



Islamic Reformation Among Tatars Part 2: Transition From Ethno-Cultural To Political Nation

*Dr. Shahla Manzoor

Abstract

The current article entitled "Islamic Reformation Among Tatars Part 2: Transition from Ethno-Cultural to Political Nation", is the 2nd article among the two set of articles on Jadidism and is aimed to evaluate the period of evolution of Tatars from ethno-confessional to an ethnic identity. This paper provides useful insights into the cultural, social as well as political scenario among Tatars belonging to Volga-Ural region during this transformation. The article also highlights the intellectuals and historians of the area in discussion, whose contributions had direct impact upon the developing trends of the region.

Key words: Islam, Reformation, Tatars, Jadidism, Political Russia.

The Jadidi reformers took an active role in framing out the Tatar national identity. This development occurred throughout the 2nd half of the 19th Century and initial decades of the 20th Century. As for Russian observers, the variations that took place amongst the Tatars were quite perceptible. In actuality, authors of "The Revue of Muslim Periodical Press in the Russian Empire in 1910 C.E. and the Kazan Tatar Newspapers for June 1913 C.E." specify that the chief tendency of the Tatar intelligentsia, which is reflected in the periodicals, was a tendency to "surrender themselves to the inner tasks, to prepare the masses, and by creating a national spirit and with an idea of an all Muslim union as a political whole, based on a unity of faith, and 'With the gradual cultural rearrangement of Tatar society, to provide people with the best weapon to fight the Russian state system and influence the Russian environment".¹ In the resources of a specific consultation to work out approaches to resist Tatar-Muslim impact in Volga Region (1910 C.E.) it was also highlighted that "progressive Kazan Tatars actively attempt to unite the Russian Muslims on the basis of a would be religious tribal unity into one nation (Millat) with the artificial Turko-Tatar language".² In 1914 C.E. P.M. Boyarski, the governor of Kazan, highlighted an observation that "previously when asked what nation they belonged to a Tatar would answer the Muslim one," now they say "in Kazan's guberniya the inclination for the Muslim religious fanaticism is growing weaker and the tendency is to elevate the national character, thus creating a learning of Tatar nationalism and creating an independent Muslim culture".³ As one can observe, in this declaration, somehow, there is a course of evolution to ethnic (national) character. Though, such a transition turned out to be complex, primarily because of the obligation to overcome the Muslim identity which had been congenital from the medieval period.

Scholars are in divergence concerning the relationship between two categories of

identity: the Muslim one and the ethnic (ethno-national) amongst the Tatars at the beginning of the 19th Century. In fact, debates are fully focused on the matter of the relationship of the Muslim Umma and the ethnic nation at a crucial stage of the establishment of the national Tatar community. Recently, this problem was modelled quite intensely by the Turkish historiographer A. Kanlidere, highlighting that exploration into the Tatar restructuring is inclined towards ethnic and secular features of this drive, leaving out its religious (Islamic) portion. He believes that the idea of millet (nation) as used by the Jadidisi reformers is not to be interpreted like a term that entitles nationality or ethnic beginning, but relatively an Islamic nationality (milliyat - Islamiya). In his view, such a condition of affairs can be elaborated by the close affinity between nationalism among Tatars which had a religious individuality and the national self-consciousness of the core Russian Muslims, which was more of a religious category, as Islam had a significant role to play in defence of their "national identity".

Hence, it is concluded that the "national" origin of ideologists of Jadidism should be considered as a complex identity which includes a very strong Muslim section; in fact, the ethnic name "Tatars" started to lead among them after 1917 C.E.⁴ Almost the same trend of reasoning was maintained by A. J. Frank, but his core theory is that before 1920s Bulghār character was most distinctive for the Muslims of the Volga-Ural region.⁵ Nevertheless in this connection, and as has beforehand been verified above, the "Bulghār" identity is in fact a Muslim ethno-confessional character; the stand of A. J. Frank is very near to that of A. Kanlidere. R. F. Muhametshin has joined this argument, signifying that at the commencement of the 20th Century, the understanding of Tatars as an autonomous millet already existed among the national cognoscenti. But then the very term millet, he believes was considered by them in three senses: in its ethno-national meaning (Tatar millet), in the more extensive ethno-cultural formation (Turco-Tatar millet) and with even greater unity (Turk millet).⁶ One more scholar from Tatarstan, A. Y. Habutdinov, who mainly analysed the issue of the "Turk nation of the Muslims in Russia" at the turn of 19th Century, resolved that Jadidism is a "mainly secular movement", its followers therefore advocated "the creation of a European type of nation",⁷ and presumed acquiescence with this idea as a national identity.

