

MARCIN KOSIENKOWSKI

THE TEACHING ABOUT DE FACTO STATES IN TIMES OF CRISES: THE CASE OF TRANSNISTRIA

Abstract. In this article, I share my personal experience of teaching about the de facto state of Transnistria during times of crises and within Central and East European and multicultural contexts. I begin by explaining where and when I teach about Transnistria, which may not be so obvious because it is a narrow topic. Next, I focus on how I approach classes devoted to Transnistria as a controversial and sensitive issue that requires specific teaching strategies. Finally, I discuss the outcomes of implementing these strategies and share my personal feelings about instruction concerning Transnistria. This article may be valuable to junior scholars who have recently started covering the subject of Transnistria and other de facto states and are seeking guidance. It may also benefit experienced senior scholars by offering them an opportunity to compare their teaching strategies.

Keywords: Transnistria; de facto states; teaching; controversial issues; sensitive issues

INTRODUCTION

I have been interested in de facto states since my college days in the first half of the 2000s. What fascinated me about these entities was that although they existed in reality, resembling normal states, they could not be found on a political map of the world. The reason for that omission was that they lacked international recognition, which meant that their territories formally belonged to universally recognized states and were presented on their maps. As such, de facto states were geopolitical anomalies (for more on de facto states, see Caspersen, 2012; Geldenhuys, 2009; Hoch and Kopeček, 2020; Ker-Lindsay, 2022; Kosienkowski, 2023; Kursani, 2021; Pegg, 1998, 2017). Of all de facto states, I chose Transnistria as my primary research object mainly due to its use of the Russian language, which

Prof. MARCIN KOSIENKOWSKI – The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Institute of Political Science and Public Administration, Department of International Relations and Security; correspondence address: Al. Raławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland; e-mail: marcin.kosienkowski@kul.pl; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7827-7371>.

Articles are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution – NonCommercial – NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

I have command of, its geographical proximity to my home country of Poland, and a limited academic interest that it garnered there.

Transnistria is formally recognized as part of Moldova, from which it ultimately de facto separated in 1992 in the aftermath of a brief war. It is a narrow strip of land sandwiched between Moldova and Ukraine, populated by less than a half million people, mainly Moldovans, Russians, and Ukrainians (about one third of the population each). Despite such a multiethnic composition, it is a highly Russified region, maintaining the strongest external relations with Russia as its patron. At the same time, Transnistria engages in relations with its parent state, Moldova, and the West, which includes not only antagonistic elements (since Moldova and the West stand against the existence of Transnistria), but also cooperative ones. It is also worth mentioning that it has an authoritarian presidential-like political system and a highly industrialized and export-oriented economy (for more on Transnistria, see, e.g. Blakkisrud and Kolstø, 2011; Colbey, 2022; Kosienkowski, 2012; Ó Beacháin, Comai and Tsursumia-Zurabashvili, 2016).

Along with researching Transnistria, I have also been teaching about this de facto state, including its internal and external dynamics. I have primarily undertaken this work as a member of the Department of International Relations and Security at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin in Poland. This department is headed by Professor Andrzej Podraza, to whom the special issue of *Roczniki Nauk Społecznych* [Annals of Social Sciences], along with this article, is dedicated. In this article, I share my personal experience with respect to my teaching practices. To be more precise, I discuss where and when I teach about Transnistria, which may not be so obvious, since it is hard to have a separate course about an individual de facto state (and even a group of de facto states) because it is a very narrow topic. Then, I focus on how I teach about Transnistria as an issue that I consider controversial and sensitive, which, consequently, requires a specific approach. I should add that pro-Russian and Ukraine-neighboring Transnistria has become an even more controversial and sensitive issue to me since Russia's covert invasion of Ukraine in 2014 and the subsequent all-out assault in 2022. Basically, this time of crises is one that I cover in this article. Finally, I discuss the results of applying this specific approach, that is, specific teaching strategies, and my personal feelings regarding the teaching about Transnistria.

The rationale behind penning this article is that scholars seem to be interested in the personal experience of teaching about de facto states. This conclusion came after a discussion during the panel, "How to teach de facto states in times

of crises?” organized at the University of Tartu in June 2023, in which I took part together with Eiki Berg, Vincenc Kopeček, Pål Kolstø, Kristel Vits, and other de facto state scholars (DFSRU, 2023b). Here, I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Eiki Berg for inviting me to this panel, Dr. Vera Axyonova for encouraging me to write this piece (speaking herself during another panel about personal experiences on how to study de facto states in times of crises; see an adjacent article by Axyonova and Lozka, 2023 about conducting field-work in and studying Ukraine after 2022), and Professor Wojciech Gizicki for inviting me to contribute to the special issue of *Roczniki Nauk Społecznych* [Annals of Social Sciences].

