

Anastasia KRAVETS¹National Technical University, Dnipro, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0003-2433-5836

DOI : 10.14746/ps.2024.1.8

ETHNO-NATIONAL BASIS OF RUSSIAN AGGRESSION IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBAL SECURITY: A BIOPOLITICAL APPROACH

INTRODUCTION

The Russian-Ukrainian war (a full-scale invasion) not only rallied foreign partners from a number of countries to help Ukraine in its quest to defend its independence but also drew the attention of scientists to the analysis of the causes and consequences of Russian aggression. There are a number of publications devoted to Russian aggression: “Deterring Russian Aggression in the Baltic States Through Resilience and Resistance” (Flanagan et al., 2019), “The Impact of the Russian Aggression against Ukraine on the Russia-EU Trade” (Estrada, Koutronasc, 2022), “Russian Aggression against Ukraine and the West’s Policy Response” (Pifer, 2015), “Russian Aggression against Ukraine: Past, Present, and Futures” (Sukhorolskyi, 2022), “Russian Aggression in Ukraine: The Problem of Definitions” (Tsybulenko, Francis, 2018), “Horizontal Escalation: An Asymmetric Approach to Russian Aggression?” (Fitzsimmons, 2019), “Deterring Russian Aggression in the Baltic States. What it Takes to Win” (Shlapak, 2019) etc. However, only a small percentage of them are devoted to the current situation. For example, the article “The Impact of the Russian Aggression against Ukraine on the Russia-EU Trade” is dedicated to analyzing trade relations between the EU and Russia.

An interesting analysis of the Russian-Ukrainian war is contained in the scientific article by Mikhail Polianskii, “Russian Foreign Policy Research and War in Ukraine” Old Answers to New Questions.” But, it has a different context. The article analyzes “geopolitical perspectives, emphasizing that Russia’s international actions are primarily driven by the impulses of the international system,” and also “explores regime explanations, emphasizing how Russia’s internal system affects its foreign policy decisions” (Polianskii, 2024).

The greatest interest causes the article of Petro Sukhorolskyi because he analyzes the past, present, and future of Russian aggression. The scientist notes that the solution to the problem (the study of Russian aggression) depends on the choice of scientific theory: “Analysis on the systemic level demonstrates the absence of the single para-

¹ This article is licensed under the Creative Commons – Attribution – ShareAlike 4.0 (CC-BY-SA 4.0) license.

Artykuł udostępniany jest na licencji Creative Commons – Uznanie autorstwa – Na tych samych warunkach 4.0 (CC-BY-SA 4.0).

digm concerning events around the Ukrainian-Russian War. The solution of the problem depends on the selection of theory, and alongside it, a choice of the worldviews and myths underlying it" (Sukhorolskyi, 2022: 5).

Therefore, the key issue is the choice of a scientific approach to analysis. This article uses a biopolitical approach to the analysis of Russian aggression. The reasons are as follows: 1) in the biopolitical approach, aggression is considered not as an emotion but as a model (type) of behavior; 2) this type of behavior is evolutionarily determined and is fixed in the process of education; 3) this system of public education has a pronounced ethnocentric character; 4) a system based on the idea of ethnocentrism poses a threat in the global dimension, because it produces a feeling of exclusivity in Russian society and, accordingly, can be the basis for aggression against those societies and those countries that disagree with this fact.

If we compare such a scientific approach to the problems of the Russian-Ukrainian war, for example, with realism, then the latter focuses on geopolitical issues, in particular, the so-called dilemma of the "idea of security." Its essence is as follows: "If one great country feels that a country from its sphere of influence is coming under the influence of another great country, the first will use any resources at its disposal, including military force, to prevent this" (Prymak, Charskykh, 2023: 71).

The aim of the article is to analyze the ethno-national basis of Russian aggression from the point of view of biopolitics. With a biopolitical approach, the focus of research attention is the ethno-national factor, which has an evolutionary nature, a biological basis, is based on the mechanism of indoctrination, and is embodied in practice in the form of ethnocentrism, the forms and manifestations of which can be different: from tolerant to aggressive.

In accordance with this, the key hypothesis of the scientific article is formulated: given Russian inclinations: xenophobia, racism, and anti-semitism, a war with Ukraine could be expected to have a similar background.

The following words are a vivid illustration of the above. Johan M.G. van der Denen (2000): "In war or war-like situations, the leader evokes the memory of the chosen trauma, as well as that of the chosen glory, to galvanize his people and make his group more cohesive. Historical enmity thus acts much like an amplifier in an electrical circuit."