As we can deduce from the brief review of the dialogue, which is devoted to the problem of the features of the Tatar national identity at the bourgeois phase of development, independent analyses must be carried out. In general, it should be noted that in the 2nd half of 19th Century, Tatar ideologists began to compete against the replacement of ethnic identity with a confessional one. This was associated to the fact that in the 2nd half of the 19th Century the Muslim community of the Volga-Ural region started to acquire new features, being reconditioned into an "ethno-cultural" nation. The difficulties of the Volga-Ural Tatars acquired specific sensitivity, as the ideologists realized the growing necessity of evolution from one type of identity to the another, which should have been different from the preceding one. The problems of such a transition were evidently debated by one of the most eminent ideologists of the establishing Tatar nation, S. Mardjani (1818-1889 C.E), who had not only predicted but also contributed in the "building" of a "second turn", i.e., an ethno-

cultural nation. His ideas of Tatar distinctiveness were stated in a substantial historical work (the 1st volume of which was published in 1889 C.E., and the 2nd volume was published in 1900 C.E.): "Sources on the history of Kazan and Bulghār";⁸ this has been denoted to by an American historian of the Tatar origin "The first modern history of Kazan Tatars (Volga-Ural Tatars-D. I.)".⁹ While deliberating upon the Volga-Ural Tatar history, S. Mardjani has emphasized the wisdom of utilizing the "Tatar" ethnic name. Y. Shamioglu maintains that with this ethnic name the establishment of historical triumph between the Kazan (Volga-Ural) Tatars of his epoch and the Volga Bulghārs was accomplished, as well as through such associations as the history of the Kazan Khanate and the Golden Horde¹⁰ This description is vital, but inadequate. According to the estimation of A. J. Frank, besides all specified above, Mardjani was also engaged with dismantling of "images", which appeared previously, such as "Bulghār" identity in the given case, as he believed that community of the Volga-Ural Muslims representing the "Tatars" surfaced as a result of ethnic community's (the Volga- Ural Turks) alliance with political one (the Golden Horde). As per A. J. Frank, for Mardjani ethnic and political aspects were supreme in the establishment of the Tatar nation, while religious aspects were of lesser importance. Criticizing the method of S. Mardjani, A. J. Frank specified that "the Bulghār identity, based on the free acceptance of Islam by individuals is important in its own way, as an alternative to the ideology of modern Tatar national identity, which is based on voluntary choice to a smaller extent and to a greater one on ethnic or genetic determinism".¹¹ As one can observe, the American historiographer almost charges S. Mardjani with hindering the use of the ethnic name Tatars by the Muslims of the Volga-Ural region.

Though, Mardjani 's selection was resulted by far more intricate reasons. Before proceeding to the deliberation of these, some Tatar historian's works should be considered. Mardjani writes that some Tatars, "due to extreme ignorance, follow Mawerannahr's sarts, and adopt the name Nugai, which is contrary to the truth, considering themselves to be representatives of these people."¹² This declaration comprises an external identity problem, concerning the insight of Tatars by the neighbouring Turks of Central Asia (Kazakhs, Uzbeks). A more difficult characteristic of this problem was the ancient "Muslim" identity. Reformers and scientists highlight that "the Russians insulted them as Tatars, perceiving their existence as some kind of an inferior state and denied their "Tatarhood", stating that there is no such thing as Tatars, but that they are Muslims." Mardjani unconditionally opposed the interchange of an ethnic name by a confessional one, asserting: "What a pity! Between these names (Tatar and Muslim) lies a difference that is as great as the distance between the Nile and the Euphrates! If your religious and national enemy is not aware of another name of yours except for "Muslim" he would hate you as "Muslim" and he would exclaim: "Who are you if not a Tatar?"¹³ It is evident that S. Mardjani had already made his choice in favour of a modern type of ethnic identity.

