

The Evolution of the State as a Process of Increment and Loss of Territory in the Context of the Implementation of the People's Right to Reunification

Mikhail M. Chernyshov✉

National Communications Development Research Institution, Moscow, Russia,
mcherny@bk.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0811-1867>

Abstract. The article considers a particular case of the evolution of state formations in the process of the increment and loss of territories, caused by the implementation of the people's right to reunification. It analyzes successful and unsuccessful attempts to implement the people's right to reunification while the states are returning their historical territories and realizing the policy of irredentism. The author analyzes the historiography of the issue in Russia, Eurasia and Africa, examines various cases of accession of territories in the XVII-XXI centuries, including the reunification the Crimea, Sevastopol, Donetsk and Lugansk People's Republics, Zaporozhye and Kherson regions with Russia. The author substantiates the need to amend the Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, providing for the right of Russia to return historical territories in the case of discrimination of the Russian-speaking population, manifestations of neo-Nazism and Russophobia.

Keywords: irredentism, historical territories, the right of peoples to self-determination, the right of peoples to reunification

For citation: Chernyshov M.M. The Evolution of the State as a Process of Increment and Loss of Territory in the Context of the Implementation of the People's Right to Reunification. *Russia & World: Scientific Dialogue*. 2022; 4(6): 160-185, [https://doi.org/10.53658/RW2022-2-4\(6\)-160-185](https://doi.org/10.53658/RW2022-2-4(6)-160-185).

Introduction

The problems of transformation of state entities caused by changes in borders, national and religious composition of the population were in focus of practical science long before the formation of its scientific foundation. Thinkers¹ at all times have been asking questions: Why do some countries maintain their autonomy, defending their independence

1 Machiavelli N. *The Sovereign* (Chapter III. About mixed states). Moscow: Planeta, 1990. Available from: <http://lib.ru/politolog/makiawelli/gosudar.txt>

through diplomatic and military means, while others unite with their neighbors on a peaceful basis? How to preserve the integrity of the state from internal separatism? What are the conditions under which people can exercise their rights to self-determination and reunification as an ethnos, nation or a religious group? This article examines examples of losses and returns of historical territories, including the reunification of peoples, identifies common signs of this process, stimulating its centrifugal or centripetal forces. We use the concept of irredentism² for the analysis.

Materials and Methods

The information materials of the research were scientific articles and monographs, periodical publications, archival documents. Information about the forms and mechanisms of reunification of various countries in the world with their historical territories is compared. The course of increment and loss of the territory of the Russian state since its inception is analysed. The territories that became a part of Russia at different stages of its development are listed; examples of voluntary entry of peoples into the Russian state are highlighted. The research used general scientific methods, including historiographical analysis, system analysis, abstraction, synthesis, comparative historical method and others.

Results

Since the emergence of the first State formations and throughout the subsequent history of mankind, there has been observed the absorption of some states by others, the process of increment and loss of territory and population, the collapse of huge empires (Macedonian, Roman, Byzantine, Mongolian, Spanish, Russian, British, Ottoman and others), the emergence of new alliances and countries. After the Second World War, the collapse of the colonial system allowed many peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and led to the emergence of new independent States – Third World countries.

At the end of the XX century, the emergence of integration associations with the transfer of a particular part of sovereignty to the supranational level, the removal of visa, customs and other inter-country barriers became a new trend. At the same time, the process of gaining independence and reunification continues and in recent decades it has

² Irredentism (from Ital. *irredento* “unredeemed; not liberated”) is the policy of the state, party or political movement to unite the people, nation, ethnos within the framework of a single state. It is expressed in ethnic mobilization, in which the question of the reunification of the territory where the irredent live and the titular state in which their ethnic group is the majority is raised. Soloviev A. I. Political science: Political theory, political technologies / Textbook for university students. Moscow: Aspect Press, 2001:559.

led to an aggravation of international tensions. Thus, the conflict between Kosovo Albanians (from Kosovo) seeking independence and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia led to a NATO military operation in 1999 and the declaration of independence of the Republic of Kosovo in 2008. The setting of a “Kosovo precedent”³ by NATO countries as a unilateral (without the consent of the central government of the country) declaration of independence by the provisional institutions of self-government on the territory actually established a new standard for the revision of state borders and secession (withdrawal from a single state of any part of it (33:27)).

Several unrecognized states appeared in the Caucasus at the end of the XX century. Among them, the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic, the Republic of South Ossetia and the Republic of Abkhazia.⁴ In 2020, during a military operation, Azerbaijan managed to establish control over a part of the territory of Nagorno-Karabakh (including the city of Shusha), and despite the ceasefire agreement, clashes between the Armed Forces of Azerbaijan and the Defence Army of the Republic of Artsakh continue to this day. In August 2008, Georgia tried to regain control over the territory of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, but the help of Russian peacekeepers allowed the republics to maintain independence. In the same year, the independence of Abkhazia and South Ossetia was recognized by Russia, and then by a number of other countries of the world⁵.

As new territories get incorporated into the states, the latter often have to make a particular choice: establish a multinational, multi-confessional society or assimilate peoples and cultures into a single nation with a dominant religion. The choice connected with this problem is the following: will the people strive for internal self-determination (autonomization) or independence (becoming part of another state)⁶.

In 2014, under the conditions of a military coup in Ukraine, the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol declared independence, and then became part of Russia as subjects of the federation. In the same year, the Donetsk and Lugansk People's Republics declared their independence. For almost 8 years, violating the Minsk Agreements, the Ukrainian authorities had been trying to regain control over the territory of the LPR and the DPR. In 2022, under the threat of invasion by Ukrainian troops, the DPR and LPR asked Russia for help in protecting their sovereignty, which led to a special military operation and the global crisis that followed.

3 Moshkin S.V. “Kosovo precedent” in the discourse of statements of the Russian leadership. *Paradigms and Processes*. 2018; 8: 159–168. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329761966_The_Kosovo_Precedent_in_Statements_of_Russian_Leaders

4 The Nagorno-Karabakh Republic (the Republic of Artsakh) declared independence in 1991. The Republic of South Ossetia declared independence in 1992. The Republic of Abkhazia declared independence in 1994.

5 Five UN member states (Russia, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Nauru and Syria). Tuvalu withdrew its recognition of both republics in 2014, Vanuatu – in 2019. Source: The Foreign Minister of Vanuatu confirmed the “territorial integrity” of Georgia Available from: <https://easaily.com/ru/news/2019/03/15/glava-mid-vanuatu-podtverdil-territorialnuyu-celostnost-gruzii>

6 “The question of the right to self-determination arises only in cases where titular peoples discriminate against other indigenous peoples who are in a minority living compactly on the territory of a state. If the peoples that make up a state are comfortable being in communion with each other, and nothing threatens their languages, cultures, customs and traditions, then, as a rule, small nations are content with the right to so-called internal self-determination” (15:40-44).

In this regard, we see that the problems of realizing the rights of the people to self-determination⁷ are becoming the main factor in the destabilization of the modern world order. Understanding the causes of this phenomenon, developing methods of scientific forecasting of the peoples' self-determination processes can help to avoid conflicts, including in the acute (military) phase.

The study of the historiography of the evolution of the Russian state from the standpoint of the increment and loss of territories allows us to understand which territories Russia can consider historically its own ones.

The tribes of the East Slavs inhabited the Eastern European plain in the VI–VII centuries. Despite the existence of the ancient cities of Derbent and Kerch on the territory of Russia, which have more than two thousand years of history, the beginning of Russian statehood is considered to be September 21, 862 – the date when the Rurik dynasty were called to the Russian reign, indicated by the chronicler Nestor⁸.

