

## **ON THE ESSENCE OF SUBJECTIVITY AND SUBJECTIVATION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES IN ETHNOPOLITICAL PROCESS: THEORETIZATION ON THE BACKGROUND OF EVENTS IN UKRAINE**

Artykuł analizuje istotę zjawisk podmiotowości i upodmiotowienia mniejszości narodowych. Badania przygotowywane są w kontekście teoretycznym, ale w oparciu o teoretyzowanie rzeczywistych przejawów podmiotowości i upodmiotowienia mniejszości narodowych w Ukrainie. Uznano, że upodmiotowienie mniejszości narodowych jest jednym z warunków wstępnych ich upolitycznienia i odbywa się na takich płaszczyznach, jak ideologia, formacja elit, formacja społeczna i formacja państwowa. W efekcie argumentuje się, że problem politycznego upodmiotowienia mniejszości narodowych, w tym w Ukrainie, jako proceduralnej charakterystyki ustroju społeczeństwa, ma charakter dość złożony i sprzeczny, a zatem nie ma identycznych i utrwalonych reguł.

*Słowa kluczowe: mniejszości narodowe, podmiotowość, upodmiotowienie, etnopolityka, przedmiot polityki, ideologia, formacja elit, formacja społeczna, formacja państwowa, Ukraina.*

The article is devoted to analyzing the essence of the phenomena of subjectivity and subjectification of national minorities. The research is prepared in a theoretical context, but on the basis of theorizing the real manifestations of subjectivity and subjectification of national minorities in Ukraine. The author revealed that the subjectification of national minorities is one of the prerequisites of their politicization, which takes place at such levels as idea, elite, society and state formation. As a result, it was argued that the problem of political subjectification of national minorities, including in Ukraine, as a procedural characteristic of the political system of society is quite complex and contradictory in nature, and therefore has no identical and consolidated recipes for solving.

*Keywords: national minorities, subjectivity, subjectification, ethno politics, subject of politics, idea, elite, society and state formation, Ukraine.*

Today, in almost every European country or even every country in the world, there are ethnic / national groups that seek to preserve their cultural independence and demand recognition as a titular or individual ethnic group. Accordingly, national minorities become or are trying to become a subject of politics in the process of defending first of all their ethno cultural identity. In other words, the protection of ethno cultural specifics at the state level is the motivational

foundation of the interests of all national minorities, especially within the specific features of the political process in a given state. In this context, national minorities should be seen as one of the constituents in politics. The fact is that ethno politics in a country becomes much more meaningful and decisive only when it becomes clearer what goals and objectives it is aimed at, which subjects and objects are involved in its implementation at a certain historical stage development. In view of this, clarifying the essence of subjectivity and subjectification of national minorities in the ethno political process opens wide possibilities for determining the attributes of relations between subjects and objects of ethno politics, features and parameters of forms of their political behavior, as well as ways of ethno political activities. It is suggested to follow this on the example of the practical experience of subjectivity and subjectification of national minorities in the ethno political process of Ukraine theorizing.

The stated research issues are revealed in a number of scientific works of scientists both from Ukraine and abroad, but some of them directly, and some only indirectly serve to reveal the task actualized in our scientific article. The fact is that the history of the study of the political subjectivity of national minorities is relatively short. It is known that national minorities have repeatedly been the subject of research, not as actors, but mainly as objects of politics and law. This is due to the fact that the events of the 20<sup>th</sup> century – the collapse of European empires in the First World War, the processes of decolonization and national revolutions in many countries – did not allow the problem of national minorities to move from the center to the periphery of political and philosophical thought. This, in turn, means that the problem of political subjectivity of national minorities is complex and its full analysis is impossible without reliance on fundamental research by L. Wirth<sup>1</sup>, J. Hutchinson and E. Smith<sup>2</sup>, E. Gellner<sup>3</sup>, W. Kymlicka<sup>4</sup>, K. Popper<sup>5</sup> and many other scientists. As for the research on the issue of subjectivity and subjectification of national minorities in the ethno-political process of Ukraine, it was revealed in the works of researchers of both the past and present. To the first, historical group belong such Ukrainian scientists as V. Antonovych<sup>6</sup>, Y. Bachynskiy<sup>7</sup>, M. Hrushevskiy<sup>8</sup>, M. Drahomanov<sup>9</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Wirth L., *The Problem of Minority Groups*, [w:] Linton R., *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, New York 1945, s. 347.

<sup>2</sup> Hutchinson Dzh., Smit E., *Sheho take etnichnist*, [w:] *Natsionalizm: Antolohiia*, Wyd. Smoloskyp 2000, s. 468–475; Smit E., *Natsii ta natsionalizm u blobalnu epokhu*, Wyd. Nika-Tsentr 2006; Smit E., *Natsionalizm i modernizm: Krytycheskyi obzor sovremennyih teorii natsiy i natsionalizma*, Wyd. Praksis 2004; Smit E., *Natsionalizm: Teoriia, ideolohiia, istoriia*, Wyd. K.I.S., 2004; Smit E., *Natsionalna identychnist*, Wyd. Osnovy 1994

<sup>3</sup> Helner E., *Natsii ta natsionalizm. Natsionalizm*, Kyiv 2003; Helner E., Prishestvie natsionalizma. Mifyi natsii i klasa, "Put: mezhdunarodnyiy filosofskiy zhurnal" 1992, vol 1, s. 9–61

<sup>4</sup> Kymlicka W., Immigration, Multiculturalism, and the Welfare State, "Ethics & International Affairs" 2006, vol 20, nr. 3, s. 281–304; Kymlicka W., *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 1995; Kymlicka W., *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Citizenship*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2001.

<sup>5</sup> Popper K., *Otkrytie obschestvo i ego vrugi*, Wyd. Feniks 1992

<sup>6</sup> Antonovych V., *Pro Kozatski chasy na Ukraini*, Wyd. Dnipro 1991.

<sup>7</sup> Bachynskiy Y., *Bilshovytska revoliutsiia i ukrainsi: Krytychni zamitky*, Berlin 1928.