If one passes to the explanations that determined the historian's choice, in our view they are the following. Initially, in Mardjani's lifetime various local ethnic names and self-names, including exo-ethnic names (for instance, Nugai) were

prevalent amongst the Tatars. As an ideologue, the pioneer of Tatar history could not support the more integral ethnic name, of Tatar. But in fact, "Muslim", as a confessional name was also rather "presumptive". Here we have to take into account supplementary aspects. It should be proposed that the historical reminiscence of the previous class of serving Tatars who reminisced the past magnificence of their ancestors (it was not overlooked by the Russians and was taken into account by Mardjani) played no part in choosing the "Tatar" as ethnic designation. Furthermore, the "Muslim" identity as divergent to the "Tatar" one, due to its "infinity" could not content Mardjani, who comprehended that in future it would be culture that would form the basis of national unity; this was certainly taking on a progressively ethnic character already in his era. Thirdly, the conceptual ambitions of missionaries like N. Ilminski also could inspire the final explanation of S. Mardjani's views. As recently established in the Ph. D thesis of R. P. Jerasi,¹⁴ from the 1860s the Kazan missionary rounds, supervised by N. Ilminski, started to progress a novel Bulghār philosophy of a Chuvash origin, targeting to authenticate the retreat of the Bulghār-Muslims from Islam and embracing of Christianity by their progenies. At the same time, a fragment of the cultural historical past was taken from the Tatars, and this was of no insignificant importance for the missionaries, due to their predisposition to cause damage to Islamic positions in the Volga-Ural region. Meanwhile, Mardjani, who succeeded to incorporate the Bulghār period into national history, focused on Islam in the Golden Horde. As per Y. Shamiloglu, this line drawn by Mardjani served to prove "a connection with the era of the Volga Bulghārs through the Golden Horde with the period of Mardjani".¹⁵ Subsequently, the founder of national historical science also responded to constructions made by imperial ideologues; targeting not to let them abolish the already elaborated line of advancement in the Tatar national character. Fourthly, one cannot take into deliberation the part played by the Russian environment (including the Russian administration) in assigning the Tatars with their contemporary ethnic name. This factor is clearly accepted by S. Mardjani, as can be observed from his statement that it is unbearable to do away with the idea of a "religious and national foe", as well as his efforts to detach the ethnic name "Tatars" from the Mongol conquerors.¹⁶ Fifthly, one cannot overlook the purely scientific part of the considered problem: deprived of the recognition of the proper "Tatar" (the Golden Horde Turks) section in Tatar history it is not imaginable to solve the query of the Tatars ethnic progress; this, in turn, deprives S. Mardjani of the chance to write a comprehensive national history. It is acknowledged that as a scholar, Mardjani quite magnificently dealt with this problem at the level of contemporary historical information. During Mardjani's lifetime not only was a novel identity beginning to be formed, but the national ethnic culture, which served as its natural foundation, was shaped as the result of a "high culture" moulding and transforming the prevailing culture, which was still influenced by the traditionally-predominant sections, was in the making. Consequently, among the masses and the minor bourgeois of the towns, predominantly in areas of the Kazan Tatars settlement, ancient identities sustained to function, predominantly the "musleman" confessional designation. Materials that are associated with the movement of Vaisovists (the commencement of this movement dates back to the 1860s) testify to that. The originator of the movement, Bagavetdin Vaisov (1819-

