



SOCIAL MENTALITY AND RESEARCHER THINKERS JOURNAL

Open Access Refereed E-Journal & Refereed & Indexed

ISSN: 2630-631X



Social Sciences Indexed

www.smartofjournal.com / editorsmartjournal@gmail.com

August 2018

Article Arrival Date: 10.06.2018 Published Date: 23.08.2018 Vol 4 / Issue 10 / pp:192-207

Post Imperial Experience Of National Building On The Post-Soviet Territory (An Example Of Kazakhstan)

Bibigul Iliysovna IMANBEKOVA

Kazakh State Women's Teacher Training University, 050000, 99, str. Aiteke Bi, Almaty/Kazakhstan

Zhazira Zhaylaubekovna KUANYSHBAYEVA

Kazakh National Technical University named after K.I. Satpayev, Satpaev st., 22a, Almaty/Kazakhstan

Sandugash Zhaynbaykizi IMANBAYEVA

Kazakh State Women's Teacher Training University, 050000, 99, str. Aiteke Bi, Almaty/Kazakhstan

ABSTRACT

This article gives the detailed analysis about the experience of national rebuilding of Kazakhstan after dissolution of the Soviet empire in the Post-Soviet territorial conditions. And it became actual issue in terms of experience of the Republic of Kazakhstan. About the former Soviet republics under the imperial experience of national development, the following phenomena are considered in the article. Firstly, the national policy of the Soviet Union is the continuity of many elements of an ethnic course of Russian empire. Secondly, it was the circumstance which dissolved the Soviet Union and because of opposition of its non-Russian ethnic groups to imperial character of the Soviet national policy, consciousness of Russian ethnic groups, its leadership in social structure of the Soviet there revealed new research aspects.

Accordingly, the attempt of designing of the nations is realized by post-imperial experience of national building in article on the post-Soviet territory in conditions of "a post imperial syndrome» of Russian Diaspora. All these phenomena were most distinctly shown in experience of national building of Kazakhstan after its independence. The purpose of the article is to analyze the post imperial syndrome in the republic of Kazakhstan and Russian influence is one of the primary factors of interfering national consolidation of the Kazakh society for the development in its interethnic harmony.

Key Words: National value, interethnic relations, ethnic groups, the national policy, national policy of Kazakhstan.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the given article, one of the basic problems is the consideration of the basic intrinsic characteristics of the Soviet national policy as historical-political continuity of an ethnic significance of Russian empire. Consideration of this issue allows us to understand many problems which are accompanied, both to the dissolution of Soviet Union, and experience of addition of the nations-states on the post-Soviet territory.

It is necessary to notice, that in a modern science there is widespread opinion, that the USSR was not an empire in classical understanding of sense of this term. We adhere to the opposite point of view. The Soviet Union in all parameters of the political device was a great empire.

The Soviet national policy – a heiress of an ethno policy of Russian empire

It is necessary to notice, that many of the above-stated signs of the imperial device of the USSR were widely considered in due time during the conference 'History of empires: comparative approaches in research and teaching' which was organized on June 7-9th, 2003 in Moscow. Practically all participants of the given conference revealed obvious continuity between various elements of political systems of Russian empire and the Soviet Union.

Firstly, the USSR was hetero-ethnic, the state with the extensive ethnic peripheries operated from one centre when interests of the state development prevailed over public interests.

Secondly, ethnic peripheries of Soviet Union was based on strengthening not only hallows of all states, but, first of all, its motherland and its centre – Moscow city.

Thirdly, greater parts of history of the USSR were based on the collective monarch-emperor in the name of the Political bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Thus the empire was occurred during an epoch of total authoritarianism under the name of I. Stalin.

As one of the main distinctive lines, the bases bearing structure of all political system of the USSR, Russian ethnos – the basic carrier of the Soviet imperial spirit acted to the full. It was shown during the Great domestic war of Soviet Union with Nazi Germany when the Soviet ideological machine began to maintain actively for victory achievement of many elements of the historical past of Russian empire. During this period all basic elements of the Russian victories of A. Nevskogo, Peter I, A. Suvorov, M. Kutuzov and other signs of the formation of the Russian empire for the first time have been put forward. Especially it became realistic in struggle for Moscow – one of the main historical centres of Russia. It is quite obvious, that mobilization of patriotic spirit of Russian people – the main support in war with Germany and its allies became a natural basis of such unprecedented step. And it was clear, because after a gain a Racial-fascist coalition practically happened in all all territories of Belarus, Ukraine and Baltic. The basic theatre of operations has been transferred on territory Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republics (RSFSR).

It is said, that this war became critical in promotion of Russian ethnic group, its culture on supervising positions in political system of Soviet Union. So, Russian failed to take a priority place in an ethnic card of Soviet Union not only because on the basis of Russian culture, but the Soviet culture was formed. Russian ethnic group also was a natural support of the power of the centre of the USSR – Moscow where the Russians, accordingly, dominated. As correctly marked by R.Sushi: ‘the Essence of relations between the centre and republics consisted in submission of non-Russian periphery ‘Russian’, (mother countries ... are more exact Soviet) as internal policy parameters were pawned in Moscow’ (Sushi 2004: 194).

Thus, the Soviet empire on the basic intrinsic parameters was the successor of Russian empire. There upon we will notice, that the known American historian SeimurBekker considered that the Soviet federation was formed on an ethnic basis, veiled heteroethnic revival of the centralized Russian empire (Becker 2000: 341).

Therefore, the non-casual Soviet national policy began to borrow all basic lines of an ethnic course of Russian empire. In concrete facts can be shown in the following facts.

First, in Soviet Union the policy of russification of its non-Russian ethnic group was carried out. It has poured out in scale development of Russian formation to the detriment of development to formation on non-Russian training. (For example, we will notice, that in capital of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Alma-Ata during the late Soviet time was only one school in the Kazakh language of training.) In the Soviet society, dialogue practice exclusively in Russian when the use in public places of languages of non-Russian ethnic group was considered as feeling of a bad form widely extended. Moreover, active use of non-Russian ethnic language elements and support of it, could serve in nationalism charge (in Soviet Union ‘nationalism’ it was understood exclusively in negative tone as display of Antirussian chauvinism).

Secondly, the principle of absorption was privately supported by Russian of ethnic suburbs of Soviet Union. It was expressed in mass movement of Russian in union republics, distribution of marriages of representatives of Russian ethnic group with representatives of local ethnic groups.