In this context, V. Dolnyk's point of view is interesting: "The laws of aggressive behavior affect not only the behavior of every person, including politicians and the military, but also the behavior of society and the state. When the state gets into the power of instincts created by natural selection for a herd like baboons, and at the same time possesses an atomic one, it is very dangerous" (Dolnyk, 1993: 4).

Unfortunately, this is true. Moreover, this danger is not local (at the level of a war between two neighboring countries) but global in nature. The only question is: who will become the next victim of the ethnocentric ideas of the Russian leadership?

Russian aggression against Ukraine and the Ukrainian people is based not only on the desire to seize the territory of an independent state but also on the desire to subjugate the sovereign nation – the Ukrainians. A series of documented crimes by the Russian Federation against the civilian population of Ukraine indicates not only a desire to conquer but also an attempt to destroy the Ukrainian nation physically. The

war showed that Ukrainians do not perceive themselves and Russians as one people, do not see a common future either as a state or a nation, and, accordingly, choose their right to independence, sovereignty, and a European future.

The complex nature of the scientific problem requires the use of appropriate methods that combine different types of systems analyses: system-structural, system-functional, and system-historical analysis, as well as rational reconstruction and predictive methods.

ETHNOCENTRISM AS A FOUNDATION OF RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

The definition of the term “ethnocentrism” was proposed by Austrian scientist I. Gumplovych, its socio-psychological component was proposed by U. Sanmer: “Ethnocentrism...is a person’s tendency to perceive and interpret the life phenomena and behavior of other peoples through the prism of culture, the values of one’s ethnicity as a standard. The phenomenon of ethnocentrism manifests itself when the superiority of one’s people, their mutual relations, culture, values... are excessively strengthened” (Danyliuk, Hresko, Kurapov, 2016).

The biopolitical approach involves the analysis of conflicts based on the ethno-national basis, from the point of view of their biological foundation due to the innate “mechanism” of recognizing “own” and “foreigners.” One of the main terms of scientific analysis, in this case, is ethnocentrism – “selective attitude towards representatives of ‘one’s’ ethnicity (nation, nationality, tribe)” (Kravets, 2018: 45). Ethnocentrism, according to A. Oleskyn (2007: 111), involves the cultivation of ethnic prejudices from early childhood – “unreasonably negative attitudes towards another group (nationality, race) or its individual members.” And that is why in human society, there are stereotyped beliefs (national, racial, as well as gender and class) related to the above-mentioned mechanisms. When studying the problem of the formation of ethnic stereotypes, the problem of “indoctrination” becomes important. It is understood as “a conscious, purposeful suggestion of political ideas, values, symbols, norms of behavior to groups of people” (Oleskyn, 2007: 113). It is important to note that indoctrination differs from informal political socialization, which involves the gradual acceptance and assimilation of political ideas and values present in society. As A. Oleskyn (2007: 113) notes: “Ideas implemented through ‘indoctrination’ acquire the character of ideology – a system of attitudes, ideas and values that reflect the attitude to reality, interests, goals, mindsets of people, classes, parties, subjects of politics and power certain eras, generations, social movements, etc.” Thus, “indoctrination” acts as one of the main mechanisms of forming a person’s ethnic consciousness and affects his social and political behavior (Kravets, 2018: 45). Accordingly, the focus of research attention is the ethnocentrism, which has an aggressive nature, a biological basis, is based on the mechanism of indoctrination.

An apt justification of ethnocentrism and aggression is provided by Johan M. G. van der Dennen (2000): “Violence in and between human societies, with the exception of some forms of domestic, criminal and pathological violence, is virtually always a collective activity or committed in the name of a collectivity.”

It is indicative that violence, and aggression always have a collective character. Johan M. G. van der Dennen (2000): “This moral double standard leads to the masquerading of the violence committed in the name of one’s own in-group as justified self-defense, or as a well-deserved punishment for transgressions of mores, laws, or ideological orthodoxy.”

Understanding aggression, which is established consciously, with the support of government structures and the education system, contributes to understanding the nature of aggressiveness. They can come in handy for preventing all kinds of conflicts and wars. As S. Kostyuchkov (2016: 8) notes: “The modern world is characterized by extremely acute manifestations of social and political conflicts, in particular, ethnic ones. It is biopolitics, as a scientific field, that is able to identify and analyze the reasons that lead to the development of ethno-political conflicts.”

According to R. Blank (2014: 220), new biopolitical studies have revealed that even among seemingly unbiased people, there is racial bias and stereotypes. This became possible thanks to the study of the human brain’s amygdala reaction, which translates into fear or anxiety. It is important to note that these reactions appear automatically, without the participation of consciousness, thereby creating a hostile environment and hindering rational choice: “The question is what causes the amygdala to produce and fix these reactions at an early age. These data are important not only for internal racial harmony but also for studying international conflicts and terrorism.”