In 882, the regent of the Novgorod Principality Oleg seized Kiev, uniting the northern and southern lands of the Eastern Slavs, establishing Kievan Rus as an Old Russian state⁹. In 914, Prince Igor conquered Drevlians, in 943, he took a campaign against Byzantium, and in 944, he concluded a military-and-trade agreement with Byzantium. Prince of Novgorod and Grand Prince of Kiev Svyatoslav (reigned in 961–972), having crushed the Khazar Khaganate and Volga Bulgaria, took campaigns to the Volga region, the North Caucasus, the Kuban, the Northern Black Sea region, the Danube, the Balkan Peninsula and Constantinople. Prince Vladimir Svyatoslavich conquered Cherven and Przemyśl, conquered Vyatichi and Radimichi, participated in campaigns against the Volga Bulgars, Khazars, Bulgarians, Pechenegs. In 1036, Prince Yaroslav Vladimirovich the Wise defeated the tribes of the Pechenegs, taking control of the Black Sea steppe, he also returned the cities of Chervensk captured by Poland and founded the fortresses of Yaroslavl and Yuryev (Dorpat) in the Baltic Region. By the XI century, the ancient Russian state had become one of the largest European countries, and it was as large as the Holy Roman and Byzantine Empires in terms of territory¹⁰.

7 The right of peoples to self-determination means the right of each people to independently decide on the form of their state existence, freely establish their political status and carry out their economic and cultural development. The right of peoples to self-determination is one of the basic principles of international law, recorded in the UN Charter, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (resolution No. 1514 of the XV UN General Assembly of December 14, 1960), subsequent international covenants and declarations of the UN. The Declaration on the Principles of International Law (Resolution No. 2625 of the XXV UN General Assembly of October 24, 1970) states: "By virtue of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples enshrined in the UN Charter, all peoples have the right to freely determine their political status and pursue their economic, social and cultural development without outside interference, and each state is obliged to respect this right in accordance with the provisions of the Charter". Available from: <https://www.un.org/ru/about-us/un-charter/full-text>

8 The 1000th anniversary of the Russian state was celebrated as a national anniversary back in 1862.

9 This important circumstance indicates that the origins of Kievan Rus have the roots of Novgorod statehood, founded by the Varangian Rurik dynasty, who later ruled on the territory of the Moscow Kingdom – the forerunner of the modern Russian state.

10 During the period of Yaroslav the Wise, several important dynastic marriages were concluded with the royal houses of Sweden, Poland, Austria, Byzantium, Norway, Hungary, France (22: 8–20).

In 1054–1073, Kievan Rus was ruled by a triumvirate of Yaroslav the Wise's sons: Izyaslav (Kiev and Novgorod), Svyatoslav (Chernigov, Murom and Ryazan lands), Vsevolod (Pereyaslavl and Rostov the Great)¹¹. In 1097, at the Congress of Princes held at the initiative of Vladimir Monomakh in Lyubech, the principle of the establishment of regional dynasties was consolidated. In 1113–1132 (the Kiev reign of Vladimir Monomakh¹² and his son Mstislav), the State managed to preserve its unity and defend its borders.

The collapse of Kievan Rus and the period of political fragmentation began in 1132¹³, which lasted until the Mongol conquest (1237–1241). During this period, only Novgorod continues its territorial expansion on the development of the north-eastern territories (in the basins of the Vychegda, Pechora and Kama rivers). In 1169, the troops of Andrei Bogolyubsky, Prince of Vladimir and Suzdal, captured Kiev¹⁴, and the center of the Russian lands began to shift towards Vladimir¹⁵. In 1299, the metropolitan's residence was moved from Kiev to Vladimir, and from 1325, it was moved to Moscow.

In the XIV century, Kiev finally lost its political significance and became a provincial city of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The Horde domination over the territories of the Russian principalities began in 1242¹⁶. In 1245–1263, the Russian lands receive a certain autonomy as a part of the Golden Horde, which controlled territories from the Danube and Vistula in the West, the Black Sea region, the Crimea, Kuban and the North Caucasus, the northern and eastern part of the Caspian lowlands, the Aral Sea, the northern part of Central Asia (the territories of modern Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan) to Lake Balkhash and the Ob River basin. Subsequently, after the collapse of the Golden Horde, the Moscow tsars were perceived by the elites of the incorporated eastern territories as heirs¹⁷ of the title of

11 In accordance with the will of Yaroslav the Wise, Russia was divided between his five sons: Kiev and Novgorod went to Izyaslav, Svyatoslav got Chernigov, Tmutarakan, Murom and Ryazan lands, Vsevolod – Pereyaslavl and Rostov the Great, Vyacheslav – Smolensk, Igor – Volyn. There was a rota system in succession to the throne among Princes (8:16–20).

12 During this period, dynastic marriages were concluded with the royal houses of England and Hungary (22:36–69).

13 Violating the rota system, Mstislav handed over the Kievan Principality to his brother Yaropolk, thus violating the rights of the younger Monomashichs – Prince Yuri Dolgoruky of Rostov and Prince Andrei of Volhynia, which resulted in the internecine war. By the middle of the XII century, Kievan Rus was actually divided into 13–18 principalities. On the eve of the Mongol conquest, the Russian state was divided into 25 state entities. Source: Presnyakov A. E. Princely Law in Ancient Russia. Lectures on Russian history. Kievan Rus. Moscow: Nauka, 1993:634.

14 In 1203, Kiev was plundered for the second time by the Smolensk Prince Rurik Rostislavich. In 1240, Kiev was burned by the Mongols (42:605).

15 Vsevolod Yurievich the Big Nest, the Grand Prince of Kiev (1173) and Vladimir (1176–1212), achieved recognition of his seniority among the descendants of Monomakh. In 1236–1238, Kiev was ruled by Yaroslav Vsevolodovich, who was a younger brother of the Prince of Vladimir, in 1240 – by the Galician governor Dmitry, and in 1243, after the Mongols recognized Yaroslav Vsevolodovich of Vladimir as the eldest Prince in Russian lands, Kiev was ruled by Vladimir governors (42: 671–683). Since 1254, the title “King of Russia” was worn by the Galician-Volyn princes, and the title “Grand Princes of all Russia” began to be worn by the Grand Prince of Vladimir from the beginning of the XIV century (53:55).

16 In 1223–1241, the conquest of the Russian principalities took place, in 1242–1245, the vassal-fief dependence was established, the issuance of a “label for reigning” to the princes was introduced, the census of the taxable population was held, the payment of the “Horde exit” (tribute) started (42: 681).

17 The intitulation of Ivan the Terrible mentions the Golden Horde uluses (Tsar of Kazan, Tsar of Astrakhan, Grand Duke of All Siberian lands). (53:57)

the governors of the Ulus of Jochi¹⁸, included in the aristocratic system of the Mongol Empire (26:20). As the Golden Horde weakened in the XIV century, part of the Russian lands came under the rule of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (8; 16).

The battle of the united Russian troops on the Kulikovo field in 1380 is considered a turning point in the process of liberation of Russian lands and development of the Russian identity, the moment of creation of the united Russian nation¹⁹.

In 1389–1434, the Horde Khan retains the rights of the supreme arbiter in the disputes of Princes, receives the “Horde exit”, labels for the reign are issued on the spot by the Khan’s authorized ambassadors. In 1434–1480, only the payment of the «exit» is preserved. The period between the battle of Alexin (1472) and the Standoff on the Ugra (1480) is considered the “completion of the Horde rule.” During this period, Ivan III the Great completed the consolidation of the lands of the northern and eastern Russian principalities around the Grand Principality of Moscow into a single Russian state²⁰. The western and southern Russian principalities became part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

In 1547, Grand Duke Ivan IV the Terrible assumed the title of Tsar (from 1547 to 1721, the Russian state was called the Russian or Moscow Tsardom). Ivan IV annexed the khanates of the former Golden Horde to the tsardom (Astrakhan, Kazan, Siberian ones²¹). Under Fyodor I the Blessed, the Russian-Swedish War of 1590–1595 was completed, returning Ivangorod, Yam, Koporye and Korela lost in the Livonian War (Narva remained to belong to Sweden).