<sup>8</sup> Hrushevskiy M., *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy: v 11 t.*, Wyd. Naukova dumka 1991.

<sup>9</sup> Drahomanov M., *Propashchyni chas: Ukrainci pid Moskovskym tsarstvom (1654–1876)*, Wyd. Tsentri pamiatkoznavstva AN Ukrainy 1992.; Hrinchenko B., Drahomanov M., *Dialohy pro ukrainsku natsionalnu spravu*, Wyd. NAN Ukrainy 1994

M. Kostomarov<sup>10</sup>, V. Lypynskiy<sup>11</sup>, M. Mikhnovskiy<sup>12</sup> and others, who dealt with this issue indirectly. Instead, the second, newest, group is represented by Ukrainian and Russian researchers who appeal to the issues of subjectivity of national minorities, including in Ukraine, more directly, in particular O. Antonyuk<sup>13</sup>, Y. Bromley<sup>14</sup>, I. Varzar<sup>15</sup>, M. Guboglo<sup>16</sup>, V. Dubinin<sup>17</sup>, V. Yevtuh<sup>18</sup>, O. Kartunov<sup>19</sup>, G. Kasyanov<sup>20</sup>, V. Kotygorenko<sup>21</sup>, I. Kresina<sup>22</sup>, I. Kuras<sup>23</sup>, O. Maiboroda<sup>24</sup>, V. Naulko<sup>25</sup>, O. Nelga<sup>26</sup>, V. Nikityuk<sup>27</sup>, M. Obushnyi<sup>28</sup>, M. Panchuk<sup>29</sup>, O. Rafalskiy<sup>30</sup>, Y. Levenets<sup>31</sup>, Y. Shapoval<sup>32</sup>, S. Rymarenko<sup>33</sup>, L. Nagorna<sup>34</sup>, A. Ponomarev<sup>35</sup>, L. Shklyar<sup>36</sup> and many others. Interestingly that, in general, the subject of their scientific interest was issues of ethno-political nature, including the assessment of subjectivity and subjectivation of national minorities in Ukraine. However, at the same time, it has been recorded that the issues of national minorities in Ukraine have been and still are mainly dealt with by ethnologists, historians, philosophers, lawyers, sociologists, as a result of which national minorities are insufficiently examined as a political phenomenon, including in terms of their subjectivity and subjectification. However, even against this background, the works of these researchers

<sup>10</sup> Kostomarov N., Dve russkie narodnosti (Pismo redaktora), "Osnova" 1861, nr. 3, s. 33–80; Kostomarov N., *Russkaya istoriya v zhbizneopisaniiakh glavnyskh ee deyatelnykh*, Wyd. Esmo 2007.

<sup>11</sup> Lypynskiy V., *Lysty do bratru-khliborobiv. Pro ideii i orhanizatsiiu ukrainskoho monarkhizmu*, Wyd. Kyiv-Filadelfia 1995

<sup>12</sup> Mikhnovskiy M., *Samostiina Ukraina*, Wyd. Diokor 2002.

<sup>13</sup> Antoniuk O., *Formuvannia etnopolityky v Ukraini: teoretyko-metodolobichni ta kontseptualni zasady*, Kyiv 2001

<sup>14</sup> Bromley Y., *Etnosotsialnyie protsesy: teoriya, istoriya, sovremennost*, Moskva 1987.

<sup>15</sup> Varzar I., *Iz kontekstiv mynulykh lit: Vybrane v kontseptualnykh i memuarnykh vymirakh*, Wyd. Fada 2003, vol 1.; Varzar I., *Politychna etnolohiia yak nauka: istoriolohiia, teoriia, metodolohiia, prakseolohiia*, Wyd. Shkoliar 1994.

<sup>16</sup> Huboglo M., *Yazyki etnicheskoy mobilizatsii*, Moskva 1998.

<sup>17</sup> Dubinin V., *Rol interesiv narodu u ustanovlenii ta rozrytku politychnoi systemy suspilstva*, Kramatorsk 2006

<sup>18</sup> Yevtuh V., *Etnopolityka v Ukraini: pravnychi ta kulturolobichnyi aspekty*, Wyd. Feniks 1997.; Yevtuh V., *Etnosuspilni protsesy v Ukraini: mozhyvosti naukovykh interpretatsii*, Wyd. Stylos 2004.

<sup>19</sup> Kartunov O., *Zakbidni konseptsii etnichnosti, natsii ta natsionalizmu*, Kyiv 2007.

<sup>20</sup> Kasianov H., *Teorii natsii ta natsionalizmu*, Wyd. Lybid 1999.

<sup>21</sup> Kotygorenko V., Kompromis u mizhetnichnykh vzaiemnykh: poshuk pravovoi formuly v suchasni Ukraini, "Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen NAN Ukrainy" 2001, vol 15, s. 180–188.

<sup>22</sup> Kresina I., *Ukrainska natsionalna svidomist i suchasni politychni protsesy*, Ed. Vyscha shkola 1998.

<sup>23</sup> Kuras I., *Etnopolitolohiia v Ukraini. Stanovlennia. Shcho dali?*, Ed. Instytut politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen NAN Ukrainy 2002.; Kuras I., *Etnopolitolohiia. Pershi kroky stanovlennia*, Ed. Hencza 2004.; Kuras I., *Skbid i Zakbid Ukrainy: problemy yednannia*, Ed. NAN Ukrainy 2001.

<sup>24</sup> Maiboroda O., *Rosiiskiy natsionalizm v Ukraini (1991–1998 rr.)*, Ed. KM Academia 1999.

<sup>25</sup> Naulko V., *Razvitie mezhetnicheskikh svyazey na Ukraine*, Ed. Naukova dumka 1975.

<sup>26</sup> Nelha O., *Teoriia etnosu*, Ed. Tandem 1997.

<sup>27</sup> Nikitiuk V., *Status etnonatsionalnykh menshyn (porivnialno-pravnyi aspekt)*, Kyiv 1996.