M. Foucault writes: “Evolutionism in the 19th century becomes not just a way of conveying political discourse in biological terms, not just a way to hide political discourse behind scientific clothes, but a real way of understanding the relations of colonization, the necessity of the existence of wars, crime, etc.” (Fuko, 2005: 125).

ETHNOCENTRIC IDEALS OF THE RUSSIAN LEADERSHIP

From the beginning of the full-scale aggression against Ukraine, the Russian leadership tried to give it the appearance of “necessity” – first in the form of denazification and demilitarization of Ukraine, then in the form of illusory protection from external threats.

In this case, one cannot but agree with the following thesis of S. Kostyuchkov (2016: 7–8): “In theoretical political science, biopolitical concepts of leadership, external and internal aggression, hierarchical and network structures, dominance – subjugation, formation of the image of the enemy, instinctive aggressiveness, etc. are relevant.”

Generations of Russian citizens were brought up on the idea of the greatness of the Soviet Union, and later – the Russian Federation. And this upbringing had devastating consequences. In addition, the image of the enemy in the face of NATO and the USA was formed in the minds of Russian citizens. With the beginning of the aggression against Ukraine, through the Russian mass media, Ukrainians who resisted were added to the image of the enemy.

The above is clearly illustrated by the following thesis of Johan M. G. van der Dennen (2000): “The most extensive, quixotic and disgusting violence is justified with the invocation of a utopian ideology, a paradise myth, a superiority doctrine, an eschato-

logical or millenarian ideal state, or other highly abstract political/ethical categories, metaphysical values, and quasi-metaphysical mental monstrosities: National Security... Empire, Historical Imperative, Sacred Order, Natural Necessity, Divine Will, and so on.” The imperial ambitions of Russia are vividly demonstrated by the following thesis: “Besides, modern Russia no longer hides that it is an empire and constantly refers to imperial attributes of the remote past” (Sukhorolskyi, 2022: 5). However, in order to be an empire, Russia needed to seize the territories (now independent, sovereign countries) that were once part of it. If a country cannot be occupied relatively peacefully, it is systematically destroyed by military means.

In this context, it is worth mentioning the official speeches of the Russian president, the deportation of Ukrainian children, the abuse of Ukrainian civilians, and the destruction of Ukrainian schools and textbooks in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine. In the official speeches of V. Putin at the beginning of the full-scale invasion, it was not only about denazification but also about the fact that Ukrainians as a nation do not exist, and Russians and Ukrainians are one people. Such a point of view contradicts historical realities. Today, Ukrainians demonstrate national unity. They are ready to defend their independence from Russian aggression. Ukraine and Ukrainian society are choosing their future as sovereign European states.

As confirmation of the European choice of Ukrainian society, we will cite the data from sociological surveys. Thus, according to the sociological group “Rating,” the percentage of Ukrainians who support joining the EU is 91% (before the full-scale invasion – 68%) (*Opytuvannia: sered ukraintsiiv zrostaie pidtrymka vstupu do EU, do NATO – zmeshuietsia*, 2022). According to the data of the Razumkov Center, 89% support joining the EU and NATO – 79% (Mykhailov, 2023).

It is important to emphasize that Ukrainian society has demonstrated a persistent ability to resist despite the threat of death since 2014. This opposition was caused by Ukrainian society’s non-acceptance of the actions of the state leadership (disciplinary authority) (Kravets, 2021: 381). Today, the Ukrainian state and society are resisting the external enemy and demonstrating unity to achieve the common goal of preserving independence and national identity.

However, the president of the Russian Federation ignores modern realities: the data of sociological surveys, the ability of Ukrainian society to resist, etc. Thanks to propaganda through mass media, the Russian leadership appeals to distorted historical realities, the former greatness of the Russian Empire, and the Soviet Union, trying to justify aggression and unite Russian society against the enemy in the face of the USA, Europe, and Ukraine. To confirm this thesis, we quote the words of the American historian T. Snyder (2024): “In a conversation with Tucker Carlson, Putin made a statement about the past. I will explain how Putin is wrong about everything, but first, I have to explain why he is wrong about everything.”

Russia’s war against Ukraine is the worst and most radical manifestation of aggression, which is based not only on territorial encroachment or the intention to redistribute influence in the world, but also on more terrible, deep things that cannot be contained either by diplomacy or “reconciliation politics.”

