

## **Contribution of Tatar Intelligentsia in Defence of National Identity in 20<sup>th</sup> Century Russia.**

**\*Dr. Shahla Manzoor**

### **Abstract**

The current article, "Contribution of Tatar Intelligentsia in Defence of National Identity in 20<sup>th</sup> Century Russia", discusses about the role of Tatar Cognoscenti in defending National identity in the period belonging to pre- and post-Soviet Russia. It discusses mainly about the era after the establishment of Tatar ASSR in 1920 C.E. This article highlights prominent historians, political figures and intellectual of the era and also discusses about their contribution in the struggle for defending National Identity, both in verbal and documented form.

**Key words:** Tatar, Soviet, Russia, National and Tatar intellectuals.

Following the establishment of the Tatar ASSR in 1920 C.E., the Tatar identity continued to evolve in the same direction as in the preceding period. By the mid-1920s, the "Tatar" identity had become dominant in ethnic terms<sup>i</sup> and, in Tatarstan, the continuance of Sh. Mardjani's traditions became the primary focus of the intelligentsia's efforts.<sup>ii</sup> However, the concept of Tatar identity was retained by emphasising the unique role played by Bulghār heritage. To begin, such an attitude was common among historians who represented Muslim circles,<sup>iii</sup> but some Russian authors who worked in the republic throughout the 1920s adopted a similar stance.<sup>iv</sup> On the one hand, the latter researchers' orientation in structures may be explained by the influence of various theories characteristic of Soviet historical science during the period.<sup>v</sup> At the same time, the fact that the Tatar ASSR was founded within constrained boundaries should be considered, since the Bulghār historic and cultural heritage appeared unusually great in the influenced minds of the intellectuals at that level of historical knowledge.

At the turn of the 1920s and early 1930s, the more or less liberal growth of Tatar society came to an end. Not without cause, mufti R. Fakhreddinov stated in his historical book (1932): "One cannot write about, much less ponder about, the present age." If Allah's will be done, we will record this in Paradise".<sup>vi</sup> Nonetheless, two major ideas of national identity, namely Tatar and Bulghāro-Tatar, coexisted in mutual rivalry during the 1930s. By analysing the original variant of the "Altynchach" libretto for the historical opera, written by poet M. Djalil in 1935-1936 C.E. and based on the epic narrative Zhikmargan", it was possible to discern a negative relationship with Kazan Khans due to the Golden Hordes' origin.<sup>vii</sup> Of course, we can see the class attitude here as well, which was usual for the period, as khans were viewed as "oppressors" of the populace. However, such an image may have been created as a result of the author's passion for the Bulghar-Tatar idea. At the same time, there was the Tatar conception of nation-building through which the Tatar identity was developed. A prominent example is the 1940 C.E. printing of folk epos in

Kazan. N. Isanbet, a folklorist and writer who compiled the publication's combined text, provided extensive and historical commentary on the Golden Horde. These annotations offered a favourable reading of the history of this significant Tatar mediaeval state.<sup>viii</sup>

Consequently, even under the most difficult socio-political conditions of the 1920s and 1930s, the national intelligentsia attempted to maintain the nation's historical "extent" by expanding on earlier concepts of Tatar identity. Since the 1940s, large-scale actions to alter the Tatars' national identity have been undertaken<sup>ix</sup> on the basis of the newly formed Bolshevik imperial ideology in the USSR.<sup>x</sup> Stalin's totalitarian administration appeared to have intended to exploit the breakout of Russian patriotism brought about by the war of 1941-1945 C.E. for its own objectives. Its objective was to stifle the emergence of national self-consciousness among the Tatars through intellectual and organisational means, particularly among the intelligentsia,<sup>xi</sup> who tended to reject imperial claims to universal control over thought.<sup>xii</sup> Beginning in 1944 C.E., the ratification of many parties' documents<sup>xiii</sup> and the subsequent organisational steps oppressing the Tatar intelligentsia proved the sincerity of Communist constructivists' aims.<sup>xiv</sup>