During the Time of Troubles (1598–1613), an internal political crisis began in the Russian Tsardom²². As a result, Russia lost the Smolensk and Seversk lands and also the access to the Baltic Sea²³. In 1623–1688, the Siberian lands became part of Russia along the Amur, Angara, Yenisei, Lena, Kolyma rivers, Lake Baikal, to the Sea of Okhotsk (Lamsky). In 1649–1689, the Russian-Qing border conflict took place, which ended with the conclusion of the Nerchinsk Treaty on the borders of Russia and China. In the XVIII–XIX centuries, the

18 Golden Horde or Ulug Ulus (Great Country), also the Ulus of Jochi (the eldest son of Genghis Khan) is a multinational state headed by the Jochid dynasty on the lands of central Eurasia in the period from 1224 to 1459, and in 1224–1269, as a part of the Mongol Empire (3:7).

19 “Muscovites, Suzdalians, Nizhny Novgorodians, inhabitants of Vladimir came to the Kulikovo field and back from there came the Russians” (11:27).

20 The lands of the Novgorod and Pskov republics, the Tver, Smolensk, Kozel, Starodubsky, Novgorod-Seversky, Ryazan principalities, part of the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania along the line Bryansk - Gomel - Chernigov - Priluki - Kursk - Yelets entered the unified Russian state under Ivan III and Vasily the Dark (29: 622–641).

21 The conquest of the Siberian Khanate began under Ivan the Terrible, it was Yermak’s Siberian Campaign (1581–1585), and ended in 1598 under Fyodor the Blessed with the conquest of the Piebald Horde and victory in the Battle of Irmen (19:128).

22 After Boris Godunov’s death in 1605, False Dmitry I (1605–1606) reigned. In 1606, Vasily IV Ivanovich Shuisky was crowned to reign, then False Dmitry II (1607–1610) and False Dmitry III (1611–1612) claimed the kingdom, after the overthrow of Vasily Shuisky, the Council of Seven (heptarchy) recognized the Polish prince Vladislav as the Russian Tsar. In 1612, the Polish interventionists were expelled by the militia, in 1613, Mikhail Fedorovich Romanov was elected to the kingdom, but it happened to be impossible to stabilize the situation in the country until 1618 (6:241).

23 Returning the cities of Novgorod, Porkhov, Staraya Russa, Ladoga and Gdov occupied by Sweden (6: 263).

Primorye lands, Chukotka and Kamchatka, Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands²⁴ joined Russia²⁵, and the colonization of Alaska also took place.

Throughout the XVIII-XIX centuries, the Russian state was constantly expanding, the Baltic States, the Northern Black Sea region, the Caucasus, Finland, Central Asia became part of it; during the partitions of Rzeczpospolita (Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth), control over all Russian lands (except Galicia) as well as the lands of the Privislinsky Region was restored²⁶. As a result of the Russian-Japanese war, Russia lost the southern part of Sakhalin Island, returning these territories and the Kuril Islands in the course of World War II.

As a result of the collapse of the Russian Empire and defeat in the First World War²⁷ Russia lost 4% of the total territory (or 26% of the European territory) (18:48). In 1939–1951, the USSR regained part of the lost territory and incorporated new ones.

In November 1939²⁸, the USSR incorporated the territories of western Ukraine²⁹ and Belarus³⁰. In the summer of 1940, the territories of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were included into the USSR³¹. In June 1940, under political pressure from the USSR, Germany and Italy Romania returned the territories of Bessarabia annexed in 1918 to the USSR³², as well as it returned the territories of Northern Bukovina and the Hertz region³³. Following the results of the Soviet-Finnish War (1939–1940), South Karelia (with the cities of Vyborg

24 According to the Treaty of Shimoda (1855), the Northern Kuriles were ceded to Russia, the Southern Kuriles – to Japan, Sakhalin remained a joint possession. According to the St. Petersburg Treaty (1875), Sakhalin passed to Russia, the Kuril Islands – to Japan (27:139).

25 According to the Aigun Treaty with China (1858) and the Convention of Peking (1860) URL: <http://www.oldchita.org/documents/6-xixc-documents/315-1858aihun.html> / (5:67).

26 The cities of Warsaw, Lodz, Kalisz, Czestochowa, Lublin, Suwalki and the surrounding area, southwest of Lithuania (Alytus, Mariampole), part of the territory of the Grodno region of modern Belarus and part of the Sokal district of the Lvov region in modern Ukraine (40:97–114).

27 On March 3, 1918, in the city of Brest-Litovsk, representatives of Soviet Russia and the Central Powers (the German Empire, Austria-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire, the Third Bulgarian Kingdom) signed the Brest Separate Peace Treaty, which ensured the withdrawal of the RSFSR from the First World War. Under the terms of the treaty, the RSFSR undertook not to claim the Baltic States and part of modern Belarus, withdraw troops from Finland and Ukraine, recognize the Ukrainian People's Republic as an independent state, withdraw troops from the territory of the Ottoman Empire, and also transfer the Ardagan, Batum and Kars districts to it. The treaty was annulled by the decision of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of November 13, 1918 (24: 64–68).

28 In accordance with Articles I-III of the Secret Additional Protocol of the Non-Aggression Treaty between Germany and the USSR of August 23, 1939. Available from: www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1939pact.html

29 In 1939, the territory of Western Ukraine was divided into Lvov, Drohobych, Ternopol, Stanislavsky, Volyn and Rovno regions (44:6). In 1951, an equal part of the territory of the Lvov region of the Ukrainian SSR was exchanged for the territory of the Republic of Poland. Documents and materials on the history of Soviet-Polish relations. M., 1980. T.X:105–109.

30 In 1940, Western Belarus consisted of five regions: Baranovichy, Belostok, Brest, Vileysk, Pinsk, which, according to the modern administrative division of Belarus, corresponds to Brest and Grodno regions, also covers the western districts of Minsk and Vitebsk regions and a small section of the Zhitkovichi district of the Gomel region (10:8–9).

31 On July 21–22, the newly elected parliaments of the Baltic states proclaimed the creation of the Estonian SSR, the Latvian SSR and the Lithuanian SSR, adopted Declarations on joining the USSR, and on August 3–6, 1940, in accordance with the decisions of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, they were admitted to the USSR (31:11).

32 Currently, the territories of Bessarabia are part of the Republic of Moldova and the Pridnestrovian Moldavian Republic, Odessa and Chernovtsi regions of Ukraine.

33 Northern Bukovina and the Hertz region are currently part of the Chernovtsi region of Ukraine (without the Dnester region).

and Sortavala), part of the Rybachy and Sredny peninsulas, the territory of Salla-Kuusamo with the city of Kuoloyarvi were also ceded to the USSR.

Following the results of World War II, the Königsberg region of Germany (part of East Prussia) became part of the USSR³⁴ as well as the southern part of Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands previously occupied by Japan. In 1944, under the armistice agreement, Finland passed the Pechenga region to the USSR.

After the collapse of the USSR, independent states established within the borders of the former Soviet republics retained their territory. In 1997-1999, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan voluntarily transferred part of their territory to the PRC. All other territorial changes took place within the borders of the former USSR.

In 2014, as a result of the implementation of the right to reunification of peoples, the Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, which broke away from Ukraine, became part of the Russian Federation, and in 2022, the territories of Novorossiia (former Donetsk, Lugansk, Zaporozhye and Kherson regions) also entered RF.

For the purposes of the study, we will consider some facts of voluntary entry of territories into the Russian state.

1. Reunification of Ukraine with Russia³⁵ in 1654.

As a result of the uprising under the leadership of Bogdan Khmelnytsky, the Hetman of the Zaporozhian Host,³⁶ following the results of the Zborovsky Peace Treaty (1649), an autonomy was formed as part of the Rzeczpospolita (Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) – Hetmanate³⁷. The ruler of the autonomy was an elected hetman, the All-Cossack Rada was recognized as the Supreme body of the autonomy.