2. DISCUSSION

In connection with the aforesaid the policy of Russian empire becomes quite obvious in assimilation of non-Russian ethnic groups with similar characters of the Soviet national policy. As S.Bekker specifies, Russian empire unlike the European empires aspired to absorb and assimilate the colonial peripheries (Becker 2000: 333). In the Soviet Union, the policy of private assimilation was realized, most likely, in the tideway of the communistic ideology. It was noticed in the construction of brotherly

communicative communities which was the ultimate goal. In this regard, Mark symptomatically notices that the main aim was the creation of a Soviet person who doesn't accept racial, ethnic and religious distinctions (Mark 2004: 140). And in this policy of Russian people, probably, the role of a consolidating kernel was taken away. It was known in the hymn of Soviet Union. Here was sung about consolidating role of Russia.

At the same time, the Soviet national policy promoted the development of the non-Russian ethnic components to a certain degree. The Soviet national policy has spent national-territorial delimitation which has led finally to occurrence of modern outlines of the majority of the states of the post-Soviet territory. In this regard S.Bekker legally specifies the considerable strengthening of national identification of the Soviet republics at the expense of the Soviet national policy (Becker 2000: 341). And it was based on the Constitution of Soviet Union. In article № 36, 1977, the Constitution: there were told about the equal rights in the USSR among 'various races and nationalities'. However, in same article, it is underlined the necessity of 'an all-around development and rapprochement of all nations and nationalities of the USSR, education of citizens must be in the spirit of the Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism' (The constitution of the USSR, 1977). Frankly speaking, the ultimate goal of the Soviet national policy is – washing out of ethnic distinctions on the basis of socialist internationalism as has been underlined. This proves the assimilation of ethno cultural elements of ethnic groups of the USSR by communistic ideology. Thereupon it is represented, that the communistic ideology has allowed the Soviet national policy to combine universal and national values. And as a natural basis of the given process Russian ethnic groups acted, assimilative roles of Russian ethnic groups in the Soviet national policy of the historical continuity with Russian empire for which assimilative absorption of non-Russian ethnic group was usual practice as seen.

As the Russian historian shows Zaionchovsky P.A . , last two decades in Russian empire the guarding policy of 'orthodox conservatism' and 'great-power' approach to the rights of non-orthodox Russian ethnic group (Zaionchovsky 1970: 117). It is echoed by the Russian researcher of the Russian ethnic group national policy Teplouhova M.V. noticed, that the policy of cultural-language justification in Russian empire had started to be formed in the end of XIX century. The given scientist specifies that from now on concerning 'foreigners', or not natural submission instead of a policy of integration the policy segregation and discrimination began to be realized. And imposing all 'foreigners' of Orthodoxy and its mentality (Teploukhova 2011: 144).

One of the basic elements of social stratification is the ethnic accessory. For hetero-ethnic societies of Russian empire this thesis acts as the basic. In the beginning of the Soviet Union, the Russian society everything, except Slaves, was called foreigners. At the same time, it is necessary to notice, that the status 'foreigner' in relation to a measure coordinated with non-orthodox confederacy (Sikevich 1999: 30). Nevertheless, foreigners were named as a whole, not a Slavic origin of inhabitants of imperial Russia. According to item 1208, 5th section of the code of laws about conditions of Russian empire, foreigners are Jews, aboriginals of Siberia, Kalmyks, Kazakhs, Kirghiz, Uzbeks, mountaineers of the North Caucasus both other tribes and nationalities (Set of Laws of the Russian Empire 1857).

As we see, the status of 'foreigners' possessed, accordingly, and Kazakhs. Moreover, throughout practically all time of the finding as a part of Russian empire Kazakhs were named not under their true name and as Kirghiz-Korsakov, or simply Kirghiz. That is already the name Kazakh was a cardinal discrepancy. In this case, the scornful relation of Russian to ethnic history of Kazakhs was somehow displayed. The neglect to ethnic structure Russian ancient societies, thus, was articulated already at level of scientific community. Not casually, for example, in the encyclopedic dictionary published in Russia in 1898 to ethnic structure of Russian empire as one of the least quantities of the information, only 22 lines (Russia 1991: 65). Thus, social stratification of the Russian society in many respects was under construction on the basis of an ethnic inequality when 'foreigners', as a matter of

fact, were limited in many civil rights. Basically this conclusion corresponds to widespread perception of ethnic stratification as universal ethnic inequality (Sikevich 1999: 29-30).

‘Foreigners’ in Russian empire have been essentially limited in the rights in comparison with representatives of Russian ethnic groups. For example, in Russia in 1887, the quantity of Jews in educational institutions, on public service, by the right of a residence, and also a freedom of movement (Diky 1994: 20-21) were legislatively limited.

The relation to non-Russian as to defective citizens of Russian empire in many respects was created from widespread Russian ethnic groups of a various sort of ethno phobias. In the article Gatagova are considered the facts and factors taking place to be ethno phobias of Russian concerning Poles, Germans, Jews and other ethnic groups of Russian empire. For example, it shows that in consciousness of Russian people after expansion of the Polish national-liberation movement the external and internal image of the Pole began to be formed in negative tones of an ethno phobia. This process of opposition of ‘stranger’ at level of ethno phobias as it shows, promoted ethnic consolidation of Russian. And ‘stranger’ was not out of empire, and in it. And it was actively stimulated with an official ethno national policy of Kremlin (Gatagova 2003: 135-150).

Such segregative character of Russian autocratic ethno policy should cause counteractions from ethnic peripheries of Russian empire. In the country national-liberation movement, including Kazakhstan began to extend. In the Kazakh steppes revolt under A.Imanova's command in 1916 became the most scale national-liberation movement it represented, that growth of national-liberation movement became result of infringement ‘difficult balance of forces and counterbalances of a huge building polyconfederation to the Russian statehood. Fair irritation policy of the authorities, more and more designated opposition between supporters of updating and conformists in the Russian Muslim environment coincided with difficult, ambiguous enough processes of awakening of the Islamic world outside Russia’ (Vasilev 2001: 25).

And national movements in the Russian periphery in turn caused strengthening of a policy segregation and discrimination of the Russian imperial centre concerning them. Teplouhova M. V specifies that the policy segregation, discrimination concerning non-Russian in Russian empire was reaction to the Antirussian national movements. Accordingly, most strongly the policy segregation and discrimination was carried out in the Polish, Ukraine, Lithuania and Belarus Kingdoms. It caused active resistance among wide ranges of the population of these colonial suburbs of Russian empire, issued in national movements (Teploukhova 2011: 141-143). Teplouhova M.V. also noticed, that growth of the national movements issued in a political cover, were used subsequently by the Bolsheviks, which still have to do ‘the rate on oppressed national minorities as the ally of proletariat in a preparing socialist revolution’. Thereon, it specifies that the aggravations of sociopolitical position of Russia in February, 1917 led to movement growth on national self-determination of its people (Teploukhova 2011: 143-144).