One cannot fail to mention V. Putin’s interview with the American journalist T. Carlson, in which he actually accuses Poland of being attacked by Hitler. That is,

V. Putin, who accused Ukraine of Nazism, justifies the main Nazi of the 20th century. Hitler attacked Poland because it was intransigent. “All the more so against the background of the actual solidarity of the Russian president with Adolf Hitler in explaining the reason why the Second World War began and why Germany had to ‘respond’ to Poland. And in this unexpected solidarity – all the cynicism of the political role of Putin, who manages to simultaneously accuse Ukraine of Nazism and use the ideological practices of this same Nazism” (*Portnikov V. Putin and Carlson...*, 2024).

GENOCIDE AS THE WORST MANIFESTATION OF ETHNOCENTRISM

The desire to destroy those who cannot be subjugated cannot be called anything other than genocide. For two years, Russia has been shelling Ukrainian cities. Russian missiles destroy houses, hospitals, and schools. Civilians and children die. Russian soldiers torture and shoot Ukrainian prisoners of war. Russia systematically violates all international obligations and all rules of warfare. It is worth quoting the second article of the “Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide and its Punishment,” adopted and proposed for signature by the UN General Assembly on December 9, 1948: “In this Convention, genocide means the following actions committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, any national, ethnic, racial or religious group as such: a) killing members of such a group; b) causing serious bodily harm or mental disorder to members of such a group; c) deliberate creation for any group of living conditions designed for its complete or partial physical destruction; d) measures designed to prevent childbirth in the environment of such a group; e) forcible transfer of children from one human group to another” (*Konventsii pro zapobihannia zlochynu henotsydu ta pokarannia za noho*, 1948).

Russia committed crimes on the territory of Ukraine on all the listed points. This, in particular, is evidenced by official data from the web portal of the National Police of Ukraine: “Since the beginning of Russia’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine, investigators of the National Police of Ukraine have initiated 67,639 criminal proceedings based on the facts of crimes committed on the territory of Ukraine by servicemen of the armed forces of the Russian Federation and their accomplices” (*Zlochyny, vchyneni viiskovymy rfpid chas povnomasshtabnoho vtorhnennia v Ukrainu*, 2023).

The Ukrainian political leadership has repeatedly appealed to the international community to recognize Russia’s actions on the territory of Ukraine as genocide. On April 14, 2022, the Ukrainian Parliament adopted the Resolution “On the Russian Federation’s Commission of Genocide in Ukraine” and once again called on the UN, the OSCE, the European Parliament, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, etc. to “recognize the Russian Federation’s commission of the genocide of the Ukrainian people” (*Postanova VRU «Pro vchynennia Rosiiskoiu Federatsiieiu henotsydu v Ukraini»*, 2022).

The crimes committed by the Russian Federation against the civilian population of Ukraine: murder, torture, rape, deportation of children, etc., go against the rules of warfare and should be perceived accordingly (as genocide) and punished by the international community.

In March 2023, the parliaments of six countries (Poland, Estonia, Canada, Latvia, Lithuania, and the Czech Republic) recognized Russia's crimes as genocide of the Ukrainian people, which demonstrated the understanding of the European countries' desire to destroy Ukrainians in the occupied territories or to destroy their self-identification as Ukrainians.

The EU and 43 countries of the world published a joint statement in support of Ukraine's intention to condemn Russia for the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide: "We reiterate our support for Ukraine's Application instituting proceedings against the Russian Federation before the International Court of Justice under the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which seeks to establish that Russia has no lawful basis to take military action in Ukraine on the basis of unsubstantiated allegations of genocide..." (*Joint statement on supporting Ukraine in its proceeding at the International Court of Justice*, 2022).

On March 17, 2023, the International Constitutional Court in The Hague issued an arrest warrant for the President of Russia, V. Putin, and the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Russian Federation, M. Lvova-Belova. The reason is the forcible removal of children from the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine to the Russian Federation. The corresponding clause is in the "Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide and its Punishment." So, this testifies to the international legal recognition of the fact of the genocide of the Ukrainian people. And therefore, Russian aggression against Ukraine and Ukrainians has a clearly expressed ethno-national basis.

Johan M.G. van der Dennen (2000) singles out two forms of ethnocentrism: "(1) A belligerent, megalomaniac, superiority-delusional form (Chosen People complex), and (2) A relatively peaceful, self-conceited, isolationist form..."

Russia chose the worst of them based on aggression, bellicosity, and megalomania. In the conditions of the Russian-Ukrainian war, this policy is, unfortunately, actively exploited by the leadership of the Russian Federation. The whole world was stunned by the consequences of Russian aggression after the liberation of occupied Buchi, Irpen, and Gostomel. The cruelty of Russian soldiers and officers not only contradicts all the rules of waging war and the treatment of prisoners of war and civilians but also demonstrates hatred of Ukrainians.

