

UDK: 323.15(470)

Pregledni rad

Primljeno: 27. 09. 1997.

**Sergei V. Sokolovski**

*Centre for the Study and Prevention of Conflicts*

*Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology*

*Russian Academy of Sciences*

*E-mail: sergei@eawarn.tower.ras.ru*

## **EARLY WARNING AND MINORITY RIGHTS IN RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

### **SUMMARY**

The article provides a critical commentary to current use of the concept "minority" in Russia, particularly in academic and political discourse. The direct borrowing of the concept as it exists in international law or western social sciences is prevented by a number of limitations inherent to its meaning, the main limitation being that Russia could not be properly characterised as a democracy. The usage of the term "minority" in the context of the so-called "transitional societies" could be misleading, as the position of a particular group in a power hierarchy as well as its influence on political decision-making process here is not a function of a group's numerical strength, but depends on such resources as the group's wealth, access to education, and position in administrative institutions, security and army, effective monopoly of important sectors of social life and economy, group's solidarity etc. Moreover, the conceptual field of in which the concept is situated is markedly different from its western analogues, wherein such political concepts as "a titular nation", "an indigenous ethnos", "a state-founding people" remain virtually unknown and normally does not belong to semantic field of "minority". As the concept "minority" in Russia is firmly tied to ethnic reality interpretations, the current paradigms of ethnicity research are outlined. Finally, a description of contemporary attempts of minority rights monitoring within the framework of an early warning research is sketched.

**KEY WORDS:** minority, ethnicity, nationalism, Russia, ethnic conflicts

It is not an easy task to review the vast field of minority rights research in Russia and sketch a state-of-the-art sort of summary. There are several circumstances, contributing to this difficulty. The first one is conceptual. It is not clear whether one really could substantiate a claim, that it is relevant to use the concept "minority" in the analysis of various groups' situations in contemporary Russia and ex-Soviet states. If it could be proved that it is relevant, than it is still not clear whether the relevance

holds for different periods of the Russian history. This conceptual predicament has to do, first and foremost, with Russia's and other NIS countries' claims to democracy. The gist of the matter is simple: if we believe (or can prove) that Russia is a democratic country, than the term "minority" is applied appropriately. The underlying reasoning is straightforward: the term implies an idea of distributory justice, according to which a minority is deficient in only one respect in order to fully and equally participate in political and social/cultural processes, namely, in its numerical strength. If this were not the case, than free individuals can protect their interests through voting and other democratic procedures. Minority groups, lacking such a powerful resource as the necessary numerical strength to guarantee the protection of their interests through voting, need special additional measures from the state, controlled by majority. Hence "minority" is a term, presupposing democratic context. In non-democracies (protodemocratic or transition societies, not to speak of autocracies and totalitarian regimes) the number of a group does not constitute a political resource. What constitutes it is the group's access to power, wealth, arms and similar things. So in the case of totalitarian societies it is better to speak of ruling and deprived groups or societal strata, of elites and disenfranchised masses, or of victimised populations. The concept "minority" if used to analyse the situation in such countries would be misapplied. As for contemporary Russia, the question, whether we can legitimately use the term "minority", is still open. The term should be used cautiously, as the numerical strength of a group in any particular case, or even its position on a power hierarchy do not automatically imply the democratic dimension. Local decision-making in many regions still bears traditional autocratic stamp, which precludes the sociologically correct usage of the minority-majority type of analysis.

Secondly, even if we presume, that the term "holds", at least generally and on a large-scale level of international relations, as Russia is a part of many international treaties and agreements, then we are confronted with one more obstacle, which could be named terminological. Incidentally, this aspect has a wider, if not a universal character. In many countries the term "minority" is either *unknown*, or *not used*, or to make matters still more complicated, is used along with many *rival terms*, with partially or substantially overlapping meanings. It could be used as well with many limiting and *particularising attributes*, stretching the signified concept far beyond its normative or internationally accepted scope. The last two cases - parallel usage of terms with overlapping meanings and usage of the term "minority" with many specifications - are typical for academic and political discourses in Russia and in most NIS.

Now there is a dilemma for a person, attempting' to review minority rights research: should s/he include *all the indigenous terms* and related concepts or pursue a limiting strategy and take into consideration only "*focal*" cases with *explicit usage* of the term "minority"? Of course, this choice does not solve all the problems for the re-

viewer. In a lot of cases the term “minority”, when used by representatives from different disciplines, academic schools and sub-fields, or by journalists and politicians, or leaders of various nationalist movements and ethnic entrepreneurs, means different things. In this case I prefer to speak of *different paradigms*, or worldviews, which could not be reduced to merely professional “schisms” and which divide both academy and general public and further contribute to the Babylon of discourse on minority issues.

To make things still worse, there exists a vast *variety of different minority groups*, which came to existence by a myriad of ways and which do not easily lend themselves to the classifying and typifying will of the academics. In this respect all the history of Russian ethnography and anthropology could be described as a history of minority research, and all the conflicting views, theories and conceptualisations of ethnicity or “ethnic reality” have a direct bearing on minority research and relevant discursive formations.

Now, having in mind all these obstacles, I have to clarify my own position and choices I made, preparing this review. In the case of the first problem, that is deciding whether the analysis in “minority-majority” terms could be applied to contemporary Russia, I had chosen to answer in the affirmative, but retained certain reservations. My argument basically boils down to the statement that there exists a number of situations and contexts, whether we speak of Russia in general, or any of its territories and times of its history, in particular, which let themselves be analysed productively in these terms. So we could speak *meaningfully* of minorities in Russia, though *not always* and *not for every place*, and be cautious not to over-generalise the analytic power of this approach.

Secondly, on the level of terminology, I opt for being *open towards “native” or “indigenous” terminology* in minority discourse, as very often the local (in this particular case, the Russian language) terms “fix” conceptual linkages or represent tropes, which become formative for this discourse, which influence it and create misunderstandings in intercultural communication, when ignored. The latter is very often the case in diplomatic, international politics and international law types of communication, when partners in a dialogue presume that by using the same terms they guarantee the clarity and transparency of meaning. I will speak specifically on this type of error, which could be provisionally labelled as *terminological homonymy*,<sup>1</sup> later, when I analyse the

---

1 “Provisionally” because we speak here of the so-called international terms, such as “minority”, which are present in the same graphic and very similar phonemic forms in many European languages, but may have different meanings; if it were one and the same language, then it would be homonymy in the standard use of the term.

usage of the term “national minority” in the documents of the OSCE and the Council of Europe, on the one side, and its interpretations in Russia, on the other.

