

*Gabrielyan O. A.*

## **Crimean project through dialogue of cultures**

*In this article analyzed some aspects of social, political and culture life in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea. There are three possible projects of Crimea's transformation: Ukrainian, Crimean-Tatar and Russian*

*Key words: Ukraine, Crimea, culture, the program of development, projects of Crimea's transformation.*

There is no doubt that Ukrainian project in the XXI century appears to be a complex phenomenon. It should cover not only various aspects of social life and involvement of our country in the context of world's international processes, but it should also reveal such an important constituent as regional diversity, which greatly influences modern history. Actually, the project of Ukraine's development is represented in its Constitution. Still, we may witness the absence of general agreement on this point among political leaders. This project outlines the status of Crimea and specifies its future objectives. However, this design is so undefined/vague, that there arises necessity to go into details of this regional project and shape its constituents precisely. Crimean project is vital for Ukraine.

This may be the reason for the President V.F. Yanukovich to proclaim this project as national: "Crimea is a pearl of Ukraine". This slogan could have remained a bright metaphor unless it hadn't been supported by a number of implementing activities. The government of Crimea has elaborated a strategy of Cri-

mea's development till the year 2020 with particular programs, focusing on various problematic issues. One of the most important points to stress is that the instruments for the realization of these programs were also designed (staff assessment is being conducted) involving not only the resources of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, but also national ones [1]. Moreover, current regional power upholds its special status in the central (part of the country) that could help to implement the designed strategy. This also applies to re-subordination of the state broadcasting company "Krym" to the government of Crimea and optimization of administration by eliminating duplicating institutions, i.e. offices of central authorities/administration that had been established in the period of separatist activities on the Peninsula. Everything listed above fits into the logic of common sense and basics of management.

There can arise a question: why this hasn't been done before? The reason is that the region itself, its population, political lead-

ers and central authorities, as well as inner and outer/external conditions were not ready/prepared for such transformations. In this sense, Crimea has a chance to become successful national project, which necessity has been foregrounded during the last 5 years.

History of Crimea's reclamation can reveal a lot. At least it can to a certain extent clearly predict the perspectives that Ukraine and Crimea will face in the near future. The retrospective reference has also a pragmatic goal. The defined/fixed points of history can help to design the schedule/diagram/ perspectives for the future development of Crimea. Prognostication is one of the integral parts of a science. Apparently, it is much more difficult to prognosticate in social sphere than in exact and natural sciences. Still, probabilistic/stochastic nature of prognostication in social sphere does not eliminate its objectiveness and significance.

The following represent actualization and systematizing/classification of a number of statements on social issues/matters relevant for the present and future of Crimea. The term 'social' is used here in a broad sense and relates to cultural, political and economic matters. Strictly speaking, we aim not only to describe Crimean project, but validate the demand for it and its imminence. It is also important to single out the major threat to its implementation. Just the last year we wondered whether the state has a project of Crimea's future/development at all. Today we face the other aspect: what are the problems

that hinder the implementation of the project and how we can overcome them.

Any possession the Crimea had undergone, presupposed its own mode of existence of this land and its population. In the monograph "Interethnic concord in Crimea: ways of achievement" our colleague S. Gradirovsky has offered the following theoretic scheme for the comprehension of the history of Crimea [2, 3]. He focused on the particular period that has direct relation to the modern concerns in Crimea. Since the active involvement of Crimea into the sphere of Russian social and cultural interests, a consequential phenomenon can be observed: "ruin of the region followed by its transformation according to the imposed standards". These processes may be defined as waves of development ("low and high tide"), as series of transformation ("ruin – development") and as a social and cultural pendulum ("devastation – creation"). New standards are always introduced by social and cultural leader. In the period of assimilation of Crimea by Russia, this phenomenon was repeated for 4 times in the Crimean history:

*Waves of devastation-ruin:*

1. annexation of Crimea accompanied by the deportation of Christians and decrease in the number of population;
2. Crimean war resulted in mass emigration of Crimean and Nogay Tatars (devastation and depopulation);
3. Civil war, unprecedented migration and blending of human masses, chain of gov-

ernments, starvation, ruin of agricultural system and collapse of class system;

4. Second World War, total ruin of all infrastructures in the peninsula, mass fascist repressions, deportations (pre-war, occupational and post-liberational).

*Waves of creation-reclamation:*

1. The primary period of assimilation by the Russian empire (before Crimean War): the foundations of a new network of cities were laid, military outpost Sevastopol was established, new policy of benefits and encouragement was developed to support migration;

2. Elite recreation, imperial palaces and landscape culture, start of the industrial revolution of the second period of assimilation, changing of agricultural specialization;

3. Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, mass recreation (child's republic 'Artek', workers' and peasants' health resorts), industrialization, collectivization, total illiteracy;

4. Investment into military-industrial complex: "unsinkable aircraft carrier", innovations (aerospace industry, agricultural novelties and North-Crimean Canal), apogee of mass recreation.