On 9 August 1944 C.E., the Decree of the CC of ARCP (b) was instructed to expunge the Golden Horde from national history. The primary objective of communist ideology was to "eradicate" the Tatar-Russian contradiction that existed implicitly during the Golden Horde's history, to the point of almost transforming Kazan Tatars into Russian allies in their war against a "shared" enemy, namely the Golden Horde. Indeed, this measure was geared against the identity that Tatar ideologists had established over a long period of time. Indeed, each section constructed by intellectuals during the writing of the national history of identity had acquired special significance; as a result, it could not be arbitrarily "removed" from the already legitimised historical chain without jeopardising the integrity of national self-consciousness.

In the meantime, alongside the prohibition on include the Golden Horde period in national history, the USSR emphasised a particular aspect of the Bulghāro-Tatar conception, which, despite its extreme narrowness, became the official conception for Tatarstan's national science in the 1940s. Other party publications (1948, 1952 C.E.) stated a rejection of the progressive phase of Tatar history, which was manifested in a negative attitude toward Islamic reformation in Tatar society, dubbed Jadidism. Jadidism was condemned as a counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie nationalistic movement advocating nationalism, Pan-Turkism, and class harmony within the Tatar country.<sup>xv</sup>

It is possible that during the 1940s and 1950s, communist officials in the USSR were preoccupied with transforming the Tatars into a "proletarian" country incapable of experiencing the normal phase of national liberation movement associated with the bourgeois stage. However, this explanation is insufficient. I believe that the political elite of the USSR faced a more complex issue, namely depriving Tatar intellectuals of the

opportunity to reconceive these views of Jadidism,<sup>xvi</sup> and thus of the entire national history of the bourgeois period, which were shaped during Stalin's period, and prohibiting them from including its recent past in the Tatars' historical consciousness. Given that the Tatars' national identity was formed at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, and particularly as a result of the efforts of Jadidi intellectuals,<sup>xvii</sup> the desire of communist ideologists to make the Tatars forget this critical stage of nation building should be interpreted as an effort to abolish modern identity.

Under these circumstances, the Tatar intelligentsia, notably scientists, had concentrated their efforts on opposing Moscow constructivists' creations. Thus, not all Tatar historians agreed with the hierarchical frames of interpretation for Tatar history. In 1951 C.E., on the front pages of the key historical newspaper "Voprosy istorii," an illustrative debate between Kazan historian Kh. Gimadi and ethnic Tatar M. Safarghaliev, a Golden Horde specialist who worked abroad, took place.<sup>xviii</sup> The former defended the Bulghār origins of the Tatars, a view that became official in the republic's history, while the latter highlighted the issue of the role of Turk tribes during the Golden Horde period in the establishment of the Tatar nation. Behind what appeared to be a purely academic dispute between two historians were actually significant issues concerning Tatars residing outside Tatarstan and the explanation of the Tatar mediaeval state system.

Due to the denial of the Golden Horde's role in Tatar history, serious difficulties arose in the preparation of textbooks for institutions of higher education (this edition was titled "History of Tatar ASSR") and manuals for local lore studies in schools regarding the explanation of Tatar identity formation. The authors' perspective in the textbooks was shaped, as was characteristic of historiography from the 1940s to the 1970s, by external "affectation" and dictation of Tatar identity and its later intensification (in the 17<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> century or even later).<sup>xix</sup> Such statements could be found in nineteenth-century school textbooks: "...The Mongols were dubbed Tatars by the Russians. They afterwards introduced [this ethnic name] to the Bulghārs. Around the turn of the nineteenth century, descendants of the Bulghārs and other Turk peoples began to refer to themselves as Tatars".<sup>xx</sup> Simultaneously, it was emphasised in methodological aids for history educators: "Pupils must understand that the Kazan Tatars as a nationality bear no resemblance to their Mongol-Tatar invaders except for their name. The Bulghārs were later given the name "Tatars".<sup>xxi</sup> Even in the late 1970s, when the level of democracy in the USSR was vastly higher than during Stalin's reign, the Golden Horde remained a forbidden subject for Tatar historians in many ways.<sup>xxii</sup>