Thirdly, I restrict myself here to a brief overview of academic discourse with short interventions into the juridical and political spheres, thus leaving out important parts of discourse on minorities such as mass media debates, public usage etc. This enables me to be more inclusive in the analysis on the “ontic plane”, that is, to include in my review *various types of minorities*, minority peoples, migrant and settled groups, ethnographic groups etc.

The approach to the academic discourse analysis would be also inclusive, as I attempt to cover the general trends in the history of minority research, putting it into the context of ethnological research in general. This strategy is chosen due to my perception, that the particular field of minority research is strongly influenced by predispositions of paradigmatic nature of a broader academic research of ethnicity.

## The History of Minority Research in Russia

Rossian<sup>2</sup> ethnography goes back to the seventeenth century - the time of extensive colonisation and formation of centralised Rossian state. Early descriptions and atlases of Siberia included information on *local tribal groups*. In those times ethnic differences were not depicted as such, and the local (Russian-language) terms for non-Russian groups were “*yasachnye*” (paying special tribute in furs), “*tuzemtsy*” (literally meaning “living in another land”), “*inorodtsy*” (meaning, being born in an alien, foreign, non-Russian, or non-Russian group), or “*inovertsy*” and “*yazychniki*” (meaning pagans, non-Orthodox, non-Christian, or belonging to another faith). The differentiating features, thus, were *fiscal status*, *land* (or region), and *faith*, but not the *totalizing concept of culture*, which has not been as yet formed as a part of nationalistic ideology. That is why the terms “*plemya*” (tribe) and “*narod*” (people), though used in respect of different groups, had different meaning from the those implied in the current Russian ethnographical discourse.

---

2 The difference between “Russian” (*russkiy*) and “Rossian” (*rossiyskiy*) remains either unknown or ignored in the West; “Rossian” refers to the state and empire and applies to citizens of all nationalities comprising the polity’s population, while “Russian” is an ethnic term. Thus the term “Russian state” (*russkoe gosudarstvo*) would refer to Russian polity of the feudal period, while “Rossian state” (*rossiyskoe gosudarstvo*) means the multiethnic polity of the new and newest history, that is Russian empire (*Rossiyskaya imperiya*) and Russian Federation (*Rossiyskaya Federatsiya*).

In 1845 the *Russian Geographical Society* with Ethnographic division was founded in Saint-Petersburg, which published materials on different regions, including studies of ethnography and languages in Central Asia, Siberia and the Far East (M. Kastren, A. Middendorf, V. Radlov). This early *association of ethnography with geography*, typical not only for Russia, but for many European countries as well, had probably served as a contributing factor in the *territorialization of ethnicity*, which later became one of the essentials of naturalistic paradigm in ethnicity research.

In the 1880-90's a strong *evolutionist school* was formed, introducing methods of historical reconstruction on archeological, physical anthropological and ethnographic materials (M. Kovalevsky, D. Anuchin, L. Sternberg). It was the time when first ethnographic journals had appeared and many popular works on the cultures of the world. With the establishment of evolutionism in the field of ethnographical research the later *reification* of ethnicity and culture and ethnic groups and *appropriation of history* on the side of the future nationalistic leaders became conceptually possible. Needless to say that both reification and appropriation of history became part-and-parcel of the forming naturalistic interpretation of ethnic reality. Evolutionism helped to establish the concepts of "*developed*" and "*less developed*" peoples, which are still used in some normative texts in Russia.<sup>3</sup>

The Bolsheviks had later used these established conceptual linkages between ethnic groups and territories in organising the Russian Federation and later, the USSR. The concepts of evolutionism had been operative in establishing a hierarchy of administrative-political units from national *sel'sovet* (ethnic minority village Soviet) to Union republic. The Bolshevik revolution (1917) and making the Soviet state with *territorial autonomies* based on ethnic principles as well as the rise of ethnic periphery movements caused very extensive studies among all groups, especially for designing borders between *ethnoterritorial* units. Ethnographers were also deeply involved in developing written alphabets and school systems for many small groups.

In 1933 *Institute of Anthropology, Archaeology and Ethnography* had been established in Leningrad and in 1937 - *Institute of Ethnography* in Moscow. It was the

---

3 I will cite one recent example: A law project "On Legal Status of Ethnocultural Associations, Representing Linguistic, Ethnoconfessional, and Ethnic Minorities", discussed in the Committee of Public Associations and Religious Organizations of the State Duma on March 18, 1997, contains the following definition of the *people, leading traditional way of life (minority indigenous, or aboriginal peoples)*: [these are] *peoples (minorities) of the Russian Federation, situated on a less advanced than the majority phase of socio-economic development, whose way of life fully or to a large degree depends on natural environment of their place of residence and whose legal status is partially or fully regulated by their own customs, traditions, or a special jurisdiction* (emphasis added S. S.).

time when Marxist-Leninist doctrine (with its priorities of stadial evolution of society and a class struggle as a major force of historical change) started to dominate theoretical disciplinary knowledge in every field of social and humanitarian sciences. Ethnology was proclaimed a "bourgeois science", many scholars were persecuted and the department of ethnology at the Moscow University had been closed (1931). In the 1950-70's major priorities were still in the studies of ethnogenesis, material cultures, ethnic histories and cartography initiated mainly from the central institutions in Moscow and Leningrad with active training and participating scholars from regional and republican academic centres. It resulted in prestigious projects like historical-ethnographic atlases (*Peoples of Siberia* 1961; *Russians* 1967-70; *Peoples of the World* 1964) and multi-volume series *The Peoples of the World* (Tishkov, 1997b: 493-495).

In the 1970-80's there was a strong shift of interest to contemporary ethnic issues with reorientation to the use of sociological survey methods. An extensive research had been done in Central Asia, Baltic republics, the Volga-Ural region (Y. Arutunyan, L. Drobizheva, V. Pimenov, M. Guboglo). Academician Yu. Bromley with other colleagues (N. Cheboksarov, V. Kozlov, P. Puchkov, S. Arutyunov) were developing a theory of ethnos based on a primordial vision of ethnicity and partly reflecting existing political hierarchy of status and non-status Soviet nationalities. Together with this version a distinct interpretation of ethnos as a "sociobiological organism" (L. Gumilev) has acquired a growing popularity.

