

HISTORY AND THEORY OF CULTURE



UDC 323.1 (477.75)

<https://doi.org/10.23947/2414-1143-2023-9-4-44-50>

Original article



Specifics of the Potential of Ethnopolitical Tension in the Municipalities of the Republic of Crimea (2014–2020)

Dmitry I Uznarodov

Federal Research Centre Southern Scientific Center, Russian Academy of Sciences,
41, Chekhov Av., Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation

✉ uzn-dmitrij@yandex.ru

Abstract

Introduction. The article analyzes the potential of ethnopolitical tension in the municipalities of the Republic of Crimea in the period from 2014 to 2021. The purpose of the article is to determine the index of ethnopolitical tension of municipalities of the Republic of Crimea, to conduct subsequent zoning of its territory according to this indicator, to identify municipalities with the highest and low level of ethnopolitical tension.

Materials and methods. With the use of statistical analysis methods (summary and grouping of the obtained statistical data, correlation analysis of statistical data), as well as by means of a developed formula containing three indicators, the final indicator of the ethnopolitical tension index for each municipality is calculated.

Results. All municipalities were classified into six groups based on the quantitative values of the level of ethnopolitical tension: municipalities with minimum, low, decreased, medium, high and maximum levels of ethnopolitical tension. As the calculations have shown, the absolute majority of municipalities with a minimum level of ethnopolitical tension are located in the southern part of the Republic of Crimea, and most municipalities with a low and decreased level of ethnopolitical tension have the administrative status of urban districts.

Discussion and conclusion. According to our calculations, in comparison with 2014, in 2021 it is impossible to single out any one part of the Crimean Peninsula, where high and maximum indicators of the index of ethnopolitical tension clearly prevail. In addition, in comparison with 2014, 76 % of municipalities of the republic experienced a decrease in the index of ethnopolitical tension, which is largely due to the increase of Russian population in the period from 2014 to 2021, which, in turn, affected the indicators that make up the final formula for calculating the index.

Keywords: Republic of Crimea, ethnopolitical tension, ethnic structure, ethnopolitical processes

Funding information. The publication was prepared within the framework of the implementation of the State Assignment of the State Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, project no. 122020100349-6.

For citation. Uznarodov DI. Specifics of the Potential of Ethnopolitical Tension in the Municipalities of the Republic of Crimea (2014–2020). *Science Almanac of Black Sea Region Countries*. 2023;9(4):44–50. <https://doi.org/10.23947/2414-1143-2023-9-4-44-50>

Научная статья

Специфика потенциала этнополитической напряженности в муниципальных образованиях Республики Крым (2014–2021 гг.)

Д.И. Узнародов

Федеральный исследовательский центр Южный научный центр Российской академии наук,
Российская Федерация, г. Ростов-на-Дону, пр. Чехова, 41

✉ uzn-dmitrij@yandex.ru

Аннотация

Введение. Анализируется потенциал этнополитической напряженности в муниципальных образованиях Республики Крым в период с 2014 по 2021 гг. Цель статьи – определить индекс этнополитической напряженности муниципальных

образований Республики Крым, провести последующее зонирование ее территории по данному показателю, выявить муниципальные образования с наиболее и наименее высоким уровнем этнополитической напряженности.

Материалы и методы. С применением методов статистического анализа (сводка и группировка полученных статистических данных, корреляционный анализ статистических данных), а также посредством разработанной формулы, содержащей три индикатора, происходит вычисление итогового показателя индекса этнополитической напряженности по каждому муниципальному образованию.

Результаты исследования. Все муниципальные образования были классифицированы на шесть групп, исходя из количественных значений уровня этнополитической напряженности: муниципальные образования с минимальным, низким, пониженным, средним, высоким и максимальным уровнем этнополитической напряженности. Как показали проведенные расчеты, абсолютное большинство муниципальных образований с минимальным уровнем этнополитической напряженности находятся в южной части Республики Крым, а большинство муниципальных образований с низким и пониженным уровнем этнополитической напряженности имеют административный статус городских округов.

Обсуждение и заключение. Согласно проведенным расчетам, в сравнении с 2014 г., в 2021 г. нельзя выделить какую-то одну часть Крымского полуострова, где явно преобладают высокие и максимальные показатели индекса этнополитической напряженности. Кроме того, в сравнении с 2014 г., в 76 % муниципальных образований республики наблюдалось снижение показателя индекса этнополитической напряженности, что во многом обусловлено приростом русского населения в период с 2014 по 2021 гг., который составил 62,71 %, что в свою очередь повлияло на показатели индикаторов, составляющих итоговую формулу расчета индекса.