<sup>28</sup> Obushnyi M., *Etnonatsionalna identychnist v konteksti formuvannia ukrainskoi natsii*, Ed. IPIEND 1999.; Obushnyi M., *Etnos i natsiia: problemy identychnosti*, Kyiv 1998.

<sup>29</sup> Panchuk M., *Natsionalni menshyny Ukrainy u XX stolitti: polityko-pravnyi aspekt*, Ed. IPIEND 2000.

<sup>30</sup> Rafalskiy O., *Natsionalni menshyny Ukrainy u XX stolitti. Istoriobrafichnyi narys*, Ed. Polius 2000.; Rafalskiy O., *Natsionalni menshyny Ukrainy u XX stolitti: polityko-pravnyi aspekt*, Ed. IPIEND 2000.

<sup>31</sup> Levenets Y., *Natsionalni vidnosyny v Ukraini u XX st. Zbirnyk dokumentiv i materialiv*, Ed. Naukova dumka 1994.

<sup>32</sup> Shapoval Y., *Etnopolitychnyi rozrytok Ukrainy: dosvid, problemy, perspektvy*, Kyiv 1997.

<sup>33</sup> Rymarenko S., *Samovyznachennia osoby, natsii, derzhavy*, Ed. lurydychna knyha 2000.

<sup>34</sup> Nahorna L., *Etnopolitychnyi rozrytok Ukrainy: dosvid, problemy, perspektvy*, Kyiv 1997.

<sup>35</sup> Ponomarev A., *Etnichnist ta etnichna istoriia Ukrainy*, Ed. Lybid 1996.

<sup>36</sup> Shkliar L., *Etnoderzhavoznavstvo. Teoretyko-metodolobichni zasady*, Kyiv 2001.

reveal some aspects of political subjectivity, on the one hand, although in general against the background of minority issues, on the other hand.

Based on the appeal to the works of these scholars, it has been established that the evaluative determinants of subjectivity and subjectification of national minorities in the ethno political process are the categories of subjects and objects of politics in general and ethno politics in particular. The political actors are people, their organizations, movements, institutions and individuals involved in the political life of society and the country, whose active practical activities are aimed at transforming the socio-political or other spheres of human life as relevant objects of politics. Thus, policy subjects are able to formulate and implement specific goals, have conscious interests and needs, purposeful activity, and i.e. are the main regulator of interaction with policy entities. In other words, subject of politics are those individuals, organizations or social groups who constantly and relatively independently participate in political life in accordance with their interests, influence the political behavior of other subject of politics and thus cause certain changes in their actions and perturbations in the political system and political process<sup>37</sup>.

In the course of his activity, the subject of politics inevitably interacts with real socio-political relations and chooses from them the layer that has a certain interest in him. Therefore, the object of politics is the subject and specific branch of reality that has become significant, interesting and necessary for the subject of politics. The objects of politics – are real political reality with its inherent socio-political, but primarily political relations and the political system of society in general, its elements, forms of political life, as well as the sphere of political interests and contradictions in the political process, and within the state, and in the regional or global space. It follows that the object of policy forms an idea of what the subject of policy directs its activity in the form of transformative or destructive political activity or inaction.

In view of this, it is noteworthy that the subjects and objects of ethno politics are obligatory elements of ethno political relations and ethno political process, as a result of which they should be considered in dialectical unity, interconnection and interdependence. At the same time, each of them has its own characteristics and functions. Thus, the subjects of ethno politics include persons who show national self-awareness and ethnic community among themselves, and in general ethnic groups, nations and national (or ethnic) minorities, indigenous peoples, parties, state, ethnic leaders and institutions created by them and organizations that take an active and conscious part in the ethno-political and ethno-national development and process. It is the awareness of all of them of their ethno political interests that makes them subjects of ethno politics, and instead of not understanding them, they are objects of ethno politics. Accordingly, the objects of ethno politics are all those phenomena of ethno political and socio-political life, which are aimed at the activities of subjects of ethno politics. The objects of ethno politics are traditionally the political system of society, elements and forms of political

<sup>37</sup> Kolodii A., Klymanska L., Kosmyna Ya., Kharchenko V., *Politolohiia*, Wyd. Elha, Nika-Tsentr 2003, s. 83

life, the sphere of ethno political interests, the contradictions of the ethno political process, both in the national and world context.

The situation in Ukraine is no exception in this context, in which the development of ethno political life, the strength of the influence of political actors on decision-making in the ethno national sphere gave and gives the grounds to classify them into primary (basic) ones and secondary ones. The primary (basic) subjects of ethno politics are ethnically, nationally and politically conscious individuals, ethnic groups, nations, and national (ethnic) minorities, indigenous peoples, which arose in an objective and natural-historical way, and not as a result of purposeful action, and create their own associations that reflect their ethno political interests or promote their implementation<sup>38</sup>. In contrast, the secondary subjects of ethno politics are socio-political actors derived from the primary subjects of ethno politics, including states, parties, ethno political and ethno national associations, ethnic elites, which participate in the decision-making and implementation associated with the activities of the primary subjects of ethno politics. It is noteworthy that in large social groups as the primary subjects of politics, their internal and mutual connection and separation, self-determination, self-organization and consolidation are the condition for the emergence of certain political organizations, social institutions and government agencies. Their interests outline the potential field of policy, the sphere of confrontation and cooperation, as well as the functions and boundaries of power. Without the need outlined by them, the effective functioning of parties, the development, dissemination and imitation of their strategies, programs, leaders and organizational forms and methods of activity are impossible. The proof of this, on the contrary, is the share of organizations that have lost, are losing or will lose public support in the future.