This article may be valuable to junior scholars who have recently started teaching about Transnistria and other de facto states and are seeking guidance. It may also be useful to experienced senior scholars who can confront their way of teaching about Transnistria and other de facto states and make some adjustments thereto or uphold their previous attitude with more confidence. At least, this is how I personally benefitted from reading the literature on teaching about controversial and sensitive issues (at all levels of education), Transnistria being one of them in my view (e.g. Chaban and Headley, 2023; Goldberg, Wagner and Petrović, 2019; Jerome and Elwick, 2020; Kello, 2016; Lowe, 2015; Niens, O’Connor and Smith, 2013; Ortega-Sánchez, 2022a; Quaynor, 2012; Sætra, 2021; Stitzlein, 2022; Stradling, 1984; Zembylas and Bekerman, 2012). Finally, although this article may be mainly of interest to scholars teaching in Central and (pro-Western) East European countries and multicultural contexts like myself, it can also attract the attention of teachers working in other domains.

1. WHERE AND WHEN TO TEACH ABOUT TRANSNISTRIA

I have never had a separate course on Transnistria (or de facto states) while teaching international relations and political science at my home university because it is too narrow a topic. However, I try to include it, either as a whole or as selected issues, in my regular courses as often as possible. The rationale behind this inclusion is to use my in-depth knowledge and research on Transnistria and de facto states in general (e.g. Devyatkov and Kosienkowski, 2013; Kosienkowski, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2018, 2020, 2022, 2023; Kosienkowski and Dembińska, 2024; Kosienkowski, Schreiber and Hahn, 2015; Kosienkowski and Ženková Rudincová, 2024) for illustrative and comparative purposes and, in addition, to expand the knowledge of the students. The best

course to include Transnistria topics is the Introduction to International Relations. Precisely speaking, I use the Transnistrian de facto state as an example of the following: a specific (state-like) actor in international relations, tensions between the principles of self-determination and territorial integrity, reasons for secession, self-determination and counter-recognition activities, importance of international recognition, and results of the lack of thereof, digital diplomatic activities, the patron–client relationship, etc.

Another noteworthy course is the Introduction to Political Science, where I refer to Transnistria while talking about the state and its functions, state- and nation-building, direct democracy and sovereignty referendums, legitimacy and legitimation, etc. Other courses offer fewer opportunities to touch on the topic, although I do not hesitate to do so. For instance, I discuss Transnistria and the OSCE field mission to Moldova, whose main task is to facilitate the resolution of the Transnistrian-Moldovan conflict, during International Organizations and Peace-keeping Operations courses. Another example is when I refer to Transnistria while discussing separatism and information warfare during the Asymmetrical Threats course. All of this shows that the issues of Transnistria or de facto states can be easily incorporated into the education process, even if there is no separate course to cover these.

In addition to teaching at my home university in Poland, I also teach about Transnistria at foreign universities, mainly during my Erasmus+ teaching mobility. Although I teach only short-term courses, I can fully devote them to Transnistria (and de facto states in general) and have enough flexibility in shaping the content. In fact, I have two main courses. The first is for less advanced students. It is about internal and external dynamics of Transnistria. I discuss how this de facto state operates in the context of international non-recognition. It is based on my Ph.D. thesis on factors behind Transnistria's survival (Kosienkowski, 2010). The other course is for more advanced students. It explores the engagement of the international community with de facto states, including Transnistria, where I argue that the engagement is more intense than it has been traditionally claimed in the scholarship. I also explain which conditions should be met for the engagement to happen and present its advantages and disadvantages. This course is based on my habilitation degree (higher doctorate) (Kosienkowski, 2018). My final remark here is that although the topic of Transnistria can be easily incorporated into the education process, its teaching may require a special approach, given that both teachers and students may consider it a controversial and sensitive issue, as I do, which I discuss in the following sections.

2. TRANSNISTRIA AS A CONTROVERSIAL AND SENSITIVE ISSUE

During my teaching, I have always considered Transnistria a controversial and sensitive issue. Importantly, it appears that I am not the only one with this attitude. Among others, this consideration was shared by the organizers of the panel, “How to teach de facto states in times of crises?” from the University of Tartu, which is one of the leading academic centers for studying de facto states (see DFSRU, 2024). In their brief description of this panel, the organizers write that it “focuses on personal viewpoints and experiences regarding teaching about de facto states at times of conflict escalation when certain topics or even wording might be perceived as taking sides, especially in a multicultural classroom where students from different sides of the conflict might participate. Panelists are invited to share their thoughts on how to maintain a balance between scientific objectivity and respecting political and personal sensibilities that students from various backgrounds might have. We’ll also reflect on lecturers’ own positionality, and discuss strategies for avoiding miscommunication and misunderstandings while balancing various voices” (DFSRU, 2023a).