Nonetheless, beginning with Khrushchev's "thaw," significant changes were seen in the USSR's historical science, most notably an increased emphasis on the Golden Horde's past. The release of M. Safarghaliev's work "Decay of the Golden Horde" in 1960 C.E., despite its provincial location, was a manifestation of new scientific concepts. Despite its flaws, this work exemplified the continuation of the legacy of national historical sciences. Later,

in the 1960s and 1970s, various publications in Tatarstan lay the groundwork for new approaches to historiography. To begin, there were works on Tatar ethnic history that aided in the formation of a broader knowledge of national history, including its territorial dimension. Second, a slew of fundamentally historical and connected research appeared (monographs by M. Usmanov, W. Khakov, F. Waleev, R. Fakhrutdinov, and A. Mukhadamiev, among others).<sup>xxiii</sup> Additionally, they made major claims for studying Tatar history throughout the Golden Horde and late Golden Horde periods. However, until the mid-1980s, Tatar historians adopted the paradigm of national identity developed by national Bolshevik (imperial) ideologists in mass editions of history textbooks for institutions of higher education and schools. As previously indicated, resistance to this strategy was largely conducted inside the boundaries of academic science.

This scenario began to alter during M. Gorbachev's Perestroika period, when the national Tatar movement gained momentum.<sup>xxiv</sup> As a result of the debate over an ethnic name that began in 1987-1990 C.E., during which clashes occurred in the periodical press and mass media between those who favoured the term "Tatars" and those who preferred "Bulghārs," two ideological streams developed among Tatarstan's historians: "Bulghārists" and "Tatarists." The latter, in the person of its more moderate wing, adopted the Turko-Tatar theory of the Tatar nation's ethnic history<sup>xxv</sup> and began to play a significant role in the preparation of history textbooks, effectively reviving the old tradition of identity construction dating all the way back to Sh. Mardjani. They imposed severe restrictions on those national historians who attempted to write Tatar history in the former spirit in the mid-1990s. Finally, despite the existence of so-called Bulghārists in science, who occasionally appear in the field of textbook preparation,<sup>xxvi</sup> a significant role in the writing of national history has been played by proponents of the Turko-Tatar theory, which defines the Golden Horde stage as critical in the formation of the mediaeval Tatar ethnos.<sup>xxvii</sup>

For a lengthy period of time (practically until the early 1980s), the bourgeois phase of Tatar history was interpreted in accordance with the 1948 C.E. and 1952 C.E. decrees. Though later textbooks for institutes of higher education (1968, 1973, and 1980 C.E.) included a covert acknowledgement of the beneficial features of the liberal-bourgeois Jadidists wing's work, such as their campaigns for national schools, linguistic equality, and consciousness freedom.<sup>xxviii</sup> Issues of Muslim reformation in Tatar society were completely ignored in schoolbooks of local lore studies. Due to its complexity and considerable political constraints, it was supplanted by the feature of so-called "democratic education," i.e., from all national Tatar organisations, at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth century; its "positive" aspects were emphasised from a Communist perspective. Typically, the most significant part of democratic enlightenment activity has been emphasised, namely its proclivity for introducing its own people to "progressive" Russian culture (at times, both Russian and foreign culture). Nonetheless, in some editions of schoolbooks, theses from editions for institutions of higher education are included, describing the "reactionary" Tatar bourgeoisie, which, along with the Muslim clergy, raised in the spirit

of "Pan-Turkism," desired that the Tatars "follow the Turks' example, with all aspects of their lives entangled in Islam," and so forth. There is little doubt that, having been educated through these types of schoolbooks, the majority of Tatar society lacked a thorough understanding of their own bourgeois period until the mid-1980s.