Ключевые слова: Республика Крым, этнополитическая напряженность, этническая структура, этнополитические процессы

Финансирование. Публикация подготовлена в рамках реализации ГЗ ЮНЦ РАН, № гр. проекта 122020100349-6.

Для цитирования. Узародов Д.И. Специфика потенциала этнополитической напряженности в муниципальных образованиях Республики Крым (2014–2021 гг.). *Научный альманах стран Причерноморья*. 2023;9(4):44–50. <https://doi.org/10.23947/2414-1143-2023-9-4-44-50>

Introduction. At present, the process of integration of the Crimean peninsula into the Russian Federation cannot yet be called complete. A special role in these processes can be played by the scientific community, which can present its understanding of various topical processes in Crimea, in particular, ethno-political ones, which are of great importance for ensuring the stability of regional security of the peninsula. Of utmost importance here are scientific studies focused on analyzing the potential of ethno-political conflictogenity in different parts of the Republic of Crimea, which also further actualizes the topic of the selected study.

The purpose of this study is to calculate the index of ethno-political tension of municipalities of the Republic of Crimea, the subsequent zoning of its territory according to this indicator, and the identification of municipalities with the lowest and highest level of ethno-political tension.

At present, a certain bibliographic base has been formed on this topic, in particular, it is possible to single out the works of such researchers as K.N. Kulikova. Akhmadeev [1], A.V. Baranov [2], D.K. Grigoryan [3], E.N. Kondratenko [3], T.K. Faraponova [3], A.V. Levin [4], D.A. Mamina [5], D.N. Mishchenko [5], T.A. Senyushkina [6], S.S. Smetannikov [7], A.B. Shvets [8]. At the same time, a more in-depth study of some aspects is required. For example, this concerns statistical research methods in analyzing ethno-political tensions in modern Crimea, as well as the application of quantitative research methods in analyzing ethno-political processes of Crimea in the context of municipalities.

Materials and methods. A number of methods of statistical analysis, in particular, correlation analysis of statistical data, as well as grouping and summarizing of the obtained statistical data were chosen as the basis of the research tools.

In the study, by means of the formula developed by us, the index of ethno-political tension of municipalities of the Republic of Crimea was calculated. The formula was based on three indicators: the level of ethnic heterogeneity of municipalities; the degree of transformation of the ethnic structure; ethno-cultural “distance” between the three largest ethnic groups of Crimea (Russians, Ukrainians, Crimean Tatars) [9, p. 27].

In the course of calculating the level of ethnic heterogeneity of municipalities, we used a methodology that was developed by researchers Taylor and Hudson in the first half of the 1970^s. last century to determine the degree of linguistic heterogeneity of the population by applying the quantitative information presented in the Atlas of the Peoples of the World [10]. The formula for determining this indicator has the following form:

$$EH = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^N (S_i)^2,$$

where S_i is the share of the population of the i -th ethnic group in the total population, N is the number of such groups.

During the calculation process, the index values range from 0 to $1 - 1/N$. The lower the index data, the lower the ethnic heterogeneity of the population in a particular municipality. If the index values are high, the heterogeneity of ethnic structure is correspondingly high. It should be emphasized that this indicator does not take into account the distance between ethnic groups of a certain society, which does not provide an opportunity to identify the most and least significant ethno-cultural differences, so for the final formula we took another indicator for calculation – the level of ethno-cultural distance between the three most numerous ethnic groups of the Crimean peninsula – Russians, Ukrainians and Crimean Tatars.

In determining such an indicator as the level of ethno-cultural distance, we applied an adjusted version of the methodology for calculating the diversity index, which was presented in 1956 by scientist J. Greenberg and is aimed at quantifying the existing distances between ethnic groups [11]. The indicator definition formula itself has the following form:

$$ED = S_i \cdot S_j \cdot P_{ij} + S_i \cdot S_k \cdot P_{ik} + S_j \cdot S_k \cdot P_{jk},$$

where S_i is the share of the population of the Russian ethnos in the total population; S_j – the share of the population of Ukrainian ethnicity in the total population; S_k – the share of the population of the Crimean Tatar ethnos in the total population; P_{ij} – ethno-conflict potential along the line “Russians – Ukrainians”; P_{ik} – ethno-conflict potential along the line “Russians – Crimean Tatars”; P_{jk} – ethno-conflict potential along the line “Ukrainians – Crimean Tatars” [9, pp. 27]. Five conflict factors formed the base of ethno-conflict potential values. Table 1 quantifies each of the factors in more detail.