When it comes to a more precise understanding of controversial and sensitive issues, the former can be seen as topics that “deeply divide a society, that generate conflicting explanations and solutions based upon alternate worldviews” (Stradling, 1984, p. 121), while the latter can be designated as topics that “evoke an emotional response,” that is, negative emotions (Lowe, 2015, p. 120). To make things clear, the Transnistrian topic is not as controversial and sensitive as common contemporary and historical issues related to sexuality, race, religion, immigration, imperialism, extremism, or violent internal conflicts that are probably the best point of reference for the Transnistrian issue (see, e.g., Goldberg, Wagner and Petrović, 2019; Kello, 2016; Quaynor, 2012; Stradling, 1984; Zembylas and Bekerman, 2012). The point is that the Transnistrian conflict is actually frozen, with no casualties seen since the brief war with Moldova in 1992 and a lower level of hatred between the conflicting parties. However, the Transnistrian issue can still divide people and evoke negative emotions.

As regards dividing people and evoking emotions, much depends on the context in which Transnistria is taught about (see more about the importance of the teaching context in Chaban and Headley, 2023, p. 742–743; Goldberg, Wagner and Petrović, 2019, p. 19–20; Kello, 2016; Stradling, 1984). The organizers of the panel “How to teach de facto states in times of crises?” pay special attention to “a multicultural classroom where students from different sides of the conflict might participate,” that is, students from a de facto state and its parent

state. Although I have never had such an experience, I have taught in a context that made Transnistria a controversial and sensitive issue for me. This context is the teaching of Polish and Polish-Ukrainian classes at my home university in Poland (since 2010), a Ukrainian class at the Chernivtsi National University in Ukraine (in 2015), a Romanian-Moldovan class at the West University of Timisoara in Romania (in 2022–2024), and multicultural classes at the Vytautas Magnus University in Lithuania (in 2017, 2019, and 2023–2024) and the University of Ostrava in Czechia (in 2023). In short, I have taught in Central European, (pro-Western) East European, and multicultural contexts.

Strictly speaking, my mere depiction of Transnistria as a state-like entity in a neutral and objective way, as required by the academic ethos, may be seen by students as normalizing this entity (which, I must admit, is an unintended but likely consequence), and additionally as legitimizing and supporting it and its separatist aspirations (which is neither intended nor desired). This may be objected to not only by students from the parent state of Moldova but also by Central European and Ukrainian students, who most likely sympathize more with internationally recognized Moldova than with separatist and internationally unrecognized Transnistria. Next, my potential normalization, legitimization, and endorsement of Transnistria, which is a pro-Russian and Russia-supported entity, may be opposed by students from Central Europe and Moldova, as they come from countries that perceive post-2014 and especially post-2022 Russia as a threat to their national security. Crucially, this may be particularly strongly objected by Ukrainian students whose country was covertly invaded by Russia in 2014 and then openly assaulted in 2022, the more so because pro-Russian Transnistria borders Ukraine and has Russian troops deployed on its territory. All this can lead to divisions between me and the students from Central Europe and (pro-Western) Eastern Europe, and also among the students themselves once they find themselves in a multicultural classroom. Consequently, negative emotions can surface in students, particularly of Ukrainian origin, such as distress, anger, or injustice, which, as many other teachers (see, e.g., Goldberg, Wagner and Petrović, 2019, p. 18; Kello, 2016), I would like to avoid.

Except for this general issue, there are also specific issues related to Transnistria, which I consider controversial and/or sensitive when teaching in a specific context. Consequently, invoking them may divide people and evoke negative emotions in a classroom. These include telling Romanian students about strong anti-Romanian sentiments in Transnistria, including the fear of Transnistria being annexed together with Moldova by Romania (which I illustrate with a cover

of a Transnistrian book, where an octopus operating from Romania grabs not only proper Moldova, which territories belonged to Romania in the interwar period, but also Transnistria; see Komarnitskiy, 2006). These also include saying to Ukrainian students about long-time support of Ukraine for Transnistria (until 2014 when Ukraine started perceiving Transnistria as a threat to its security), telling Moldovan and Romanian students that Moldovan/Romanian radical nationalism could have triggered Transnistrian separatism at the turn of 1980s and 1990s, or saying to (pro-Western) Central European and East European students about the advantages of international community engagement with (pro-Russian) Transnistria, etc. Below, I discuss how I cope with teaching about Transnistria as a controversial and sensitive topic, including how I handle the general and specific problems mentioned above.

3. STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING TRANSNISTRIA AS A CONTROVERSIAL AND SENSITIVE ISSUE

My strategies for teaching about Transnistria as a controversial and sensitive issue include relying on the academic and field knowledge, taking an impartial stance (when it comes to the status of Transnistria), criticizing and questioning the rhetoric and behavior of the two conflicting parties (i.e., Transnistria and Moldova), providing counter-intuitive facts, leaving the truth open, humanizing Transnistria, and even introducing entertaining elements. The application of a specific strategy or a set of strategies largely depends on whether I am addressing the general issue of the possible normalization, and legitimization and endorsement of Transnistria, or if I am discussing a specific controversial and/or sensitive issue related to Transnistria. I review all these strategies below.

3.1. Relying on the academic and field knowledge

When teaching about Transnistria, I rely on the academic knowledge that I have accumulated over nearly two-decade-long research of this de facto state. I also draw from other scholars whose output I try to follow on a regular basis. This is what makes me willing and quite confident about teaching about Transnistria as a controversial and sensitive topic. I feel in a position to address specific problems, such as telling Ukrainian students in detail about the long-time support of Ukraine for Transnistria, now probably perceived by them as a threat to their country (Kosienkowski, 2009, 2014a, 2014b). Indeed, as noted in the literature, the lack of proper academic knowledge is one of the main reasons

why teachers hesitate to teach controversial and sensitive topics (Goldberg, Wagner and Petrović, 2019, p. 18; Ibañez-Etxeberria *et al.*, 2022, p. 83). When teaching about Transnistria, I also rely on the field knowledge acquired during my fieldwork (I had managed to travel to Transnistria at least once a year until the COVID pandemics) and on reading journalism (which I struggle to be abreast with due to extensive research, teaching, and service effort). This is what also makes me confident as an instructor.

3.2. Taking an impartial stance (when it comes to the status of Transnistria)

Another strategy for teaching about Transnistria is taking an impartial position. This is mainly about avoiding supporting either Transnistria's pursuit of its separatist aspirations or the reintegration of Transnistria with Moldova. In other words, I refrain from taking a position on whether Transnistria should live or die, which is a very serious, controversial, and sensitive dilemma. Crucially, taking an impartial position when it comes to the status of Transnistria should defuse controversies and sensitivities in a classroom. Furthermore, specifically avoiding support for Transnistria's separatist aspirations should counter the possible impression among students from Central Europe and (pro-Western) Eastern Europe that I legitimize or support Transnistria's separatist aspirations (for more information about avoidance as a teaching strategy, see Kello, 2016, p. 41–42). I must additionally confess that when I started teaching in the mid-2000s, I leaned more toward the reintegration of Transnistria with Moldova because I worked in a (pro-Moldovan) Polish context, and it took me some time to reach an impartial position.

3.3. Criticizing and questioning the rhetoric and behavior of both conflicting parties

Although I avoid taking a position when it comes to the future status of Transnistria, I do not refrain from criticizing and questioning the rhetoric and behavior of the two conflicting parties, that is, Transnistria and Moldova. For example, I undermine the sincerity of separatist aspirations declared by the Transnistrian authorities, that is, gaining internationally recognized independence and subsequently integrating/associating with Russia. I claim that they want to retain the status quo instead (i.e. de facto statehood) for political and economic benefits (Kosienkowski, 2013). Similarly, I express my doubts about the sincerity of the declared desire of Moldova (when ruled by the pro-Western government) to reintegrate Transnistria, as this would significantly increase the influence of pro-Russian voters, far beyond the current scale, even though some Transnis-

trians with Moldovan passports already participate in Moldovan elections (Socor, 2019). Furthermore, I criticize Moldova for unilateralism and inaction when it comes to the reintegration of Transnistria, including creating the proper conditions for this process, such as a democratic and prosperous environment. Clearly, proper knowledge is required to make and substantiate such critical claims or suggestions. By criticizing and questioning the rhetoric and behavior of the two conflicting parties, I demonstrate that not everything is so black and white, which should blur divisions and, consequently, soothe controversies and sensitivities in a classroom. In addition, specifically criticizing Transnistria should counter the possible impression among students from Central and (pro-Western) Eastern Europe that I legitimize or support Transnistria's separatist aspirations.