It is extremely important that the primary actors are decisive and initial in policy-making, especially in the ethno political sector. They are the bearers of political interests and needs on which conscious or unconscious political activity is based. Therefore, it is the interests and needs that motivate different socio-political communities to take political action. Instead, the secondary policy actors are derived from primary ones, both from a genetic point of view (because they were formed mainly in response to requests from certain groups) and from a functional point of view (because they perform an official and executive role for significant socio-political groups. By means of carrying out their tasks, such entities may differ significantly in the differentiated degree of independence or activity and efficiency. However, it is important that their main functions are to develop the values and goals of civic and political activity and the ethno political process.

Against this background, it is quite obvious that national minorities are the basic or primary subjects of ethno politics. Subjects of the same level are nations, ethnic groups and various social strata. Their political subjectivity does not presuppose the total participation of representatives of these relatively large groups in politics. Instead, it is enough to form public and

---

<sup>38</sup> Antoniuk O., *Osnovy etnopolityky*, Wyd. MAUP 2005.

socio-political organizations based on them, which would express and protect the interests of the whole group, and the group itself would be the basis for mass political action, nominating activists and leaders of the certain direction. Accordingly, the peculiarity of the basic subjects of ethno politics can be considered that they are at the same time subjects of other types of social activity – economic, cultural, etc.

In terms of space and time, it is important that national minorities arise in the process of historical development of states under the influence of a whole range of factors. Thus, R. Oliver notes among them the migration carried out for many centuries, resettlement on other continents with oppression of the local population, the importation of labor during the colonial period to the places where it was needed, the collapse of historical empires and the emergence of new states. In other words, as F. Hackmann points out, the formation of national minorities is based on the principles and factors of origin (ways of formation), structural and social position in society and political orientations.

It is also important that among the current classifications of policy actors, one of the most common and suitable for the analysis of national minorities is the division of policy actors into individual and group. Individual policy actors include individuals who are the main policy actors, as other group or collective actors are personal. However, “to be a subject” is not a mechanical and automatic political quality. After all, a person is not born a subject of politics, but becomes one only in the process of long-term political socialization, constant ties, and clear social relations with other political actors. Instead, group (collective) subjects of politics include social communities of people (nation, ethnic group and social groups), as well as political institutions (state, political parties, socio-political organizations). To become a subject of politics, social communities of people must at least realize their own common interests, institutionally institutionalize the relationship between members of a particular social community of people and realize these interests in practice. This leads to the conclusion that there is a dynamic system of relationships between policy actors – dependence, subordination and relative autonomy. The place and role of a political entity in this system is determined by its willingness to influence political processes, i.e. the presence of the necessary political qualities and political culture.

It is noteworthy that an individual actually becomes a subject of the political process only to the extent that he acts on behalf of any other interest group and has the support of this group. In this approach to the definition of political subjectivity, the real subjects of political activity are only and exclusively group subjects of politics – socio-political communities. Moreover, the identification of a member of the community with a particular subject of politics is the most important mechanism for entering the political process. Therefore, the starting point of a political subject is his position as a representative of the community on whose behalf he acts. Such relations of representation presuppose that millions of people do not exist as separate entities, but as communities formed by objective connections and means of self-awareness. But through their representatives, social communities realize themselves as an independent actor,

on whose decisions and actions the life of the whole society depends. That is why socio-political communities as subjects of politics are integral formations that are formed on the basis of certain socio-political and cultural-economic ties, tendencies and prospects of development, etc. Socio-political community operates only inherent in its beliefs. The hierarchical structure of group subjects of political activity also depends on the nature of socio-political communities and their functions and role in the political structure of society.

In view of this, it is obvious that the driving force of national minorities as basic subjects of politics is the presence of political (together and in dependence with others) interest<sup>39</sup>. In this regard, scholars believe that the circle of political actors cannot be limited to political institutions, elites and leaders, leaving outside the vast majority of ordinary voters, especially those who do not vote at all. However, even in such non-participation, the political subjectivity of citizens is revealed, which may consist in passive opposition to the officially implemented policy of one or another state<sup>40</sup>. At the same time, the essential fact that they are active by nature is an attribute of political actors. The scope of activity is determined by the ability of the subject to influence the behavior of people (interaction with other actors), the compliance of political actions with the developed goals and the challenges of change in the political environment. Thus, the subjectivity of minorities in politics is traditionally determined by the relationship between objective opportunities to act, which are limited by the structure of political forces, and the level of maturity, the maturity or formation of the political environment, subjective opportunities (knowledge, motivation, emotional state, etc.). In addition, political actors have their own special functions and are governed by legal relations and norms, as well as who is the main and who is the secondary person, and who is the mass, the crowd and the passive object of manipulation.

On this basis, scholars studying the forms of political subjectivity of national minorities, including in Ukraine, note the peculiarity of their inclusion in politics, which is that they can affect the socio-political life of the state individually (as equal citizens to participate in elections and referendums) and collectively (through institutionalized to varying degrees, the procedures and institutions of democracy – parliament, representative bodies of party and other public organizations, local authorities, etc.). In addition, national minorities may establish political institutions or participate in the work of existing ones<sup>41</sup>. All this is the basis for the argument that national minorities, in particular in Ukraine (as well as in other countries of the world), are a specific subject of politics / ethno politics. The explanation for this is clearly seen in the interpretation of the psychological foundations of nationalism, which is based on the assertion that all people have an innate and primordial desire to be united in groups. In this regard, scientists believe that human mental life is governed by both consciousness and collective memory.

<sup>39</sup> Panov M., Herasina L., Zhuravskiy V., *Politolohiia: Akademichnyi kurs*, Ed. In Yure 2006, s. 176.

<sup>40</sup> Shliakhtun P., *Politolohiia (teoriia ta istoriia politychnoi nauky)*, Ed. Lybid 2002, s. 156.

<sup>41</sup> Poteriaiko H., *Osoblyvosti politychnoi subiektyvatsii natsionalnykh menshyn v Ukraini*, Kyiv 2005, s. 3.