Still, the period of 250 years represent the waves of social and cultural influence on Crimean-Tatar ethnos (obvious assimilation tendencies, objective emigration issues undermining demographic structure, ambivalent educational activity of I. Gasprinsky, phenomenon of deportation - repatriation):

– first surge of emigration, caused by Russian-Turkish wars and annexation of Crimea;

– technology of complementary co-optation of population and elites of the khanate into social structure of the empire;

– second surge of emigration, caused by the defeat of the allies in Crimean war and Porta's propaganda due to the loss of northern lands demanding population inflow;

– educational activity of I. Gasprinsky, progressive dispossession of land, implementation of a new agricultural configuration of the Peninsula, emigration burst of 1902-1903;

– spontaneous disorders during the Civil war, intervention, 'red' and 'white' terror, starvation;

– collectivization (complete ruin of *vakuf* system), resettlement of land-poor Crimean tatars from foothills and mountainous regions to the steppe, *korenizatsiya* and the policy of total literacy to fit the standards of *Strana Sovetov*;

– deportation after revelation that destructive to the Russian lands (Kerch and Sevastopol in Crimea) influence of the Second World War didn't influence natives much;

– struggle to return from deportation;

– repatriation as a pullback of social and cultural influence, provoking further assimilation and determining national elite's behavior.

Regarding uniqueness of any culture and region, still, we can make some generalizations that reveal certain tendencies and regular occurrences. Investigations show, that

assimilation of territories as well as social and cultural transformations have a typical nature. The similar processes were witnessed in Western Prussia, i.e. modern Kaliningrad region or Kosovo. Just a brief retrospection and some generalizations apparently show that nowadays Crimea has entered a new stage of social and cultural development/assimilation. It is a post-soviet period that has started in 1991. Nowadays we face a transition to the second stage of this assimilation/development just due to objective process of the alternation of generations. The first stage was characterized by ukrainization and polyethnization in social and cultural sphere, by transference to 'bazar' capitalism in economic sphere and by overcoming the lowest degree of birth rate and return of Crimean tatars in demographic sphere.

Preceding *period of devastation-ruin*, as compared to the stages of past series was minimal. Decrease of crop capacity did not lead to hunger. Decrease of recreation flow did not prevent *recreation barons* from enrichment and the local population benefit from summer season. Decrease of industry did not result in mass migration to the more prosperous regions (still we may witness the renewal of seasonal work in Ukraine and in Crimea directed particularly to Russia). Crimean Tatars have returned to Crimea, but no new standard of settlement, ethnic innovations in agricultural sphere or some entrepreneurial schemes were introduced.

The *period of transformation* that has started is highly controversial. The major question is which of the ethnoses will become CK-leader of a new surge of assimilation remains unsolved.

S. Gradirovsky investigates CK-transformation not as inner spontaneous development of land and ethnicity, but as external force. "Transformation" he speaks about is not a "creation" in general, but the one that is arranged by external power by some imposed standard. With the lack of such standard, there will be no creation.

Unlike S. Gradirovsky we suggest that no ethnos will become CK-leader, but state. Otherwise, the state will lose the region. Eventually, rhetoric statements on civil society, multiculturalism, regional identity – Crimeans as an integral part of national (state) Crimean project appear to be urgent. Apparently, Ukraine shapes to be a new proprietor of this region. Crimean Constitution as a regulation of Crimean political being is supported by the project, as a programme for its social and cultural existence in a broad sense. Crimea as a Ukrainian land acquires ideological notions sufficient as for the state, and for the majority of the population of Crimea. In general, this fits into the paradigm of transformation of Ukraine in the context of modern geopolitical changes.

The policy of Ukraine regarding Crimea could be masterly under the condition Ukraine could consider geopolitical interests of its neighbors and attract Europe, Russia

and even Turkey to the implementation of this project. It can be possible regarding relative complementarity of their interests. The forms of realization of this project may vary being offshore, tourist, recreation zone, summer international political center etc. The challenge is to define the main idea of the project, which will be interesting to those, who will implement it.

The statements above fit into normative political science. The processes in reality are much more complex. There are three possible projects of Crimea's transformation: Ukrainian, Crimean-Tatar and Russian.

*Ukrainian project*, as we have already stated above is possible on the national basis. It possesses all the externally imposed standards for the Crimea. It can be implemented on the basis of national standards: integrated political, economical and partly integral cultural unity. Domination of Russian social and cultural background as an outcome of common history in the frame of former USSR is obvious. The difficulty appears to be that it can not be overcome by administrative ukrainization only. The strings of discontent may stretch for a long time, but eventually they will break, revealing the energy of social resentment of not only ethnic Russians. The aim of Ukrainian project is to offer new social and cultural standards that can be accepted by the majority of the population of Crimea. The project appears to be successful in political and legal sphere. Political elite of Crimea is a part of political elite of Ukraine. The situa-

tion of inner non-citizenship (rejection of Ukrainian citizenship on psychological, emotional level) shifts to involvement of population into political activities as citizens of Ukraine. Domestic economic ties appear to be tighter than border ties with Russia. Ukrainian project has one distinct advantage and disadvantage at the same time. Being a state project has the most powerful resource possible. On the other hand, being a state project and consecutively administrative and bureaucratic it is not creative and non-responsive. The weakness of Ukrainian project lies in the fact that the Constitution of the country, being a project of nation's present and future is subject to transformations itself.