In 1651, after the defeat of Cossacks in Berestech, the Belotserkovsky Peace Treaty was concluded, significantly limiting the rights of their autonomy. After the defeat of the Poles in the Battle of Batog (1652) and the Battle of Zhvanets (1653), the Belotserkovsky Treaty was annulled and the Zborovsky Treaty was restored³⁸. As a result of the Cossacks's

34 According to the Potsdam Agreement of 1945. Article VI of the Potsdam Agreement "On the city of Königsberg and the surrounding area" states that the part of the western border of the USSR adjacent to the Baltic Sea runs from the point on the eastern shore of the Danzig Bay, indicated on the attached map to the east – a little more to the north of Braunsberg – Goldap to the point where the borders of Lithuania, the Polish Republic and the former East Prussia meet.

35 This refers to the transfer of the registered Zaporozhian Host and part of the territories controlled by it, Hetmanate, to the Russian allegiance of the Russian Tsardom.

36 The uprising began in 1648, it was conducted under the slogans of liberation from national and religious oppression, covered the lands of the Zaporozhian Sich, Polish Rus, Lithuanian Rus, voivodships of the Crown of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Then the uprising turned into the Russian-Polish War of 1654–1667. Reunification of Ukraine with Russia. Comp. P. P. Gudzenko, M. K. Kozyrenko, etc. Documents and materials in three volumes. Volume 1. Ukraine on the eve of the Liberation War (1620–1647). M.: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1953:586.

37 Hetmanate (Zaporozhian Host) – an autonomous territory in 1649-1654, covering part of the territory of modern Ukraine, Russia (Starodubye), Belarus (Loev) and Moldavia (northern part Transnistria). These territories of Kievan and Vladimir-Suzdal Rus were captured by the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the XIV century.

38 Reunification of Ukraine with Russia. Comp. by P. P. Gudzenko, M. K. Kozyrenko, etc. Documents and materials in three volumes. Volume 2. The Liberation war of the Ukrainian people and the struggle for reunification with Russia (1648–1651). M.: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1953:558.

uprising and the punitive campaign of the Poles, the population of the autonomy was almost halved, famine and epidemics began. In 1653, the hetman sent envoys to Moscow with a request to accept "his entire Malorossiia (Little Russia) and the entire Zaporozhian Host into its eternal firm possession, allegiance and patronage."³⁹ In 1654, the All-Cossack Rada was held in Pereyaslav, which decided to unite the Hetmanate with the Russian Tsardom. By the decision of the Assembly of the Land of the Russian Tsardom, the King of Poland and the Grand Duke of Lithuania were accused of violating the oath of religious toleration; the Orthodox people of the Hetmanate (the people are treated as a religious community) were released from the Polish oath and passed into Russian citizenship. The Hetmanate was guaranteed broad powers of autonomy⁴⁰.

According to the Treaty of Andrusovo in 1667, the Hetmanate was divided into the Left-Bank Hetmanate as part of the Russian Tsardom – Little Russia⁴¹ (included the city of Kiev and its environs) and the Right-Bank Hetmanate as part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth⁴². In 1668, both parts were united within the framework of the Right-Bank Hetmanate⁴³. Following the results of the Second Russian-Turkish War (1672–1681) and the Treaty of Bakhchisarai⁴⁴, Russia included the left-bank lands of the Dnepr and Kiev with its surroundings. Zaporozhye gained its independence (41:9).

In 1708, the hetman of the Left Bank, I.S. Mazepa, broke the oath to Russia and took the side of the Swedish Kingdom. In 1709, Russian troops stormed the Zaporozhian Sich and destroyed it. In 1722–1727, the institutions of Hetman power were abolished, and their powers were transferred to the Little Russian Collegium (39:106). By 1764, the institutions of the Hetmanate were abolished and the Zaporozhian Host was disbanded, in 1775, the Zaporozhian Sich was abolished⁴⁵. Thus, the regions of

39 Reunification of Ukraine with Russia. Comp. by P. P. Gudzenko, M. K. Kozyrenko, etc. Documents and materials in three volumes. Volume 3. The end of the struggle of the Ukrainian people for reunification with Russia. Pereyaslavskaya Rada. (1651–1654 years.). M.: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1953: 646.

40 Articles of March, 1654 ("The Treaty of Pereyaslav", "Articles of Bogdan Khmelnytsky", "Articles of the Zaporozhian Host", "Pereyaslav articles") are a legal act that formalized the autonomous position of the Hetmanate as part of the Russian state after the Pereyaslav Rada. Reunification of Ukraine with Russia. Comp. by P. P. Gudzenko, M. K. Kozyrenko, etc. Documents and materials in three volumes. Volume 3. The end of the struggle of the Ukrainian people for reunification with Russia. Pereyaslavskaya Rada. (1651–1654 years.). M.: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1953:646.

41 In 1764, after the liquidation of the Hetmanate, the Little Russian (Malorossiia) governorate was established on the territory of the part of the Left-Bank Ukraine, in 1775, the Little Russian and Kiev provinces were united, and in 1781, it was divided into three parts – the Chernigov, Novgorod-Seversk and Kiev vicegerency, in 1796, the Little Russian province was reunited, and in 1802, it was divided into Poltava and Chernigov governorate. In 1835, the Kharkiv governorate was incorporated into the Little Russian Governorate-General (abolished in 1856). (9:14–48)

42 Zaporozhye came under joint Russian-Polish administration. In 1657 and 1687, a period of civil war (the Ruin) was observed on the territory of the Hetmanate. (23:7).

43 Right-bank Ukraine became part of the Russian Empire as a result of the second partition of Poland in 1793. (23:46).

44 The treaty was signed on January 3, 1681 between the Russian Tsardom and the Ottoman Empire and the Crimean Khanate (23: 69).

45 The Highest Manifesto of the Empress of All-Russia Catherine II dated August 3, 1775 "On the destruction of the Zaporozhian Sich and its inclusion in the Novorossiysk governorate". Available from: https://russportal.ru/index.php?id=russia.manifest1775_08_03_01

Little Russia⁴⁶, the Northern regions and the regions and Slobozhanshchina can be considered as voluntarily joining the Russian state in 1654 and Russia can consider these territories its historical ones.

2. The entry of the Crimean Khanate into Russia in 1783, the reunification of the Republic of Crimea and Sevastopol in 2014.

According to the results of the Russian-Turkish war of 1768–1774 and the conclusion of the Kyuchuk-Kaynardzhi Peace Treaty (1774), the independence of the Crimean Khanate from the Ottoman Empire was recognized⁴⁷. Sahib II Gerai (1771–1775) came to power in the khanate, after his overthrow, the pro-Russian Shahin Gerai became the Khan (1777). In 1782, supporters of the Ottoman Empire, with the help of the clergy and aristocracy, rebelled against the power of Shahin Gerai⁴⁸. Assisted by the Russian troops, Shahin Gerai managed to suppress the uprising and block armed intervention by the Ottoman fleet. During the civil war, most supporters of the Ottoman Empire were exterminated or fled, but the Khan did not stop the repression against the civilian population. Under Russian influence, Shahin Gerai abdicated from the Khan's throne in 1783, and Catherine II, by her manifesto, included the lands of the Crimean Khanate, the Taman Peninsula and the Kuban into the Russian Empire⁴⁹. Crimean Tatar elders and clergy were sworn into allegiance to a Russian Empress, having received the rights of self-government. The entry of the Crimean Khanate into Russia was not opposed by the European powers (with the exception of the Ottoman Empire). In 1784–1796, Crimea was part of the Tauride region, then Novorossiysk governorate (1796–1802), Tauride governorate (1802–1921)⁵⁰, Crimean ASSR (1921–1946, 1991)⁵¹, the Crimean region⁵² (1946–1991), Autonomous Republic of Crimea (1992–2014), Republic of Crimea (2014–present).