In Kazakhstan at this time, national self-determination in the form of an autonomy leader of Kazakh party ‘Alash’ was widely supported. In December, 1917, a general Kazakh congress was held in Orenburg for the creation of the first autonomy in Kazakhstan – ‘the Alashsky autonomy’ with creation of its government in the person the Alash-horde which has existed since December 1917 till March 1920 when it has been liquidated by Bolshevik Revolutionary-military committee on management of the Kirghiz edge was initiated.

Thus, Russian empire collapsed in many respects thanks to movements for national self-determination of the ethnic group entering into its structure. In many respects, these national movements became reaction to the ethnic policy of Russian empire which is not considering various interests of its ethnic peripheries. The same reasons accompanied the disorder of the Soviet Union.

Disorder of Soviet Union as consequence of inferiority of the Soviet national policy

The Consideration of inferiority of the Soviet national policy as one of the main reasons of the splitting of the USSR is practically standard phenomenon in the numerous bibliographies on this theme. But in given article it is considered as some other aspect of this problem. As it has been shown above, the Soviet national policy was directed finally on the deletion of ethno cultural and ethno language originality of non-Russian ethnic group in the USSR. Yes, the ethnic course of Soviet Union was based on a principle of development of its ethnic groups. But practical realization of this policy actually conducted to russification of ethnic peripheries of Soviet Union. In its unreasoned character of the Soviet national policy, it was shown that in greater measure was showed on a decline of the USSR by Gorbachev M.S's former assistant, Chernjaev A.S. The management of the USSR at that time has been ideologically broken and had no clear representation about essence and priorities of national building necessary for the Soviet society. It specifies that among a management of Soviet Union 'there were the illusions which have passed in self-deception that the ethnic question inherited from tsarism, basically is decided that the objective aim for serious international contradictions disappeared, and led to backlog from a course of events, delay with decision-making' (Cohen 2007: 7, 8).

These miscalculations in the ethnic policy of the Soviet central management resulted to the still basis for the interrelated conflict in the USSR. Ethnic elite began to declare the rights in Moscow. At the beginning, it became hidden and implicit, for example, during sad events in December, 1986 when Moscow made the forcible decision instead of D.Kunaeva decided to direct to operate KAZSSR Kolbina G.V. – Russian on an ethnic accessory. It has led to occurrence in December, 1986 of an ethnopolitical conflict in capital KAZSSR of Alma-Ata in which tens of persons suffered. After these events ethnic elite of peripheries of Soviet Union began to support actively various national movements in the republics, supporting national self-determination.

The considerable role of ethnic elite in the Soviet political process became possible, thanks to the specific recruitment ruling elite of Soviet Union. For hit in the Soviet ruling elite of the second and third echelon, it was unessential to be the representative of Russian ethnic groups. Practically from the formation of the USSR in a management of republics on places representatives of local ethnic elite widely participated. On the removal, for example, from a post of head KAZSSR Kunaeva D., the Kazakh on an ethnic accessory should cause discontent in the Kazakh society.

In the Soviet Union, the central ruling elite of the first echelon consisted basically of the Russian and Russified representatives of other ethnic groups. To it, the sociopolitical status of Russian was the highest in an ethnic cut of the Soviet society. At this time began prestigious rank for Russian to marry Russian. This state of affairs tried to fix up at legislative level, having accepted it on April, 24th, 1990 'About languages of the people of the USSR' which established Russian as official (state) language of the USSR.

At the same time after the 'reorganization' in the beginning when revaluation of the settled ideological basis of Soviet Union began, radical ethnicity in union republics began to leave on the first positions in identification of ruling elite. In some Soviet republics recruiting ruling elite on the basis of representatives of radical ethnic groups began even before 'reorganization' started.

In particular, D.Kunaev processed homo-ethnicity ruling elite of Kazakhstan when Kazakhs began to dominate gradually among administrative and managerial shots of republic. In many respects it occurred thanks to D.Kunaeva's strong positions in the structure of the highest level of ruling elite of the USSR. As is was known, D.Kunaev was a member of the Political bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU who was, as a matter of fact supervising an ideological body of Soviet Union. It managed to reach in many respects thanks to friendship with the Secretary General of the CPSU, Brezhnev L.I.

Nevertheless, in the middle of 1980s, the ethnic accessory had no great value for advancement on a social ladder. Subsequently, after the beginning of "epoch" of publicity in days of reorganization when the ideological skeleton of the USSR started to be loosened, 'ethnicity in the form of the ethnic status becomes an essential element of social differentiation while the ideological inequality loses the value in finding of higher social position' (Sikevich 1999: 30). Thereby decrease in a role of communistic ideology in ethnic stratification, designing of the Soviet person, the society became one of the main reasons of strengthening of ethnic elite of the Soviet republics. Thanks to it, in the Soviet republics, the power gradually began to be supervised by local ethnic elite.

As a result of strengthening of ethnic elite of the Soviet republics led to easing of the power of the centre. In our opinion, process of disintegration of the USSR began at this moment. Russian researcher Vorozhejkina I. considered type societal developments of Russia as state- centralization a matrix. She understands the central, operating role of the state as such type of development in formation of social, economic and political relations (Vorozheykina 2001: 5). We believe that such type of societal developments is inherited not only to the majority of the Post-Soviet states, but also characterized by the essence of the political device of Soviet Union. To its easing of the power of the centre of the USSR of Moscow has led to shaking of all bases of its political device.

Actually, the presence of the strong centre operating ethnic peripheries is one of the main signs of empire. Thereupon, S.Bekker, when he noticed the power of the centre of the USSR and its legitimacy weakening, the imperial periphery was transformed to the states-nations (Becker 2000: 341). In our opinion, legitimacy of the centre weakening not only because of infringements of balance in ruling elite and imperfection of an official ethnopolitical policy. Its weakness is also because the great-power imperial status of Russian and their primordial centre began to lose the importance in the opinion of ethnic suburbs in the person first of all their elite. And to support this, the conflict in December, 1986 in Alma-Ata showed it ethno political inherently.

The conflict in Alma-Ata was ethnopolitical not only because in this case was counteraction to an ethnic course of the imperious allied centre. In this conflict, opposition of the Kazakh youth to attempts by Russian to play a key role in management of Kazakhstan also was showed. (In this case the ethnopolitics is understood by us not only as a course of the states concerning ethnic groups, but also as political activity of ethnic groups for the purpose of protection of the ethnic interests.) No casualty in a threshold of the given conflict and after it, especially in Alma-Ata, was observed a high tension in mutual relations of Kazakhs and Russians. The conflict in December, 1986 in Alma-Ata was ethnopolitical by nature as far as is not casual. As we have shown above, the Soviet national policy was inherently undemocratic – struck at the ethno cultural rights of non-Russian ethnic groups of the USSR. At the beginning of democratization which was carried out within the limits of 'reorganization' promoted scale revival of national values of the Kazakh ethnic groups. The most essential tool of easing the bases of imperial consciousness, the device of political system is democratization of public mutual relations and political process. That is open expression of the national interests by representatives of Kazakhs in December, 1986 which became possible thanks to the democratic beginning in Soviet Union.