They are both a complex mental formation, which is a consequence of the experience of distinguishing and opposing the “Me” and the world around us, “We” – the team, etc.<sup>42</sup>. Therefore, a person separates the individual from others and forms his own needs and interests. At the same time, a person identifies himself with the collective, but the belonging (even unconscious) of a person to the “national minority” determines the conditions of individual existence. Thus, the entry of national minorities into the political arena is determined not only by political interests, but also by ethno cultural identity, awareness of their uniqueness and belonging to another ethnic group. However, the most important thing is that ethnic groups and nations appear as subjects of politics mainly at the stage of struggle for the nation-state or national-territorial autonomy, in determining national priorities during the development of political institutions, in international relations, in the process of defending their ethno cultural specifics. However, even in this case, the volume of activity of such large social groups is often determined by the ability of political actors to influence people’s behavior (interact with other political actors), subordinate political actions to the goal, cause changes in the political environment and influence the political process<sup>43</sup>.

It is this ability is defined in political science as “political subjectivity”, including of national minorities. It is traditionally positioned and interpreted as the ability of a political entity to make policy, confidently and independently participate in political life in accordance with their interests and interact with other policy actors. However, it is important that the activities of different policy actors can have different goals and different degrees of activity. The latter grows sharply in the crisis transition periods of public and political life, can have a socio-constructive and destructive and anti-social nature, which violates the legal norms institutionalized in the interests of the people. At the same time, political activity can manifest itself in many forms: in the negotiation process; activities of political leaders, elites, parties and the state apparatus; mass political actions (rallies, demonstrations and riots). As an extreme form of political activity is social revolutions, during which there is a radical destruction of existing social and political relations.

However, as noted above, national minorities become subjects of politics in the process and process of protecting their own ethno cultural specifics at the state level. At the same time, not all national minorities actively participate in the political life of society. Although, in general, national minorities as a subject of politics are a structural element of the political system of the multiethnic states, and in a broad sense they denote all ethno-national communities that do not belong to the titular ethnos, i.e. are not a national majority. Accordingly, in the context of the problem of political subjectivity of national minorities study we suggest to be guided mainly by a narrow understanding of this concept. In general, due to the variability of the definition of “national minority”, which is generated primarily by the plurality of forms of existence of

<sup>42</sup> Mainouh K., *Anatomiiia natsionalizmu*, [w:] *Natsionalizm: Antolohiia*, Ed. Smoloskyp 2006, s. 149

<sup>43</sup> Volynets O., *Politolohiia*, Ed. Lvivska politekhnikha 2005, s. 105.



national minorities, in scientific research, including Ukrainian, as well as in international law there is no generally accepted interpretation of this concept. However, based on the analysis of various scientific approaches, the features of national minorities have been identified, which make it possible to consider them as subjects of politics. We are talking about such attributes of national minorities as: compact or dispersed residence on the territory of the state together with representatives of other national groups; the difference of original features of culture, customs, language; compulsory citizenship; the presence of a historical homeland, i.e. a country where the minority is the national majority.

In this context, it is crucial that in the course of ethno-national genesis, each of the subjects of ethno-politics develops its own vision of solving the national question, motivating it under the auspice of certain arguments and ideas. The set of relevant values, views and statements, which reflect the interests of a subject of ethno politics, is its ideology. In this context, it is mainly about ideology as a systematized set of concepts and ideas through which different ethnic entities (ethnic group, nation, ethnic groups, etc.) are aware of their ethno-national positions and interests, which are usually relevant motives for ethno-political activities of such ethnic entities<sup>44</sup>. At the same time, the “core” of ideology is an idea that embraces the worldview inherent in the ethnos, reflects the peculiarities of its development and is based on such basic ethno cultural characteristics that allow optimal coverage of the best qualities and stimulate ethno genesis. In view of this, it is quite obvious that ideology is the initial or lowest level of political subjectivity of national minorities.

However, it is the elite – the most conscious and most active strata of society create, develop and spread ethnic and national ideology. Given this, the strategy of the ethnic elite or ethnic leaders is important. The functional role of the ethnic elite is that it creates a strategic policy course aimed at forming tolerance of the interethnic relations, and develops an ideology in ethno politics and serves as a model of behavior. Many of the features that distinguish a particular ethnic group are primordial. From another angle, assembling them into a set and then preserving them is a matter for the leaders. The ethnic elite often resort to instrumentalism and speculation on ethno-group solidarity for the sake of their own, often mercantile, interests. One of such speculative means is to involve the group in the election and election campaign, to create the impression of it as a group of like-minded people, ready to vote in solidarity for one or another subject of the election process to “bargain” its votes.

However, often the solidarity of the group is a very real fact. Thus, the next level of political subjectivity of national minorities is considered to be elite creation.

From this it is quite natural to position, according to which the political destiny and success of the ethno-national minority is or can be in the hands of the ethno-political party<sup>45</sup>. The formation and activity of ethnic political parties is a clear characteristic of the political subjectivity

---

<sup>44</sup> Antoniuk O., *Osnovy etnopolityky*, Wyd. MAUP 2005, s. 35

<sup>45</sup> Varzar I., *Iz kontekstiv mynulyykh lit: Vybrane v kontseptualnykh i memuarnykh vymirakh*, Wyd. Fada 2003, vol 1, s. 298

of national minorities. After all, the existence of political parties, which are supported by a clear ideology, means the presence of conflict-generating potential in a multiethnic society. At the same time, by demanding power, national minorities not only associate themselves with the state through their political parties, but also introduce organized forms of representation of their own ethno-political interests. Therefore, by creating a political party on a national basis, national minorities reach the next level of political subjectivity – party formation.

As for the next level of political subjectivity – society formation – its role and significance is manifested in the fact that national minorities are an ethnic component of a multiethnic society, forming together with the titular ethnic group and ethnic minorities a single multiethnic society inherent in any state from the moment of its formation. Multiethnic society is considered as a social phenomenon, which is based on the definition of society as the objective existence of man, his existence in the material environment and culture, which are the principles of human communication, self-understanding and self-determination. National minorities in this context are effective actors and stable structural components of any society, including the Ukrainian one. This is especially evident against the background that the urgent problem of Ukrainian ethno politics, especially against the background of the Ukrainian-Russian conflict that began in 2013-2014, is the unification of all national minorities into a single society – a political nation.

