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This article presents the determinant factors that affect the management of ethnopolitics in the countries of Eastern Europe and the way those factors influence the security of the region. The first part of the article explains what ethnopolitics is and where the essence of the management of ethnopolitics lies. The second part points out the key determinants of national politics in Ukraine, Moldova, and Belarus, including ethno-demographic, cultural, legal, ethnopolitical and multilateral factors. The article concludes that omitting these determinants hinders the effective planning, organization and control of ethnopolitical management. The failure of state authorities in the region to take these factors into account in formulating geopolitical goals results in a lack of effectiveness of national politics. It is, however, conducive to creating conflicts and tensions on ethnic grounds, which threaten the security of individual countries, and consequentially the security of the region. The last part of the article also contains recommendations concerning the effective management of ethnopolitics in the countries of Eastern Europe.
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Introduction

Ongoing transformations in Eastern Europe, which are mainly taking part on the territory of Ukraine and Moldova, create more and more questions regarding the management
of ethnopolitics in these countries. It is clearly visible that no country is able, in the long run, to prevent national conflicts by sanctioning the already existing divisions related to language, identity or politics or, what is particularly important, by generating new ones. The question of how to manage ethnopolitics so that it does not generate unnecessary divisions which affect the safety of a country, is becoming the topic of a growing number of discussions and public debates, but it also becomes a subject of analyses for scholars [Deyermond 2007].

Eastern Europe due to its geographical location, cultural and ethnic diversity and simultaneous clashing of influences between the Russian Federation and the European Union on its territory, is a region that is susceptible to the influence of numerous ethnopolitical processes, but also confrontations which may and do take a form of ethnopolitical conflicts that endanger its security [Kuzio 2007; Wolff 2006]. That the existing regimes create crises is confirmed by the political and geographic transformation that has been continuing for years in the region, by the pathologies, corruption, and paralysis of the justice systems which are characteristic of Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine, by the war in Donbas [Haines 2015] and by the issue of separatist Transdniestria. These countries are not able to work out an effective mechanism for monitoring and controlling ethnopolitical processes and for resolving (especially in Ukraine and Moldova) ethnopolitical conflicts, let alone enhancing the development of the region and shaping its security. Tensions in the region are linked to the demographic potential of the Russian minority; based on different statistics [Chislennost’ i sostav naseleniya Ukrayini 2001; Perepis’ naseleniya respubliki Belarus’ 2009; Naselenie 2019; Recensamant.statistica 2014] it can be projected that in 2019 Russians in Belarus made up 8.3% of the ethnic structure, in Moldova 4.1%, in Transdniestria 30–35%, in Ukraine 17.3–25%. These Russian minorities are more and more actively demanding the expansion of their rights to be realized while being supported, not only politically, but also financially by Russia [Laruèlle 2015; Wierzbicki, Karolak-Michalska 2016]. Our own observations made in the region lead to the conclusion that it is characterized by fighting between elites who compete for power [Solchanyk 2001], economic profit, influence in other spheres of social life, and the activation or development of ethnopolitical processes. More and more frequently ethno-nationalist and separatist forces are revealed – the things we observe in the light of the war in Donbas and the founding of the Luhansk People’s Republic and the Donetsk People’s Republic, but also in Moldovan Transdniestria and the Autonomous Territorial Unit of Gagauzia. In practice, such ambitions may involve the introduction of changes to boarders in the region and they pose a real threat that the security crisis in the post-Soviet region will deepen. This blocks the development of democratic processes and hinders socio-economic transformation [Sanders 2001], but it also raises questions of how to effectively manage ethnopolitics.

The literature on the determinant factors, entities, concepts and carrying out of ethnopolitics in the countries of Eastern Europe [Hale 2008; Kelley 2004; Turnaev 2004; Wimmer 2013; Zisserman-Brodsky 2003] concludes that there are not enough synthetic elaborations that would refer to factors that condition the effective management of ethnopolitics for the security of individual countries. There are also no models for the management of ethnopolitics, the application of which could mean the identification of threats and the minimization of ethnic tensions. This article identifies the main determinants that shape the management of ethnopolitics in the countries of Eastern Europe, the overlooking of which results in difficulties in ensuring the security
of the region. The thematic scope of the research is Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine. The author asks two main research questions: (1) in what way are the ethnopolitics and the management of ethnopolitics understood in these countries; (2) what factors need to be taken into account in the management of ethnopolitics in order for it to be effective?