In November 2022, the European Parliament declared Russia to be a state sponsor of terrorism (*European Parliament declares Russia to be a state sponsor of terrorism*, 2022). In the document, the European Parliament acknowledged that Russia has carried out "indiscriminate attacks on residential areas and civilian infrastructure" in Ukraine, resulting in the deaths of thousands of people. In the occupied territories, the aggressors carry out "executions without trial and investigation, carry out kidnappings, sexual violence, torture and other atrocities" the resolution added (*European Parliament declares Russia to be a state sponsor of terrorism*, 2022).

On February 23, 2023, the UN General Assembly adopted the following resolution: "Principles of the Charter of the United Nations underlying a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in Ukraine." The Resolution states, in particular: "The General Assembly reaffirmed its commitment to the sovereignty, independence, unity, and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders, which extend to its territorial waters, and determined further steps aimed at ending Russia's aggression,

restoring peace and territorial integrity of Ukraine and global world security” (*Comment of the MFA of Ukraine regarding the UNGA resolution...*, 2023).

141 countries from different continents supported the resolution and therefore condemned Russian aggression against Ukraine. Thus, the world community has a clear understanding that Russian aggression threatens global security.

BIODIPLOMACY AS A WAY OF AGGRESSION PREVENTION

In the modern civilized world, all disputes and conflicts must be resolved by diplomatic methods. Biopolitics not only follows ethnocentrism and aggression but also presents several options for preventing aggression, for example, education in the spirit of ethnic tolerance, biocentrism, and biodiplomacy. The biocentric doctrine, represented by modern biopolitics, “promotes respect for all ethnic groups and nationalities and insists on educating the international community in the spirit of ethno-national tolerance in order to prevent ethno-national conflicts” and the spread of ethnocentrism (Kravets, 2019: 14).

However, the realities of the Russian-Ukrainian war demonstrate the impossibility of the existence of biocentrism and biodiplomacy as long as there are authoritarian/totalitarian regimes in the world that possess nuclear weapons and for which ethnocentric ideas and ideas of racism are more important than biocentric ones.

The problem is that such ideas, spread through violence, have a reverse side. The sociological survey conducted by the Kyiv International Institute of Sociology (KIIS) on May 13–18, 2022, is indicative of the attitude of Ukrainians towards Russians after the start of full-scale aggression. According to the data published in the press release: “At the beginning of February 2022, 34% of the population of Ukraine had a good attitude towards Russia... Now only 2% of citizens have a good attitude towards Russia, while 92% have a bad attitude” (Hrushetskyi, 2022).

R. Blank (2014: 220) notes that “diplomats often try to reconcile opposing parties through compromises that allow each side to save face and involve third parties as guarantors.” However, this does not always lead to positive consequences: “When at the end of the day, both sides seem to hate each other, even more than before the intervention” (Blank, 2014: 220).

At the same time, sometimes even the leaders of the opposing parties can be limited in their ability to convince their followers to accept the world rationally, without an emotional background that is fixed deep inside the brain. This is confirmed by the negotiations in Istanbul with the participation of representatives of Ukraine, Turkey, and Russia, as well as the meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs of the countries mentioned above. Negotiations that did not lead to the signing of a peace agreement. And can it lead? Is a peaceful settlement possible when one of the parties speaks exclusively in the language of ultimatums and demands to lay down arms and surrender? No, it is not possible. This is unacceptable for Ukraine, both for the authorities and the armed forces, and for citizens in general.

Unfortunately, diplomacy does not work in the case of Russian aggression. It violates all possible international agreements, international organizations’ statutes, and

