geopolitics the Black Sea region always represents an extremely significant strategic centre. In the result of USSR disintegration and the following social transformations at the end of 20 beginning of 21 century, at the direction of market relations and changing of geopolitical cartography, a significant part of population of this region territory is appeared to be socially indefensible: engineers, scientists, agricultural producers, production workers, lost the job in the result of business liquidation, refugees, displaced persons, large families, pensioners and young people. Social relations between dominant ethnical groups and minorities, constantly changing in composition and number by reason of unstable migration directions, induce spread of disbelief of an old population, anxiety feeling and uncertainty in preservation of existing economic and sociocultural order, customs and traditions.

From the viewpoint of many experts, the Black Sea region became one of the priorities in geopolitical aspirations of Washington, endued itself with stability guarantor role in the whole world, but practically necessary for supplying oil free floorage from the region to the western markets [2, p.7]. All of this led to the significant changing of the political situation and geostrategic configuration of the region, where NATO members – Rumania, Bulgaria and Turkey already dominate in the south and west lands, and Ukraine and Georgia striving to entry NATO abruptly shorten northeast coast, which is not under the influence of North that Atlantic alliance. The real boundaries narrowing of Russian influence in the Black Sea led to the appearance of new challenges and threats for the regional security that required to produce effective reaction tactics to arising situations, and entering serious additions and corrections in Russian state political strategy, rejection from of stereotypes in interaction with political players. Geopolitical and economic significance of Krasnodar region increased in the post-Soviet period. But study of ethnocultural factors of geopolitical region situation, polyethnic character of its population requires more careful attention. According to the data of All-Russian population census of 2010 on ethnic composition there were about 86,5% of Russians, the Armenians – 5,4%, the Ukrainians – 1,6%, also the Tartars, the Greeks, the Geor-

gians, the Belorussians, the Adygeis, the Romany, the Germans, the Azerbaijani and etc live there [5] Uncontrolled migration in one of the most attractive regions of Russia – Black Sea region coast, is very dangerous, as it can lead to cardinal changing of ethno cultural population composition. Quoting a lot of actual materials and statistical data, A.V. Baranov confirms that “ethnopolitical mobilization of “Circassian” movement”, presence of ethnical entrepreneurship and ethnical networks, violation of norms and customs of an accepting society by in-ethnical new occupants, growing into the conflict of values and orientations have destructive character. Besides very often the conflicts are consciously constructed by the part of ethnical elites, for whom “discontent of personal and ethnogroup situation, multiplied on overstated expectations and ambitions are considered to be peculiar” [1, p.47, 72, 101]. One also should not forget about Krasnodar region near-border location which not just gives advantages in the form of transportation costs cutting and improved accessibility to the technical and scientific achievements of the neighboring countries. But it also generates a row of specific problems from which one should emphasize proper regulation lack of sea and land frontiers of the south of Russia, and also the problems of migration, concealed unemployment and danger of interethnic conflicts, connected with them. In reality, after the USSR disintegration, besides the already existing internationally-legal problems of Black Sea straits Bosphorus – Sea of Marmara – Dardanelles, the new problems, connected with boundaries between the new Black Sea region states appeared. Ethnocultural mosaic of Crimea population composition is increased by the factor of Crimean-Tatar ethnocultural identity. According to Federal State Statistics Service data, there are about 65% of Russians in Crimea, 16% of the Ukrainians, 12,6% of Crimean Tatars, besides 97, 8% of Tatars consider themselves to be Muslims, 85,1% of the Ukrainians and 84,9% of Russians – are orthodox Christians. But in Sevastopol correlation of ethnical groups differs from Crimea in whole, as there are 81% of Russians, 14,2% of the Ukrainians, and Crimean Tatars – 0,7% [1, p.147-148]. Intensive efforts of the western on involving of Ukraine into the Euro integration processes were accompanied with a sharp opposition liveliness of internal political powers, based on ethnical identities manipulation and their politicization [3, p.148]. Such “wars for identity” and “memory wars” became to denote by the concept of “hybridism”, (initially applied concerning subcultures and identities). “Hybrid wars” are conducted against “state- target” with the goal of separatism activation, radical nationalism, induction of ethnical groups confrontation for dominance, that gradually leads to the internal split and demolition of nationhood. NATO block illegal promotion to the east was conducted within the program “Partnership for the sake of the world”. Post-Soviet Ukraine and Georgia expressed the great attention to this program in the Black Sea region, obtained support of the USA in their aspiration to the nearest entrance to this organization. Integration with European Union – is the most significant, officially proclaimed political and ideological priority of these countries. According to the opinion of some analysts, the USA are interested in their support, to fight the new and old Europe, weak the last one and increase their influence in EU. Naturally, such events development should have led to more loss of Russia political influence in the Black Sea region. And for the USA the temptation to complicate at one blow positions of two competitors at once – Europe and Russia is very great [4], using and actively provoking the Ukrainian internal split with the priority-oriented orientation to destruction of Russian-Ukrainian relations. The strategy of intrastate regionalization, which is appeared to be subjectively-managed process, became one of the newest tendencies in the modern west geopolitics [7, p.295-299]. In this context geopolitical competitors use intricate technologies of geopolitical space fragmentation, when transnational elites place stake on the local societies interests, local nationalism, encourage a linguistic split and on this basis intensify anti-State supernational tendencies.