Political liberalization since late the 1980's and the rise of ethnic nationalism and conflict has brought radical changes for Russian anthropology. Identities studies, nationalism and conflicts, status and rights of minorities, ethnicity and power and a number of other issues became a subject of research and debates. Another serious challenge is ethnonationalistic engagement and usage of ethnic studies as a resource for political mobilization. As a response anthropology demonstrates a new interest towards problems of "new minorities" like Russians, of Russian nationalism and identity. Russian anthropology is going through a process of deep transformation and crisis as the rest of society (Tishkov, 1997b: 494).

## The Paradigms of Ethnicity Research

Basic ways of interpreting ethnic phenomena are usually grouped into three main approaches, which could be designated as *primordial* (objectivist, positivist or naturalistic), *instrumentalist*, and *constructivist* (subjectivist, or relativistic). The first of these scholarly traditions is usually traced to ideas of nineteenth-century German romanti-

cism and to the positivist tradition of social science. Its adherents view ethnicity as an objective given, a sort of primordial characteristic of humanity. For primordialists there exist objective entities with inherent characteristics such as *territory, language, recognizable membership and a common mentality*. In its extreme form, this approach conceives of ethnicity in socio-biological terms as a “comprehensive form of natural selection and kinship connections”, a primordial instinctive impulse (Van den Berghe, 1981). Some primordialists even hypothesise that recognition of group affiliation is *genetically encoded* and this code is the product of early human evolution, when the ability to recognise the members of one’s family group was essential for survival.

Contemporary political discourse on ethnicity and nationalism in Russia belongs conceptually to the primordialist school and is influenced to a substantial degree by anthropological theories, prevalent in the history of Russian ethnology and anthropology since the disciplines’ formation. Explicit primordialism has played a major role both in Russian and in Soviet anthropology. Originating in Herder’s neoromantic concept of *Volk* as a unity of *blood and soil*, it had been worked out into positivist program for ethnographic research in the work of S. M. Shirokogorov, who had defined ethnos as “a group of people, speaking one and the same language and admitting common origin, characterized by a set of customs and a life style, which are preserved and sanctified by tradition, which distinguishes it from other [groups] of the same kind” (Широкоров, 1923: 122).

This approach was later developed in the works of Yu. Bromley, who gave a very similar definition of *ethnos* (Бромлей, 1981), and L. Gumilev. The latter believed in the existence of *ethnos* as a “biosocial organism” and proposed a framework for the study of ethnogenesis as a *geographically determined* process, in which the formation of an *ethnos* was depicted as a combined effect of cosmic energies and landscape (Гумилев, 1989). As the works of L. Gumilev are still very popular in Russia and exert influence on the ethnic reality perception, especially on public and political levels, I will briefly mention the constitutive characteristics of his theory. For Gumilev ethnos is analogous to an organism in many respects, but one of the basic is the similarity of its life cycle to a life cycle of an organism. As an organism ethnos is born, then experience periods of growth and maturity, followed by inertia, breakdown, and death. He has even given an estimate of ethnic life-cycle duration of about 1200-1500 years. What is perhaps more important, interethnic relations and their coexistence are believed to depend upon mutual compatibility of contacting ethnoses. According to Gumilev there are three types of interethnic coexistence: *symbiosis*, *xenia*, and *chimera*. In symbiosis ethnoses peacefully co-exist, using different ecological niches of the same landscape. Xenia is also a harmless way of coexistence, when one ethnos is living “inside” another as an impregnated foreign particle. But

when the isolation between the guest and host ethnoses breaks down, it may give rise to chimera, which is characterised by negative complementarity. Then bloody conflicts, leading to extermination of one or of both of the contacting ethnoses, are inevitable. The danger of this type of pseudo-theoretical constructions becomes evident, when they are employed to legitimise violence, or to view ethnic conflicts as inevitable consequences of “natural laws”.

Sceptical of the bio-geographical approach, Yu. Bromley and most Soviet social scientists adhered to historical-primordial theories. For them, *ethnos* and *ethno-social organism*, understood as objective linguo-cultural entities were the basic categories (Бромлей, 1983). As a director of the Institute of Ethnography, USSR Academy of Sciences in the 1970's and 1980's, Bromley has published four theoretical monographs (Бромлей, 1973, 1981, 1983, 1987), which formed the backbone of academic discourse on ethnicity theory in those years. Bromley defined ethnos as “a stable intergenerational community of people, historically formed on a certain territory, possessing common relatively stable features of culture (including language) and psyche, as well as a consciousness of their unity and of their difference from other similar entities (self-awareness), reflected in a self-name (ethnonym)” (Бромлей, 1983: 57-58).

This theory goes back to S. Shirokogorov writings of the the1920's and corresponds to the so-called Leninist theory of national question, defining “nation” as the highest type of ethnic community (ethnos), where ethnos is viewed as an archetype and major form of social grouping, legitimising the state with its economy and culture (Sokolovski and Tishkov, 1997: 190-193).

The term “*nation*” itself (“*natsiya*”) is understood and interpreted in Russian academic, political and public realms exclusively as ethnic nation, or ethno-nation (though the latter two terms are practically not used in Russia). The concept still bears the stamp of the Stalin's definition of a nation as the community of people with objective characteristics (common territory, economy, language, and psychic organisation). The *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* in its third edition (1974, vol. 17: 375-376) defines nation in very similar terms as “a historical community of people, setting up with the forming communality of their territory, economic ties, literary language, some specific features of their culture and character, which make up its constitutive attributes”.

Most of the Soviet and contemporary Russian scholars basically share this understanding, adding only one element of definition, which is the so-called “*national self-consciousness*”, that is self-awareness or a feeling of common identity. This understanding of the nation has important implications for the interpretation of the con-



cept of *national minority*, of which I will speak further. The definition of a nation in exclusively ethno-cultural terms (versus citizenship terms) is still dominant, if not the only one in Russian political and academic discourse. Common history, culture and language, as well as "ethnic homeland" or territory are mentioned or implied in every usage of the term. As it had been mentioned above, the nation is understood as the highest stage of an ethnos development in the Soviet theory of ethnos, the other stages being *plemya* (a tribe), and *narodnost'* (a nationality, that is an ethnic group). The notions of political or civil nations are practically out of use in contemporary political and public discourses. This explains the fact that nationalism in Russia is understood exclusively as ethnonationalism and is usually perceived as a sort of deviation, improper behaviour, or misdemeanour. It is very often associated with separatism as well. As ethnonationalism is an ideology based on the theory that ethnonations constitute the basic human forms of "normal" collectivities, it becomes evident that it is based on naturalistic approach to ethnic reality, on primordialist versions on ethnicity interpretation. The ethnonationalism is the ruling ideology in most of the NIS, including the Baltic states, and practically in all the republics of the Russian Federation.