warfare rules. This aggression is not rationally determined, and therefore, it is difficult to analyze scientifically. However, Russian aggression made the world think about the existing system of global security, which resulted in the unconditional support of Ukraine by European countries (especially Poland and the Baltic states), the European Union, the USA, Canada, Great Britain, etc. Tough sanctions were introduced against the aggressor country. Russian aggression against Ukraine hastened the aspiration of Finland and Sweden to become NATO members and stimulated the review of defense measures (including increasing the available weapons) in a number of countries in Europe and the world. For the first time since the Second World War, the United States introduced lend-lease. The very fact of Russia's aggression against Ukraine substantiates the need for a decisive reaction of the international community to the facts of violation of a number of international agreements and the fundamental principles of the existence of a number of international institutions, organizations, and institutions. Perhaps after the end of the war, the system of global security will be revised. New international institutions will be created, and new international agreements will be signed to support sustainable peace on a global scale. However, this is not enough. Criminals must be punished, everyone who is responsible for committing crimes on the territory of Ukraine and for the very fact of unprovoked aggression against a sovereign independent state and its people.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of the analysis was to draw attention to the ethno-national basis of aggression as a global threat to the existence of humanity, stability, and security in the modern world. The unprovoked aggression of the Russian Federation against the sovereign country of Ukraine has a pronounced ethno-national background. The inadmissibility of aggression on a territorial or ethno-national basis in the modern globalized world is proven. Issues of the genocide of the Ukrainian people provoked by Russian aggression are raised, and the need for a decisive reaction of the international community to the facts of violation of a number of international agreements and the fundamental principles of the existence of a number of international institutions, organizations, and institutions is substantiated. It was established that diplomacy does not work in the case of Russian aggression. The Russian Federation violates all possible international agreements, statutes of international organizations, and rules of warfare. A number of countries of the world condemned Russia's aggression against Ukraine, and a number recognized Russia as a sponsor of terrorism. The International Court of Justice in The Hague issued a warrant for V. Putin's arrest. Russia's aggression against Ukraine is not rationally determined and, therefore, difficult to analyze scientifically. However, she made the world think about the existing system of global security, which resulted in the unconditional support of Ukraine by European countries (especially Poland and the Baltic countries), the European Union, the USA, Canada, Great Britain, etc. Russia's aggression against Ukraine called into question the effectiveness of the existing global security system. After the end of the war, the world security system must be reviewed, and the criminals

must be punished, which will create the basis for the existence of sustainable peace on a global scale.

REFERENCES

- Blank R. (2014), *Biology and politics: an introduction. Politics and the life science: the state of the discipline*, United Kingdom.
- Comment of the MFA of Ukraine regarding the UNGA resolution “Principles of the Charter of the United Nations underlying a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in Ukraine” (2023), <https://mfa.gov.ua/en/news/komentar-mzs-ukrayini-shchodo-rezolyuciyi-ga-oon-principi-statutu-oon-shcho-lezhat-v-osnovi-vseohoplyuyuchogo-spravedlivogo-ta-stalogo-miru-v-ukrayini> (25.03.2023).
- Danyliuk I. V., Hresko V. V., Kurapov A. O. (2016), *Etnotsenryzm yak sposib zberezhennia kulturnoi identychnosti*, “Naukovyi visnyk Khersonskoho derzhavnoho universytetu”, Vol. 6.
- Dolnyk V. (1993), *Etolohichni ekskursii zaboronenyi sadamy humanitariiv*, “Pryroda”, Vol. 1.
- Estrada M. A. R., Koutronas E. (2022), *The impact of the Russian Aggression against Ukraine on the Russia-EU Trade*, “Journal of Policy Modeling”, Vol. 44(3), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpolmod.2022.06.004>.
- European Council conclusions on the Russian military aggression against Ukraine (2022), <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2022/03/25/european-council-conclusions-on-the-russian-military-aggression-against-ukraine-24-march-2022/> (15.07.2022).
- European Parliament declares Russia to be a state sponsor of terrorism (2022), https://www.eeas.europa.eu/delegations/ukraine/european-parliament-declares-russia-be-state-sponsor-terrorism_en (27.03.2023).
- Flanagan S. J., Osburg J., Binnendijk A., Kepe M., Radin A. (2019), *Deterring Russian Aggression in the Baltic States Through Resilience and Resistance*, Research report, <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/AD1086498.pdf> (15.02.2023).
- Fitzsimmons M. (2019), *Horizontal Escalation: An Asymmetric Approach to Russian Aggression?*, “Strategic Studies Quarterly”, Vol. 13, Issue 1, https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/SSQ/documents/Volume-13_Issue-1/Fitzsimmons.pdf (15.02.2023).
- Fuko M. (2005), *Nuzhno zashchyschat' obshchestvo: kurs lektsyy prochytyannykh v Kollezh de Frants v 1975–1976 uchebnom hodu*, Sankt Petersburg.
- Hrushetskyi A. (2022), *Dynamika stavlennia naselennia do Rosii ta emotsiyni fon u naslidok viiny: rezultaty telefonnoho opytuvannia, provedenoho 13–18 travnia 2022 roku*, Presreliz, <https://www.kiis.com.ua/?lang=ukr&cat=reports&id=1112&page=1> (20.07.2022).
- Joint statement on supporting Ukraine in its proceeding at the International Court of Justice (2022), https://www.amueas.europa.eu/eeas/joint-statement-supporting-ukraine-its-proceeding-international-court-justice_en (27.03.2023).
- Konventsii pro zapobihannia zlochynu henotsydu ta pokarannia za noho (1948), <http://www.prevent-genocide.org/ua/konventsia.htm> (15.03.2023).
- Kostyuchkov S. (2016), *Mistse i rol' suchasnoyi lyudyny u planetarnomu butti: biopolitychna interpretatsiya*, <http://ekhsuir.kspu.edu/bitstream/123456789/3176/1/23.pdf> (14.06.2020).
- Kravets A. (2018), *Evoliutsiini perspektyvy biopolitychnoi analityky*, „Politychne zhyttia”, Vol. 2.
- Kravets A. (2019), *Biopolitychna paradyhma politychnoi nauky: suchasnyi stan ta perspektyvy rozvytku*, atoreferat dys. doktora polit. nauk, Dnipro.