1893 C.E.), was inclined to deliberate himself as "Old Muslim" from the "Turkish estate". In the 1890s his supporters, who called themselves "the Muslims of Old Believer's Society", not desiring to identify themselves as "peasants-Tatars", specified that they "have nothing in common with Tatars". In their view "the Tatars... believe in kelemishriat (that is Muslim theology-D.I.), drink alcohol, smoke tobacco and their wives devote themselves to dissoluteness". In contrast to this "Old style Muslims do not do all that is stated above; they believe in Islam, the holy Shari'at and the holy Qur'an". Subsequently representatives of Vaisov's movement comprised of peasants and minor bourgeoisies' former peasants, this kind of specific "Muslim" self-consciousness should be measured as a phenomenon that spread through the masses in the 2nd part of the 19th Century. Accordingly, it was documented by S. Mardjani and can be noticeably seen from his declaration that part of Tatars denies their "Tatarhood", rather identifying themselves as "Muslims". One should treat the declarations, concerning the last quarter of the 19th Century, made by one of the enlightened Tatars, K. Nasyri (1824-1902 C.E.) in the same essence. An illustration follows: "...when I referred to the nationality of my people as "Tatar", this was disapproved of, when I called the language (of the people) Tatar, this was not approved of (either)".¹⁷ Outwardly, opponents, not tolerant to the ethnic name "Tatar", opponents who were not quantified by the scholars, were supporters of the confessional name of Muslim.

By now the given information and, in particular, the intellectual deliberations of the Tatar's national ethnic name in the 1st decades of the 20th Century, which will be explained later, are dubious to provide grounds for approving with A. Kanlider; in his estimation, until 1917 C.E., the politically energetic section of the Turks, including the Tatars, referred to themselves as "Muslims" and among them "there were no arguments about either Muslim or Tatar identity".¹⁸ On one hand, the period of the 1905-1907 C.E. revolution actually authorizes Kanlider's approach: from the 1st to the 3rd Muslim congresses (1905-1907 C.E.), the "Muslim" self-rule had a dominating nature among Turk political personalities.¹⁹ According to a memorandum by A. Kanlidere, there were cases when some of these personalities made "modern" declarations, for example Y. Akchura, who stated at the 3rd Muslim congress (1906 C.E.): "We must establish political coalitions based on the principle of nationality". Yet it should be remembered that in fact this was referring to "Islamic nationality".²⁰ Then there is another aspect which should not be overlooked, as the political condition in 1905-1907 C.E. was emerging in such a way that Turkish political figures were incapable to surpass the limits of cultural self-government for the Muslim people and this never went beyond educational or religious domains.²¹ The combined actions of the Jadidi politicians within these slender limits contributed to the usage of the term "Muslim" in political documents; all their actions took place within the confines of the Orthodox, or more exactly, outside of politics that were carried in Russia in that era. But not only was the ethnic factor preserved under these circumstances, but it grew even stronger, as is well established by articles devoted to Tatars.