According to R.Inglhartu and. K.Veltselju (that is, apparently, one of the main senses of their joint work 'Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy'), values are the rarities which are not designed by ideologists, and arising in reply to inquiries of the population at sensation of the shortage of these values (Inglehart 2011). It most action was observed in days of reorganization in the USSR. Such moods of the Soviet society were most accurately put in the early nineties by the known singer V.Tsoy. The following are words in the song: 'We wait for changes; changes are demanded by our hearts'. All of this led to that already before disorder of the USSR search of new national values began. The main things among which became – national self-determination, the national sovereignty and independence.

Distribution of democratic values have specified to non-Russian ethnic groups of Soviet Union in equality of their rights with the rights of Russian in an ethnic card of the Soviet society. Earlier it was shown that Russian possessed the highest status in ethnic hierarchy of the USSR. It has led to that Russian in Soviet Union were the basic carriers of the Soviet imperial consciousness. The significant amount of Russian before and after disorder of the USSR, according to numerous sociological interrogations is not casual, continued to identify itself with the Soviet empire. In particular, during the closed interrogations of the All-Union centre of study of public opinion. in 1986 it was found out, that 78% of Russian respondents considered themselves Soviet, and Russian – only 15%. In the end 2000th as Russians in Russia. 42% of the interrogated Russian considered the others – Russians as Soviet (Sherbakova2009: 127).

In this plan the direct historical continuity between a place and a role which was played by Russian ethnic groups in Russian empire and Soviet Union is looked through. John Darwin in article 'Empire and Ethnicity' has in detail considered communication ethnicity and accessories to empire in the course of identification. And he has noted inherently this fact and Asia on which considerable part of it was created and thrived by real Russian, and then Soviet empires (Darwin 2010).

Thus, Russian was a uniting kernel of the Soviet society of Soviet Union. There it is clear, that when the leader of RSFSR Eltsin B.N. began to act in favour of secession of the USSR, it became one of solving steps on the disorder of this powerful empire. Interrelated friction in the centre of the Soviet empire in aggregate with growth of movements for national self-determination of ethnic peripheries of Soviet Union led to its transient disorder. And as E.Smith in a Russian translation of the book 'Nationalism and Modernism specifies. A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism': 'After disintegration of Soviet Union that they represent 'the nations' oppressed before in empires or federations' (Smith 2004: 12).

Thereby the ethnic climate of the Soviet society became the solving contribution to the disorder of the USSR. Thereafter, it is represented, that the understanding of the nature ethnicity in the Soviet society became a fundamental basis of growth of national movements, national consciousness in Soviet Union after the beginning of democratization process.

In Soviet Union among wide ranges of the simple people the understanding of the nature ethnicity in the spirit of primordialism was the most widespread. As Russian researcher Murtuzaliev S.I. marks, it became possible because in 1938, the rule of definition of an ethnic accessory on parents without dependence from a cultural and language accessory was entered. In his opinion, this principle 'imposed to people representation ... about ethnic relationship as 'relationship by birth'... about certain steady 'national spirit' which ostensibly remained at people irrespective of language and cultural changes'. According to Murtuzaliev S.I. such understanding of the nature ethnicity has opened road to negative ethnonationalism (Murtuzaliev 2010: 114).

In Soviet Union xenophobic moods were extended widely enough. In 1989, about 20% of the interrogated Soviet citizens open ethnophobia was inherent. Approximately from 6% to 12% of the Soviet citizens depending on residing region expressed aggressive ethnophobia moods. In areas of interethnic conflicts, these moods were observed at more than 90% interrogation. After only a year the aggressive and open ethnophobia characterized from 35% to 40% of the Soviet citizens. Thus such moods were mostly widely extended in the countries of Baltic, Transcaucasia, Central Asia both the western Ukraine and Moldova (Sherbakova2009: 119). That is, in those Soviet republics where the greatest growth of national consciousness was observed, value of national interests. The elite of the given regions, accordingly, actively maintained national moods of the fellow citizens, focusing attention to necessity of revival of cultural and other originality of the title ethnics. At sight, Gudlova.L. pointed the fact that also influenced growth of negative ethnonationalism in the given regions (Gudkov 2004: 180).

Negative ethnonationalism and xenophobic moods opened road to large-scale interethnic conflicts in the Soviet Union, in such places as New Uzen, Upland Karabakh etc. These conflicts showed fragile national consolidation Soviet society. The Soviet national policy, pursuing a policy of absorption, assimilations ethnicity communistic ideology under supervising role of Russian ethnic groups, made two main strategic errors:

The first error consisted in misunderstanding of that fact, that among ethnic groups of Soviet Union, the perception of the ethnicity as primordial formations dominates. The second error consisted in infringement of the ethnocultural rights of ethnic groups of the USSR to the detriment of ethno cultural and ethno political positions of Russian ethnic groups. Finally, in our opinion, these errors led to an inconsistency of the project of construction of the Soviet nation and liberation of powerful negative and positive ethnonationalism. In this aspect not to dominate subsequently on the post-Soviet territory, there was casually an ethnonational approach in national building.

F.Gerts somehow noticed, that the modern nations-states are the former empires which have succeeded in business of consolidation of different ethnic groups in the uniform nation (Hertz 1944: 154). as if in a counterbalance to this thesis assert, that in turn disorder such empire as Soviet Union, the experience of its national policy became a motility for national development of the former Soviet peripheries.

Designing of the nations on the post-Soviet territory in conditions of 'a post imperial syndrome' Russian diaspora

Finding of the sovereignty, independence of the former Soviet republics first has caused euphoria of emotions of their people. It was accompanied by wide popularity not only national values, but also a democratic way of the state development. And it is not casual, as national self-determination of republics of Soviet Union became possible in many respects, thanks to a wide circulation of democratic values in 'reorganization'. Probably, therefore the majority of the Soviet republics which have found independence have chosen a way of construction of the democratic states. The ruling elite of these states saw, that moods dominated in a society. But this euphoria has taken place not only because democratic transit of the majority of the countries of the post-Soviet territory and has not taken place, It has occurred also because actually construction of the high-grade national state in these countries also was not carried out these years.

Besides, transformation of economic systems on more post-Soviet territory has not led to substantial improvement of social and economic position of their citizens. Moreover, for the past after independence, many of these states had social injustice, wide stratification of a society on rich and poor became an everyday occurrence. Therefore, we will make digression to consideration of political moods of Russians as it is of interest for our research.