3.4. Providing counter-intuitive facts

A similar approach to criticizing and questioning is to provide counter-intuitive facts, which also helps demonstrate that not everything is so black and white and, consequently, helps defuse controversies and sensitivities in a classroom. I use it to handle both general and specific issues that I consider controversial and sensitive. For example, I explain to students that despite Moldova and the West are generally in conflict with Transnistria (given that they want Transnistria to be reintegrated with Moldova), they also cooperate with the Transnistrian de facto state, including engaging in substantial trade. Hence, my message to students from Central and (pro-Western) Eastern Europe is that if Moldova and the West normalize Transnistria (at least, to some extent), why cannot I do the same (which, as I have noted, is an unintended but likely outcome when I merely depict Transnistria as a state-like entity in a neutral and objective way). Another example is to tell Romanian students that although Transnistria promotes strong anti-Romanian sentiments among its population, including upholding the fear that Romania wants to annex Transnistria together with Moldova, it sells its products to Romania, making it one of its main export partners. This can lower the level of sensitivity of Romanian students, who may be concerned about the poor image of their country in Transnistria as promoted by the Transnistrian authorities.

3.5. Leaving the truth open

When teaching about Transnistria, I also do what Kello (2016, p. 45–46) calls “leaving the truth open,” that is, I present different perspectives on a given issue. I often apply this strategy to present arguments of the conflicting parties,

and mainly when there is no consensus in the scholarship on a specific issue, which I find controversial and/or sensitive. This concerns, for example, reasons for the Transnistrian separatism, which may not only be Moldovan/Romanian radical nationalism but also the vested interests of economic and political elites of Transnistria, or the geopolitical ambitions of the USSR/Russia. Another example is the advantages and disadvantages of the international community engagement with Transnistria (that is, weakening Transnistria's separatist aspirations vs. strengthening Transnistria's de facto statehood). Having heard that, the students become aware of the heterogeneity of opinions and can make their own choices based on the argumentation provided, which should defuse controversies and sensitivities in a classroom. At the same time, I also readily give voice to students, which strengthens the heterogeneity of opinions and facilitates the establishment of a good teaching and learning environment (see Sætra, 2021). What is more, as noted in the literature, presenting different perspectives on controversial and/or sensitive issues and discussing them brings additional benefits. Specifically, this practice encourages critical thinking among students, which is a fundamental aspect of democracy (see, e.g. Goldberg, Wagner and Petrović, 2019, p. 15; Jerome and Elwick, 2020, p. 224; Kello, 2016, p. 37; Miralles and Ibagón, 2022).

3.6. Humanizing Transnistria

In addition to employing the above rationality-based strategies, I also appeal to students' positive emotions, mainly empathy. In doing so, I humanize Transnistria, which is not so common in research on de facto states, including in my publications. Specifically, I tell students that Transnistria is not only an abstract geopolitical anomaly, or a more real object but with elites and external actors promoting their interests, but also home for ordinary people. I explain that although these people may have different (geo)political views, they share the same desire as my students to have a normal life for themselves and their children. However, they face many obstacles due to living in an unrecognized state, such as their documents not being internationally recognized. I demonstrate all this by telling personal stories and showing photos (for example, of people enjoying their free time) from my fieldwork in Transnistria. As noted in the literature, evoking empathy should decrease the level of controversy and sensitivity in a classroom (e.g. Goldberg, Wagner and Petrović, 2019, p. 15; Kello, 2016, p. 44–45; Ortega-Sánchez, 2022b, p. 5). However, at this point, I need to add that humanizing Transnistria may also bring undesirable results, as some students can interpret this as legitimizing and supporting Transnistria's separatist aspira-

tions. Yet, while I could use (as I have in the past) the adjective “so-called” before the names of Transnistrian institutions (or place them in quotation marks), as many de facto state scholars do to clearly show the lack of support for Transnistria’s separatism, I could not refer to “so-called human beings” (something that these scholars would not do either).

3.7. Introducing entertaining elements

Finally, although the Transnistrian topic is serious, I introduce entertaining elements to the class. I resort to humor when, for example, showing students a photo of four Transnistrian helicopters flying during a parade and telling them that they can see all the Transnistrian air force. I may even add that Transnistria is a superpower compared to Moldova, the latter having no air force at all (yet, these four Transnistrian helicopters are not in use any longer due to either their poor technical condition or destruction, which also softens military jokes during the times of crises). I also show Transnistrian banknotes and (metal and, curiously, plastic) coins to students. Then, I ask students to solve a riddle related to a poster (available at <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/706964>) used during the 2006 Transnistrian sovereignty referendum. It includes a photo of the front of a bakery kiosk with three bread loaves and information on the prices of the products sold, that is, a loaf (“HLEB 2 r.”) and a roll (“bulochka 3 r.”). It also includes slogans encouraging vote for Transnistria to gain internationally recognized independence and subsequently integrate/associate with Russia (instead of voting for Transnistria’s reintegration with Moldova). The riddle is how the photo of the front of the bakery kiosk was supposed to convince the Transnistrians to follow these slogans when casting their votes. The answer is not obvious for non-Transnistrians (I do not reveal it here, so that I can use this riddle in the future). By introducing entertaining elements, I try to ease possible tensions and create a supportive environment for discussing controversial and sensitive issues, as suggested by the literature (Johnson, 1990; Ortega-Sánchez, 2022b, p. 4; cf. Sætra, 2021).