The naturalistic explanations of ethnicity and of nationalism in Russia are still deeply entrenched, institutionalised in state policy, scholarly thought, education and, most important, in public opinion and the administrative-political structure of the federation. This is true also for all post-Soviet states. The reasons for this institutionalisation are various; among the most important are the disciplinary tradition of the Russian ethnography/ethnology, close political control and censure of academic research during the Soviet period, popularisation of academic discourse through the education system and media, and, to a certain extent, the "fusion" of political and academic elites in post-Soviet times. Another important reason, which needs to be mentioned, is the basic similarity and convergence between popular views on ethnic phenomena and naturalistic treatments of ethnic reality, which are sometimes so striking that I am inclined to speak not only of mutual reinforcement of lay and scholarly opinions in this respect, but also to suspect that the context of naturalistic theories formation was formed, in the first place, under a strong influence of nationalistic ideas. Here the German romantic treatment of ethnic reality should be mentioned once again, as Russian ethnology and anthropology not only inherited many of its ideological biases, but even the interdisciplinary boundaries and understanding of the discipline's subject in Russia was modeled similar to the divide between *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* of the German academic tradition.

It would be incorrect to argue that there were no other strains of theoretical thought, existing side by side with the dominant primordialist tradition, in the Soviet ethnology. Political liberalisation since the late 1980's and the rise of ethnic nationa-

lism and conflict, have brought radical changes for Russian anthropology. But even by the end of the 1970's a number of approaches, which could be viewed as different forms of instrumentalism, had appeared. Some authors, influenced by system and informational approaches, were trying to use the concept of information in ethnic phenomena analysis, combining primordialist views on "ethnos" as objective entity (ethno-social organism) with instrumentalist perspectives on intergenerational transfer of ethnic culture (Арутюнов and Чебоксаров, 1972; Арутюнов, 1989). Others were experimenting with information patterns or "models" of particular "ethnoses" (Пименов, 1977). Still others began suggesting that ethnic differentiation could be adequately described as an information process, reducing behavioural expectations in a multicultural environment to a set of typologically neat ethnic stereotypes (Сусоколов, 1990).

Another instrumentalist approach developed in the sub-discipline of economic anthropology, where the analysis of ethnic competition in labour markets was based implicitly on ethnic mobilisation theories (Шкаратан, 1986; Перепелкин and Шкаратан, 1989). Nevertheless, though these approaches which could be labelled as instrumentalist were considered fresh and exerted a certain influence, they were a sort of side show at the time they appeared, and were not viewed as substantially significantly distinct from the predominant naturalistic approaches, particularly since their authors were using the same terminology (*ethnos*, *ethno-social organism* and similar terms) and shared many presuppositions of the "naturalistic school".

While the instrumentalist approach to ethnic phenomena had been by the end of the 1970's, the constructivist approach remained outside domestic social science and was never seriously tested until the start of the 1990's, that is, almost a generation later. With the emergence of ethnic revival and the growth of separatism in the last decade in the post-Soviet space, scholars started to pay more attention to ethnicity construction in both theoretical and practical research. As a result ethnicity began to be seen as part of the repertoire that is "chosen" or "indoctrinated" by an individual or a group to achieve certain interests and goals, or as a *representation*, actively constructed by ethnic entrepreneurs. This approach has never attained predominance, though some publications had been made by sociologists (Филиппов, 1991, 1992; Voronkov, 1995), ethnologists and anthropologists (Tishkov, 1989, 1992; Соколовский, 1993, 1994a-c; Sokolovski and Tishkov, 1997; Ссорин-Чайков, 1991) and social psychologists (Солдатова, 1996). Though post-communist societies contain many examples of constructed and mobilised ethnicity, the instrumentalist and constructivist approaches to ethnic phenomena have not really been actively applied in the policy realm, remaining known principally within academia, and even there being met with scepticism and opposition. They have failed to become more widely used

due to their inherent complexity and deviance from popularised versions of ethnic reality models. For obvious reasons nationalist leaders oppose them as well, and support primordialist views on ethnic reality. Another reason, perhaps, why instrumentalist-constructivist frameworks have failed to resonate in the public's imagination is that they do not assign any automatic significance to *territory*. In both strains of primordialist thought in Russian anthropology, territory is definitive: landscape plays a crucial role in the process of *ethnogenesis* as described by L. Gumilev, whose books are as widely read as they are well written (in a manner reminiscent of historical novels, travel books or adventure stories) and appeal to a nationalistically oriented audience; Yu. Bromley includes territory in his definition of *ethnos* as well, listing it among the most important ethnic attributes.

“Naturalistic” ethnicity is often if not always territorialised. Territory becomes an ethnic homeland, an *ethnos*' inalienable property, *Lebensraum* for a living ethnic “organism”. *Blut* (which is camouflaged in some contemporary writings as “ethnic heritage”, “primordial givens”, or some sort of “intergenerational reproduction”) in this perspective is always intrinsically connected to *Boden* (that is, territory, landscape, geographical *locus*. This ideational linkage of *ethnos* to *territory* would seem to prime its advocates for ethnoterritorial conflict. And, indeed, there were almost 300 territorial claims made on behalf of ethnic groups or movements and parties in the period of 1988-96 in the CIS. Almost half of them are still active and ongoing. “Territorial claims”, “contested territories” and “territorial interests” are the most frequent terms that are employed in the current neo-geopolitical discourse.

It is worth mentioning here that in various ethnoterritorial conflicts there are different “objects” that are contested: very often it is territory itself, that is land. In this case it might be treated and is often actually treated as a resource. In other cases, the right of a particular ethnic group or category to live on the territory is contested. Sometimes only property rights or managerial aspects of territory usage on the side of one or another ethnic group are contested.

The ethnoterritorial nature of Soviet federalism as it was engineered and employed by Bolsheviks, has greatly contributed to and still influences the tailoring of various conflicts as ethnoterritorial, for such a tailoring exploits an apparent legitimacy to territorial claims on the side of “titular” ethnic groups,<sup>4</sup> or makes people

---

4 A “titular group” in the Soviet and post Soviet contexts means a group, which has given its name to the respective administrative and political unit, or state, such as Kazaks and Latvians in Kazakhstan and Latvia, Bashkirs, Karelians and Tatars in Bashkortostan, Karelia and Tatarstan etc. A titular group, being often a numerical mino-

think that this or that piece of land “belongs to” a locally dominant ethnic group. As the NIS’s borders remain ill-defined (which is even truer of the regional borders), mutually contested territories surround territorial units on all levels of administrative and political subdivision (Tishkov, 1992).