Within 20 years after the disorder of the USSR, Russia sociological gaugings of social, economic and political moods of Russians were seen. Following the results of it became known, that, for example, Russians in comparison with 2001 were very modestly estimated with such democratic values as 'self-expression in the politician', 'freedom of speech', 'multi-party system', 'free elections'. In 2001, such achievement of reforms of 1990's as a freedom of speech in estimations of Russians was on 2nd place, and in 2011 – already on 6th position (Analytic report 2011: 22-24).

In the given interrogation also it was found out, that negative social consequences of reforms were most strongly affected, according to the opinion of the majority interrogated, not on everyone, but at level of all society. Quite obviously, these data speak about the presence in Russia high level of social trouble (Analytic report 2011: 28). During this interrogation in 2011, accurate communication with sensation of injustice 'an event around' with feeling of shame of Russians-respondents for a condition of the country and comprehension of that, 'that also came to light to make it impossible' (Analytic report 2011: 67).

Researchers naturally come to conclusion, that such moods are a consequence 'of discrepancy of a reality with socio-cultural norms, widespread in all layers of Russians that also talk about processes of delegitimizing the authorities' (Analytic report 2011: 68). In other words, power activity ceases to satisfy universal and national values of Russians. Moreover, researchers sum up: 'Social intensity, latently while decaying in a society can suddenly be splashed out on the streets ... and it is connected with a socially-psychological condition of the population, instead of with any personal material interests' (Analytic report 2011: 73-74). And, according to researchers, these violent actions can be issued in a kind of 'nationalist performances' as communication with such moods of Russians somehow in this case is traced: 'People of my nationality for the last 15-20 years have lost' and 'all means for the good protection of interests of my people' (Analytic report 2011: 75).

According to sociological researches, in 1993, about 34% of the interrogated Russian considered, that non-russian are the main reason of all social troubles of Russia. And more than 54% of Russian respondents of all social strata believed, that the non-russian have in Russia a lot of rights and influence (Gudkov 2004: 206).

3. DISCUSSION

The above-stated data and conclusions about national moods of title ethnic groups of Russia prove to be true also by others sociological researches. So, it is believed (the All-Russia centre of study of public opinion), during the period of 1998 till 2002, the percentage of the Russians supporting the idea 'Russia for Russian' grew from 45% to 55% (Sherbakova 2009: 86). It is necessary to notice, that among adherents of the given idea, aged people of 18-30 years prevailed. Besides, the index of ethnic tolerance is lowest among respondents till 24 years – it is 2.6-3 times lower, than the aged people which are 40 years older (Sherbakova 2009: 106). These data tell us first of all that consolidation and mobilization of Russian society of Russia on the basis of ethnophobias will proceed further. No casualty in 2007, according to closed interrogations (the All-Russia centre of study of public opinion), 70 % of the interrogated Russian supported the slogan 'Russia for Russians' (Sherbakova 2009: 127).

In Russia, ethno phobias among Russians population were extended very widely. And they, most likely, have the roots in the past. For example, ethnophobias concerning Chechens who actively circulate now in Russian society were in it even before the first Russian-Chechen war from 1994-1996 (Sherbakova 2009: 95). And Chechens are included into group of natives Caucasus in which relation of an ethnophobia have the general lines and are characterized, in particular terms like: 'the criminal inclined to terrorism', 'grows rich at our expense', 'despises people of other ethnics' etc. (Sherbakova 2009: 104-105).

And such negative ethnonationalist moods in Russia grew in strength from year to year. As Russian expert Zvereva G. marks Russian ethno nationalism from periphery of public consciousness displaced recently in its centre, becoming an ideological mainstream of the political validity of Russia (Zvereva 2005).

In Russia growth of negative ethno nationalism became a strong basis for distribution of violence concerning non-russian. So, in 2005, 435 persons became victims of skinheads, natives Caucasus, the Central Asia, etc. And all these actions of violent ethno nationalism began to turn to a system (Kozhevnikova 2006: 9). Thus, the negative ethnic group nationalism continues to remain one of the main basis of consolidation, mobilization of Russian society in Russia.

All of it should be reflected in the political process in Russia, its national policy. Xenophobia in Russia became one of the powerful electoral resources when candidates for various state bodies actively demonstrate negative ethno national ideas. The Support of negative ethnonationalism by the representatives of ruling elite of Russia was included into wide practice. For example, frequently, deputies of the State Duma of the Russian Federation act with various references, the requirements directed on infringement of the rights of representatives of non title ethnic groups of Russia. On

January, 19th, 2005, 19 deputies of the State Duma acted with the requirement to close the Jewish organizations of Russia, having accused them of Zionism. It is necessary to notice, that President Putin V.V. condemned this requirement only after a week (Kozhevnikova 2006: 23-33).

In Russia, we had two installations on nation construction – ethno national and civic which were realized. That is the Russian ruling elite, wide ranges of Russian ethnic group simultaneously support the nation construction by a principle of fellow citizenship and on the basis of Russian ethnic groups. Thus, among Russian elite the idea of a priority of ethno cultural and other interests of Russian ethnic groups in national building of Russia is actively exaggerated.

As Russian researcher Panov P. has shown, the discourse of the Kremlin is realized now in a channel ‘Russianness’ when Russian carry those who recognizes Russian cultural values in a special way in great historical mission of Russia. The co- citizenship in the politics of the Kremlin the given researcher considers the appeal, how aspiration absorbs other ethnic groups is capable to accept Russian culture (Panov 2001: 85). Moreover, as Russian researcher Cherbakova D.I. and Eltsine B.N said the ethnic course of the state was the reaction to national movements as Putin V. became the head of a corner of the politics of restriction of the rights of ethnic elite and maintenance of the rights of Russians (Sherbakova 2009: 86-87). Thus, the management of Russia, probably, tries to mobilize ethno national potential of Russian ethnic groups in realization of the geopolitical plans, including the restoration of the influence on the post-Soviet territory. In other words, the Russian ruling elite once again starts to play a card of revival of imperial Russia. In this plan Putin V. and Medvedeva D.A.'s Anti-American demarches are quite clear, for example.

Thus, the ruling elite of the Russian Federation in many respects promotes consolidation of Russian on the basis of negative ethno nationalism. It becomes implicitly concerning Caucasians, natives of Central Asia, and also concerning the countries of the Euroatlantic block in its display of an imperial syndrome reviving of Russia.