CONCLUSIONS

Despite some anxiety when entering the classroom, I have never had a problem teaching about Transnistria. In other words, I have never experienced divisions between myself and the students, among the students, or negative emotions from the students. I believe this is due to the application of the aforementioned strategies

to teach about Transnistria as a controversial and sensitive issue. However, this may also be because students generally trust everything I say, which could be due to their limited knowledge about Transnistria and/or the high social status of academic teachers in Central and (pro-Western) Eastern Europe, where I work. This may also be because students simply do not share my perception and do not consider Transnistria a controversial and sensitive topic, which is generally the case as acknowledged in the literature (see, e.g., Goldberg, Wagner and Petrović, 2019, p. 22–24; Kello, 2016). Still, separate research is needed to plausibly identify the reason why I have no problem teaching about Transnistria. Despite having no problems during classes, I must point out that I was criticized for depicting Transnistria in a neutral and objective way when talking to some scholars and officials from Central and (pro-Western) Eastern Europe.

In my article, I discuss how to approach the teaching about Transnistria as a controversial and sensitive topic, which is likely to create divisions between myself and the students, as well as among the students, and which can evoke negative emotions in them. However, when teaching about Transnistria, I also experience divisions and negative emotions within myself. Such internal strife faced by teachers is also well acknowledged in the literature (see, e.g. Goldberg, Wagner and Petrović, 2019, p. 18; Ibañez-Etxeberria *et al.*, 2022, p. 85; Kello, 2016, p. 35). In other words, I experience how students from Central Europe and (pro-Western) Eastern Europe may feel. Consequently, I ask myself the question how to discuss Transnistria that sympathizes with Russia – a country that has invaded Ukraine, killed and wounded many innocent people, and forced many others to leave their homes (I personally witnessed the influx of war refugees as a resident of a region neighboring Ukraine)? My ultimate answer is that, despite experiencing divisions and negative emotions, I must do my utmost to adhere to the academic ethos of instruction in a neutral, balanced, and objective manner. What also helps me stay in this track is my understanding of the historical experience and geopolitical situation of Transnistria (the point is that Transnistria regards Russia as its savior and defender), and the Transnistrian authorities keeping a low profile when it comes to the Russo-Ukrainian war (see Foster, 2024).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Axyonova V. and Lozka K. (2023), 'We Are at War': Reflections on Positionality and Research as Negotiation in Post-2022 Ukraine, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, no.4, pp. 711–721, <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-023-00297-z>.

- Blakkisrud H. and Kolstø P. (2011), *From Secessionist Conflict Toward a Functioning State: Processes of State- and Nation-Building in Transnistria*, *Post-Soviet Affairs*, no. 2, pp. 178–210, <https://doi.org/10.2747/1060-586X.27.2.178>.
- Caspersen N. (2012), *Unrecognized States: The Struggle for Sovereignty in the Modern International System*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Chaban N. and Headley J. (2023), *Responsibility Not to Be Silent: Academic Knowledge Production About the War Against Ukraine and Knowledge Diplomacy*, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, no. 4, pp. 733–747, <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-023-00300-7>.
- Colbey R. (2022), *The Status and Recognition of Post-1992 Transnistria: An Investigation of the Case for de jure Independence*, London: The University of Buckingham Press.
- De Facto States Research Unit (DFSRU) (2023a), *Dynamics of Frozen Conflicts under Scrutiny: Producing and Delivering Knowledge (Program of a Pre-conference Workshop)*, 11 June, Tartu: The University of Tartu.
- De Facto States Research Unit at (DFSRU) (2023b), *Newsroom: A Pre-conference Workshop*, 11 June, Tartu: The University of Tartu, <https://www.defactostates.ut.ee/newsroom/> [accessed: 9.05.2024].
- De Facto States Research Unit (DFSRU) (2024), *About Us*, 9 May, Tartu: The University of Tartu, <https://www.defactostates.ut.ee/?lang=et> [accessed: 9.05.2024].
- Devyatkov A. and Kosienkowski M. (2013), *Testing Pluralism: Transnistria in the Light of 2011 Presidential Elections*, [in:] M. Kosienkowski (ed.), *Spotkania polsko-moldawskie: Księga poświęcona pamięci Profesora Janusza Solaka* [Polish-Moldovan Encounters: The Commemorative Book for Professor Janusz Solak], Lublin: Episteme, pp. 303–328.
- Foster S.D. (2024), *“Pridnestrovie for Peace”: Accounting for Transnistrian Divergence From the Russian Position vis-à-vis the Russo-Ukrainian War*, *Peace Review*, no. 1 (special issue), pp. 115–129, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402659.2024.2311691>.
- Geldenhuis D. (2009), *Contested States in World Politics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goldberg T., Wagner W. and Petrović N. (2019), *From Sensitive Historical Issues to History Teachers’ Sensibility: A Look Across and Within Countries*, *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, no. 1, pp. 7–38, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2019.1566165>.
- Hoch T. and Kopeček V. (eds.) (2020), *De Facto States in Eurasia*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ibañez-Etxeberria A., Albas L., Gaskue S. and Vicent N. (2022), *Education and Controversial Topics in Post-conflict Societies: The Coexistence and Memory Project in Contemporary Teacher Training in the Basque Country*, [in:] D. Ortega-Sánchez (ed.), *Controversial Issues and Social Problems for an Integrated Disciplinary Teaching*, Cham: Springer, pp. 81–98.
- Jerome L. and Elwick A. (2020), *Teaching About Terrorism, Extremism and Radicalisation: Some Implications for Controversial Issues Pedagogy*, *Oxford Review of Education*, no. 2, pp. 222–237, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2019.1667318>.
- Johnson H.A. (1990), *Humor as an Innovative Method for Teaching Sensitive Topics*, *Educational Gerontology*, no. 6, pp. 547–559, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0380127900160605>.
- Kello K. (2016), *Sensitive and Controversial Issues in the Classroom: Teaching History in a Divided Society*, *Teachers and Teaching*, no. 1, pp. 35–53, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1023027>.
- Ker-Lindsay J. (2022), *De Facto States in the 21st Century*, [in:] *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*, pp. 1–13, 28 January, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.635>.
- Komarnitskiy G. (2006), *Мина замедленного действия* [Мина замедленного действия/A Time Bomb], Tiraspol: Poligrafist.