In particular, in the 1910s the dialogue of the national name among the Tatars began with a new vigour. For illustration, G. Ibraghimov (1887-1938 C.E.), a renowned author and public figure, stated: "Tatars inexplicably avoid this name" in the article "We are Tatars" (1911 C.E.).²² There were numerous reasons for such an "evasion". Primarily, there was the strength of "Muslim" distinctiveness amongst the Tatars. Therefore, the renowned Tatar ethnographer and historian G. Ahmarov (1864-1911 C.E.), who backed the Bulghār theory of Tatar origin in his book "History of Bulghār" (1909 C.E.), specifies the fact that his contemporaries among the Kazan Tatars favoured to be addressed as "Kazan Muslims" or "Kazan Turks".²³ But then there were other reasons that led to the disagreement of the "Tatar" ethnic name in society. Amongst these was the cognoscenti's contemplation of the requirement to unite all the activities of the Turkic and Muslim nations against the Russian hegemony. As an outcome, at the start of the 20th Century, the quasi-ethnic name "Turok" was put into circulation among the Tatars. For example, the Tatar writer F. Karimov wrote in 1914 C.E.: "we have investigated whether we are Turks or Tatars and have tried to prove that we are Tatars as far as possible." Further he noted: "are not our essences, origin, spirit and ideas Turk?"²⁴ This phenomenon had an objective base as well; numerous historical and linguistic studies have established the closeness of Turkic people and the shared features of their history. The eminent Tatar scholar J. Walidov (1887-1932 C.E) has written: "Historians who study our past call us Turks."²⁵ Even such strong supporters of the Bulghār theory of the Tatar origin like G. Akhmarov used not only the "Bulghār" ethnic name, but also that of the "Turco-Bulghār people" in reference to the Kazan Tatars.²⁶ In addition to conserving the religious adjective of Muslim, which fit the emerging political situation, the supporters could "inject" a quasi-ethnic name "Turk", since the overwhelming majority of Turkic people of Russia were Muslims. But there was one more purpose for the efforts made by the Tatar intellectuals to go past the scope of the "Tatar" ethnic name - the presence of close ethno-cultural contacts and relations of the North-Western Bashkirs with the Tatars.²⁷ The proposal was spread among the Tatar intellectuals that Tatars and Bashkirs belonged to one ethnic foundation. It was precisely stated by J. Walidov; "To pose the question of whether the Meshcryaks and Bashkirs can be considered to be Tatars is not only absolutely senseless but it is erroneous", because what makes one "(people) separated from another is the language difference, but there is no particular difference between the language of the Mesheryaks and Bashkirs on the one hand and the Kazan Tatars on the other"²⁸ Such an estimation existed since the "elite" culture that was shaped amongst the Tatars until 1917 C.E. aided not only Tatars, but Bashkirs as well.

Though, in spite of the fact that there were several methods by the Tatar intelligentsia for alternate national names, there was a gradual strengthening of the position of the "Tatar" name. J. Walidov, one of the most prominent philosophers of the early 20th Century, quite delicately noted that: "Our literati, poets and a considerable part of our youth call us Tatars."²⁹ In fact, the newer generations of Tatar culture, and particularly the intellectuals, in the broadest sense of this word

(including journalists) unambiguously reinforced the "Tatar" ethnic name. For instance, G. Ibragimov, who supported this ethnic name and opposed the application of the "Turk" name as a national name, rationally noted that since "Slavs can be Russian as well", then "Turks can be Tatars".³⁰ In 1920 C.E. G. Tukai (1886-1913 C.E.) also noted: "Newspapers, books and articles started to be issued in Tatar and we simply remained Tatars".³¹ The gifted poet and miner Z. Ramiev (Derdmend) (1859-1921 C.E.) in one of his poems also asked: "Can one be insulted by the name "Tatar", can a man deny his ethnic name? I am a Tatar, a son of the Tatar, do not tell me I am not Tatar."³²

Documents from the 1910s validate that in the advancement of Tatar self-awareness the supreme energy belonged to Tatar intellectual and national bourgeoisie.³³ In spite of the fact that peasants did not contribute in this process, its ethnic realization, influenced by the national philosophy, rapidly transformed. Kazan's governor P. M. Boyarski had spoken quite comprehensively in 1914 C.E. about the acceptance by all the Tatars of this new type of identity in the pre-revolutionary era. Works by the eminent Tatar historian G. Gubaidullin (1887-1938 C.E.) and J. Walidov also evidently state the same fact. The former, having analysed in his work "Some Principles of Nationalism" (1913 C.E.) the understanding of the commencement of millet in Tatar public opinion resolved that ethnos is elevated to a national level by a national culture. In his belief, while all the Turks of the world are from the "Turkish nation", the Northern Turks, i.e., the Tatars, are quite a sovereign nation.³⁴ R.F. Muhammetdinov, who analysed this work, records, appropriately, that G. Gubaidullin considers Turkic peoples to be "some kind of Turk supnation", i.e., a community of a complex order.³⁵ Thus, the "Arab nation" concept is revealed. J. Walidov, in his well-known article "Millet ve Milliyat" (1913 C.E.), defined a nation as a community "that was united due to unity based on blood, religion, language, customs and traditions." In this background, he mainly highlighted the role of literature, culture and historical traditions in establishing the national culture, listing them along with "faith".³⁶ It is clear from the subsequent statement that he measured Tatars (or more precisely the Volga-Ural region Turks) to be an sovereign ethnic nation: "At present we (the Tatars) have formed ourselves as a united nation according to the demands of our life, language, and Fatherland, increasingly separating from the Osmons (Turks) and the Sarts (Uzbeks)".³⁷ It is evident that during the 1st decades of the 20th Century, the term milliyat in Tatar journals was not linked to the religion but to ethnic group.³⁸ Consequently, a well-known investigator N. Yaushev (1886-1917 C.E.) wrote in 1915 C.E: "How much we consider our country and shari'at to be great, let us from the bottom of our hearts love our millet and our milliyat". Then he adds: "Language and literature may be measured to be the heart and soul of the milliyat".³⁹ J. Walidi resounded as well that "milliyat" is grounded on Language, Faith, Fatherland, Ethnic Origin and Customs.⁴⁰ As we can observe religion is one of nation's foundations which does not occupy any foremost place.