It is necessary to notice, that the transformation of the Soviet political system was associated mainly as familiarizing with political values of the West. But subsequently, from the middle of 1990, at least, in Russia moods about its uniqueness civilization development originality began to dominate. From now on, the majority of Russians, according to interrogation, ‘orientation on civilization originality was combined with traditional installations’ (Analytic report 2011: 155-156). Researchers as a whole came to conclusion that in Russia ‘revolution of values has come to the end for a long time’, but search ‘the new senses, new ideas’ political sense (Analytic report 2011: 158). In this sense the appeal of the Russian ruling elite lead to the necessity of revival of Russian originality which has imperial values which have deep roots in Russian ethnicity. According to the Swiss scientist Andy. Kappeler, imperial identity, imperial patriotism were very important factors of consolidation of Russian ethnic groups in all its social estates (Kappeler 1997: 179).

The above described moods of Russian ethnic groups of Russia should cause quick response and discontent first of all among radical ethnic groups of subjects in the Russian Federation. So, following the results of carrying out of focus groups in Tatarstan, it was found out, that the majority of its participants considered, that the ethno policy of the authorities of Russia is not considered with ethno cultural interests of title ethnic groups of the given republic (Shumilova2006: 140). InTatarstan, there are widely prevalent moods on national self-determination. And here the discontent with the federal centre – Moscow is regarded as the majority of ethnics in Russia (Sagitova 2006: 258).

The perception of Russian as imperial ethnic groups is often enough articulated in a non-russian information field. As Russian expert Kuznetsova A.B. marks, in due time, deportation of Chechens and Ingushs also was considered as power capture by imperial ethnos – Russian. Therefore, it shows, that from Russia the indigenous population of the Chechen Republic perceived discrimination of the Checheno-Ingush people more in a key of imperial expansion of Russia (Kuznetsova 2005: 125).

The facts considered earlier in a given article, say that the mobilization of Russian people at the expense of xenophobia, imperial values is the developed historical practice for Russia. Therefore, it is represented that the exact counteraction to Russian imperial ethnonationalism became the main characteristic of national self-determination and development of those Post-Soviet states where Russian diaspora had, or has great volume.

National values are formed on the basis of the model of the nation accepted by a society national ideology. In this case on the post-Soviet territory two approaches dominated. In the first approach, national values started with model of construction of the nation by a principle of fellow citizenship. In the second approach – on the basis of nation construction by an ethnic principle, that is on the basis of radical ethnic groups of the given state. The ruling elite of the majority of the Post-Soviet states aspires to the realization of the second model of national building. The first model took its root and takes root in territory of those states where there is no absolute domination of number of radical ethnic groups.

Though here there are deviations on for example Ukraine and such states of Baltic, as Latvia and Estonia. In these countries, absolute domination of title ethnic group is not observed, But the ruling elite of the given states also supports monoethnic, a sign of construction of the nations-states. At the same time in the given states, there is no accurately allocated legislatively issued orientation to nation construction to a monoethnic sign. But as a whole, the elite of the given states adheres to this principle and in every possible way introduces it in practice. In the given approach, national values are mainly any strategy of historical and cultural character of radical ethnic groups of these states.

Therefore, it is not casual in these countries periodically so-called ‘Russian question’. The main basis of it is the fact, that in these states, representatives of Russian ethnic groups make a significant amount. By data in 2011, in Latvia, the volume of radical ethnic groups was 62.1%, the others, accordingly, representatives of other ethnic groups, Russian among them were – 26.9%. In Estonia in 2010, Estonians was 68.8%, Russian – 25.5% (Kalabekov 2010). The title ethnic groups of Ukraine equaled to 77.82%, the ethnic generality of the given state was seconded by Russian – 17.28% (Pankov 2005). Periodic operation of Russian question in these countries also is provided with uneasy mutual relations with Russia. Besides, the aspiration of the given states to develop cooperation with the countries of the Euro Atlantic block restrains geopolitical plans of Russia. As a result, the set of these factors does not give possibility to elite these countries to realize the full plans on mono-ethnic to a principle of construction of the nations and, probably, compels them to articulate thoughts on necessity of construction of the nation by a principle of co-citizenship.

The situation in the field of national building in the above-stated countries is possible to tell, it is the characteristics of the majority of the countries of the post-Soviet territory. The example of Kazakhstan in this case is indicative. In the territory of Kazakhstan in an independence threshold in 1990, Kazakhs were 40.3%, Russian 37.6%, in 1992; Kazakhs reached 41.9%, Russian – 37%. And Russian prevailed in northern and northeast regions of the country (Zimovina 2003).

Besides, from researches, Kazakhstan is one of the most strongly exposed states to the process of russification of republics of Soviet Union. During Soviet time, and also as a part of Russian empire, the welfare space of Kazakhstan underwent a scale deconstruction by means of demolition of the basis – a nomadic way of life.

Meanwhile, the Kazakh national movement widely developed in a threshold of declaration of independence in Kazakhstan in the form of such organizations as ‘Azat’, ‘Zheltoksan’, etc. These movements, as a matter of fact, appealed to the necessity of construction of the nation of Kazakhstan on mono-ethnic to a sign. These ideas got the wide response among the Kazakh people. All it has led to was the promotion of legislative registrations of these ideas, especially when they have been supported by considerable circles of ruling elite which in the majority consisted of representatives of Kazakhs at this time. In the political process of the country to be demonstrated, there were actively

the ideas of the Kazakh ethnic groups nationalism directed on forced introduction of the Kazakh language, the Kazakh culture in the public validity.

4. FINDINGS

Since these years process of recruitment on public service has accepted mono-ethnic character. In many respects, it has been provided by a necessary condition of knowledge of a state language - the Kazakh language. In January, 1993, the first Constitution of Republic Kazakhstan which defined its statehood as 'statehood of the gained independence Kazakh nation' was accepted. About Russian status in the given Constitution it was not spoken words. That is, Kazakhstan has been officially proclaimed as the Kazakh nation-state. Most likely, this fact led to sharp increase in mass emigration of Russian from Kazakhstan, which begun after the declaration of independence. Years of intensive emigration of Russians as a whole left Kazakhstan more than 2 million people. As a result, many strategic Kazakhstan factories remained without qualified workers and engineering shots.

Probably, in this kind of problem in 1995, the next Constitution in which Russian received the status of officially used language in state and local government were accepted. Also in this current Constitution, the point on statehood of Kazakhstan as the Kazakh statehood was excluded. In this Organic law of the country, the point is on protection of ethno cultural and ethno language interests, the rights of all ethnic groups of Kazakhstan was entered. Also the interdiction for party's creation and the organizations of an ethnic and religious basis was entered. In the Same year, the Assembly of the people of Kazakhstan under which lies the cultural-national centers of some ethnic groups of Kazakhstan including Russian function was created. In total within the limits of Assembly of the people of Kazakhstan worked 22 republicans and regional national-cultural centres of some ethnic groups in Kazakhstan which united 470 regional, city and regional organizations.