- Kosienkowski M. (2009), *Ukraina wobec Naddniestrza* [Ukraine towards Transnistria], Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej.
- Kosienkowski M. (2010), *Naddniestrzańska Republika Mołdawska: Determinanty przetrwania* [The Pridnestrovian Moldavian Republic: Survival Determinants], Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Kosienkowski M. (2012), *Continuity and Change in Transnistria's Foreign Policy after the 2011 Presidential Elections*, Lublin: The Catholic University of Lublin Publishing House.
- Kosienkowski M. (2013), *Is Internationally Recognised Independence the Goal of Quasi-States? The Case of Transnistria*, [in:] N. Cwicińska and P. Oleksy (eds.), *Moldova: In Search of Its Own Place in Europe*, Bydgoszcz: Epigram, pp. 55–65.
- Kosienkowski M. (2014a), *Naddniestrze a bezpieczeństwo Ukrainy* [Transnistria and Ukraine's Security], *Securitologia*, no. 1, pp. 93–104.
- Kosienkowski M. (2014b), *Ukraine and Transnistria*, *New Eastern Europe*, 29 September, <https://www.neweasterneurope.eu/2014/09/29/ukraine-transnistria-troubled-borderland/> [accessed: 9.05.2024].
- Kosienkowski M. (2018), *Współpraca społeczności międzynarodowej z państwami de facto: Studium przypadków* [International Community's Engagement with De Facto States: The Study of Cases], Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Kosienkowski M. (2020), *The Patron-Client Relationship Between Russia and Transnistria*, [in:] T. Hoch and V. Kopeček (eds.), *De Facto States in Eurasia*, Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 183–207.
- Kosienkowski M. (2022), *The 2006 Sovereignty Referendum in Transnistria: A Device for Electoral Advantage*, *Ethnopolitics*, no. 5, pp. 496–516, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2021.1953317>.
- Kosienkowski M. (2023), *Four Problems of De Facto State Studies: A Central European Perspective*, *Polish Political Science Yearbook*, no. 1, pp. 41–53, <https://doi.org/10.15804/psy202244>.
- Kosienkowski M. and Dembińska M. (2024), *Russia's Patronage Over Post-Soviet De Facto States: Protecting Compatriots or Geopolitical Interest in Transnistria?*, *Geopolitics*, pp. 1–22, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2024.2329948>.
- Kosienkowski M., Schreiber W. and Hahn J. (2015), *Social Media in the Service of Territorial Reintegration in the post-Soviet Area*, [in:] W. Schreiber and M. Kosienkowski (eds.), *Digital Eastern Europe*, Wrocław: The Jan Nowak Jezioranski College of Eastern Europe.
- Kosienkowski M. and Ženková Rudincová K. (2024), *Client De Facto States and Quasi-Patrons: Insights From the Relationship Between Somaliland and Ethiopia*, *Ethnopolitics*, no. 2, pp. 152–172, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2022.2121470>.
- Kursani S. (2021), *Reconsidering the Contested State in Post-1945 International Relations: An Ontological Approach*, *International Studies Review*, no. 3, pp. 752–778, <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viaa073>.
- Lowe P. (2015), *Lessening Sensitivity: Student Experiences of Teaching and Learning Sensitive Issues*, *Teaching in Higher Education*, no. 1, pp. 119–129, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2014.957272>.
- Miralles P. and Ibagón N.J. (2022), *Historical Thinking and Controversial Issues in Social Studies Education*, [in:] D. Ortega-Sánchez (ed.), *Controversial Issues and Social Problems for an Integrated Disciplinary Teaching*, Cham: Springer, pp. 65–80.
- Niens U., O'Connor U. and Smith A. (2013), *Citizenship Education in Divided Societies: Teachers' Perspectives in Northern Ireland*, *Citizenship Studies*, no. 1, pp. 128–141, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2012.716214>.
- Ortega-Sánchez D. (ed.) (2022a), *Controversial Issues and Social Problems for an Integrated Disciplinary Teaching*, Cham: Springer.