The research involved an interdisciplinary approach, integrating methods characteristic for sciences that focus on management, politics, international affairs or security. The following methods are mainly used in research: (1) systemic analysis, whereby events are interpreted not as a loose set of isolated elements, but as an internally integrated and regular “space”; (2) the institution-legal method; (3) the comparative method, which makes it possible to identify common and different elements in the countries undergoing political, legal, economic and social system changes; (4) the historical method; (5) the behavioral method, which allows the analysis of social phenomena through the observation of the behavior of individuals and communities; (6) the ethno-political method, which analyzes the participation of ethnic communities in power structures, the interdependence between the ethnic structure of the state or region, and ethnic representation in legislative and executive bodies; (7) the ethno-demographic method, which analyzes the basic demographic indicators of ethnic communities. The author uses conclusions from her own research during her international trips between 2014 and 2018 and survey studies, quantitative and extended interviews carried out between 2016 and 2018 in research centers such as SWPS University in Warsaw.

Understanding ethnopolitics in the countries of the region

In the countries of Eastern Europe ethnopolitics is becoming more and more significant in the relations between ethnicity and politics. This is the influence that the elites who represent a state have on ethnic groups. This is the “internal” verification of state ethnopolitics.

---

1 Republic of Belarus, Republic of Moldova and Ukraine which make up the countries of Eastern Europe, together take up the area of 845.1 thousand km², which, according to data from the first half of 2019 is populated by approx. 54.5 million people of different nationalities. Each of those countries apart from ethnic mosaic, typical for that given country, is also characterised by geographical, cultural, economic and political idiosyncrasies. It needs to be made precise that those countries are parts of a broader area that is referred to as Middle-Eastern Europe – space identified on the ground of geopolitics and international relations, that consists, in a holistic and at the same time the broadest conceptual meaning, of: 1) countries of the Visegrád Group (Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary); 2) Baltic countries (Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia); 3) Republic of Belarus, Ukraine, Republic of Moldova; 4) countries that were created after the breakup of former Yugoslavia (Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Macedonia, Serbia, Kosovo); 5) the remaining Balkan countries (Albania, Bulgaria, Romania) [Lach 2014]. According to the classification used by the Statistical Division of the United Nations, Eastern Europe included: Republic of Belarus, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Republic of Moldova, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Ukraine, Hungary [Standard Country or Area Codes for Statistical Use 2019].

2 From the geographical point of view of the discussed topic, it is of key importance in the above context to refer to Russian language, in which the following terms function: “этнополитика” (“etnopolitika”), “национальная политика” (“natsional’naya politika”). Those terms are used interchangeably. Own analyses concerning occurrence of the analysed term, allow to agree with the researchers [Chałupczak, Zenderowski, Baluk 2015], that in political science, as well as linguistic and philosophy dictionaries if a definition of “этнополитика” is provided, there is no definition of “национальная политика” (and the other way round). The term “этнополитика” to a greater extent is used in scientific literature, while the term “национальная политика” dominates in official documents (e.g. acts). On the other hand, in Ukrainian language the term “национальна політика” (“natsional’na polityka”), is more popular than the terms “етнополітика” (“etnopolitika”) or “етнічна політика” (“ethnic politics”). From analysis of Ukrainian literature it stems that the terms “национальна політика” and “етнополітика” are used interchangeably. It draws attention that the term “национальна політика” is much more often used in legal acts of a country, and the term “етнополітика” in scientific research works [Zenderowski, Chałupczak, Baluk 2015].
performed by political elites and mutual relations between ethnic groups. Therefore, three categories of ethnopolitics are key for the analysis: (1) country/state; (2) political elites who represent a state and ethnic groups and; (3) ethnic groups [Wierzbicki 2015, p. 54]. From a subject perspective, ethnopolitics, as a practical activity, consists of three interdependent components: (1) ethnicity, which is embodied by ethnic communities in politics and social life; (2) ethnopolitical organisms, which involve the overall organizations of social life and their political institutions, including legal and political norms, and the ethnopolitical institutions shaped by tradition and customs; (3) ethnopolitical processes, which embrace political representation of ethnic communities, their participation in the management of state and political behaviors, the activity of ethnic socio-political organizations, nation making processes, and linguistic issues [Wierzbicki 2008, p. 29].