Territorial claims on behalf of an ethnic group usually seek corroborative legitimisation. Ethnic leaders and politicians in ethnic mobilisation campaigns often resort to what might be called *appropriation of history*, by which history itself becomes an important political resource. The appropriation of time, thus, is a strategy put in the service of appropriating space. Here academic reconstructions of an ethnic group’s history play a crucial role. These reconstructions are usually based on a certain conception of time, in which it is treated as a homogenous flow, characterised by the absence of any gap, rupture, schism or fracture (or what Heidegger might have called *der Riss*). This conception of a homogenous, continuous, and uninterrupted flow of time enables them to lend their time concept a quality of transparency, supported on a linguistic level by optical metaphors of *looking* at the past, *viewing* it, etc. Russian historiography, archaeology and ethnography are very often based on this reduction of the past to the present, and represent a projection of the modern state of things and a contemporary understanding of time, based on the concepts of gradualness and homogeneity on the historical process.

Examples of an instrumental use of cultural history are numerous. One such is the case of the Azeri historians’ whose nationalistic interpretation of the history of Caucasian Albania claims the territory of ancient Albania as the “grand-fatherland of the Azeris” (the same territories, incidentally, are viewed by Armenian historians as “historical Armenia”). This construction of a “rich” and “ancient” history of the Azerbaijani people has as a necessary component a description of the Karabakh territory as the “heart of Azerbaijan.” Similarly, Georgian intellectuals declare Shida Kartli or Somachablo (Southern Ossetia) “the heartland of Georgia”; Ingush leaders consider the village of Angusht, located in a disputed area, as the “fatherland of the Ingush”; and Ossetian intellectuals claim that the bones of the Alans, cultural predecessors of the Ossetians, “are scattered throughout the Northern Caucasus”. Many of the so-called national histories, encyclopedias, and cultural studies often bear little resemblance to the balanced, unprejudiced, and historiographically-attentive accounts by which a peoples actual history and ethnography might be learned. While

---

city within the state, or, as in the case of some republics in the Russian Federation - even on the territory of a respective republic, could use at the same time its top positions in the regional power hierarchy and effectively be a majority (or power elite) with appropriate for a majority political behavior patterns.

objectivist interpretations of ethnic group histories aim at linking archeological artifacts and cranial measurements with contemporary cultures, instrumentalists and constructivists pay attention to the role of cultural repertoires and language as symbols around which a perception of ethnic distinctiveness crystallizes. For the latter, historical reconstructions are merely ideological means used to justify the authenticity and the continuity of one or an other ethnic identity (Tishkov, 1997a: 14-15).

In addition to claims for an ethnic "Ur-homeland", I would mention here two more types of cases in which the inseparability of ethnos and territory in the public consciousness and in political discourse sets the stage for conflict. The first is the case of territorially constructed ethnoses such as Altay, Shor or Khakass in southwestern Siberia, where central authorities arbitrarily united diverse tribal groups into one nationality on a territorial basis. Though the constructed "nations" acquired arbitrary conceptual and territorial borders (which are, however, partially undermined by the attempts of some constitutive groups to have their own identity, as with the Kumanda or Teleut, currently categorised as constituents of the "Altay nation"), this fact has not prevented the national elite from striving for higher status and sovereignty, including control over regional resources.

Another type is the host of ethnoterritorial conflicts arising wherever pastoralist and farming groups come into close and prolonged contact. The classical example here is the cohabitation of farmers and pastoralists in the Transcaucasus (Azerbaijani seminomads and Armenian settled farmers in Karabakh) and Northern Caucasus (transhumant Avars, Laks or other "Highlanders" and Kumyk farmers in Dagestan) (Yamakov, 1993).

Naturalistic discourse on ethnicity is reinforced by a naturalistic treatment of resources. The Soviet and post-Soviet "political unconscious" binds the notion of *ethnos* with territory and its resources, thus creating a predisposition to see as legitimate territorial claims by ethnic groups. Contemporary research on ethnic conflicts in post-Soviet space contains numerous examples of such claims.

It is interesting to note how naturalistic conceptions of ethnicity and legitimisation of land claims through constructed ethnic histories and nationalistic discourse operate. Conceptually the "moral" position of *permanently* settled groups is considered to be more "legitimate" compared to the claims of groups who were using the land seasonally. This understanding springs from the coupled notions of *ethnos* and *territory* in the naturalistic paradigm of ethnic reality perception. Nomads evidently deviate from this standard concept of a people, for their links to territory are different. That is why it had been considered possible and even just to claim the return of lands

which are used by settled nomads (Kyrghyz in Batken', or Avars and Laks in Kumykia), while the reverse (demands to return pastures, previously used by pastoralists and turned later into crop-growing plantations) never happened. That is, claims by settled farmers seem to be automatically attributed more weight and legitimacy, than those by nomadic groups would be. This helps explain why former nomads feel the need for "surplus measures" (e.g., the planned land privatisation) to further legitimise their rights to lands.

Part of the difficulty in explaining a subject like "territorialised ethnicity" is that it is often so deeply embedded in, as to be indistinguishable among, the fundamental assumptions of nationalistic discourse. As a *topos*, moreover, it is inherent in many conceptual systems and disciplinary lexicons. We may approach this subject, nonetheless through the available and much discussed topic of "national minorities", which potentially contains both the idea of place ("national") and of ethnos ("minority"). The notion of "national minority" is a cornerstone of European policies in minority issues, setting the terms for the approaches of OSCE and the Council of Europe current approaches. Interestingly enough, though, even here neither the field of social science, nor the documentation of intergovernmental organisations contains a comprehensive and broadly agreed upon definition. I will discuss two of the term's meanings, one designated for convenience sake as "broad", the other as "narrow". Both meanings contain the *topos*, or conceptual linkage "ethnicity - territory", but the respective interpretations of this linkage differ substantially.

Let us consider first the broad meaning, exemplified by the usage of the term in such documents as the "Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and Explanatory Report" of 1994 (European Council) and the Copenhagen Conference for Human Dimension document of 1990 (CSCE). Both documents interpret the term "national" as referring to "nation" in its technical and legal meaning of "citizenship-bestowing", thus excluding such potential beneficiaries as migrant workers, stateless persons or apatrids, non-nationals, and refugees, whose protection is attended to by other international agreements. The phrasing of the documents supports the understanding that the notion "national minority" is extended to cover citizens who are members of ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious minorities. This breadth of categories is the reason why I defined this usage of the term as "broad". This interpretation of the term is also more liberal, than the narrow understanding, which I will discuss below. Nevertheless, this understanding unequivocally links the concepts of "minority" and "state", and the documents explicitly mention such characteristics of the state as sovereignty and territorial integrity, thus dividing nationalities into two distinct categories: groups with "their own" states and stateless groups. The linkage of ethnicity and territory is mediated in this interpretation by an overarching state.