However, in the 1940s, the first attempts were made among Tatarstan's scientists to legalise Jadidism through its consideration as a stage of enlightenment.<sup>xxix</sup> Simultaneously, or slightly later, semi-official historians criticised this position.<sup>xxx</sup> However, the growing emphasis on historical heritage, which was characteristic of Tatar society in the 1960s and 1970s and coined the term "mirasizm" by American historian E. Lazzerinin, ultimately encouraged the "repair of forgotten past, protection of ethnic identity".<sup>xxxi</sup> Demand for the restoration of national history's integrity resulted in the 1970s reintroduction of Jadidism into historical writings, albeit under the garb of enlightenment.<sup>xxxii</sup> Already during that period, it was evident to the uninformed spectator that in reviving national consciousness, the Tatar intelligentsia would not confine itself to cultural concerns, but would also raise the problem of the Tatar nation's participation in the country's political processes.<sup>xxxiii</sup>

In the second half of the 1980s, changes in public consciousness led to a gradual interpretation of Jadidism in the works of Tatarstan's academics as an ideological embodiment of the bourgeois-democratic movement at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Tatar society.<sup>xxxiv</sup> Despite the fact that Jadidism was viewed as a stage of enlightenment, the primary distinctions between the first and second were highlighted.<sup>xxxv</sup> After that, researchers began to identify Jadidism explicitly as the stage of nation construction.<sup>xxxvi</sup> Finally, in the 1990s, Tatar intellectuals fundamentally reverted to the 1920s Tatarstan interpretation of Jadidism. This, in turn, is consistent with the view of contemporary international historians who examine the Jadidist movement against the backdrop of Tatar bourgeois reformation in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>xxxvii</sup>

Academic circles' changing perspectives on this period of history resulted in the revision of Jadidism interpretation in national history textbooks. Thus, in recently published Tatar language textbooks for higher education institutions, the terms "educational" and "Jadidist" are used interchangeably, whereas Sh. Mardjani is regarded as one of the most renowned leaders of the Tatar reform movement. Jadidism is considered a continuation of education, as well as a reformative movement or one of the trends of the Tatar national struggle, in a new schoolbook issued in 2001 C.E.<sup>xxxviii</sup> Jadidist political projects (national and cultural self-government, "Idel-Ural" state) are interpreted as attempts to establish a Tatar national state inside the confines of federal Russia.<sup>xxxix</sup>

All of this indicates that, despite the incomplete representation of contemporary Tatar historians' conceptions in Tatar history schoolbooks, old stereotypes about specific aspects of Tatar society's development at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, introduced to history by Communist ideologists, have been broken in these new editions. Thus, the



totalitarian regime in the USSR's attempt to change the Tatar national identity, which had been developed over several generations of intellectuals, met with complete failure. The Tatar intelligentsia, particularly historians, played a critical role in the struggle against Communist- Bolshevik constructivists. They were the ones who initiated the struggle for national identity, which included significant Muslim components, from the start of Gorbachev's Perestroika; and who, over the course of a decade or more of post-Soviet transformations, essentially destroyed imperial-Communist structures and restored the magistral line of Tatar identity, as stated by the foremost Tatar "nation builder," Sh. Mardjani.

---

<sup>i</sup> Ishaqov D. M., *Istoricheskaya demografiya Tatarskogo naroda (XVIII -nachalo XX veka)*, Kazan, 1993, p.21; Idem, "Etnicheskoe razvitiye Volgo- Ural'skikh Tatar v XV -nachale XX veka", *Dissertatsiya v vide nauchnogo doklada na soiskaniye uchenoi stepeni doctora istoricheskikh nauk*, M.,2000, p. 96; *Tatary*, M.: Nauka, 2001, p. 152; Ishaqov D. M., *Tatary: kratkaya etnicheskaya istoriya*, Kazan,2002, pp. 4-5, 44.