Studies devoted to definition-related approaches to ethnopolitics also reveal its goals. The following are among the most frequently seen in research and expert analyses:

1) enabling full political participation of individual ethnic groups in a political system of a given country [Jansons 2003, p. 125; Wierzbicki 2008, pp. 44–45];

2) creating conditions for cooperation between individual ethnic groups [Toshchenko 2003, p. 137];

3) regulating relations between ethnic groups [Abdulatipov 2004, pp. 102–103];

4) the justification and harmonization of business–ethnic politics as a “realization of business of every ethnic community, taking into account the character of their mentality, way of living, history, cultural legacy, independently from their number or dense or scattered inhabitancy” [Guboglo 2003, p. 723];

5) preventing and resolving ethnic conflicts, protecting minorities, and solidifying inter-ethnic tolerance [Kellas 1998, p. 6; Tavadov 2002, p. 323];

6) satisfying the needs and aspirations of individual ethnic groups;

7) creating conditions for developing and maintaining national identities, but also national rebirth, e.g. after periods of compulsory assimilation [Guboglo 2003, p. 723];

8) promoting and maintaining the social and political integrity of a country and individual ethnic groups [Guboglo 2003, p. 723];

9) the integration and assimilation of members of individual ethnic groups with the majority [Cordell, Wolff 2004; Rothschild 1981, pp. 71–73].

Alternatively, ethnopolitics is presented as an aspiration:

1) maintaining and strengthening the privileged position of the titular nation at the expense of other ethnic groups and nations;

2) the continuation of planned and organised social, cultural and economic marginalisation of minority groups or consciously ignoring the needs of minorities;

3) eliminating minorities (through assimilation, repatriation, expulsion) [Zenderowski, Chałupczak, Baluk 2015, p. 46].

Moreover, as Posner writes, “we can look at ethnopolitics in the category of coalition-building policy, and the choice of ethnic identity can be seen in the category of aiming at membership in a coalition that will be the most politically and economically useful” [Posner 2005, p. 2].

The management of ethnopolitics – understood as planning, organizing, managing and controlling it – is also connected with social functions. The following functions are among the most important:

1) the protective function (of a given status quo, of identity and the state, of the rights of minorities, etc.);
2) the integrative function (of members of the state, including nation-building; maintaining bonds with fellow countrymen who live abroad, permanently or temporarily; of members of the minority, creating and maintaining social cohesion in a supra-ethnic dimension);

3) the distributional function (materially and non-materially), which enables the center of power to distribute limited resources between individual ethnic/national groups and this significantly affects socio-political attitudes of individual groups;

4) the regulatory function (the creation of procedures and institutions that define the relations between public authorities and individual ethnic groups; defining the rights and responsibilities of their members; defining the state’s responsibilities to minorities);

5) the conflict-making function (creating and managing social conflicts that have ethnic grounds as a form of solidifying and keeping political power; most frequently it involves creating a sense of threat and making the nation believe that this threat comes from an ethnic group and putting the state in a role of protector);

6) the educational and propagandist function (generating knowledge about a nation and ethnic groups and encouraging certain type of attitudes towards them);

7) the communication function (creating official and unofficial channels of symmetrical or asymmetrical, vertical or horizontal communication between entities of ethnic politics: authorities, minorities, immigrants, diaspora, etc.);

8) the mobilization function (the creation of a system of incentives that motivate more active participation in socio-political life, including the strengthening of social bonds, acting for the benefit of national cohesion) [Zenderowski, Chalupczak, Baluk 2015, pp. 75–76].

The main determinants of the management of ethnopolitics

The determinants which shape the contemporary management of ethnopolitics of the countries of the region have a varied character that concerns numerous spheres, including demographic, cultural, identity-related, legal and political. It is especially important that the determinants have a specific character and that affects the management of ethnopolitics in these countries.