But if one leads the parallels in development of Crimean Tatar ethnocultural segment in Crimea, with those processes which are conducted in the North Caucasus, then it is necessary to consider risks of sociocultural dynamics, which are concluded in the fact that the professor M.Ya. Yakhyaev notices, “in civilizational direction the North Caucasus still appears to be a “layer cultural cake”. An original autochthonous culture of the local societies under which there are Arabic-Muslim, Russian and Western cultural layers is in the basis of this weird sociocultural phenomenon. The tendencies of its alteration are such as, despite some life archaization, especially of highland

rural population, there are displacement, narrowing of Russian and western elements and swelling, enlargement of Arab-Muslim Islamic cultural constituent” [9, p.44]. That is, the speech is about danger influence decrease of Russian culture in the result of Soviet state liquidation consequences and contradictory, sometimes inconsistent sociocultural policy of the federal centre, ethnocultural separative manifestations in the separate regions, especially difficult integrated into the one civilizational space of RF, and other threats and challenges of an internal and external character for national security of the modern Russian state.

Thus, for the solving of the concrete practical political challenges it is very important to organize deep constant research, with using of various methods and scientific instruments of political analysis and conflictological expertise, modern Russia national security ethnocultural factors under the conditions of the new geopolitical challenges, particularly, in the Black Sea region, for which it is necessary, under the preservation of SSC RAS priority, preservation (and work activation) of scientific regional centers of situation analysis under the auspices of politologists Russian society and on the basis of its regional divisions.

References

1. *Baranov A.V.* Regional political conflicts in the North Caucasus and Crimea: comparative analysis. Krasnodar, 2015.
2. *Grinevetsky S.R., Zhiltsov S.S., Zonn I.S.* The Black Sea knot. M., 2007.
3. *Kapitsyn V.M.* Ethnical identities politicization in the “ hybrid war” // “Hybrid wars” in the chaotic world of XXI century. M., 2015.
4. *Karaganov S.* Russia and Europe: Ukrainian divarication // Russian newspaper. 2008. April, 25.
5. National population composition according to the subjects of Russian Federation. Census 2010. URL: www.perepis-2010.ru/results_of_the_census/tab7. Xls
6. South of Russia: problems, forecasts, decisions / Chief editor acad. G.G. Matishov. Rostov on Don: 2010.; Problems of socially-economic and ethnopolitical development of the South macroregion / Chief editor acad. G.G. Matishov. Rostov on Don, 2012. etc.
7. *Yurchenko I.V.* Regionalization as a modern geopolitical tendency and controlled process // Problems of national security of Russia: history lesson and modernity challenges. To the 70th anniversary of Victory in Great Patriotic War. Krasnodar, 2015.
8. *Yurchenko N.N.* Anti-recessionary political and administrative technologies as a mechanism of the regional security supplying in the Black Sea region // Russia in the modern architecture of international security: challenges and perspectives. M., 2016.
9. *Yakhyaev M.Ya.* Ethnocultural processes and social risks in the North Caucasus // Ethnosocial processes and risks in the South of Russia. Maikop, 2015.

Литература

1. *Баранов А.В.* Региональные политические конфликты на Северном Кавказе и в Крыму: сравнительный анализ. Краснодар, 2015.
2. *Гриневецкий С.Р., Жильцов С.С., Зонн И.С.* Черноморский узел. М., 2007.
3. *Капицын В.М.* Политизация этнических идентичностей в «гибридной войне» // «Гибридные войны» в хаотизирующемся мире XXI века. М., 2015.
4. *Караганов С.* Россия и Европа: украинская развилка // Российская газета. 2008, 25 апреля.
5. Национальный состав населения по субъектам Российской Федерации. Перепись 2010. URL: www.perepis-2010.ru/results_of_the_census/tab7. Xls

6. Юг России: проблемы, прогнозы, решения / Гл. ред. акад. Г.Г. Матишов. Ростов н/Д., 2010.; Проблемы социально-экономического и этнополитического развития южного макрорегиона / Гл. ред. акад. Г.Г. Матишов. Ростов н/Д, 2012 и др.
7. *Юрченко И.В.* Регионализация как современная геополитическая тенденция и управляемый процесс // Проблемы национальной безопасности России: уроки истории и вызовы современности. К 70-летию Победы в Великой Отечественной войне. Краснодар, 2015.
8. *Юрченко Н.Н.* Антикризисные политико-административные технологии как механизм обеспечения региональной безопасности в Причерноморье // Россия в современной архитектуре международной безопасности: вызовы и перспективы. М., 2016.
9. *Яхьяев М.Я.* Этнокультурные процессы и социальные риски на Северном Кавказе // Этносоциальные процессы и риски на Юге России. Майкоп, 2015.

August, 21, 2016