In 1954, without holding a referendum or any other form of population survey, by the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Crimean region was transferred from the RSFSR to the Ukrainian SSR. At the same time, although Sevastopol

46 The Left Bank includes Little Russia (Kiev, Zhytomyr, Cherkasy and Poltava regions), Severshchina (Chernigov region) and Slobozhanshchina (Kharkov and Sumy regions). The right bank is Volyn (Volyn and Rovno regions) and Podillya (Vinnytsia and Khmelnytsky regions). Novorossiya (Donetsk, Lugansk, Dnepropetrovsk, Zaporozhye, Kirovograd, Nikolaev, Kherson and Odessa regions) were the territories of the Ottoman Empire and the Crimean Khanate, incorporated into Russia in the XVII–XVIII centuries (9:85).

47 The Crimean Khanate was formed in the middle of the XV century after the collapse of the Golden Horde. In 1475, the coastal cities and the mountainous part of Crimean peninsula were conquered by the Ottoman Empire, the rest of the territory became the possession of the Crimean Khanate vassal to the Turks (17:290).

48 Bahadyr II Gerai was proclaimed the new Crimean Khan by the rebels (39:74).

49 In 1784, Catherine II, having signed the decree «On the establishment of the Tauride region», took a new official title – “Tsarina of the Tauride Chersonis”, which was present in the title of Russian emperors up to Nicholas II (53:59).

50 During the Crimean War of 1854–1856, it was partially occupied by the troops of Great Britain, France and the Ottoman Empire (16:116).

51 In the period 1941–1944 the territory of Crimea was occupied by the troops of Nazi Germany and its allies (37:56).

52 In 1948, the city of Sevastopol was singled out as a separate entity being a city of national significance. Source: Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the USSR No. 403 of October 25, 1948 “On measures to accelerate the restoration of Sevastopol”

was considered a city of republican subordination within the Ukrainian SSR since 1954, no legal acts have been adopted in this regard (45:53).

In accordance with the all-Crimean referendum⁵³, held in January 1991 (81.37% of voters took part), “93.26% voted for the re-establishment of the Crimean ASSR as a subject of the USSR and a participant in the Union Treaty”. The Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR recognized the Crimean autonomy, but ignored its claims to get the status of a subject of the USSR.

Under the conditions of political instability and aggravation of civil confrontation in Ukraine, the removal of President Viktor Yanukovych as a result of the 2014 coup d'état, pro-Russian public activists carried out a change of the authorities of Sevastopol and Crimea⁵⁴, and a referendum on joining Russia was held (96.57% voted “for joining the Russian Federation”). On March 18, 2014, the Republic of Crimea and Sevastopol returned to the Russian state on the rights of its subjects.

Thus, on the basis of the realization of the right of peoples to reunification, the historical territory of the Crimean Peninsula returned to Russia.

The entry of the Kartli-Kakhetian Kingdom into Russia in 1783.

In the XVI century, there were several kingdoms and principalities on the territory of Georgia, which were in the sphere of influence of the Ottoman Empire and Persia. During the Persian campaign in 1722, Peter I was unable to provide the promised assistance to King Vakhtang VI of Kartli in the fight against Persia. In 1782, the Kartli-Kakhetian tsar Irakly II appealed to Catherine II with a request to accept Georgia under the patronage of the Russian Empire, in 1783, the Treaty of Georgievsk on the Russian protectorate over the kingdom of Kartli-Kakheti was signed (the people are treated as an ethnic and religious community). However, in 1787, Irakly II signed a separate peace with the Turks, as a result of which Russian troops withdrew from Georgia. In 1795, the kingdom of Kartli-Kakheti was ravaged by the troops of the Persian Shah Mohammad Khan Qajar. After the death of Irakly II and the outbreak of the civil war, Tsar George XII (1798–1800) asked Emperor Paul I to accept the Kartli-Kakhetian Kingdom into Russian allegiance (14:39). In 1799, the Treaty of Georgievsk was renewed, Russian troops entered Kartli-Kakheti. In 1801, Paul I signed a decree on the entry of Kartli-Kakheti into the Russian Empire⁵⁵.

According to the Treaty of Georgievsk, only a small eastern part of modern Georgia (Kartli-Kakheti) became part of Russia. In the period 1803-1878, as a result of the Russian-Turkish wars and diplomatic efforts, Imereti, Batumi, Artvin, Akhaltsikhe, Poti, Abkhazia became part of Russia. In this regard, for example, South Ossetia and Abkhazia were not part of Georgia (14:40), but were territories of the Russian state, for some period

53 The first Soviet plebiscite is the all-Crimean referendum in 1991. Historical Note. Available from: <https://ria.ru/20110120/323139824.html>

54 The Russian military blocked the possibility for the Ukrainian law enforcement agencies to use the force.

55 Berdzenishvili N. A., Dondua V. D., Dumbadze M. K., Melikishvili G. A., Meskhia S. A., Ratiani P. K. History of Georgia from ancient times to the 60s of the 19th century. Educational settlement. Tbilisi, 1962, Chapter XXIII: 387.

administratively⁵⁶ united with Georgia on the rights of autonomies. All this creates legal prerequisites for the independence of the Republic of Abkhazia (1994) and the Republic of South Ossetia (1991), and also preserves for them the possibility of reunification with Russia.

4. The territories of Dagestan and Northern Azerbaijan became part of Russia in 1803.

At the beginning of the XIX century, the territories of modern Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan became part of the Russian Empire. The territories of the feudal lords of Dagestan and the khans of Northern Azerbaijan turned out to be inside the Russian possessions (4:47). By political and diplomatic means on December 26, 1802⁵⁷, an agreement was concluded in Georgievsk, which provided for the establishment of a “firm, unshakable and eternal, peaceful and friendly union” of Caucasian owners under the patronage of Russia⁵⁸. The Union provided rights for broad internal autonomy, obliged feudal lords and mountain societies to stop internecine strife, peacefully resolve disputes, and create the necessary conditions for the development of trade relations in the Caucasus [46:18]. With the signing of the Gulistan Peace Treaty (1813), the entry of these territories into Russia received international recognition.

After the murder of the Avar khans allied with Russia by the second imam of Dagestan and Chechnya Gamzat-Bek in 1834 (32:73), his successor Imam Shamil united the territories of Dagestan, Chechnya and Circassia into the theocratic state of the North Caucasian Imamate, which maintained independence until 1859, and then became part of the Dagestan region (1860–1917)⁵⁹.

This example is characterized by the fact that the voluntary reunification of the Dagestani peoples with Russia took place despite religious and ethnic differences.

5. The entry of the Uriankhaisky Krai (Region) into the Russian Empire in 1914 and the Tuva People's Republic into the RSFSR in 1944.

Historians date Tuvan statehood (the state of Dinlin-Go) to the IV-III centuries BC. In the VII-X centuries, on the territory of modern Tuva there was a state of the Kyrgyz Khaganate. At the beginning of the XIII century, the tribes of the Yenisei Kyrgyzes became part of the Mongol Empire, in the XIV century, they became part of the states of the Northern Yuan and the Khotogoyt Khanate, in the XVII-XVIII centuries, – part of the Dzungarian Khanate, from 1758 to 1912, -- part of the Manchurian Qing Empire.

Under the influence of the Mongolian National Revolution (1911) and the Xinhai Revolution in China (1912–1913), the Tuvan feudal lords appealed to the Russian Empire

56 Kartli-Kakheti Kingdom (1762 – 1801), Georgian Governorate (1801–1840), Georgian-Imereti Governorate (1840–1846), Tiflis and Kutaisi Governorates (1846–1917), Transcaucasian Democratic Federal Republic (1918), Georgian Democratic Republic (1918–1921), Socialist Soviet Republic of Georgia (1921–1936) as part of Transcaucasian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic (1922–1936), Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic (1936–1991), Republic of Georgia (1991 – present).