The second, "narrow" meaning of the term is more conservative. This understanding is standard and widely spread in Central and Eastern European literature, though not limited to these regions. "National" in this second interpretation of the term implies "having its own state or polity", "having a homeland", which is always different, as in the case of "national minorities", from the country or region of residence. In Russia the term is applied to all minority groups, which are living "outside" their respective lands of origin, be it a state, or a political administrative unit within the Russian Federation. Examples include Kazakhs and Ukrainians, living in Russia, or Tatars and Mordvinians, residing outside Tatarstan and Mordovia respectively. Here the idea of a territorialised ethnicity is manifested more vividly, as this concept implies the existence of a "host state" and a "state of origin", "titular groups" (or dominant ethnic majorities, who gave their name to the polity) and kin groups "abroad", ethnic "homelands" and "other-lands". It is well documented that this territorialising project led to massive population exchanges immediately after World War I and ethnic cleansing campaigns and deportations afterwards.

The theoretical issues concerning the interrelationships of national minorities, nationalising states and external national homelands have been brilliantly analysed in the works of Rogers Brubaker (see, for example, Brubaker, 1994). He demonstrated the relational character and conceptual as well as "essentialist" interdependence of ethnicity, state, and territory (with its resources) in the political discourses of modern European history. The hypothesis put forward above, that the naturalistic paradigm applied to both resources and ethnicity subtly contributes to the production and reproduction of conflict relationships between territorialised ethnic groups, is supported by the analysis of ethnoterritorial conflicts. In Russia the *topos* "ethnicity - territory", or to be more exact, "*ethnos* - territory" is further reinforced by a proliferation of geopolitical publications and the influence they exert on foreign and domestic policies, especially on such aspect of these policies as the so called "nationalities policy". Geopolitical jargon pervades official and semi-official documents of various parties, political speeches, and discourses on ethnic, cultural and security issues etc.

Unfortunately, these discussions of geopolitics, whether in political or academic discourse, essentially reinforce the linkage between *ethnos* and territory, formed along the lines of the naturalistic paradigm. The link has become, ominously, an *assumption* of influential public figures and the mass public; it has become part of the conceptual or linguistic landscapes of the Russian and other NIS contemporary reality; it has begun to experience a degree of institutionalisation in the practices and planning strategies of analysts and policymakers. The critical analysis put forth by this paper and its attempt to de-couple, or at least re-examine the naturalistic version

of a linkage between ethnos and territory could be viewed as a step reversing its incipient institutionalisation.

## On The Model Of Early Warning

Considerable attention has been devoted in the past few years to the idea of getting an early warning of violent political conflicts. The goal of conflict early warning is straightforward. If we (a global or regional power or the international community) can be alerted that a violent conflict likely to result in bloodshed and/or a significant number of displaced persons (refugees) is going to occur in the near future with a high probability, we can then initiate actions to prevent that bloodshed or displacement. These actions include preventive diplomacy (sending in mediators to establish and facilitate negotiations between the parties of the brewing conflict), preventive peacekeeping (sending observers into an area to deter entry by (usually armed) groups whose presence in that territory would be incendiary), and applying political and economic pressure. Early warning and the associated preventive actions are considered good because it is almost certainly less costly in terms of both money and human lives for us to conduct those activities than it is to mount a major peace enforcement operation like Chechnya, Somalia or Bosnia where the violence has already erupted.

Contemporary conflict research disposes of vast conflict events data bases, well developed mathematical and computer methods and several competing methodologies on a more general level, which could be roughly outlined as numerical or quantitative and descriptive or qualitative approaches. The EW-model employed in this project is evidently and unequivocally descriptive. The choice had been made due to several limitations inherent in EW data collection procedures in post-Soviet states. First and foremost, there are no open data base collections in Russia or in any other of the NIS countries similar to that of Reuters or New York Times. The only exclusion - the ITAR-TASS data base is made in the computer formats, incompatible with personal computers operational media. Besides the journalistic understanding and construction of "an event" may differ both from academic and lay (that is local perspective on conflict of the adversaries) understandings. From the practical standpoint, the NIS differ in many respects from the West and the rest of the world in terms of accessible and reliable information such as statistics or events monitoring. The statistical categories employed have not necessarily a one-to-one correspondence to their western analogues, often to the point that they do not have such analogues at all (as in the case of "*propiska*", a sort of a residence permit, which is a specific factor in permanent population census calculus). All these idiosyncrasies of post-Soviet information space precluded borrowing and usage of a ready-made EW-model and made the task of creating a new one especially challenging.

The model employed in Russia had been worked out by the director of the Network for Ethnological Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts Prof. Valery Tishkov and had been discussed by the Network participants during their seminar in Lymassol (Cyprus), in October 1995 and discussed in Londonderry (1996) and Colombo (1997). The opportunity for global



comparisons had been provided, as the suggested model is based on interactive matrix which is used by the UNHCR staff for early warning of refugee flows on the level of a state, but the new model has a substantially different set of indicators, and could be used for assessing the situation on different levels (state, regional, communal etc.).

Since 1996 part of the Network participants had been involved in a project "Monitoring of Ethnicity, Conflict and Cohesion", which is supported by UNESCO programme "Management of Social Transformations" (MOST). During the first phase of the project its participants had collected extensive data on model indicators in regions, and the resulting reports provided a reference point for measuring of the positive or negative dynamics of the local situations. As most comprehensive of the reports were found to be of great interest for the specialist and demonstrated high analytical skills of their contributors, a decision had been made to publish them in monograph form. The first book of a planned series of monographs had been published in March 1997 and contained full-scale description of the model applied to the situation in Tuva Republic (Russian Federation). Later three more monographs (on Kalmykia, Kazakhstan and Latvia) had been published. The project participants believe that an exchange of expertise results from regular monitoring between existing networks and research groups may improve the quality of the public policy and find more balanced solutions for erupting ethnic conflicts.