Table 1

Quantitative expression of conflict factors used to calculate the indicator of ethno-cultural distance [9, p. 28]

Conflict factors	Russians – Crimean Tatars (P_{ik})	Russians – Ukrainians (P_{ij})	Ukrainians – Crimean Tatars (P_{jk})
Historical	4.0	2.0	2.0
Confessional	3.5	1.0	3.5
Land (socio-economic)	4.0	1.5	4.0
Sociocultural	3.0	1.0	3.0
Psycho-behavioral (mental)	3.5	1.5	3.5
Total	18.0	7.0	16.0

As for such an indicator as the degree of transformation of the ethnic structure, it was calculated according to the dynamic ratio of two ethnic groups – Russians (who are the majority in the ethnic structure of the population of the Republic of Crimea) and Crimean Tatars (the ethnic group that had the greatest impact on the transformation of the ethno-cultural and demographic balance of the Crimean peninsula in the late 1990s – early 2000s) [9, p. 28]. These processes were greatly influenced by the repatriation of the Crimean Tatar ethnos that took place during this period, which significantly changed the nature of the ethnic structure of the Crimean population. This is evidenced by the quantitative data: in the period from 1989 to 2001, the share of Crimean Tatars in the population structure of the Crimean peninsula increased more than sixfold (from 1.58 % in 1989 to 10.26 % in 2001) [12], [13].

Below we present in detail the formula for calculating the degree of transformation of the ethnic structure:

$$TES = \frac{S_{k2021}}{S_{k2014}} \div \frac{S_{i2021}}{S_{i2014}},$$

where S_{k2021} is the share of the Crimean Tatar population in 2021; S_{k2014} – share of the Crimean Tatar population in 2014; S_{i2021} – share of the Russian population in 2021; S_{i2014} – share of the Russian population in 2014 [9, p. 28].

Speaking about the final formula for calculating the index of ethno-political tension in the municipalities of the Republic of Crimea, it has the following form:

$$I_{\text{эпн}} = EH \cdot ED \cdot TES,$$

where *EH* – ethnic heterogeneity (ethnic heterogeneity); *ED* – the level of ethno-cultural distance (the level of ethno-cultural distance); *TES* – the level of transformation of the ethnic structure (the level of transformation of the ethnic structure).

Results. In the course of the calculations made, the data were obtained, which are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2

Index of ethno-political tension of municipalities of the Republic of Crimea. Municipalities

Municipalities	Ethno-political tension index	Ethno-political tension level
Belogorsk district	2.17	Maximum
Razdolnensky district	2.16	
Kirovsky district	2.15	
Bakhchisarai district	1.99	High
Sovetsky district	1.95	
Simferopol district	1.88	
Pervomaisky district	1.83	
Krasnogvardeysky district	1.69	Middle
Nizhnegorsky district	1.66	
Krasnoperekopsky district	1.64	
Dzhankoy district	1.50	Lowered
Saksky district	1.38	
Leninsky district	1.31	
Sudak City District	1.16	
Chernomorsky district	0.78	Low
Armyansk City District	0.61	
Krasnoperekopsk City District	0.60	
Simferopol City District	0.54	
Saki City District	0.52	
Evpatoria City District	0.44	
Dzhankoy City District	0.38	
Alushta City District	0.28	
Feodosia Urban District	0.26	Minimum
Yalta Urban District	0.12	
Kerch Urban District	0.05	

As evidenced by the data presented in Table 2, 75.00 % (absolute majority) of municipalities with a minimum level of ethno-political tension are located in the southern part of the Republic of Crimea. Most of the municipalities with low and lowered level of ethno-political tension are located in the northern part of the Crimean Peninsula (36.36 %), however, it should be noted that, with the exception of Dzhankoy District, these municipalities are urban districts, not just districts. In this aspect, it is also necessary to emphasize another important detail – none of the urban districts of the Republic of Crimea record average, high, or maximum values of the index of ethno-political tension. The only district among the municipalities with minimal and low indicators of the ethno-political tension index is the Chernomorsky district.

Compared to 2014 [9, p. 29], in 2021 it is impossible to single out any one part of the Crimean peninsula, where high and maximum indicators of the index of ethno-political tension clearly prevail: If in 2014 the majority (58 %) of municipalities with high and maximum indicators of the index of ethno-political tension were located in the central part of Crimea [9, p. 9. 29], then in 2021, 28 % of such municipalities were located in the central, eastern and northern parts of the republic (see Table 3).