57 January 8, 1803 according to the new style.

58 Butkov P.G. Materials for the new history of the Caucasus from 1722 to 1803. Ch. 2. St. Petersburg, 1869:562.

59 Subsequently, the independent Republic of the Union of Peoples of the North Caucasus (1917–1919), the Dagestan ASSR (1921–1991) as part of the RSFSR, the Republic of Dagestan (1991 – present) as part of the Russian FederationIO

to take the territories of Tuva under their patronage. In 1914, Tuva became part of the Yenisei Governorate as the Uriankhaisky Krai (Region) (25:13). In 1918, the Treaty on Self-Determination of Tuva was adopted. In 1921, the independent People's Republic of Tannu-Tuva was formed (since 1926 – the Tuva People's Republic – TPR). In 1944, the Small Khural of the TPR adopted a declaration on the entering the USSR. However, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR admitted the TPR as an autonomous region of the RSFSR. In 1961, the region was transformed into the Tuva ASSR (Tuva SSR till 1991, the Republic of Tyva since 1992).

The example of Tuva's entry into Russia shows the entry of a territory with a dominant ethnic group other than Russian (Tuvans are the Turkic people), a different language (Tuvan) and professing Buddhism and Shamanism.

The multinational and multi-confessional nature of the Russian state remains attractive in the modern period.

It should be noted that many countries of the world in recent centuries have incorporated their historical territories, realizing the right of peoples to reunification. Among them: Reconquista in Spain (722–1492), Risorgimento in Italy (1815–1871), People's Republic of China (Manchukuo – 1945, People's Republic of Inner Mongolia and East Turkestan Revolutionary Republic – 1949, Tibet – 1951, Hong Kong – 1997, Macau – 1999), India (Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir – 1947, Hyderabad and Berar – 1948, Goa, Daman and Diu – 1961), Germany (German Empire – 1870, Saarland – 1934, Sudetenland and Anschluss of Austria – 1938, Unification of Germany – 1989). There are positive examples of the unification of peoples similar in ethnic composition and religion (UAE, 1968–1971), and peoples different in language, ethnic groups and confessions (Swiss Union, 1291). There are also negative examples of the unification of peoples of different faiths and ethnic groups into a single state (Sudan – 1956, Yemen – 1990).

Having systematized the signs of various cases of the implementation of the right of peoples to reunification, comparing the presence (absence) of various external and internal factors, the use of mechanisms for legalizing the annexation of territories and international recognition (Table 1), one can note the evolution of the China's approaches: from short-term cases involving direct military intervention and annexation (Tibet), China has moved to the use of long-term predominantly diplomatic methods, granting territories extensive rights of economic autonomy. China (as well as the UAE and Yemen) did not hold referendums on the joining of territories to the country, making the decision of the issue at the elite level. The cases of the UAE and the Republic of Yemen are in many ways opposite: the two Arab countries had different prerequisites for unification, incomparable economic potential, different approaches to public administration, as a result, the UAE embodies a successful project, and Yemen is a failure. The reunification of peoples in Sudan occurred as a result of gaining independence, but it was artificial in nature, which later led to the collapse of the country.

Indian cases of joining territories show practically no dynamics in the choice of approaches. In all four cases, the Indian armed forces were actively used; territories with people (Punjab, Kashmir) or a religious community (Hyderabad) seeking self-determination

and independence were joined. In no case was a plebiscite held on the incorporation of the territory. A number of territories were further divided between several countries (Punjab, Kashmir) or between administrative units within the country (Hyderabad). The inclusion of a number of territories (Goa, Daman, Diu) into India did not receive international recognition for decades.

European cases are presented by Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Germany and Russia. Reunification in Spain took place by military (Reconquista) and politico-diplomatic (through dynastic marriages) means. At the same time, the ethnic, linguistic and confessional community of the territories was quite relative, since separatist sentiments are still strong in Spain today, during the Reconquista the population was forcibly Christianized.

The unification of German lands, despite the aggressive nature of Germany's foreign policy in the XIX-XX centuries, took place without active use of military force. Germany actively used forms of public hearing of the population (Saarland, Austria) and diplomatic methods. At the same time, the reunification of Germany in 1989 shows the haste of the decision that violates democratic decision-making procedures. Residents of the GDR did not get the opportunity to preserve their sovereignty.

The example of the inclusion of the territory of the Papal Region into Italy is very indicative. On the one hand, it shows that the opinion of the population and the desire of the people for reunification were taken into account, and on the other hand, it represents a political conflict (the so-called "Roman question"), which was not settled for 59 years (before the formation of the Vatican state in 1929).

Switzerland is an example of unification of peoples differing in religion, languages, and culture into a single confederate state. At the same time, the country is an example of non-violent (with due consideration given the opinion of the population) indication of a sovereign territory (Jura) and the possibility of transition (reunification) of small communities from one canton to another.

Throughout its history, Russia has actively incorporated territories, on a voluntary basis as well. Russia, as a multinational and multi-confessional country, is attractive even for peoples with a different religion, ethnic and cultural affiliation (Dagestan, Tuva). Most often, the incorporated territories were a zone of socio-political instability (Hetmanate – Little Russia, Crimea, Georgia, Novorossiia, Tuva) and, having become part of Russia, the territories experienced positive changes in their political and economic spheres. In all cases, Russia took into account the opinion of the population (or elites) of the incorporated territories.

In the conditions of instability, military aggression and increased discrimination of the Russian and Russian-speaking population, the regions of Novorossiia decided to reunite with Russia⁶⁰. Little Russia, Crimea and Novorossiia remained Russian historical

⁶⁰ The results of the vote on reunification with Russia in September 2022 ("for"): LNR – 98.42%, DNR – 99.23%, Kherson region – 87.05%, Zaporozhye region – 93.1%. Available from: https://www.rbc.ru/politics/27/09/2022/63335bff9a79475dbe1c7a69?from=from_main_8

Table 1. Comparative analysis for Russia and other countries of some cases of accessions of historical territories

	Events									
	Papal Region, 1870	Tibet, 1951	Hyderabad, 1948	Goa, Daman, Diu, 1961.	Hetmanate, 1654	Georgia, 1783	Crimea, 1783	Dagestan, 1803	Crimea, Sevastopol, 2014	Novorossiya, 2022
Donor country	Papal Region,	Тибет	Hyderabad	Portugal	Poland	Persia	Turkey	Persia	Ukraine	Ukraine
Acceptor country	Italy	China	India	India	Russia	Russia	Russia	Russia	Russia	Russia
The influence of violence of power factors										
socio-political instability in the studied territories or in the donor country (riots, mass protests, civil war)	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
the entry of the troops of the acceptor country to protect (control) the territory	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
carrying out active military operations to protect against the aggression of the donor country or the third countries	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+
Influence of geopolitical and global economic factors										
geopolitical conditions (results of wars, confrontation of the world's "poles of power")	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
the need to protect against the threat from external enemies	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+
availability of economic benefits from the connection	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
Prerequisites for the accession of territories to the acceptor country										
reunification of the territory with the historical core	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+
the influence of the irredentism policy, creating a condition for reunification with the acceptor country	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+
ethno-cultural similarity with the acceptor country	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+

linguistic similarity with the acceptor country	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+
confessional similarity with the acceptor country	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+
ethnic, confessional or other discrimination of the population of the annexed territory by the donor country	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Taking into account the opinion of the population in the donor country and the acceptor country											
holding a plebiscite among the population of the territory	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+
holding a plebiscite in the acceptor country	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
holding a plebiscite in the donor country	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conditions for the entry of the territory into the acceptor country											
the incorporation of the territory in the acceptor country on the terms of centralization of power	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
the incorporation of the territory under the conditions of decentralization of management (the status of autonomy)	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
the existence of a transition period for the adaptation of legal and economic systems	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
preservation of the legal and economic autonomy of the territory during the transition period	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
preserving the integrity of the territory as a separate administrative unit	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+
division of the territory into parts, becoming part of another administrative unit	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-

Events										
	Papal Region, 1870	Tibet, 1951	Hyderabad, 1948	Goa, Daman, Diu, 1961.	Portugal	Poland	Persia	Turkey	Crimea, 1783	Novorossiya, 2022
									Sevastopol, 2014	
Donor country	Papal Region, Italy	Тибет	Hyderabad	India	India	Russia	Persia	Russia	Ukraine	Ukraine
Acceptor country		China								
International recognition of the fact of the territory becoming part of the acceptor country										
recognition of accession by the donor country	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
recognition after entering the territory	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
(conclusion of international agreements by the donor country and the acceptor country)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
the absence of recognition	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Recognition of accession by the majority of UN member states	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Complete lack of international recognition of accession	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
The influence of third countries on the separation or the entry of the territory into the acceptor country										
Direct military intervention, military-technical assistance	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Diplomatic pressure	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Economic assistance	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
The meaning of the term «people» in the realization of the right of the people to reunification										
The people act as a nation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
The people act as an ethnic group	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
The people act as a religious community	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

The table is compiled by the author

territories artificially rejected during the USSR period⁶¹ in violation of the conducted plebiscite⁶².