One of the main determinants of ethnopolitics in the countries of Eastern Europe is the ethno-demographic situation of each country, which most often is a result of historic, economic, political and cultural circumstances. Between 1991 and 2019 in Belarus (see: [Kakarenko 2018; Tymanowski 2017]), Moldova and Ukraine, the basis of their national structure was made up of the titular nation, without giving way to any of the national or ethnic minorities. According to the National Censuses, the titular nations made up in Belarus 81.23% of the population in 1999, and 83.4% in 2009; in Moldova in 2004 79.1% and in 2014 75.1%; in Ukraine in 2001, 77.8%. The demographic position of Russian minorities highlights the background of the region; according to the data from 2019 Russians make up 8.3% of population of Belarus, 4.1% of Moldova (without Transdniestria where Russians make up around 30% of the ethnic structure) and 17.3% in Ukraine [Chislennost’ i sostav naseleniya Ukrainy 2001; Perepis’ naseleniya respubliki Belarus’ 2009; Naselenie 2019; Recensamant.statistica 2014]. Migration is a reflection
of changes that are taking place in the cultural, economic and political sphere. Certain trends in demographic transformations have the power to create social changes, therefore, they need to be observed and analyzed in order to be able to intervene at the appropriate time – to skillfully manage migration waves. For example, in Ukraine, because of the migration wave that involved 2 million people, partly caused by the war in Donbas, the country has entered a phase of socio-political change, which has consequences for security, including impaired national defense capabilities.

Many years of observations of the region lead to the conclusion that the ethnic differentiation of Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine makes it necessary for local authorities to build a new paradigm of ethnic relations. The situation of national minorities with a less favorable demographic is a source of various types of state and social discrimination. Discrimination may be one of the potential sources of threats to social and political security. The presence of minorities in society gives rise to a whole spectrum of emotions of the rest of society, such as fear, suspicion, distrust, enmity. Such a situation may generate threats to security, affecting stability, public order, causing social conflicts with the dominant majority or affecting relations with the state or the international community.

The national identities in the region draws attention to cultural determinants. It is becoming indisputable that significant differences in national identity in Ukrainian society are actually present, which is caused in part by the large influence of Russian culture, mainly the Russian language [Poppe, Hagendoorn 2003]. Hnatiuk thinks that “this nation is not united neither by a common language, nor by a common historic memory, or a common challenge – three elements that are considered constitutive for national identity” [Hnatiuk 2003, p. 56]. The differences in perception of what Ukrainian identity is [Hagendoorn, Linssen, Tumanov 2001] are often so strongly polarized – which is confirmed by the events during the war in Donbas – that they make it impossible for the country to function. Continuing, violent changes in Ukraine make it difficult to precisely define what Ukrainian identity consists of and what kind of character it is taking. In the face of the war in Donbas in Ukraine a radicalization of social attitudes has occurred. People started to look for military models from the past, as seen in the common usage of OUN-UPA symbolism in environments in which Russian-speaking citizens of central and eastern Ukraine dominate (however, this was not accompanied by the adoption of the ideologies of the historical organizations); “Accelerated weakening of the traditional identification of nationality with language typical for Ukrainian national thought – occurs. Using Ukrainian ceased to be the main indicator of identity. It enables the creation of a new concept of Ukrainian nation – which is now understood not only as a strictly ethnic community, but also as a civil, political community, in which there is place for all citizens who are loyal to the country” [Olszański 2015].

Belarusian national identity in comparison is being carried out in a complicated and ambiguous way. Most Belarusians feel related to Russia. The average person in Belarus perceives their Belarusian identity in the category of folklore-ethnographic, linguistic and regional distinctiveness in the context of a larger whole, which they co-create together with Russians and they compare themselves with Russian, not with the West [Radzik 2009, p. 58]. In the national and territorial context, Belarusians describe themselves as белорусы (Belarusians), but when it comes to cultural belonging, they refer to themselves as Русские (Russians). In Moldova two main models of identity have developed over the years: pan-Romanianism (related to the nation) and Moldavism (related to ethnicity). Pan-Slovianism is also present [Wierzbicki 2014, pp. 21–22].
In terms of the cultural factors in the management of ethnopolitics, the issue of the status of national languages also needs to be addressed (in Belarus it is Belarusian and Russian, in Moldova it is Moldavian, in Ukraine it is Ukrainian), but also the position of languages of national or ethnic minorities. The languages of national minorities often become a source of conflict, which result in ethnic conflicts and generates divisions among society. For example, in practice the situation in Ukraine refers to Russian language (Russians since 1991 have been suggesting giving it status as a national language), but also Hungarian (the Hungarian minority living in Transcarpathia seek cultural autonomy for the region including having Hungarian as a regional language). Moldavian and Ukrainian linguistic divisions constantly raise questions concerning the unity of the country and the stability of Moldavian and Ukrainian independence. In Ukraine they are particularly symbolized by division of the country into “East and West”, generating a conflict of “two Ukraines”.