*Crimean-Tatar project*. Having failed to achieve Crimea-wide support and being highly ethnocentric, still, it is being actively implemented. Among its other features we should list:

- confrontation;
- expansionism;
- purposiveness;
- passionateness.

All these features possess both positive and negative potential. In the political sphere this project is realized by active penetration of Crimean Tatars into power authorities: assignment of quotas on all levels of power, coordination of all politically relevant matters, appearance of duplicate authorities and quasi-national institutions. This project is also implemented in economic sphere. We face ethnization of certain spheres of economic

activity: building (construction markets), transport, restaurant and tourist business. The implementation of this project in social and cultural sphere also demonstrates considerable results. We face official spread of Crimean-Tatar language on republican level. There is constant and steady renewal and alternation of toponymy. We also witness restoration of historic landmarks and building of new ones, majorly religious ones. The complex hierarchy of national system of education and culture is being established. Eventually, we should recognize Crimean-Tatar project to be the most actively implemented in Crimea.

*Russian project* is not obviously articulated. It may be outlined above as the previous project of Crimea's assimilation by Russia, later by USSR. Due to objective and subjective reasons, Russian community of Crimea failed to become a representative body of Russian and Russian-speaking part of the population of Crimea. At best, it will succeed in retaining what it already has. The lack of resources and real support from Russia also has a great impact. In the political sphere Russian community faced a crushing defeat at the last elections. In economic sphere this project also lacks bright ethnic nature. The most important resource of a possible Russian project in Crimea is objective dominance of Russian culture. Two centuries' potential will not soon be exhausted. Still, it is being actively forced out in language, toponymy etc. However, church appears to be a serious institution supporting the project. As a matter of

fact, it has really succeeded in building up its power and emphasizing its presence at the peninsula. It is the only institution that possesses mobilization power.

So, a war, or a dialogue of cultures? Regarding the culture in a broad sense we embrace traditional notion of culture, politics and economy. All cultures exist in a state of war, it is natural. Cultures are aggressive and eventually expansive Ego, self-sufficient entity. The culture may be limited only by a stronger culture. Where the cultures meet, there starts a dialogue. Otherwise, the stronger culture absorbs the weaker one. But the dialogue itself induces mutual enrichment (e.g. methods of management/household, education, particular forms of culture adopted by a nation).

No doubt, we face separatism and segmentation of Crimea. We face *palpation* of cultures by one another, redistribution and privatization of Crimean cultural populated universe. There are no limits to this process as there are no proprietors that are the necessary condition for the dialogue. Still, on the lowest level the dialogue is in progress and it can become a basis for a greater social dialogue. There are a lot of opportunities for the Crimean project, but the threats are also considerable. The importance of state in this respect can scarcely be overestimated, but now the state majorly focuses on economic aspects. This is the weakness of the project. Social project lacking spiritual grounds is doomed. It can't be limited to a business project. We need a bright image of common future as a

system of social and cultural ideals and values. There can be no future without it.

### **Bibliography**

1. Стратегия экономического и социального развития Автономной Республики Крым на 2011 – 2020 годы. // [www.ark.gov.ua/images/strategiya](http://www.ark.gov.ua/images/strategiya) 2011-2020new-5.pdf
2. Градировский С., Николаенко Е. Особенности социокультурного освоения

Тавриды. // Межэтническое согласие в Крыму : пути достижения / Ред. О. А. Габриеляна и др. – Симферополь, 2002. – С. 144-179

3. Габриелян О. А. Проблемное поле межэтнической напряженности. // Межэтническое согласие в Крыму : пути достижения / Ред. О. А. Габриеляна и др. – Симферополь, 2002. – С. 260 -298

*У статії пропонуються до аналізу питання соціального, політичного та культурного життя в Автономній Республіці Крим. До розгляду пропонуються три проекти розвитку ситуації в Криму: український, кримськотатарський, російський.*

*Ключові слова: Україна, Крим, культура, програма розвитку, проект розвитку Криму.*

*В статье анализируются вопросы социальной, политической и культурной жизни в Автономной Республике Крым. К рассмотрению предлагаются три возможных проекта развития ситуации в Крыму: украинский, крымскотатарский, российский.*

*Ключевые слова: Украина, Крым, культура, программа развития, проект развития Крыма.*