It should also be noted that over time, the factors of religious, linguistic and ethno-cultural community in Russian incorporation cases fade into the background, the people reunite as a nation, a multinational and multi-confessional superethnos.

Despite the rejection of the reunification of Crimea, Sevastopol and the regions of Novorossiia with Russia by the countries of the collective West, the factors, mechanisms and other features of the return of these territories to the Russian Federation do not have fundamental differences from the cases used in the past by China, India, Germany, Spain, Italy, and other countries of the world, and thus, these reunification processes represent the usual civilization trend.

Conclusion

The incorporation and loss of territories is a normal process of state development that needs to work out a scientifically sound and internationally recognized political and legal basis. In particular, mechanisms are needed for the peaceful settlement of issues to exercise the right of peoples to reunification between the donor country and the acceptor country.

Taking into account the influence of third countries on the process of secession or incorporation of territories, it is necessary to develop and approve at the international level a set of measures for permissible intervention in a dispute between a donor country and an acceptor country that would prevent the escalation of the conflict and its transfer to the stage of armed confrontation.

In the process of reunification of territories in the past (up to the middle of the XX century), the people more often acted as a holder of religion, and not as an ethnos or nation. Currently, the content of the term “the people” is closer to notion of “the nation”.

The plebiscite is an important element in the exercise of the right of peoples to reunification. It is necessary to develop universally recognized legal mechanisms for conducting this kind of a plebiscite and international legitimization of its results.

The reunification of peoples in the process of exercising the right to self-determination is a mutual process, which involves efforts of both the joining territory and the acceptor country.

61 “I can’t help but recall how the Soviet Union was formed when Russia was establishing modern Ukraine. It was Russia that created modern Ukraine by transferring significant territories there, the historical territories of Russia itself, together with the population, which no one asked about where and how people want to live, how they want to arrange the future of their children, in which state. And when the Soviet Union collapsed, the same thing happened – the elites decided everything among themselves, no one asked millions of ordinary citizens about anything.” Speech by the Russian President Vladimir Putin at the rally-concert “People’s Choice. Together forever” in support of the admission of the DPR, LPR, Zaporozhye and Kherson regions into Russia. September 30, 2022. Available from: <http://www.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/69470>

62 According to the referendum held on March 17, 1991, 77.8% of the country’s residents voted for the preservation of the USSR, including 71.4% of the residents of the Ukrainian SSR. Source: On the results of the USSR referendum held on March 17, 1991 (From the message of the Central Commission of the USSR Referendum). *Izvestia*. 1991. March 27.

The actual annexation of the territory and its full or partial international recognition may be separated by a significant period of time (several decades).

The author's opinion is that it is necessary to amend p.14 of section II. "The Modern World and the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation" of the Concept of the foreign policy of the Russian Federation, providing for the right of the Russian state to ensure security or return of historical territories in case of discrimination of the Russian-speaking population, manifestations of neo-Nazism and Russophobia. The legal consolidation of the possibility of holding a "Russian Reconquista" can become a weighty argument for the republics of the former USSR implementing a policy of neo-Nazism and Russophobia, and it will also mark the "red lines" in Russian foreign policy across the former Soviet Union in protecting representatives of the Russian nation who found themselves on the historical territories of Russia which became part of the Union republics without taking into account the opinion of the population.

References

1. Antonova, K.A., Bongard-Levin, G.M., Kotovsky, G.G. History of India. Moscow: Mysl, 1979. 612 p. (In Russian).
2. Baranov, S.A. Separatism in India. Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2003. 238 p. (In Russian).
3. Bichurin N. Ya. (Iakinf) The story of the first four khans from the house of Genghisov. The History of the Mongols. Moscow: AST: Transitkniga, 2005. 234 p. (In Russian).
4. Bronevsky, S.M. Historical notes on the relations of Russia with Persia, Georgia, in general with the mountain peoples in the Caucasus, living from the time of Tsar John Vasilyevich to this day. St.-Petersburg, 1996. 150 p. (In Russian).
5. Bolgurtsev, B. N. The Russian Fleet in the Far East (1860–1861): The Beijing Treaty and the Tsushima Incident. Vladivostok: Dalnauka, 1996. 133 p. (In Russian).
6. Buturlin, D. P. The history of the Time of Troubles in Russia at the beginning of the XVII century. Moscow: Kuchkovo pole; Berkut, 2012. 576 p. (In Russian).
7. Volokitina, T.V., Murashko, G.L., Noskova, A.F., Pokivailova, T. A. Moscow and Eastern Europe. The formation of Soviet-type political regimes (1949–1953). Essays on history. Moscow: Russian Political Encyclopedia (ROSSPEN), 2002. 686 p. (In Russian).
8. Gorsky, A.A. Russian lands in the XIII–XIV centuries: ways of political development. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2016. 192 p. (In Russian).
9. Grinin, L.E. The State and the historical process. The era of the formation of the state: The general context of social evolution in the formation of the state. Moscow: KomKniga, 2007. 272 p. (In Russian).
10. Gorbunov, T.S. The reunification of the Belarusian people in a united Soviet socialist state. Moscow: State Publishing House of Political Literature, 1948. 231 p. (In Russian).
11. Gumilev, L.N. Ancient Russia and the magnificent steppe. Moscow: Iris Press, 2007. 764 p. (In Russian).
12. Gumilev, L.N. From Medieval Russia to Modern Russia. Moscow: AST, 2003. 397 p. (In Russian).
13. Dzhakhiev, G.A. Russia and Dagestan at the beginning of the XIX century. Makhachkala, 1985. 96 p. (In Russian).
14. Dzidzoev, V.D. Territorial claims of Georgia to Abkhazia and South Ossetia in the context of the St. George's Treatise of 1783. North Caucasian Legal Bulletin, 2014; 4: 38–44. (In Russian).
15. Dikaev, S.U. The right of the people to self-determination and reunification as a victimological problem // Criminology: yesterday, today, tomorrow. Law. 2014:40–44. (In Russian).
16. Zaionchkovsky, A.M. The Eastern War: 1853–1856: In 2 vols. Saint-Petersburg: Polygon, 2002. Vol.2, part 1. 573 p., Vol. 2, part 2. 716 p. (In Russian).
17. Zaitsev, I. V. Crimean Khanate: vassalage or independence? The Ottoman World and Osmanistics. Collection of articles. Moscow, 2010. pp. 288–298. (In Russian).