As a whole now in our country which operates more than 100 national schools, 126 high schools where representatives of 15 ethnic groups who study the native languages. In 76 high schools, native languages are studied facultatively or in mugs. At schools of national revival, 29 branches study 11 languages of ethnic groups in Kazakhstan. Besides, 170 similar Sunday language centres function. Annually under the state order are issued more than 30 books in languages of ethnic minority of Kazakhstan in the general circulation of about 100 thousand copies.

But official declaration nation construction in Kazakhstan on a basis of co-citizenship became the main innovation in the interethnic sphere which has been put in pawn by the Constitution in 1995. Thus the Kazakh language, the Kazakh culture was declared by a cementing kernel of the Kazakhstan nation. The Concept of formation of the state identity of the Republic Kazakhstan became one of the concrete steps at first process of national building; national identification which was accepted on May, 23rd, 1996. According to this concept, it should be built on the basis of the principle of co-citizenship and continuity with traditional Kazakh statehood. In the same concept, it is directly said that models of statehood of Russian empire and Soviet Union were inherently imperial.

Recently, in 2010, the Doctrine of the national unity which proclaimed the construction of the Kazakhstan nation on a basis of co-citizenship, the general civil interests and values was accepted. About high level of democratic character of the given Doctrine speaks of its basic principles: 'One country – one destiny', 'the Different origin – equal possibilities' and 'Development of national spirit' (The doctrine of national unity of Kazakhstan. 2010).

As we see, in Kazakhstan good conditions for nation construction 'Kazakhstan' under a uniting role of the Kazakh language, the Kazakh culture was created. But this problem has not been reached – in the Kazakhstan society till now is not observed in any comprehensible level of national consolidation.

In many respects it has occurred for such objective reason – as low functionality of a state language of Kazakhstan – the Kazakh language. Numerous researches have shown that the Kazakh language

on applicability sphere, use level in daily practice continues to concede to Russian and cannot become national language of Kazakhstan (Aliyarov 2011).

Other objective factor interfering national consolidation of the Kazakhstan society is high level of interethnic intensity, conflictness in Kazakhstan. There are basis to believe, that interethnic relations in Kazakhstan comprises of the latent intensity which at certain coincidence of circumstances can be shown in open interethnic collisions. In favour of it, a number of researches showed the Kazakhstan experts. In particular, it shows quite proved research of the Kazakhstan centre of the humanitarno-political conjuncture, made in 2009 (Aliyarov 2010: 119-131).

It is necessary to notice, that in Kazakhstan, it is not accepted to see the reasons of interethnic conflicts, conflict situations in ethno political disagreements, cultural confrontation and ethno phobias. Probably, behind it there is a desire not to complicate the relation with the authorities which present the interethnic policy as the Kazakhstan know-how and consider interethnic sphere of Kazakhstan as one of the most stable in the world. Therefore, there is nothing surprising that the overwhelming majority of the Kazakhstan experts, analytical structures as a principal cause of the interethnic conflicts, taking place to be in Kazakhstan, and put forward the business factors ostensibly bound with shootouts.

Nevertheless, we believe, that primary factors of interethnic conflicts, interethnic intensity in our country welfare factors act. Then in our opinion, such phenomena are the conflict of social statuses and cultural values. Among Kazakhs position in a society, public respect and honour is strongly appreciated. These values stand above, than material. Also Kazakhs highly appreciate quiet tone, a quiet manner of speech of the interlocutor (Krysko 2002). Therefore when, someone starts to neglect these values, Kazakhs regard it as an insult. For example, the conflict between hired workers of the Kazakh and Turkish ethnic accessory at the oil and gas extraction enterprise in KarabatanAtyrausky area of Kazakhstan in 2006; the Kazakh workers got smaller wages for long and social privileges, than their Turkish colleagues. But this circumstance has not led to occurrence between them to a conflict situation. Though the given fact, certainly, cannot be dismissed. But it is only minor reason of the conflict. The main reason of the conflict was that Turkish workers behaved defiantly, scornfully and disrespectfully in relation to the Kazakh colleagues. As a result of this, it led to scale collision.

In connection with the aforesaid it represented, that the big influence on forcing of interethnic intensity, the general level of the relation of non radical ethnic groups in Kazakhstan to Kazakhs renders the relation of Russian Diaspora to the Kazakh statehood, culture and the Kazakh language. Allocation of this factor quite legally as Russian is the most functional in the Kazakhstan society. Besides, the Kazakhstan Russian from the very beginning of independence of Kazakhstan as if it acted as private competitors of Kazakhs in their birth right to the Kazakhstan territory and statehood. No casualty still in the early nineties in the Russian information environment, the project of transfer of some northern and northeast Kazakhstan areas where Russian population dominates, the structure of Russia was actively exaggerated. And in this factor, in our opinion, also the so-called post imperial syndrome of the Kazakhstan Russian which existed made negative impact on the general status not only the Kazakh language and the Kazakh culture, but also the statehood of Kazakhs as shown. We will cite the concrete data testifying to the presence of this syndrome among a significant amount of Russian in Kazakhstan.

So, for example, in 1991, 77% of the Kazakhstan Russian in Kazakhstan represented the native land - Soviet Union. Meanwhile, as among Russian of Baltic this indicator made 50–60% (Pope 2002). During sociological research of Institute of philosophy and political science of the Ministry of Education and Science of Republic Kazakhstan in July-August, 2007, it was found out, that about 23% of the interrogated Russian continued to consider it as the native land of the USSR.

Enough vigorous activity was conducted in Kazakhstan by Russian ethno political organizations, finding support among representatives of Russian ethnic groups in the republic. So, for example, in

the web site which worked till the end of last year, a site of Russians in Kazakhstan <http://www.russians.kz> interrogated about readiness of Russian was passed in spring of 2010 to live in 'the Kazakh republic' and to live under domination 'state of the Kazakh nation'. As a result from 7 453 voted 80 % and 5 972 persons opposed it. Probably, under pressure of the authorities – resulted to this interrogation to be erased.

Besides, as a result of sociological interrogations in different years, it was found out, that Russian possessed the lowest degree of readiness to be integrated round a kernel of the Kazakh culture among all other radical ethnic groups of Kazakhstan (Kharitonova 2008). Also it is necessary to note, that the Kazakhstan Russian show the lowest knowledge of the Kazakh language and aspiration it to study (Shaukenova).

5. CONCLUSION

To sum up we can draw conclusions as follows. In our opinion, unwillingness to learn the Kazakh language also will unite round the Kazakh culture caused by contradictions of social statuses of Kazakhs and Russians. Russian lost the former high status in a society when they were predominating the ethnic groups of Soviet Union. Kazakhs, on the contrary, found higher status in independent Kazakhstan. Thereby, there was a competition because of the status caused by the animosities under the relation to the competitor, neglecting its culture and language, as Russian consider themselves above in cultural-civilization development than Kazakhs. Also it is necessary to notice, that growth of negative nationalism, imperial moods in Russia which we have considered above, also made essential impact on the behaviour and motivation of Russians in Kazakhstan.