However, national self-realisation still could be influenced in order to make a vibrant rectification of its concluding format. Such a constructive effort was made by the Tatar ideologists during the construction of the Tatar political nation.⁴¹ During the summer of 1917 C.E., in developmental documents known as "the

fundamentals of national and cultural self-government by the inner Russia's Muslims" there were numerous notions that designated the ethno-political community idea of millet and were constructed by the generous bourgeoisie ideologues. On one side, the term "the Muslims of inner Russia and Siberia" or more concisely "the Muslims of inner Russia" is also used in the writing as the short form "Muslims" (muselman, muselmanlar).⁴² It is clear that the specified description is nothing less than muselman, that is, a religious characteristic, traditional for the Volga-Ural region and Western Siberian Tatars. Seemingly, it was not without the impact of the clergy that this appeared in document, as they played a substantial part in the political courses that took place in 1917 C.E. and the commencement of 1918 C.E. In the view of the mufti R. Fakhretclinov (1859-1936 C.E.), who believed that the Tatars, the Bashkirs, the Mishars and Teptyars were all as single nation (millet) in 1925 C.E., positioning them under the name "Muslims" or "Russian Muslims", may aid to be unswerving for this conclusion.⁴³ Nevertheless, on the other side, in the document in query, the term "Turco-Tatars" is of much larger importance, as it produced the views of both "Turkic" and "Tatar" progressive lines of national self-consciousness. The 3rd notion in this document "Turki Language", affirming to the modern Tatar literary language, establishes that the ethnic name "Turco-Tatars" encased a concrete "political" nation, which comprised not only the Volga-Ural (Astrakhan) and Siberian Tatars, but the Bashkirs also. The confessional name "Muslims" actually had the exact connotation. In addition, the 1st national Constitution, the "Constitution of Cultural-National Self-Government" (January 16, 1918 C.E.) states the political description of the nation not only as "Turco-Tatars", but also that of "Turco-Tatar Muslims of inner Russia and Siberia",⁴⁴ which verifies to be a substitute of both notions.

Subsequently, the Volga-Ural state project was substituted by the Soviet one, forming the Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic the Tatar cognoscenti tried to promote another name in the public perception-"Tatar-Bashkirs".⁴⁵ This was associated to the inclination of ideologists to build a nation so that it could gain a definite provincial form. Besides, the element that at the same time the Tatar ideologists considered some objective aspects (ethno-cultural harmony of the Tatars and Bashkirs in the north-western Volga-Ural area), the method recommended was all-inclusive. Already by July-August, 1917 C.E., the Bashkir ideologists had counterbalanced themselves to the Volga-Ural Muslims,⁴⁶ that is Tatars, pronouncing an inclination to create territorial self-government in the form of a Bashkurdistan State and the substance linked with the Bashkir political nation in the limits of "Minor Bashkiriya". The subject of "Tatar-Bashkirs" appeared yet again in 1920 C.E. In their declaration on January 17, 1920 C.E., the Bashkir leaders opposed the usage of such terms as "the Tatar-Bashkir language", "the Tatar-Bashkir literature" and the "Tatar-Bashkir army". Lastly, the Tatar leaders had to defend themselves, affirming that they required to give a twin name to the nation not due to proselyte deliberations, but because of the anxiety that the Bashkirs, who continued behind the area of Soviet Bashkiriya and the Bashkirs who were inflowing the Tatar republic will complaint against the republic being referred to by the name of the Tatar nationality".⁴⁷