- Ortega-Sánchez D. (2022b), *Teaching Controversial Issues and Social Problems from an Integrated Perspective*, [in:] D. Ortega-Sánchez (ed.), *Controversial Issues and Social Problems for an Integrated Disciplinary Teaching*, Cham: Springer, pp. 1–8.
- Ó Beacháin D., Comai G. and Tsursumia-Zurabashvili A. (2016), *The Secret Lives of Unrecognised States: Internal Dynamics, External Relations, and Counter-Recognition Strategies*, *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, no. 3, pp. 440–466, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2016.1151654>.
- Pegg S. (1998), *International Society and the De Facto State*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Pegg S. (2017), *Twenty Years of de Facto State Studies*, [in:] *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*, pp. 1–30, 27 July, <https://www.oxfordre.com/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-516> [accessed: 10.04.2022].
- Quaynor L.J. (2012), *Citizenship Education in Post-conflict Contexts: A Review of the Literature*, *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, no. 1, pp. 33–57, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197911432593>.
- Sætra E. (2021), *Discussing Controversial Issues in the Classroom: Elements of Good Practice*, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, no. 2, pp. 345–357, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2019.1705897>.
- Socor V. (2019), *Transnistrian Voting Raid: A Bad Precedent for Moldova and Other Conflict Theaters*, *Eurasia Daily Monitor*, no. 33, <https://jamestown.org/program/transnistrian-voting-raid-a-bad-precedent-for-moldova-and-other-conflict-theaters/> [accessed: 29.10.2024].
- Stitzlein S.M. (2022), *Divisive Concepts in Classrooms: A Call to Inquiry*, *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, no. 6, pp. 595–612, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-022-09842-8>.
- Stradling R. (1984), *The Teaching of Controversial Issues: An Evaluation*, *Educational Review*, no. 2, pp. 121–129, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013191840360202>.
- Zembylas M. and Bekerman Z. (2012), *Teachers' Views about Forgiveness in Israel and Cyprus: Mapping the Prospects of Forgiveness as an Educational Goal*, *Educational Review*, no. 1, pp. 99–114, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2011.578733>.

NAUCZANIE O PAŃSTWACH DE FACTO W CZASACH KRYZYSU NA PRZYKŁADZIE NADDNIESTRZA

Streszczenie

W niniejszym artykule dzielę się swoimi doświadczeniami z nauczania o jednym z państw de facto, Naddniestrzu, w czasach kryzysu oraz w środowisku środkowo- i wschodnioeuropejskim i wielokulturowym. Rozpaczynam od wyjaśnienia, gdzie i kiedy uczyć o Naddniestrzu, co może nie być oczywiste, ponieważ jest to wąski temat. Następnie koncentruję się na tym, jak podchodzę do nauczania o Naddniestrzu jako kwestii kontrowersyjnej i drażliwej, która wymaga specyficznego podejścia dydaktycznego. Na koniec omawiam wyniki zastosowania tego podejścia i dzielę się swoimi odczuciami związanymi z nauczaniem o Naddniestrzu. Artykuł ten może być wartościowy dla młodszych nauczycieli akademickich, którzy niedawno rozpoczęli nauczanie o Naddniestrzu i innych de facto państwach i potrzebują wskazówek. Może również zainteresować doświadczonych nauczycieli, oferując im możliwość porównania swoich strategii nauczania.

Słowa kluczowe: Naddniestrze; państwa de facto; dydaktyka; tematy kontrowersyjne; tematy drażliwe