In general, the problem of the relationship between the state and national minorities is extremely relevant for the relatively young Ukrainian state, which is in the process of forming a democratic civil society, which is particularly complicated, including artificially, in the last decade. In such conditions, a feeling of involvement in the development of the state in which they live has been and continues to be formed among national minorities, including Ukraine. In other words, national minorities demand a fair distribution of power at the state, regional and local levels, participation in foreign policy-making and protection of their ethno-national identity. Therefore, it is quite expedient to talk about state formation as a level of political subjectivity of national minorities, including in Ukraine. The fact is that the participation of national minorities in state-building processes is quite clearly explained by one of the provisions of the Constitution of Ukraine, in particular its preamble. It states that Ukrainian statehood, which has a long history, takes place on the basis of the exercised right to self-determination not only of the Ukrainian nation, but also of the entire Ukrainian people, which consists of citizens of Ukraine of all nationalities. This combination of words has absorbed the whole meaning of the polyethnic composition of the population of Ukraine and makes it possible to interpret it as a political term. On the other hand, this means that Ukraine has chosen the path of forming a political nation as a society based on statehood from the people who gave the name to the state and other ethnic groups living in this country.

In this regard, O. Kartunov's remark that the politicization of ethnicity is a process of entering the political arena of ethnic communities, as well as their transformation into subjects of history and politics is fully justified. In other words, it can be described as an ethno political

renaissance – a kind of continuation of the process of ethnic renaissance<sup>46</sup>. However, the use of the term “politicization of ethnicity” is questionable because it offers a vague understanding of ethnicity itself, and thus does not define the parameters of politicization of national minorities as a special form of ethnicity. Instead, J. Rothschild notes that the “politicization of ethnicity” occurs at a time when the ethnic group penetrates the universal culture and technology, and the basis of politicization, he considers a unique ethno specific culture of the group. He calls this situation “the paradox of the politicization of ethnicity.” The result is a “general hybrid tendency” that simultaneously unites the desire to universalize and strengthen “ethno political devotion.” The scholar argues that “politicizing ethnicity” involves: giving people the opportunity to understand the role of politics in preserving their ethno cultural values and vice versa; stimulate their attention to this relationship; to mobilize them for the formation of ethnic groups with a single self-consciousness; to direct the behavior of such groups in the sphere of political activity, based on the existing consciousness and group self-consciousness<sup>47</sup>.

This is a sufficient reason to postulate the conclusion that the process of acquisition of the basic features and attributes of a political subject by national minorities can be synonymously understood as the political subjectification of national minorities. Agreeing with some scholars, we insist that political subjectification should be understood as a complex process of acquisition of the basic features and attributes of political actors (including political consciousness, political interests, internal organization to achieve political goals, political activity aimed at participating in the adoption decisions and control over their implementation) by national minorities, that provides a certain level of political subjectivity as a formed capacity for political activity, which is characterized by a certain level of consciousness and organization of national minorities<sup>48</sup>.

In this view, political subjectivation is considered to be, on the one hand, as one of the essential characteristics of self-determination of national minorities in the broadest sense of the word, and on the other hand – as a procedural characteristic of the political system of society, as it provides for the formation of political relations such as “state – national minorities”, the creation of socio-political organizations of national minorities and change of their political behavior and consciousness in accordance with current political principles and norms in the state. Among the conditions of political subjectification of national minorities are the achievements of the political history of national minorities, including in Ukraine, as well as the specifics of the ethno-national structure of Ukrainian multiethnic society and the nature of legislative support of this process and national minorities.

Despite the fact that the political subjectification of national minorities, on the one hand, is described by normative boundaries, it, on the other hand, is quite naturally influenced by the processes of ethno-national revival, which in theoretical political science are explained by the

<sup>46</sup> Kartunov O., *Vstup do etnopolitologii*, Kyiv 1999, s. 200.

<sup>47</sup> Mainouh K., *Anatomia natsionalizmu*, [w:] *Natsionalizm: Antologia*, Wyd. Smoloskyp 2006, s. 119

<sup>48</sup> Poteriaiko H., *Osoblyvosti politychnoi subiektyvatsii natsionalnykh menshyn v Ukraini*, Kyiv 2005, s. 3

awakening of ethnic identity, as well as the search for ways to effectively participate in socio-political processes and self-affirmation as effective factors in state formation, including the occupation of relevant niches in the political life of a state. The characteristic feature of these processes in Ukraine is the fact that they are both inherent in both national minorities and the titular ethnic group, which usually creates for them special conditions for participation in the political process.

The peculiarity of the forms of political subjectification of national minorities comes down to the fact that they can be included in politics, firstly, individually (as equal citizens of the state) and, secondly, collectively (and this way is the most effective for expressing social, ethno cultural and political needs of national minorities at the state level). And the democracy of the political system of a country is evidenced by the diversity of forms of participation of national minorities in political life – participation in elections and the creation of representative democracies, the formation of their own representative bodies, parties and public organizations, participation in the work of public authorities and local governments. Additionally, there are different types of autonomy as a form of self-preservation and self-organization of minorities. In this context, special attention should be paid to the problem of national and cultural autonomy. After all, it is obvious that national-cultural societies in a specific sense are not subjects of politics, because they are not created for the struggle for power, and political activity is not their essential characteristic. Nevertheless, the experience of Ukraine testifies to this, they can be political subjects, because they are more and more often interested in national interests and participate in the political life of society, and they can also significantly influence it.