<sup>ii</sup> Above all, history textbooks for the senior school by prominent Tatar historian G. Gubaidullin (Gaziz), *Istoriya Tatar ("Tatar tarikhy")*, which were published three times in the 1st half of the 1920s (See: *Tatar tarikhy*, Gubaidullin G., *Tarikhy sakhifalar achylganda. Sailanma asarlar*, Kazan, 1989, pp.55-195 bb; Gaziz G., *Istoriya Tatar*, M., 1994), may serve as reliable · proof. Close opinions · may be discovered among Tatar emigrants (Battal G., *Kazan Torkilare*, Kazan, 1996. Work was composed in 1922-1923 in Finland and published in 1925 in Turkey; Ishaqi G., *Idel-Ural*, Paris, 1933) and some Russian authors, who worked in Tatarstan (See; Vo.robeyev N.I., *Material'naya kultura Kazanskikh Tatar (opyt etnograficheskogo issledovaniya)*, Kazan, 1930, pp. 21-22).

<sup>iii</sup> For instance, see recently published manuscript of mufti R. Fakhretdinov on history of the Tatars, completed in 1932 r. (Fakhretdinov R., *Bolgar wa Kazan toreklare*, Kazan, 1996, pp.35-36, 49 bb).

<sup>iv</sup> Firsov N.N., *Chteniya po istarii Srednego i Nizhnego Povolzh'ya*, Vyp. 1-2, Vtoray izdanie, Kazan, 1921; Idem., *Proshloe Tatarii (Kratkii nauchno-poularnyi istoricheskiy ocherk*, Kazan 1926; Khudya kov M., *Musul'manskaya kultura v Srdnem Povolzh'ye*, Kazan, 1922; Idem, "Ocherki po Istarii Kazanskogo khanstva"; Kazan, 1923.

<sup>v</sup> Here the Influence of Marr's "Japhetic" theory, which issued from indigenous origin of people, is referred to. (Izmailov I.L., "Istoricheskoe proshloe kak faktor natsional'noi mobilizatsii", *Edinstvo Tatarskoi natsii*, Kazan, 2002, p.65)

<sup>vi</sup> Fakhretinov, R., *Bolgar*,58 b.

<sup>vii</sup> Dlalil M., "Altynchah, Opera echen librettolar", *Asarlar*, vol. 2, *Shigyr'lar (1941-1944)*; *Librettolar*, Kazan, 1976, 251-322 bb.

<sup>viii</sup> "Tatar khalyk dastany ldegai, N. Isanbat Zhyinalmasy", *Sovet adabiyaty*, 1940, No. 11(November), pp. 39-76; No. 12 (December), pp. 36-98.

<sup>ix</sup> For more details see: Bordugov G., Bukharaev W., *Natsional'naya istoricheskaya mysl v usloviyakh sovetskogo vremeni, Natsional'niye istorii v sovetskom i postsovetskom gosudarstvakh*, M., 1999, P. 21-73; Izmailov I., "Tomanga Torelgan tarikh", *Miradj*, 1992, No. 7, pp. 67-74.

<sup>x</sup> See: Ishaqov D., Izmailov I., "Chernoye" postanovleniye, ili o dukhovnom genotside protiv tatarskogo naroda", *Tatar ile*, 1991, No. 10; Ishaqov D., Izmailov I., "Aisbergi proshlogo", *Tatarika*, Kazan, 1992, pp. 20-26; Sultanbekov B., "Idegi, Stalin i nashe vremya", *Tatarstan*, 1992, No. 7-8, pp.32-47; Ishaqov D. M., *Rol' tatarskoi intelligentsii v formirovanii i sovremennom funktsionirovanii natsional'nogo samosoznaniya Tatar, Sovremennye natsional'niye protsessy v Respublike Tatarstan*, Vyp. II, Kazan, 1994, pp. 5-26; Izmailov I. "Ne dano marksistkoi otcenki Zolotoi Orde", *Gasyrlar avazy (Eho vekov)*, 1996, No. 3/4, pp. 96-114; Ishaqov D. M., *Problemy stanovleniya i transformatsii Tatarskoi natsii*, Kazan, 1997, pp. 92-99, 194-205.