18. Siebert, D. Map from the appendix to the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty: reasons for non-publication and errors in the interpretation of the text of the document in German-language historiography. Journal. Belarusian State University. History. 2018;2:47–56. (In Russian).
19. Zuev, A. S. The nature of the annexation of Siberia in the modern Russian historiography // Eurasia: Cultural heritage of ancient civilizations. Vol.1. Cultural space of Eurasia. Novosibirsk, 1999:124–136. (In Russian).
20. Kashin, V.P. Section of Punjab, 1947. India: Society, power, reforms. Moscow, 2003:164–187. (In Russian).
21. Kolesnitsky, N.F. “The Holy Roman Empire”: claims and reality. Moscow: Nauka, 1977. 210 p. (In Russian).
22. Kostomarov, N.I. Russian History in the biographies of its main figures. St. Petersburg: Lenizdat, 2007. Vol. 1: X–XVII centuries. 541 p.
23. Kostomarov, N.I. Ruina: Mazepa. Mazepintsy. Historical monographs and research. Moscow: Charlie, 1995. 800 p. (In Russian).
24. Ksenofontov, I.N. The world they wanted and hated: Dokum. report [on the conclusion of the Brest Peace Treaty]. Moscow: Politizdat, 1991. 414 p. (In Russian).
25. Kuzmin Yu. V. Urianhai in the system of Russian-Mongolian-Chinese relations. Irkutsk: Publishing house of the ISU, 2000. 66 p. (In Russian).
26. Kuchkin, V.A. Formation of the state territory of North-Eastern Russia in the X–XIV centuries. Moscow: Nauka, 1984. 353 p. (In Russian).
27. Latyshev V. M. After the Simodsky tract (1855–1858). Bulletin of the Sakhalin Museum. 2015;22:137–148. (In Russian).
28. Levchenko M.V. USSR and Germany relations in 1952–1955. The search for the ways to solve the “German question” by the Soviet Union. Bulletin of Udmurt University. 2019; Vol. 29. Issue 1:77–86. (In Russian).
29. Mavrodin, V.V. Ancient and Medieval Russia. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. 719 p. (In Russian).
30. Marusenko, M.A. Languages and national identity: modern challenges to national unity and territorial integrity. Moscow: Political Encyclopedia, 2015. 575 p. (In Russian).
31. Meltyukhov, M.I. The escalation of the Soviet military presence in the Baltic States. Stalin’s Missed chance: The Soviet Union and the Struggle for Europe: 1939–1941 (documents, facts, judgments). Moscow: Veche, 2000. 605 p.
32. Neverovsky, A. A. Extermination of the Avar Khans in 1834. – St. Petersburg, 1848. 37 p.
33. Nurullin, R.M. The concept of secession in political science. Scientific Notes of Kazan State University. 2010; Vol. 152, book 1:212–221. (In Russian).
34. Petrov, I.A. Bulletin of Europe: Separatism in Swiss. Vestnik Europy. 2005; Vol. XIII–XIV:99–103.
35. Polynov, M.F. M. S. Gorbachev and the unification of Germany. The Modern History of Russia. 2011;1:202–215. (In Russian).
36. Pochekaev, R. Yu. The Right of the Golden Horde. Kazan: Publishing House “Feng” of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, 2009. 260 p. (In Russian).
37. Raskina, E.Y. Crimea in the Great Patriotic War of 1941–1945. Moscow: Yauza-catalog, 2017. 397 p. (In Russian).
38. Romanov, D. A. “Siberian capture” or voluntary entry: The Siberian connection to Russia in Russian historiography. Tula Scientific Bulletin. Series of History and Linguistics. 2020;2:20–28. (In Russian).
39. Russia – Ukraine: The history of relations. Editors: Miller, A. I., Reprintsev, V.F., Florya, B.N. Moscow: Languages of Russian culture, 1997. 248 p. (In Russian).
40. Rolf, M. The Polish lands under the rule of St. Petersburg: from the Vienna Congress to the First World War. Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoje Obosrenije, 2020. 576 p. (In Russian).
41. Selivonenko, A.N. The influence of Russia on the relationship between the Zaporozhye Sich and the Hetmanate. Izvestiya Saratov University. A new series. History and International relations series. 2019; Vol. 19, issue 1:8–13. (In Russian).
42. Solovyov, S.M. Essays: In 18 books. Book 1: The History of Russia since ancient times. Vol.1–2. Book 2: The history of Russia since ancient times. Vol. 3–4. Moscow: Golos, 1993. 768 p. (In Russian).
43. Takhnaeva, P.I. Hadji Murad. Khajimurad from Khunzakh / Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow. 2019. 688 p. (In Russian).
44. Trainin, I.P. National and social liberation of Western Ukraine and Western Belarus. Moscow: Sotsekgiz, 1939. 80 p. (In Russian).
45. Fedorov A.V. The legal status of Crimea. The legal status of Sevastopol. Moscow: Publishing House of Moscow University, 1999. 56 p. (In Russian).
46. Feodaeva, F.Z. Russian-Dagestan relations in the second half of the XVIII – early XIX centuries. Moscow, 2008. 240 p. (In Russian).

47. Filitov, A. M. Soviet politics and unification of Germany (1989–1990)). *Otechestvennaja Istorija*. 2004;6:45–60. (In Russian).
48. Filitov A. M. The Soviet Union and the German Question in the period of late Stalinism (on the genesis of the “Stalin note” on March 10, 1952). *Stalin and the Cold War*. Moscow, 1998: 315–349. (In Russian).
49. Shearer, W. The rise and the fall of the Third Reich. In 2 vol. Moscow: Voenizdat, 1991. (In Russian).
50. Yugoslavia in the XX century: essays on political history / K. V. Nikiforov, A. I. Filimonova, A. L. Shemyakin, etc. Moscow: Indrik, 2011. 888 p. (In Russian).
51. Yurlov, F.N., Yurlova, E.S. History of India. XX century. Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2010. 920 p. (In Russian).
52. Yakovlev, A.Y. The Sikh question: the history of religious conflict in Punjab. *Journal of scientific publications of postgraduates and doctoral students*. 2008;9(27):102–106. (In Russian).
53. Yakovlev, R.A. About the titles in the ancient Russia // *NovaInfo*. 2017; 69: 57–59. (In Russian).
54. Boucek, Ch. Ottaway, M. Yemen on the Brink. *Carnegie Endowment*, 2010. 110 p.
55. Collins, R. *The Arab Conquest of Spain: 710 – 797*. Wiley, 1995. 256 p.
56. Goldstein, M. C. *A History of Modern Tibet, 1913–1951: The Demise of the Lamaist State*. University of California Press, 1991, 936 p.
57. Kris, Ch. One Country, Two Systems’ could remain unchanged after 2047, says Hong Kong’s Carrie Lam / *Hong Kong Free Press*. 16.01.2020. URL: <https://hongkongfp.com/2020/01/16/one-country-two-systems-remain-unchanged-2047-says-hong-kongs-carrie-lam/>
58. Yousaf, N. Pakistan and India: The Case for Unification. Paper presented at the New York Conference on Asian Studies (NYCAS) at Cornell University held on October 09–10, 2009. URL: https://archive.org/details/infomashriqi_yahoo_1kc
59. Pounds, N.J.G. *Political Geography*. New York, McGraw Hill, 1963.
60. Singh, K. *The Partition of Punjab*. Patiala, 1972.
61. Steininger, R. Eine Vertane Chance. *Die Stalin-Note vom 10, März 1952 und die Wiedervereinigung*. Berlin/Bonn, Dietz, 1985. 412 p.
62. Stephen, P. C. *The idea of Pakistan*. Brookings Institution Press, 2004. 367 p.
63. Symonds, R. *The Making of Pakistan*. London: Islamic Book Service, 1987. 226 p.
64. *The World Factbook 2009*. Government Printing Office, 2009. pp. 559–561. URL: <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/>
65. Waheeduddin, F. S. *The Real Ranjit Singh*. Lion Art Press, 1965. 217 p.

About the author

Mikhail M. CHERNYSHOV. CandSc (Econ). Advisor to The National Communications Development Research Institution. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0811-1867>. Address: 22, building 1, Korobeynikov Lane, Moscow, 119034, Russian Federation, mcherny@bk.ru

Contribution of the author

The author declares no conflicts of interests.

Article info

Submitted: October 11, 2022. Approved after peer reviewing: October 22, 2022.
Accepted for publication: October 30, 2022. Published: December 21, 2022.

The author has read and approved the final manuscript.

Peer review info

«Russia & World: Scientific Dialogue» thanks the anonymous reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.