Thus, the post imperial syndrome of wide ranges of the Kazakhstan-Russian is one of the primary factors interfering addition of the Kazakhstan ethnic groups in reformed nation of the country, and also reducing level of the interethnic consent in the Kazakh society. Certainly, there are also other powerful reasons which are breaking national development in Kazakhstan. For example, such factor as a low level of democratization of the political system in Kazakhstan, interference of high-grade realization of the various rights and interests of the Kazakhs, including ethno political and ethno cultural aspects.

REFERENCES

1. Aliyarov, E.K., Mamiraimov, T.K 2010. *Inter-ethnic situation in the Republic of Kazakhstan: dynamics and trends in Kazakhstan: an annual report on the development of society and state (in 2009)*. Almaty
2. Aliyarov, E.K., Mamiraimov, T.K. 2011. 'Understanding 'language'. The analysis of a government program on the development of the Kazakh language', in *Kazakhstan: the annual report on society and state development (in 2009)*. Almaty; Mamiraimov, T.K., Belgibaev, S.T 2010. 'Language politics in the Republic of Kazakhstan: purposes and forecasts', in *Civil Foresight: a prospect in the future of Kazakhstan*. Almaty
3. Analytic report. 2011. *Twenty years of reforms in the eyes of Russians (experience of long-term sociological gaugings)*. Moscow: Institute of sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences
4. Becker, S. 2000. 'Russia and the Concept of Empire', *AbImperio* 3-4: 329-342
5. Cohen, C. 2007. '*the Question of questions*»: why was there no Soviet Union' (Translated from English). Moscow: AEPO-XXI.
6. Darwin, J. 2010. 'Empire and ethnicity'. *Nations and Nationalism* 16, 3: 383-401
7. Diky, A. 1994. *Jews in Russia and in the USSR*. Novosibirsk: Ringing of church bells

8. Gatagova, L.C. 2003. 'Crystallization of ethnic identity in the course of mass ethno phobias in Russian empire (2nd half XIX century)', in M.T.Stepanjants (eds.) *Religion and identity in Russia*. Moscow: Eastern literature
9. Gudkov L. 2004. *The negative identity*. Moscow: the new literary review
10. Hertz, F. 1944. *Nationality in History and Politics. A Psychology and Sociology of National Sentiment and Nationalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
11. Inglehart, P.,Veltset, K. 2011. *Modernization, cultural changes and democracy: the human development sequence*. (Translated from English). Moscow: New publishing house
12. Kalabekov,E.G. 2010. 'National Population Composition', in Kalabekov,E.G. *Russia and the Baltic states: Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia*.available at <http://kaig.ru/bal/nation95.pdf>
13. Kappeler, A. 1997. *Russia – multinational empire. Occurrence. History. Disintegration*. Moscow: Progress-tradition.
14. Kharitonova, H. 2008. 'In search of national idea', available at <http://www.ia-centr.ru/expert/1593> accessed on the 9th of July 2008.
15. Kozhevnikova G. 2006. 'Radical nationalism in Russia and its counteraction', contents in A.Verhovsky (eds.), *Russian nationalism: ideology and mood*. Moscow: Owl.
16. Krysko, V. 2002. *Ethnic psychology and ethnic relations: a course of lectures*. Moscow: Exam
17. Kuznetsova, A.B. 2005. *Ethno political processes in Checheno-Ingush ASSR in 1957-1990: consequences of deportation and the basic aspects of rehabilitation of Chechens and Ingushs*. The dissertation on scientific degree competition institute of Sciences. Moscow.
18. Mark von Hagen. 2004. 'Empires, suburbs and Diasporas. Eurasia as an antiparadigm for the Post-Soviet period', by Gerasimov I.V., Glebov S.V., Kaplunovsky A.P., (eds.), *New imperial history of the post-Soviet territory*. Kazan: the Center of researches of Nationalism and Empire
19. Murtuzaliyev, S.I. 2010. *Problem of identity of Caucasians and Russians*. Makhachkala: Formatand *religious identity in modern Russia*. Moscow: Publishing house of Institute of sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences *Set of Laws of the Russian Empire*. 1857. Tom the ninth. Saint- Petersburg: The typography of the second section in its own Imperial Majesty Office
20. Shaukenova, Z.K. 'language situation in Kazakhstan', available at <http://www.cessi.ru/index.php?id=169>
21. Sherbakova, D.I. 2009. *Stereotypes in the Russian-Chechen relations*. Rostov-on-Don: Publishing house
22. Shumilova, E.A., Khodjaeva, E.A. 2006. 'Feature of formation of the Russian civil identity of Moslems in Tatarstan', in Magun, V.S. (eds.), *Civil, ethnic and religious identity in modern Russia*. Moscow: Publishing house of Institute of sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences
23. Sikevich, Z.V. 1999. *Sociology and psychology of national relations*. Saint-Petersburg: V.A. Mihajlova's publishing house
24. Smith, A.D. 2004. *Nationalism and modernism*, in Smirnova A.V., Filippova J.M., Zagashvili E.S. (eds.), (translated from English). Moscow: Praxis
25. Sushi, R. 2004. 'Empire dialectics. Russia and Soviet Union', in Gerasimov I.V., Glebov S.V., Kaplunovsky A.P., (eds.), *New imperial history of the post-Soviet territory*. Kazan: the Center of researches of Nationalism and Empire

26. Teploukhova, M.V. 2011. 'Ethnonational policy in Russian empire XIX – the beginnings of XX centuries', *EcumeneMagazine*. Nakhodka: The Vladivostok state university of economy and service, findings 2: 139-144
27. *The doctrine of national unity of Kazakhstan*. 2010. Astana
28. Vasilev, M. (eds.). 2001. *Islam in Russian empire: Acts, descriptions, statistics*. Moscow: Academy books
29. Vorozheykina, T.E. 2001. 'The State and a society in Russia and Latin America', *Journal Social studies and the present* 6: 5-26
30. Zaionchovsky, P. A. . 1970. *Russian autocracy in the end of XIX century. Political reaction 80 - the beginnings of 90th years*. Moscow: Thoughts
31. Zimovina, E.P. 2003. 'Dynamics of number and structure of the population of Kazakhstan in the second half of the 20th century', *Demoskop Weekly*, 3 - 16 March.
32. Zvereva, G. 2005. 'Nationalistic discourse and network culture', *Pro et contra* 2 (29): 25-40