<sup>xi</sup> It is evident from the public appearance of Z. I. Muratov, secretary of Tatar regional committee of ARCP (b) at the meeting of Party activists on 18 September 1944, who noted, "the work in ideological and political training of the intelligentsia was not organised" (Ishaqov D. M. *Rol*, p. 15).

<sup>xii</sup> See: Lipkin P. Bukharin, "Stalin i "Manas", *Ogonek*, 1989, No. 2, pp. 23-24.

<sup>xiii</sup> It is said of the decree of CC of ARCP (b) of 9 August 1944, "On state and measures to improve mass-political and ideological work in the Tatar Party organisation" and two decrees of the Tatar regional committee of ACP(b), "On textbook of the Tatar literature for the 8<sup>th</sup> grade of secondary school" (2 September 1948), and "On mistakes made in the textbook of literature for the 8<sup>th</sup> grade of the Tatar secondary school" (18 January 1952). Regarding its texts see: KPSS v rezolyutsiakh i resheniyakh, koferentsii i plenumov SK, vol. 6, 1941-1954, M., 1971, pp.113-120; *Islam v Tatarskom mire: istoriya i sovremennost' (Materialy mezhdunarodnogo simpoziuma, Kazan, April 29-May 1, 1996)*, Kazan, 1997, pp. 354-356, 361-364.

<sup>xiv</sup> History of this action is described in number of publications, which are listed in footnote 10. Besides, for documental materials see: "Gasyrlar avazy" (*Ekho vekov*), 1996, No. 3/4, pp. 84-95, 101-114; *Islam v Tatarskom mire*, pp. 338-378.

<sup>xv</sup> *Islam v Tatarskom mire*, p. 362.

<sup>xvi</sup> Now it is well known that the Tatar intelligentsia, starting from the 1940s, was trying to "legalize" Djadadism by means of making "equalisation" between enlightening, which was accepted by Bolshevistic ide- ologists, and Djadadism, which was disagreeable for them, (See: *Ibid*, p. 371, Also on this account see: Batyev S. G., *Tatarskii Jadidizm i ego evolutsia, Istoriya the USSR*, 1964, No.4, p. 53).

<sup>xvii</sup> *Tatary*, pp. 144-152.

<sup>xviii</sup> Safarghaliev M., "Odin is spornykh voprosov istorii Tatarii", *Voprosy istorii*, 1951, No. 7, pp. 75-80; Gimadi Kh., "O nekotorykh voprosakh istorii Tatarii", *Voprosy istorii*, 1951, No. 12, pp. 118-126.

<sup>xix</sup> See: Zakiev M. Z., *Problemy yazyka i proishozhdeniya volzhskikh tatar*, Kazan, 1986, pp. 66, 102-103; Karimullin A., *Tatary: etnos i etnonim*, Kazan, 1988, p. 118.

<sup>xx</sup> Abdrashitova I., *Istoriya Tatarskoi ASSR. Uchebnoe posobie po krayeveeniyu dlya 7 i 8 klassov*, Kazan, 1964, p. 15.

<sup>xxi</sup> Litvin A. L., Ustyuzhanin E. I., Khamitov G. I., *Krayevedenie v shkole (Istoriya Tatarskoi ASSR), Metodicheskoe posobiye dlya uchitelei*, Kazan, 1967, p. 9.

<sup>xxii</sup> Ishaqov D. M., *Problemy stanovleniya*, pp. 92-94, 203.

<sup>xxiii</sup> For more details of these works see: Ishaqov D., "O kontseptual'nykh problemakh Tatarskoi istoricheskoi nauki i zadachakh zhurnala "Tatarica", *Tatarica*, 1997-98, No.1 (winter), pp. 2-12.