As a consequence of Ufa's guberniya linking the Bashkir ASSR (1922 C.E.), the "constructive" hard work of Tatar ideologists was concluded. However, the shadow of the "Turco-Tatar" nation was presented concealed in some declarations by the Tatar Soviet elite in the 1920s.⁴⁸ For political settlers from the Tatar elite, the "Turco-Tatar" continued primary.⁴⁹ Occasionally the same community was stated to the old style as the "Muslims" or "Russian Muslims". In general, efforts by Tatar ideologists to present counteractive to the progression of national character development between 1917 C.E. and 1920C.E. were not fruitful, due to the confrontation of the Bashkir political elite and the overall failure of the Tatar national political movement between 1917 C.E. and 1920C.E. to generate a Tatar "political" nation over extensive ethnic and territorial confines. Nevertheless, the hard work of Tatar reformers caused in the fact that by the mid-1920s most of the Tatars measured the "Tatar" ethnic name to be the national one.⁵⁰ At the same time the old confessional name "Muslims" continued in the background. It did not entirely vanish, and could even be perceived in the survey which was applied between 1920 C.E. and 1926 C.E. Nevertheless, its character had transformed, subsequently under the circumstances of modern distinctiveness and this term was used only to describe a confessional association.

¹ RGIA, fund 821, inv.133, ed. khr. 471, p. 3.

² RGIA, fund 821, inv. 133, ed.khr.470, part 11 p.45.

³ RGIA, fund 821. inv. 133, ed. khr. 472, part 4, p. 116.

⁴ Kanlidere A., Reform within Islam. The Tajdid and Djodid Movement among the Kazan Tatars (1809-1917). Conciliation or Conflict?, Istanbul, 1997, pp.129-132.

⁵ Frank A. J., Islamic Regional Identity in Russia: Tatar and Bashkir Historiography in the 18th and 19th centuries, Indiana University, 1994.

⁶ Muhametdinov R. F., Natsiya i revolyutsiya (Transformatsiya natsional'nol idel v Tatarskom obshchestve pervoi treti XX veka), Kazan: "Iman" Publishers, 2000, pp. 10-19.

⁷ Khabytdinov A. Yu, Millet Orenburgskogo dukhovnogo sobraniya v kontse XVIII-XIX vekokh, Kazan, "Iman" Publishers 2000, p. 147.

⁸ This work was written over a rather long time beginning from the 1850s until the early 1880s. (See: Usmanov M. A., Istochniki knigi Sh. Mardjani 'Mustafad al-akhbar fi ahwal Kazan wa Bulghar', Pt.1 Kazan, 1885 Ocherki istorii Povoizh'ya i Priural'ya, Collected articles, Fasc.11111, Kazan, KGU Publishers, 1969, pp. 144 -154; Yusupov M.H., Shigabutdin Mardjanl kak istorik, Kazan, 1981, pp. 114-115).

⁹ Shamiloglu U., "The Formation of a Tatar Historical Consciousness : Sihabuddin Mardjani and the Image of the Golden Horde", Central Asian Survey, vol. 9, No. 2, 1990, p.43.

¹⁰ Ibid, p.43.

¹¹ Frank A., Islamic, pp. 197, 207, 212.

¹² Mardjani Sh., Mustafad alakhbar fi ahwal Kazan wa Bulghor, Kazan, 1989, p.43.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ See Geraci R.P., Window on the East: Ethnography, Orthodoxy, and Russian nationality in Kazan, 1870-1914, University of California at Berkley, 1995.

¹⁵ Shamiloglu U., The formation, p. 45.