Among the municipal formations with high and maximum values of the index of ethno-political tension, there is also one area of the south of Crimea (Bakhchisarai district), while in 2014 there were two such municipalities among the southern part of the Crimean Peninsula. It should be noted that in the period from 2014 to 2021. There was a significant

decrease in the ethno-political tension index in the Sudak city district. In many respects, this was due to a certain change in the ethnic structure, in particular, an increase in the share of Russian ethnicity and a decrease in the number of Ukrainian ethnicity in the population structure.

It should be emphasized that such a trend is typical for other municipalities of the republic after 2014. For the first time since 1939, the second largest ethnic group on the Crimean peninsula were Crimean Tatars rather than Ukrainians. For the period from 2014 through 2021, the loss of Ukrainian population in Crimea amounted to 49.98 % [14], [15]. At the same time, the growth of the Russian population amounted to 62.71 %, Crimean Tatar population – 9.20 % [15]. To a certain extent, such transformations were caused by the outflow of the Ukrainian population from the territory of the Crimean peninsula after 2014 due to the rejection by some residents of the events of the “Crimean Spring” and the processes of integration with Russia. At the same time, we do not consider this factor as the main one, because among the Ukrainian population there were quite a lot of those citizens who positively perceived the events of the “Crimean Spring”, and who earlier, before 2014, for a number of reasons, were forced within the framework of the 2001 census identify themselves as Ukrainians, although internally they felt themselves as Russians. The situation had already begun to change in the 2014 census, as the statistics clearly show, but even more global identity transformations could only take place after a certain time, which happened by 2021.

Table 3

Level of ethno-political tension of the Republic of Crimea by geographical location of municipalities (based on data from Table 2)

	Level of ethno-political tension (in percentage of the total number of municipalities in a certain part of Crimea)					
	Minimum	Low	Lowered	Middle	High	Maximum
North of Crimea	0	42.86	14.29	14.29	14.29	14.29
South of Crimea	60	0.00	20.00	0.00	20.00	0.00
The center of Crimea	0	25.00	0.00	25.00	25.00	25.00
West of Crimea	0	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
East of Crimea	20	0.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00

It should also be noted that, compared to 2014 [9, p. 29], in 76 % of municipalities of the republic there was a decrease in the index of ethno-political tension. In six municipalities these indicators increased: in Razdolnensky, Pervomaisky, Krasnoperekopsk, Leninsky districts, as well as in the urban districts of Krasnoperekopsk and Feodosiya. Mainly, the increase in the index of ethno-political tension in these municipalities is due to the highest values of growth in the number of the Crimean Tatar ethnic group, which influenced the values of the three indicators that make up the final formula for calculating the index of ethno-political tension. If in the period from 2001 to 2014 in the mentioned municipalities there was a negative dynamics of the number of the Crimean Tatar ethnos, in the period from 2014 to 2021 the opposite processes took place. This was particularly strongly reflected in such a calculated indicator as the degree of transformation of the ethnic structure, the values of which directly depend on the specifics of demographic transformations of the Crimean Tatar ethnos.

Discussion and conclusion. So, as a result of the analysis, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- 1) at present, the southern part of the Crimean peninsula hosts the absolute majority of municipalities with a minimal level of ethno-political tension;
- 2) Most of the municipalities with low and lowered levels of ethno-political tension are located in the northern part of the Republic of Crimea and have the administrative status of urban districts;
- 3) in comparison with 2014, in 2021 it is impossible to identify a single part of the Crimean peninsula, where high and maximum indicators of the index of ethno-political tension clearly prevail.

In general, in comparison with 2014, in the municipalities of Crimea (in 76.00 % of the total number) there is a decrease in the index of ethno-political tension, the main factor of which is the 62.71 % increase in the Russian population in the period from 2014 to 2021, which, in turn, had an impact on the indicators that make up the final formula for calculating the index.