A strong national identity of the citizens these states corresponds to their security. We have titular nations which, if they are aware of their national identity and its determinants (attachment to language, culture, national history, etc.), and also strongly identify with it (feeling like Ukrainians in Ukraine, Moldovans in Moldova, Belarusians in Belarus), protect their historical homeland, taking care of its internal and foreign security. On the other hand, we are faced with non-titular nations (national and ethnic minorities), who, being aware of their national identity, cultivate and strengthen it, among other things by using their native language. The sense of national identity of individual titular and non-titular nations may vary from insignificant to important. From the point of view of state security, of particular importance are those non-titular nations that have a strong sense of their own national identity and ties with their motherland, which they articulate in their cultural activity, but also socio-politically, demanding a number of different rights, and often when creating local communities, autonomy (e.g. Russians in Crimea, Gagauzi in Moldova, Hungarians in Zakarpattia, Russians in Transdnjestria).

Another level of determinant factors are legal determinants. They refer to internal and external legislation in respect of the rights of national or ethnic minorities [Kymlicka 2000]. By analyzing the legal acts of these countries, which concern ethnopolitics (the constitutions of Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine, but also acts and regulations of lower rank) it is clear that they contain basic guarantees when it comes to rights of national or ethnic minorities. Moreover, they treat belonging to a minority as a matter of individual choice for every citizen. What is particularly important, the legislation of the countries in question and the regulations concerning the rights of national or ethnic minorities are neither extended nor detailed. The multi-ethnicity of a country (especially Ukraine) contributed to the creation of a legislative basis connected with national minorities but it failed to provide representation of minorities in the mechanism of defining the scope, distribution and controlling of how the resources from the national budget are devoted to the needs of minorities.

---

In these countries there is a need for legislative action to be taken which refer to respecting of rights of national minorities. The national political management performed by the authorities of Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine, first and foremost, should focus on inter-ethnic agreement and the prevention of ethnic conflicts on their territories [Schneckener, Wolff 2004], and on ensuring the harmonious development of relations between the majority and minorities. Furthermore, it should be focused on democratization, the improvement of living conditions, the activation of all the groups in building civil society and guaranteeing the protection of the ethnic and cultural identity of citizens [Wierzbicki, Karolak-Michalska 2016, pp. 104–106].

The laws concerning national and ethnic minorities in Eastern Europe are an important element in providing security for the region. The absence of legal solutions to secure and protect the rights of minorities correlates with the growing dissatisfaction of minorities, causing ethnic tensions. The laws and activities of national and ethnic minorities, and the way they are respected in practice, show the degree of openness of the state and the maturity of society towards a heterogeneous ethnic structure. It is particularly important that individual states have a duty to ensure the free development of national identity, cultural development, the use of native languages and protection in situations where these rights are threatened. Respect for, and the protection of, the rights of national and ethnic minorities in the region are one of the most important recommendations concerning the ethnopolitics of states, and are one of the main challenges for the security of Eastern Europe.

Other factors affecting the management of ethnopolitics are the ethnopolitical determinants connected with the participation of representatives of national minorities in the structures of power and with their activity in political parties and non-governmental organizations. Ethnopolitical processes in the countries of the region correspond to the transformation of post-Soviet political systems and this is dictated by a wide range of factors (e.g. the existence or lack of a strong tradition of statehood, the distinctness of the social structure, the attitude of power elites to the process of transformation, the economic condition of the country and its economic relations with neighboring countries, or finally belonging to different cultural circles [Bodio, Jakubowski 2010]).

In the countries of the region the titular nation prevailed in the structures of legislative power between 1991 and 2019. None of the analyzed countries introduced limitations to other national or ethnic groups in access or participation in power in the period; representatives of minorities can participate in state-creation.

The key factor which stimulates activity of national and ethnic minorities are the socio-political changes which have been taking place in those countries since 1991 [Bodio 2010, p. 229; Kubaczyk, Majchrzak, Żyła 2018]. New conditions – undergoing certain changes – give space for the activities of ethnic communities, and since the 1990s, these were focused and are still focused on issues related to the rebirth or revitalization of ethnic cultures. Along with the dynamics of socio-economic changes in the region, the activity of national minorities starts to get a more pre-thought character. It finds its expression in minorities organizing themselves into unions, associations or organizations. Furthermore, it reveals struggles among the ethnic communities, as their members acquire political awareness, they build a sense of being subjects, but they also self-organize and solve internal conflicts.