- Kravets A. (2021), *Biopolitical reflection of human safety: Ukrainian and Belarusian experience*, "Przegląd Strategiczny", Issue 14, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14746/ps.2021.1.22>.
- Kravets R. (2022), *Dmytro Kuleba pro perehovory z Lavrovym, zustrich Zelenskoho z Putinym, pro nepovorotkyi Zakhid ta tsinu, yaku zaplatyt Rosiia za viinu*, <https://www.pravda.com.ua/rus/articles/2022/03/18/7332427/> (20.07.2022).
- Kuleba i Lavrov pohovoryly pro viinu i myr. Pro shcho domovylys (2022), <https://www.bbc.com/ukrainian/news-60691136> (20.07.2022).
- Mykhailov D. (2023), *Yak ukraintsi stavliatsia do YeS, OON i NATO – opytuvannia*, <https://suspilne.media/436167-ak-ukraintsi-stavlatsia-do-es-oon-i-nato-opytuvanna/> (10.04.2023).
- Oleskyn A. (2007), *Byopolytyka. Polytycheskyi potentsyal sovremennoi byolohyy*, Moskva.
- Opytuvannia: sered ukraintsiiv zrostaie pidtrymka vstupu do YeS, do NATO – zmenshuietsia (2022), <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/news-eu-nato-opytuvannia/31787252.html> (15.03.2023).
- Pifer S. (2015), *Russian Aggression against Ukraine and the West's Policy Response*, https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/030415_Pifer_Testimony.pdf (15.02.2023).
- Polianskii M. (2024), *Russian Foreign Policy Research and War in Ukraine" Old Answers to New Questions*, "Communist and Post-Communist Studies", Vol. 57(2), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/cpcs.2024.2112378>.
- Portnikov V. *Putin and Carlson: the Russian president showed actual solidarity with Hitler* (2024), <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/putin-karlson-hitler/32813441.html> (10.02.2024).
- Postanova VRU «Pro vchynennia Rosiiskoiu Federatsiiei henotsydu v Ukraini» (2022), <https://www.rada.gov.ua/print/221682.html> (15.03.2023).
- Prymak V., Charskykh I. (2023), *Realizm i rosiisko-ukrainska viina*, Visnyk studentskoho naukovoho tovarystva im. V. Stusa Donetskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Vasylia Stusa, Vol. 1(15).
- Putynskyi henotsydni mif. Timoti Snaider pro durist fashyzmu, rozkryty v intervii rosiiskoho dyktatora Karlsonu (2024), <https://texty.org.ua/fragments/111756/putynskyj-henocydynj-mif-timoti-snaider-pro-durist-fashyzmu-rozkryty-v-intervyu-dyktatora-karlsonu/> (28.10.2024).
- Shlapak D. (2017), *Deterring Russian Aggression in the Baltic States*, <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/AD1028526.pdf> (15.02.2023).
- Snyder T. (2024), *Putin's genocidal myth*, https://snyder.substack.com/p/putins-genocidal-myth?utm_source=substack&publication_id=310897&post_id=141573198&utm_medium=email&utm_content=share&utm_campaign=email-share&triggerShare=true&isFreeemail=true&r=2my38f (15.02.2024).
- Stoianova A. (2018), *Etnonatsionalizm u zakhidnii Yevropi: suchasna interpretatsia*, "Naukovi zapysky", Vol. 5(61), https://ipiend.gov.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/stoianova_etnonatsionalism.pdf (15.02.2023).
- Sukhorolskyi P. (2022), *Russian Aggression against Ukraine: Past, Present, and Futures*, "Journal of Futures Studies", Vol. 26(4), [https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.202206_26\(4\).0001](https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.202206_26(4).0001).
- Tsybulenko E., Francis J. A. (2018), *Separatists or Russian Troops and Local Collaborators? Russian Aggression in Ukraine: The Problem of Definitions*, in: *The Use of Force against Ukraine and International Law: Jus Ad Bellum, Jus In Bello, Jus Post Bellum*, (eds.) S. Sayapin, E. Tsybulenko, The Hague, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6265-222-4_6.
- van der Dennen J. M. G. (2000), *Of Badges, Bonds and Boundaries: Ingroup/outgroup differentiation and ethnocentrism revisited*, in: *In-group/out-group behaviour in modern societies. An evolutionary perspective*, (eds.) K. Thienpont, R. Cliquet, Groningen, <https://pure.rug.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/32091593/ETHNOCEN.pdf> (25.03.2023).