References

1. Akhmadeev KN. Yazykovoj i diasporalnyj faktory etnopoliticheskoy mobilizacii krymsko-tatarskoj etnicheskoy gruppy = Linguistic and diasporal factors of ethno-political mobilization of the Crimean Tatar ethnic group. *Society: politics, economics, law*. 2018; 2:12-15 (In Russ.).
2. Baranov AV. Etnopoliticheskie processy v Krymu i Sevastopole (na materialah sociologicheskikh oprosov) = Ethnopolitical processes in Crimea and Sevastopol (based on the materials of sociological surveys). *The Black Sea region in the context of Russian civilization: history, politics, culture: materials of the international scientific and practical conference*. Ed. A.V. Baranov, V.V. Kasyanov. Krasnodar. 2019. pp. 14–22 (In Russ.).
3. Grigoryan DK, Kondratenko EN, Faraponova TK. Etnopoliticheskaya mobilizaciya krymskih tatar v kontekste interesov tureckoj elity = Ethnopolitical mobilization of Crimean Tatars in the context of interests of the Turkish elite. *State and Municipal Administration. Scientific notes*. 2020;2:178–182 (In Russ.).
4. Levin AV. Monitoring etnopoliticheskikh processov v Krymu = Monitoring of ethno-political processes in Crimea. *Innovations in Science*. 2017;13:23–25 (In Russ.).
5. Mamina DA, Mishchenko DN. Etnopoliticheskie faktory vnutrennej migracii v Respublike Krym = Ethnopolitical factors of internal migration in the Republic of Crimea. *Humanities of the South of Russia*. 2020;4:137–149. (In Russ.).
6. Senyushkina TA. Vossoedinenie Kryma s Rossiej kak etnopoliticheskij process = The Reunification of Crimea with Russia as an ethno-political process. *Political expertise: POLITEX*. 2015;4:75–91 (In Russ.).
7. Smetannikov SS. Razvitie regionalnoj etnopoliticheskoy sistemy Respubliki Krym v sovremennykh usloviyah = Development of the regional ethno-political system of the Republic of Crimea in modern conditions. *Scientific Bulletin of Belgorod State University. Series: History, Political Science*. 2017;8:187–191 (In Russ.).
8. Shvets AB. Risk politizacii etnichnosti v Krymu = The risk of politicization of ethnicity in Crimea. *Geopolitics and ecogeodynamics of regions*. 2017;3:5–21 (In Russ.).
9. Uznarodov DI. Analiz potentsiala etnopoliticheskoy napryazhennosti v municipalnykh obrazovaniyah Respubliki Krym v XXI v. = Analysis of the potential of ethno-political tension in the municipalities of the Republic of Crimea in the XXI century. *Society: politics, economics, law*. 2022;11:26–31 (In Russ.).
10. Taylor C, Hudson M. *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press; 1972. 443 p.
11. Greenberg JH. The Measurement of Linguistic Diversity. *Language*. 1956;1(32):109–115.
12. The All-Union Population Census of 1989. Distribution of urban and rural population of the USSR regions by gender and nationality. Crimean region. Demoscope Weekly. Available from: http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/resp_nac_89.php?reg=11 (Accessed 24 July 2023).
13. State Statistics Committee of Ukraine. The national composition of the population, citizenship. Autonomous Republic of Crimea. Available from: http://2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/rus/results/nationality_population/nationality_popull/ (Accessed 24 July 2023).
14. Department of the Federal State Statistics Service for the Republic of Crimea and Sevastopol. Censuses and surveys. Population census in the Crimean Federal District with 100 % coverage of the population in 2014, the Republic of Crimea. Results. National composition and language proficiency. Available from: <https://82.rosstat.gov.ru/folder/28299> (Accessed 24 July 2023).
15. Department of the Federal State Statistics Service for the Republic of Crimea and Sevastopol. Censuses and surveys. All – Russian Population Census 2020–2021. The Republic of Crimea. Results. National composition and language proficiency. Available from: <https://82.rosstat.gov.ru/folder/179764> (Accessed 24 July 2023).

About the Author:

Uznarodov Dmitry Igorevich, Cand. Sci. (Political Science), Senior Research Fellow, Laboratory of Sociology, Federal Research Centre the Southern Scientific Centre of the Russian Academy of Sciences (41, Chekhov Av., Rostov-on-Don, 344006, RF), [ORCID](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9151-1111), uzn-dmitrij@yandex.ru

Received 18.08.2023

Revised 12.09.2023

Accepted 16.09.2023

Conflict of interest statement

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

The author read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Об авторе:

Узнародов Дмитрий Игоревич, кандидат политических наук, Федеральный исследовательский центр Южный научный центр Российской академии наук (РФ, 344006, г. Ростов-на-Дону, пр. Чехова, 41), [ORCID](#), uzn-dmitrij@yandex.ru

Поступила в редакцию 18.08.2023

Поступила после рецензирования 12.09.2023

Принята к публикации 16.09.2023

Конфликт интересов

Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Автор прочитал и одобрил окончательный вариант рукописи.