¹⁶ Having noted this fact, Shamiloglu stresses that S. Mardjani was trying to distance himself from the Mongol conquerors by saying that the Mongols had become acquainted with the term "Tatars" later than the grouping that formed under this name. Therefore, he stated that initially the name did not have any connection with Mongols at all (Shamiloglu U, the formation, p. 44).

¹⁷ Ishaqov D., "Stanovlenie natsional'nogo samosoznaniya Tatar", Tatarstan, 1993, No.6, p. 56.

¹⁸ Kanlidere A., Reform, p. 132.

¹⁹ Ishaqov D.M., Problemy stanovleniya i transformatsii Tatarskoi Natsii, Kazan, 1997, pp. 75-76.

²⁰ Kanlidere A., Reform, p. 130.

²¹ Ishaqov D.M., Problemy, p. 75.

²² "Pantyrkizm v Rossii", Mir islama, vol. 11, SPb, 1913, p. 28.

²³ Akhmarov G., Izbrannye trudy (Selected works). "Istoriya Bulghārii, Istoriya Kazani, Etnicheskie gruppy i traditsii Tatar", Kazan, 1998, p. 27.

²⁴ RGIA, fund 821, inv. 133, ed. khr. 470, part 2, p. 363 ob, p. 364.

²⁵ Pantyrkizm v Rossii, p. 217.

²⁶ Akhmarov G., Izbrannye, p. 62.

²⁷ See for details in: Ishaqov D.M., Etnicheskoe razvitie Volgo-Ural'skikh Tatar v XV-nachale XX veka, Doctoral Thesis in the form of scientific report (History), M., 2000, pp. 54-72; Idem, Istoricheskaya demographiya Tatarskogo naroda (XVIII-nachalo XX veka), Kazan, 1993. pp.105-124.

²⁸ Pantyrkizm v Rossii, p. 18.

²⁹ Ibid, pp. 2, 17.

³⁰ RGIA, fund 821, inv. 133, ed. khr. 470, part 2, p. 363.

³¹ Tukai G., "Khalyk adabiyaty", Asarlar, vol.4, Kazan, 1974, p. 280.

³² Dardmand, "Isa Zhillar Shigy'lar : istalek parchalar", Bak khikayalar, Kazan, 1980, p. 106.

³³ RGIA, fund 821, inv. 133, ed. khr. 471, part 3, p.3, 31.

³⁴ Muhametdinov R. F., Natsiya, p. 16.

³⁵ Ibid, p. 17.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid, p.18.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ For more information, see: Ishaqov D.M., Problemy.

⁴² Davletshin T., Soviet Tatarstan: Theory and Practice of the Lenin National Policy, London, 1974, pp. 338-359.

⁴³ Fakhretdinov R., "Otkrytoe pis'mo Ufimskomu gorispolkomu, Tatarskoi molodyozhi, vsem, kto stoit vo glave dela (1 January 1925r.)", Idel, 1991, No. 8-9, pp. 93-96.

⁴⁴ Ishaqov R., "Konstitutsiya kul'turno-natsional'noi avtonomii Tatarskogo naroda", Idel, 1995, No.5-6, pp. 56-61.

⁴⁵ See: Sharaf G., Miller B.F., Boshkiry, Vystavka kul'tur norodov Vostoka, Kazan, 1920, pp.44-59.

⁴⁶ Etnopoliticheskaya mazaika Boshkortostana, Ocherki, Dokumenty, Khronika., vol. 2. "Bashkirkoe natsional'noe dvizhenie", M., 1992, pp. 73-74.

⁴⁷ "Obrazovanie BASSR", Sbornik Documental'nykh materlalav, Ufa, 1959, p. 611.

⁴⁸ Ishaqov D.M., Problemy, pp. 84-85.

⁴⁹ IsgaqiA., Idel-Ural, Paris, 1933.

⁵⁰ Lshaqov D.M., Etnicheskayo Istoriya, Tatory i Tatarstan, Kazan, 1993, pp. 14-15; Tatars, M.: Nauka, 2000.