As one of the stated goals of the project has been to increase knowledge and understanding of conflicting ethnicity the following research tasks were considered as crucial in attainment of this goal:

- further development of a database on ethnicity and conflicts in post-Soviet states;
- development and strengthening of a competent high-speed computer network of experts;
- in-depth analysis using the privilege and strength of local perspectives;
- a comparative overview and critical assessment of relevant concepts and terminology;
- dissemination of data and research outcomes through periodical publications and other communication means;
- information for policy makers, public and specialists on results of ethnological monitoring and positive experience in the sphere of inter-ethnic relations and conflict prevention.

## **STRUCTURE OF THE MODEL FOR EARLY WARNING**

### **CATEGORY 1. Environment and Resources**

1. Water resources and condition (drinkable water, irrigation, waterways and industries)
2. Land resources (quality of lands, size per person, accessibility, forest and other resources)
3. Mineral resources (extraction/production, accessibility users, profits)
4. Technological impact (hazardous production, emissions, wastes, pollution, compensations)
5. Ecological Disasters (earthquakes, landslides, etc., industrial, man-made, sabotage)

## CATEGORY 2. Demography and Migrations

6. Population (dynamics of numbers, ethnic composition, levels of urbanisation etc.)
7. Mixed marriages and divorces
8. Natural growth (birth rate, death rate, longevity)
9. Migration (internal and external, refugees, forced migrants, displaced population, seasonal workers)

## CATEGORY 3. Power and Politics

10. State-administrative status
11. Political regime and prevailing doctrine (federalism vs. unitarism, local self-government, parties and blocs, elections and power transition, state programs on various levels)
12. Ethnic representation (in bodies of power, business, media, science and academia)
13. Centre-periphery relations (legal foundations, negotiations, contacts, benefits and burdens)
14. Individual and group human rights (legal sufficiency, violations, control, human rights activities)
15. Public order and control (status and ethnic composition of the local police, arms availability and control, courts and judiciary)
16. Competence and legitimacy of leaders and power holders
17. Official symbols and calendar

## CATEGORY 4. Economy and Social Relations

18. Production and macro-economic dynamics
19. Income levels and gaps
20. Employment and unemployment
21. Division of labour (ethnic, regional and branch of industry on the level of services, exchange of services, prestigious occupations)
22. Social and occupational mobility (upward mobility of ethnic groups, increase or decrease in status in labour, existence of marginalised groups and their composition)
23. Participation in privatisation, including land
24. Social welfare
25. Crimes and communal violence

## CATEGORY 5. Culture, Education and Media

26. Cultural domineering
27. Religion (confessional composition and changes, number of temples, proselytising activities, tolerance/intolerance, role in the state, region, community)
28. Linguistic conditions (laws and instructions, state language, languages used in business, education, media and inter-group contacts)
29. School education (accessibility, textbooks and supplies, ethnic composition of teachers)
30. Higher education (admission regulations, ethnic composition of students and faculty, curriculum, student life)

31. Mass media (structure, composition, control, nature of programs, ethnic background and composition of journalists)
32. Traditional holidays and customs (conditions, support of authorities, political implications, participation of various ethnic groups)
33. Historical discourse

#### CATEGORY 6. Contacts and stereotypes

34. Group grievances
35. Previous conflicts and group traumas
36. Ethnic stereotypes (positive/negative, official resistance, spread and usage, pejorative names)
37. Changes in self-perception (correlation of ethnic and civic, regional and local components, revival of old and new identities)
38. Myths, fears and rumours
39. Existence and level of development of group ideologies
40. Levels of tolerance (inter-group animosity, clichés and violence)

#### CATEGORY 7. External conditions

41. Presence and influence of Diaspora (in neighbouring countries, regions)
42. Stability/instability of neighbouring countries, regions
43. Influence of global/geopolitical competition
44. Territorial claims and border disputes
45. External ties and co-operation
46. Changes of the image (of country, region, ethnic group, community; of political regime in the region, regime in the region, country, world)

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- АРУТЮНОВ, С. А. (1989). *Народы и культуры: развитие и взаимодействие*. Москва: Наука.
- АРУТЮНОВ, С. А. and Н. Н. ЧЕБОКСАРОВ (1972). "Передача информации как механизм существования этносоциальных и биологических групп человечества", in: *Расы и народы*, vol. 2. Москва: Наука.
- БРОМЛЕЙ, Ю. В. (1973). *Этнос и этнография*. Москва: Наука.
- БРОМЛЕЙ, Ю. В. (ed.) (1979). *Проблемы типологии в этнографии*. Москва: Наука.
- БРОМЛЕЙ, Ю. В. (1981). *Современные проблемы этнографии*. Москва: Наука.
- БРОМЛЕЙ, Ю. В. (1983). *Очерки теории этноса*. Москва: Наука.
- БРОМЛЕЙ, Ю. В. (1987). *Этносоциальные процессы: теория, история, современность*. Москва: Наука.

BRUBAKER, R. (1994). *National Minorities, Nationalizing States and External National Homelands in the New Europe: Notes towards a Relational Analysis. A research paper within collaborative Research Planning Group*. UCLA, Dept. of Sociology.

ФИЛИППОВ, А. Ф. (1991). “Социология и космос”, in: *SocioLogos*. Москва: Прогресс, pp. 241-273.

ФИЛИППОВ, А. Ф. (1992). “Наблюдатель империи”, *Вопросы социологии*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 89-120.

GELLNER, E. (1988). *State and Society in Soviet Thought*. London: Basil Blackwell.

ГУМИЛЕВ, Л. Н. (1989). *Этногенез и биосфера Земли*. Ленинград: Издательство Ленинградского университета.

ПЕРЕПЕЛКИН, Л. С. and О. И. ШКАРАТАН (1989). “Экономический суверенитет республик и пути развития народов”, *Советская этнография*, no. 4.

ПИМЕНОВ, В. В. (1977). *Удмурты: опыт компонентного анализа этноса*. Ленинград: Наука.

Regards sur l'anthropologie soviétique (1990), *Cahier du Monde Russe et Sovietique*, Paris, vol. 31, no. 2-3.

SHANIN, TH. (1989). “Ethnicity in the Soviet Union: Analytical Perceptions and Political Strategies”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 31, no. 3.

SLEZKIN, YU. (1991). “The Fall of Soviet Ethnography, 1928-38”, *Current Anthropology*, vol. 32, pp. 476-484.

СОКОЛОВСКИЙ, С. В. (1993). “Этнографическое исследование: идеал и действительность”, *Этнографическое обозрение*, no. 2-3.

СОКОЛОВСКИЙ, С. В. (1994a). “Парадигматика этнологического знания”, *Этнографическое обозрение*, no. 2.