While studying the activity of national and ethnic minorities in political parties and non-governmental organizations, it can be noted that separatist activities are
particularly important for state security. In the case of Belarus, this problem does not exist. In Moldova (Gagauzia and Transdniestria) and Ukraine (Crimea, Donbass, the Carpathian region), on the other hand, it has a real dimension. The separatist tendencies dictated by ethnic factors are an important element in the shaping of state security policy. They are also a space where the reaction of state authorities is necessary, including not only security, but also the efficient management of ethnopolitical processes in the state. It is crucial that separatist issues are not “temporarily frozen”, but peacefully resolved without disturbing the territorial integrity of states.

The multimedia sphere is the final key determinant of the management of ethnopolitics. Relations between parent states of non-titular nations and the receiving countries are its essence. The relations of Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine with Russia are of special importance in this context. The Russian minority in Belarus is not a source of tension and does not generate conflict in the relations between Belarus and Russia; the situation looks different in Moldova and Ukraine. The issue of separatist Transdniestria is a burden that affects relations between Moldova and Russia. This in fact is a “frozen conflict” but it is directly related to the Russian minority. From the Russian perspective, Transdniestria is a border area of Russia’s sphere of influence, belonging to which is accepted by the authorities of the separatist region. Transdniestria is a territory in Eastern Europe in which Russian uses as excuse to protect the Russian minority and Russian-speaking people, and this can affect the security of the subregion. It needs to be borne in mind that Russia is trying to force a federal variant in which the right-bank of the Dniester river of Moldova with Transdniestria, and with Gagauzia, would create one common country. This solution, in a form of a pro-Russian state – from the point of view of Russian authorities bringing numerous benefits – influences the actions of the Moldavian government, especially in foreign policy. It is meaningful that citizens of both regions, like their authorities, are strongly against the integration of Moldova with the EU or NATO, and they prefer cooperation with Russia, including joining the Eurasian Economic Union [Całus 2016, p. 77].

On the other hand, in the case of relations between Ukraine and Russia the situation concerns the incorporation of Crimea into Russia, and the ongoing war in Donbas (see: [Błażewicz, Krzyszkowski, Żyła 2018; Bodio, Marszałek-Kawa 2018]). Although, in the eyes of the Russian authorities, the direct reason of the separation of Crimea from Ukraine was the state revolution which happened on 22nd of February 2014 in Kiev, which is considered one of “color revolutions” on the post-Soviet territory, independent researchers and experts do not omit the role of the Russian minority and its activity in the process of the incorporation of the peninsula by Russia [Bajor 2011, pp. 129–140; Bajor 2014]. The Russian minority is also involved in the rhetoric of the Ukrainian and Russian war which has been going on since 2014 in Donbas. The success of the incorporation of Crimea into Russia encouraged the Russian-speaking part of society – which is mainly in clusters in the eastern part of the country – to continue their activities aimed at succession. In many cities (especially in the east-southern region – e.g. Donetsk, Luhansk, Kharkiv) there were demonstrations and protests against the Ukrainian authorities, during which pro-Russian activists demanded the incorporation of individual districts into the Russian Federation.

In the post-Soviet area, there is a need to treat the security of individual states and their bilateral and multilateral relations in the context of national and ethnic minorities as a process subject to permanent change because of the ongoing political and socio-economic transformations.
Conclusions

The determinant factors do not exhaust the complex socio-political reality that influences the effective management of ethnopolitics in the countries of Eastern Europe. However, they create a framework of conditions. If those conditions are not taken into account it would make it difficult to effectively plan, organize and control ethnopolitical management. The omission of the above determinants by state authorities in formulating the goals of geopolitics would result in a lack of effectiveness of national politics, while creating conflicts and tensions on ethnic grounds, threatening the security of individual countries (especially Moldova and Ukraine), and consequentially the security of the whole region.