Separately in the context of political subjectivity, which is extremely relevant in the case of Ukraine, the problem of separatism and irredentism should be revealed as strategic goals of political activity of national minorities aimed at changing the territorial integrity of the country mainly to create their own state (in the case of separatism, unrecognized DPR and LPR in Ukraine) or joining the territory of another state under the slogans of ethno cultural unity of the population (in the case of irredentism, the Autonomous Republic of Crimea in the case of Ukraine). And it is here that it is appropriate to advert to the stages of subjectivity of national minorities, which were discussed in detail above. At the same time, it should be emphasized that the subjectification of national minorities in politics is conditioned by objective opportunities to act, depends on the foreign policy conditions created by a certain model of political relations between the country (in particular Russia) and national minorities (concerning Ukraine). Accordingly, it is quite natural that the entry of national minorities into the arena of political life carries the potential danger of arbitrariness and violence, the source of which may be minorities and the state. The latter can influence national minorities as subjects of politics, thus defining the matrix of their political activity, as well as limiting the space of political activity. Moreover, the higher is the level of political subjectivity of minorities, the less they are the object of politics.

Therefore, attention must be paid to the fact that the mechanisms of internal mobilization of national minorities, their activity in the arena of political life and the struggle for the right

to participate in political decision-making may largely depend on the dispersed and compact settlement of different communities and external factors – terrorist movements, geopolitical strategies of other states, which contribute to the intensification and radicalization of irredentist and separatist sentiments. That is why the existence of divergent regional political interests, including in Ukraine, also requires a special mechanism for their implementation, under which the political interests of individual minorities do not interfere with national interests.

Finally, it is clear that the political subjectification of national minorities is due to their inclusion in the political processes of multiethnic states as a social subject of politics, the source of political activity which is due to the fact that in the development of a certain sovereign state, in particular Ukraine, along with the revival of ethnic identification of minorities formed a sense of complicity in the development of the country in which they live. As a result, the minorities, as a collective subject of politics, in one way or another seek to influence the domestic and foreign policies of a state, as well as call for a fair distribution of power at all levels. The ability to engage in political activity, which is characterized by the level of consciousness and organization of national minorities, is in fact the essence of political subjectivity, which is correlated with the political subjectification of national minorities. And when political subjectivity is the ability to participate directly or through political institutions in the political life of society, to influence the behavior of others and generate important changes in political relations, then political subjectification is actually the process of acquiring these qualities of a political subject. That is why the political subjectification of national minorities presupposes the attainment of a certain level of political consciousness, the presence of certain political interests, the internal organization for achieving political goals, political activity aimed at participating in political decision-making and monitoring their implementation. In this context, the criteria of political subjectivation are the awareness of national minorities of their common interests, strengthening of internal interconnection, as well as consolidation, self-organization and direct activity in politics as a representation of perceived common interests.

In this view and within the framework of such theorizing, the construction of the subjectification of national minorities in Ukraine was and remains quite specific, as it and the choice of its forms are influenced by several basic preconditions. First, the Ukrainian ethnos has historically been characterized by a conflict-free neighborhood with various ethno-national communities of other countries, as a result of which other national minorities against the background of the Ukrainian titular ethnos in this state are naturally perceived as separate elements of society and even politics. Secondly, the specifics of the ethno-national structure of Ukraine and the diversity of national minorities have previously made it impossible and even more so today makes it impossible the functioning of a single mechanism for the realization of the political interests of national minorities or even involves the introduction of various forms of participation in politics. Third, the subjectification of national minorities in Ukraine, although it has one of the most democratic political and legal support in the world, is not perfect in terms of mechanisms

and conditions for minorities to exercise their guaranteed political rights. Finally, and fourthly, the subjectification of national minorities in Ukraine typically takes place in parallel with the establishment of the Ukrainian titular ethnic group as a state-building one, which creates additional conditions and problems for political representation for participants in the political process. It follows that the formation and re-formation of the titular ethnic group as a subject of politics significantly or even decisively affects the political subjectivity of all national minorities in Ukraine. In general, this proves and argues that the problem is political subjectification of national minorities, including in Ukraine, as a procedural characteristic of the political system of society is quite complex and contradictory in nature. As a result, there are no identical and consolidated recipes for solving this problem.

## References

1. Antonovych V., *Pro Kozatski chasy na Ukraini*, Wyd. Dnipro 1991.
2. Antoniuk O., *Osnovy etnopolityky*, Wyd. MAUP 2005.
3. Antoniuk O., *Formuvannia etnopolityky v Ukraini: teoretyko-metodolobichni ta kontseptualni zasady*, Kyiv 2001.
4. *Bachynskiy Y., Bilshovytska revoliutsiia i ukraintsi: Krytychni zamitky*, Berlin 1928.
5. Bromley Y., *Etnosotsialnyie protsessyi: teoriya, istoriya, sovremennost*, Moskva 1987.
6. Drahomanov M., *Propashchyi chas: Ukraintsi pid Moskovskym tsarstvom (1654–1876)*, Wyd. Tsentri pamiatkoznavstva AN Ukrainy 1992.
7. Dubinin V., *Rol interesiv naroduv ustanovlennit arozvytku politychno systemy suspilstva*, Kramatorsk 2006.
8. Hatchinson Dzh., Smit E., *Shcho take etnichnist*, [w:] *Natsionalizm: Antolohiia*, Wyd. Smoloskyp 2000, s. 468–475.
9. Helner E., *Natsii ta natsionalizm. Natsionalizm*, Kyiv 2003.
10. Helner E., Prishestvie natsionalizma. Mifyi natsii i klasa, *Put: mezhdunarodnyiy filosofskiy zhurnal* 1992, vol 1, s. 9–61.
11. Hrinchenko B., Drahomanov M., *Dialohy pro ukrainskunaratsionalnu spravu*, Wyd. NAN Ukrainy 1994.
12. Hrushevskiy M., *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy: v 11 t.*, Wyd. Naukova dumka 1991.
13. Huboglo M., *Yazyki etnicheskoy mobilizatsii*, Moskva 1998.
14. Kartunov O., *Vstup do etnopolitologii*, Kyiv 1999.
15. Kartunov O., *Zakhidni kontseptsii etnichnosti, natsii ta natsionalizmu*, Kyiv 2007.
16. Kasianov H., *Teorii natsii ta natsionalizmu*, Wyd. Lybid 1999.
17. Kolodii A., Klymanska L., Kosmyna Ya., Kharchenko V., *Politolohiia*, Wyd. Elha, Nika-Tsentr 2003.
18. Kostomarov N., Dve russkie narodnosti (Pismo redaktoru), *Osnova* 1861, nr. 3, s. 33–80.
19. Kostomarov N., *Russkaya istoriya v zhizneopisaniyah glavneyshih ee deyateley*, Wyd. Esmo 2007.
20. Kotyhorenko V., Kompromis u mizhetnichnykh vzaiemnykh: poshuk pravoi formuly v suchasni Ukraini, *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen NAN Ukrainy* 2001, vol 15, s. 180–188.