Yevroparlament vyznav Rosiiu derzhavoiu-sponsorom teroryzmu (2022), <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/news/2022/11/23/7151178/> (15.03.2023).

Zlochyny, vchyneni viiskovymy rf pid chas povnomasshtabnoho vtorhnennia v Ukrainu (stanom na 20.03.2023) (2023), <https://www.npu.gov.ua/news/zlochyny-vchyneni-viiskovymy-rf-pid-chas-povnomasshtabnoho-vtorhnennia-v-ukrainu-stanom-na-20032023> (25.03.2023).

ABSTRACT

The biopolitical approach to the analysis of aggression allows us to analyze one of the causes of the biggest conflict in Europe after the Second World War. The purpose of the analysis was to draw attention to the ethno-national basis of aggression as a global threat to the existence of humanity, stability, and security in the modern world. The unprovoked aggression of the Russian Federation against the sovereign country of Ukraine has a pronounced ethno-national basis based on the idea of ethnocentrism. The ethnocentric ideas of the Russian leadership can pose a real threat not only to Ukraine but also to a number of countries in the world. After all, a system based on this idea creates a feeling of exclusivity in any society (not only the Russian one) and, accordingly, can be the basis for aggression against those societies and those countries that do not agree with this fact. The key hypothesis is that the basis of Russian aggression against Ukraine and the Ukrainian people is not only the desire to seize the territory of an independent state but also the desire to subjugate a sovereign nation – the Ukrainians. A series of documented crimes committed by the Russian Federation against the civilian population of Ukraine testifies not only to the desire for conquest but also to the attempt to destroy the Ukrainian nation physically. In the paper, the problem of the genocide of the Ukrainian people is raised, and the reaction of the international community to the condemnation of Russia's aggression against Ukraine and the genocide of the Ukrainian people is investigated. The inadmissibility of the spread of ethnocentrism and aggression based on ethno-national characteristics in the global dimension is proven. Global changes in the world security system after the end of the war are predicted.

Keywords: ethnocentrism, aggression, genocide, war, global security

ETNICZNO-NARODOWE PODSTAWY AGRESJI ROSJI W KONTEKŚCIE BEZPIECZEŃSTWA GLOBALNEGO: PODEJŚCIE BIOPOLITYCZNE

STRESZCZENIE

Biopolityczne podejście do analizy agresji pozwala zbadać jedną z przyczyn największego konfliktu w Europie po II wojnie światowej. Celem analizy było zwrócenie uwagi na etniczno-narodowe podstawy agresji jako globalnego zagrożenia dla istnienia ludzkości, stabilności i bezpieczeństwa we współczesnym świecie. Niesprowokowana agresja Federacji Rosyjskiej przeciwko suwerennemu państwu – Ukrainie – ma wyraźne podstawy etniczno-narodowe, oparte na idei etnocentryzmu. Etnocentryczne idee rosyjskiego przywództwa mogą stanowić realne zagrożenie nie tylko dla Ukrainy, ale także dla szeregu innych państw na świecie. System oparty na tej idei tworzy bowiem poczucie wyjątkowości w każdym społeczeństwie (nie tylko rosyjskim) i może być podstawą do agresji wobec tych społeczeństw i państw, które się z tym nie zgadzają. Kluczową hipotezą jest to, że podstawą rosyjskiej agresji przeciwko Ukrainie i narodowi ukraińskiemu jest nie tylko chęć zajęcia terytorium niepodległego państwa, ale

także dążenie do podporządkowania suwerennego narodu – Ukraińców. Szereg udokumentowanych zbrodni popełnionych przez Federację Rosyjską przeciwko ludności cywilnej Ukrainy świadczy nie tylko o dążeniu do podboju, ale także o próbie fizycznego zniszczenia narodu ukraińskiego. W artykule poruszono problem ludobójstwa narodu ukraińskiego oraz reakcji społeczności międzynarodowej na potępienie agresji Rosji wobec Ukrainy i ludobójstwa Ukraińców. Udowodniono niedopuszczalność rozprzestrzeniania się etnocentryzmu i agresji opartej na cechach etniczno-narodowych w wymiarze globalnym. Przewidziano globalne zmiany w systemie bezpieczeństwa światowego po zakończeniu wojny.

Słowa kluczowe: etnocentryzm, agresja, ludobójstwo, wojna, bezpieczeństwo globalne