СОКОЛОВСКИЙ, С. В. (1994b). “Этничность как память”, in: *Этнокогнитология: подходы к исследованию этнической идентичности*. Москва.

СОКОЛОВСКИЙ, С. В. (1994c). “Третий путь или попытка объяснения в разделенном сообществе”, *Мир России*, no. 2

СОКОЛОВСКИЙ, С. В. (1995). “О неуютности автаркии, национализме и постсоветской идентичности”, in: *Этнометодология*, vol. 2. Москва, pp. 87-114.

SOKOLOVSKI, S. and V. TISHKOV (1997). “Ethnicity”, in: *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Routledge, pp.190-193.

СОЛДАТОВА, Г. У. (1996). “Этническая идентичность и этнополитическая мобилизация”, in: Л. М. Дробижева, А. Р. Аклаев, В. В. Коротева and Г. У. Солдатова. *Демократизация и образы национализма в Российской Федерации 90-х годов*. Москва: Мысль.

- ССОРИН-ЧАЙКОВ, Н. В. (1991). "Национальные отношения и образ других в культуре центрально-сибирских эвенков", in: А. Г. Осипов (ed.). *Этнические конфликты в СССР: причины, особенности, исследовательские проблемы*. Москва.
- STEPANOV, V. V. (1994). "Hotbeds of Inter-Ethnic Tension", *Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 98-105.
- СУСОКОЛОВ, А. А. (1990). "Структурные факторы самоорганизации этноса", in: *Расы и народы*. Москва: Наука.
- ШИРОКОГОРОВ, С. (1923). *Этнос. Исследование основных принципов этнических и этнографических явлений*. Шанхай.
- ШКАРАТАН, О. И. (ed.) (1986). *Этносоциальные проблемы города*. Москва.
- TISHKOV, V. A. (1989). "Glasnost' and the nationalities within the Soviet Union", *Third World Quarterly*, Oct. issue.
- TISHKOV, V. A. (1992). "The Crisis in Soviet Ethnography", *Current Anthropology*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 371-382.
- TISHKOV, V. A. (1997a). *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Conflict In and After the Soviet Union: The Mind Aflame*. London: Sage.
- TISHKOV, V. A. (1997b). "Russian and Soviet Anthropology", in: *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Routledge, pp. 493-495.
- VAN DEN BERGHE, P. L. (1981). *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. New York: Elsevier.
- VORONKOV, V. (1995). "Do 'Russians' Exist as an Ethnic Community?", in: K. Segbers (ed.). *Post Soviet Puzzles: Mapping the Political Economy of the Former Soviet Union*, vol. 4. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verl-Ges, pp. 81-90.
- YAMSKOV, A. N. (1991). "Ethnic Conflict in Transcaucasus: The Case of Nagorno-Karabakh", *Theory and Society*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 631-660.
- YAMSKOV, A. N. (1993). "Causes of Ethnic Conflicts over Territories in the Former Nomadic and Pastoral Areas of the Caucasus", in: *Региональные проблемы межнациональных отношений в России*. Омск, pp. 322-326.

**Сергей В. Соколовский**

## **ПРАВА МЕНЬШИНСТВ И РАННЕЕ ПРЕДУПРЕЖДЕНИЕ КОНФЛИКТОВ В РОССИЙСКОЙ ФЕДЕРАЦИИ**

### **РЕЗЮМЕ**

Статья содержит критические комментарии к использованию понятия "меньшинство" в российских социальных науках и политике. Существует множество проблем, препятствующих прямому заимствованию этого понятия из языков международного права или западных социальных наук. К числу важнейших относится то обстоятельство, что понятие "меньшинство" наиболее адекватно применимо в контексте демократических государственных устройств. В так называемых "переходных обществах", где положение группы в системе властных отношений зависит не столько от ее численности, сколько от иных ресурсов - богатства, уровня образования и групповой солидарности, доступа к силовым структурам и органам управления, монополии на важнейшие социальные и экономические сферы и т.п. - использование понятия "меньшинство" становится неуместным. Помимо этого, понятийное поле, в котором оказалось "меньшинство" в дискурсах российской науки и политики, резко отличается от своих западных аналогов. Здесь "меньшинство" противопоставляется не столько "большинству", сколько таким неизвестным на Западе политическим реалиям постсоветского пространства как "титовская нация", "коренной этнос", "государствообразующий народ" и др. Поскольку понятие "меньшинство" в России оказывается тесно связанным с представлениями об "этнотопосе", постольку значительное место в статье уделяется анализу парадигм исследований этнической реальности. В заключение приводится описание модели раннего предупреждения конфликтов, составной частью которой является мониторинг прав меньшинств.

**КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА:** меньшинство, этничность, национализм, Россия, этнические конфликты

**Sergej V. Sokolovski**

## **PRAVA MANJINA I RANO OTKLANJANJE SUKOBA U RUSKOJ FEDERACIJI**

### **SAŽETAK**

Članak kritički komentira pojam "manjina" što se rabi u ruskoj društvenoj znanosti i politici. Postoje mnoge poteškoće u vezi s izravnim preuzimanjem tog pojma iz jezika međunarodnog prava ili zapadne društvene znanosti. Među najvažnijima možemo navesti to što je pojam "manjina" najprikladniji u demokratskim državnim ustrojstvima. U tzv. "prijelaznim društvima" u kojima položaj skupine u sustavu odnosa vlasti ne ovisi toliko o njezinoj brojnosti, koliko o drugim resursima - bogatstvu, razini obrazovanja i grupne solidarnosti, dostupu do struktura moći i tijelima upravljanja, monopoli nad najvažnijim socijalnim i gospodarskim sferama itd. - uporaba pojma "manjina" manje je umjesna. Osim toga, konceptijsko polje u koje rasprave u ruskoj znanosti i politici stavljaju "manjinu", oštro se razlikuje

od zapadnih analogija. Ovdje se "manjina" suprotstavlja ne toliko "većini", koliko političkoj stvarnosti nepoznatoj na Zapadu kao što su "titularna nacija", "korijenska /indigena/ etnija", "državotvorni narod" i dr. Budući da je pojam "manjina" u Rusiji tijesno povezan s predodžbama o "etnijski", znatno mjesto u članku nudi analizu paradigama istraživanja etničke stvarnosti. U zaključku opisani modeli za rano otklanjanje sukoba, sastavni su dio promatranja kako se prava manjina poštuju.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: manjina, etničnost, nacionalizam, Rusija, etnički sukobi