<sup>xxiv</sup> Ishaqov D. M., "Sovremennoe Tatarskoe natsional'noe dvizheniye: podyem i krizis", *Tatarstan*, 1993, No. 8, pp. 25-31; Idem, *Sovremennyyi natsionalizm Tatar; Tatar Millate: utkane, bungengese, kilachage (Tatarskaya natsia: proshloye, nastoyashchee, buduushchee)*, Kazan, 1997, pp. 31-58.

<sup>xxv</sup> The divide between "moderate" and "radical" Tatarists passed along the line of estimation of Bulghār heritage: if the former recognised significant participation of Bulghār component in forming of the Tatar nation and its culture, the latter denied it or considered it insignificant.

<sup>xxvi</sup> Ishaqov D., *Rol nauchnoi intelligentsii v formirovanii natsional'nogo samosoznaniya Tatar (1940-1990-e)*; Ishaqov D. M., *K 50-letiy so dnya rozhdeniya i 30-letiyu nauchnoi deyatelnosti*, Kazan, 2001, PP. 69-84.

<sup>xxvii</sup> For instance, see: *Tatars*, pp. 43-44, 64- 100.

<sup>xxviii</sup> *Istoriya Tatarskoi ASSR (S drevneishikh vremen do nashikh dnei)*, Kazan, 1968, p. 236; *Istoriya Tatarskoi ASSR*, Kazan, 1973, p. 80; *Istoriya Tatarskoi ASSR*, Kazan, 1980, pp. 79, 81.

<sup>xxix</sup> *Islam; musul'manskaya kultura v Srednem Povolzh'ye*, Kazan, 2001, p. 123.

<sup>xxx</sup> *Ibid*, p. 122.

<sup>xxxi</sup> Lazzerini Ed. "Tatarovedenie and the "Newe historiography" in the Soviet Union: revising the interpretation of the Tatar-Russian relation- ship", *Slavic reviu*e, vol. 40, n. 4, 1981, pp. 625-635.

<sup>xxxii</sup> See: Abdullin Y.G., *Tatarskaya prosvetitel'skaya mysl*, Kazan, 1976; Idem, *Jadidizm, ego sotsial'naya priroda i evolyutsia, Iz istorii Tatarskoi obshchestvennoi mysli*, Kazan, 1980, pp. 79-81.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> Lazzerini Ed., "Ethnicity and uses of history: The case of the Volga Tatars and jadidism" *Central Asian survey*, vol. 4, n. 2, 1984, pp. 87-98.

<sup>xxxiv</sup> Abdulin Y.G., *Burzhuazno-demokraticheskie dvizheniya rubezha XIX-XX vekov i ego ideologicheskoe vyrazhenie, Jadidizm, Obshchestvennyia i filosofskaya mysl' v Tatarii nachala XX veka*, M., 1990, p. 16.

<sup>xxxv</sup> Abdullin Y. G., *Jadidizm sredi Tatar: vozniknovenie, razvitie, istoricheskoe mesto*, Kazan, 1998.

<sup>xxxvi</sup> Ishaqov D. M., "Jadidizm kak natsiistrotel'stvo", *Imam nury*, 1996, No. 4, pp. 20-27; Idem, *Fenomen Tatarskogo Jadidizma: vvedeniye k sotsiokul'turnomu osmysleniyu*, Kazan, 1997; Idem, *Problemy stanovleniya*; Idem., "O tatarskom Jadidizme v svyazi s diskussiyey o ego sushchnosti", *Musa Bigiev, Musa, Miras ham khazarge zaman. Khalykara fanni konferentsiya materiallary*, Kazan, 2000, pp. 148-157.



---

<sup>xxxvii</sup> *See literature review: Islam i Islamskaya kul'tura, pp. 122-128.*

<sup>xxxviii</sup> *Sabirova D. K., Sharapov, Ya. Sh., Vatanybyz tarikhy (In boryngy chor, XX gasyr akhyry), Kazan, 2001, 177 b.*

<sup>xxxix</sup> *Istoriya Tatarstana, Uchebnoya posobiye dlya osnovnoi shkoly, Kazan, 2001, pp. 259-261, 292.*