The essence of the effective management of ethnopolitics is the precise and quick translation of strategic concepts developed at the highest level of power into precise goals (included in field strategies) for individual elements of the security system of a country or for the performers in individual sectors of the administration (ministers or managers of organizational units of government administration) and later on, into individual tasks carried out on the operational level [Kulisz 2011, p. 110]. This reasoning becomes one, although given the complex character of the situation, not the only one or even a sufficient mechanism to eliminate ethnopolitical threats in the region. To ensure the effective management of ethnopolitics for the security of the countries of Eastern Europe it is necessary:

1) to treat each citizen of a given territorial unit (especially if it is ethnically diversified) as a special security subject;
2) to develop the organization of a power system and a means to ensure ethnopolitical security which would be adjusted to the level of threats;
3) to adjust the financing of the security system to identify and monitor ethnopolitical threats;
4) to educate state administration personnel that would have professional preparation based on leadership;
5) to conceptualize the functioning of an ethnopolitical security system on grounds of a clearly defined strategy [Kwieciński 2009, p. 9].

The management of ethnopolitics in Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine must embrace the specificity of each of those countries and respond to local needs. Despite the different characters of each of these countries, a catalogue of universal actions in the sphere of ethnopolitics can be created, the implementation of which could calm ethnic tensions in the region. The following need to be listed among those:

1) a detailed analysis of the demographic, cultural, legal, ethnopolitical and multilateral circumstances of the nationalistic policy by state authorities;
2) designing a multidimensional sphere of communication (both on the level of media and politics) characterized by a factual exchange of information, without building tensions and symptoms of discrimination against any ethnic group;
3) changes in legislation to eliminate any discrimination related to ethnic origin; the initiation of legislative actions that refer to respecting the rights of national and ethnic minorities;
4) the popularization of communication between the intellectual and cultural elites of individual ethnic groups;
5) the creation of institutions to detect ethnopolitical threats at an early stage (their identification, scale, intensity, a rational assessment of the degree of advancement and a correct evaluation of potential threat, the creation of projects to neutralize a given threat, building scenarios of solutions);

6) the constant monitoring of the ethnic situation of a country, including the creation of clusters of people and migration (of the titular nation and national and ethnic minorities).

The use of these recommendations would, in practice, significantly increase the effectiveness of the management of ethnopolitics in the region, and by this, the level of security of the countries of Eastern Europe.
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В статье анализируются условия регулирования этнополитики в Российской Федерации и в странах Восточной Европы (Республике Беларусь, Республике Молдова, Украине) и их влияние на безопасность субрегиона. В первой части статьи объясняется сущность этнополитики; во второй части рассматриваются ключевые детерминанты национальной политики в Украине, Молдове и Беларуси, включая этнодемографические, культурные, правовые, этнополитические и многосторонние факторы. В ходе анализа факторов, формирующих современное управление этнополитикой государств субрегиона, выявляется, что они имеют специфический характер, влияющий на весь процесс администрирования этнополитики в Республике Беларусь, Республике Молдова и Украине. В заключении делается вывод, что отсутствие детерминант сдерживает эффективное планирование, организацию и контроль этнополитических процессов. Неспособность государственных органов при формулировании этнополитических целей субрегиона учитывать вышеперечисленные условия, с одной стороны, приведет к неэффективности проведения этнополитики и, с другой, будет способствовать возникновению этнической напряженности и конфликтов, что поставит под угрозу безопасность отдельных государств (особенно Республики Молдова и Украины) и, следовательно, всего субрегиона в целом.
Последняя часть статьи содержит рекомендации по эффективному управлению этнополитикой в странах Восточной Европы: в Республике Беларусь, Республике Молдова и Украине необходимо учитывать специфику каждой из этих стран и реагировать на потребности их обществ. Несмотря на своеобразие каждой страны, следовало бы создать перечень универсальных действий в области регулирования этнополитики, реализация которых могла бы стать превентивным фактором перед вызовами этнического разнообразия в отдельных странах, тем самым ослабляя этническую напряженность в субрегионе. Среди них следует отметить (1) подробный анализ демографических, культурных, правовых, этнополитических и многосторонних условий национальной политики; (2) внесение поправок в законодательство в целях ликвидации любой дискриминации по признаку этнического происхождения, принятие законодательных мер в отношении уважения прав национальных и этнических меньшинств; (3) создание институтов, направленных на выявление этнополитических угроз на максимально ранней стадии их возникновения (идентификация, масштаб, интенсивность, рациональная оценка их развития и соответствующая оценка их потенциала, создание проектов по нейтрализации данной угрозы, построение сценариев); (4) постоянный мониторинг этнической ситуации в стране, включая концентрацию и миграцию населения (типуальной и национальных и этнических меньшинств).
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