21. Kresina I., *Ukrainska natsionalna svidomist i suchasni politychni protsesy*, Wyd. Vyshcha shkola 1998.
22. Kuras I., *Etnopolitohiia v Ukraini. Stanovlennia. Shcho dali?*, Wyd. Instytut politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen NAN Ukrainy 2002.
23. Kuras I., *Etnopolitohiia. Pershi kroky stanovlennia*, Wyd. Heneza 2004.
24. Kuras I., *Skhid i Zakhid Ukrainy: problemy yednannia*, Wyd. NAN Ukrainy 2001.
25. Kymlicka W., Immigration, Multiculturalism, and the Welfare State, *“Ethics & International Affairs”* 2006, vol 20, nr. 3, s. 281–304.
26. Kymlicka W., *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 1995.
27. Kymlicka W., *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Citizenship*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2001.
28. Levenets Y., *Natsionalni vidnosyny v Ukraini u XX st. Zbirnyk dokumentiv i materialiv*, Wyd. Naukova dumka 1994.
29. Lypynskiy V., *Lysty do brativ-khliborobiv. Pro ideiu i orhanizatsiiu ukrainskoho monarkbizmu*, Wyd. Kyiv-Filadelfia 1995.
30. Maiboroda O., *Rosiiskyi natsionalizm v Ukraini (1991–1998 rr.)*, Wyd. KM Academia 1999.
31. Mainouh K., *Anatomiia natsionalizmu*, [w:] *Natsionalizm: Antolohiia*, Wyd. Smoloskyp 2006.
32. Mikhnovskiy M., *Samostiina Ukraina*, Wyd. Diokor 2002.
33. Nahorna L., *Etnopolitychnyi rozvytok Ukrainy: dosvid, problemy, perspektyvy*, Kyiv 1997.
34. Naulko V., *Razvitie mezhnatsionalnykh svyazey na Ukraine*, Wyd. Naukova dumka 1975.
35. Nelha O., *Teoriia etnosu*, Wyd. Tandem 1997.
36. Nikitiuk V., *Status etnonatsionalnykh menshyn (porivnialno-pravnyi aspekt)*, Kyiv 1996.
37. Obushnyi M., *Etnonatsionalna identychnist v konteksti formuvannia ukrainskoi natsii*, Wyd. IPiEND 1999.
38. Obushnyi M., *Etnos i natsiia: problemy identychnosti*, Kyiv 1998.
39. Panchuk M., *Natsionalni menshyny Ukrainy u XX stolitti: polityko-pravovyi aspekt*, Wyd. IPiEND 2000.
40. Panov M., Herasina L., Zhuravskiy V., *Politolohiia: Akademichnyi kurs*, Wyd. In Yure 2006.
41. Ponomarov A., *Etnichnist ta etnichna istoriia Ukrainy*, Wyd. Lybid 1996.
42. Popper K., *Otkryitoe obschestvo i ego vragi*, Wyd. Feniks 1992.
43. Poteriaiko H., *Osoblyvosti politychnoi subiektivatsii natsionalnykh menshyn v Ukraini*, Kyiv 2005.
44. Rafalskiy O., *Natsionalni menshyny Ukrainy u XX stolitti. Istoriografichnyi narys*, Wyd. Polius 2000.
45. Rafalskiy O., *Natsionalni menshyny Ukrainy u XX stolitti: polityko-pravovyi aspekt*, Wyd. IPiEND 2000.
46. Rymarenko S., *Samovyznachennia osoby, natsii, derzhavy*, Wyd. Iurydychna knyha 2000.
47. Shapoval Y., *Etnopolitychnyi rozvytok Ukrainy: dosvid, problemy, perspektyvy*, Kyiv 1997.
48. Shkliar L., *Etnoderzhavoznavstvo. Teoretyko-metodolohichni zasady*, Kyiv 2001.
49. Shliakhtun P., *Politolohiia (teoriia ta istoriia politychnoi nauky)*, Wyd. Lybid 2002.

50. Smit E., *Natsii ta natsionalizm u hlobalnu epokhu*, Wyd. Nika-Tsentr 2006.
51. Smit E., *Natsionalizm i modernizm: Kriticheskiy obzor sovremennyih teoryi natsiy i natsionalizma*, Wyd. Praxis 2004.
52. Smit E., *Natsionalizm: Teoriia, ideolohiia, istoriia*, Wyd. K.I.S., 2004.
53. Smit E., *Natsionalna identychnist*, Wyd. Osnovy 1994.
54. Varzar I., *Iz kontekstiv mynulykh lit: Vybrane v kontseptualnykh i memuarnykh vymirakh*, Wyd. Fada 2003, vol 1.
55. Varzar I., *Politychna etnolohiia yak nauka: istoriolohiia, teoriia, metodolohiia, prakseolohiia*, Wyd. Shkoliar 1994.
56. Volynets O., *Politolohiia*, Wyd. Lvivska politekhnikha 2005.
57. Wirth L., *The Problem of Minority Groups*, [w:] Linton R., *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, New York 1945.
58. Yevtukh V., *Etnopolityka v Ukraini: pravnychi ta kulturolohichni aspekty*, Wyd. Feniks 1997.
59. Yevtukh V., *Etnosuspilni protsesy v Ukraini: mozhyvosti naukovykh interpretatsii*, Wyd. Stylos 2004.