

UDC 930.85

The problem of interethnic relations in the Russian Federation in modern historiography. The 1990s to 2017

Nikolai F. Bugai

Doctor of History, Professor,

Chief Researcher at the Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences,

117336, 19 Dmitriya Ulyanova st., Moscow, Russian Federation;

e-mail: nikolay401@yandex.ru

Abstract

The article is devoted to the topical problem of the multinational community – the state of interethnic relations and research on such relations in Russian historiography. It aims to describe the current state of the historiography of the problem itself. The author points out that events in this sphere always develop on the verge of historical and psychological factors, which requires increased attention and responsibility. The article also makes an attempt to deal with such aspects of the topic as the state of Russia's multinational consolidation, its economy, the sphere of culture, the conditions for the development of self-consciousness and national consciousness, the implementation of the principles of the democratisation of communities, solutions to these problems in history by analysing papers having been published on the problem of national policy. The analysis of scientific works makes it possible to draw conclusions about the ongoing process of the satisfaction of the needs of citizens, the consolidation of national communities in the state with a view to solving their own everyday problems, developing self-consciousness and national consciousness, constructing new forms and "models" of working with the population. It is of prime importance to devise new social schemes for regulating national processes in the country and create such conditions, under which the multinational consolidation of the peoples of the Russian Federation would live comfortably.

For citation

Bugai N.F. (2018) Problema mezhetnicheskikh otnoshenii Rossiiskoi Federatsii v sovremennoi istoriografii. 1990-e – 2017 gg. [The problem of interethnic relations in the Russian Federation in modern historiography. The 1990s to 2017]. *"Belye pyatna" rossiiskoi i mirovoi istorii* ["White Spots" of the Russian and World History], 3, pp. 52-73.

Keywords

Interethnic relations, national policy, nation-building, institution of civil society, autonomy, regulations, migration, democratisation.

Introduction

In a multinational state, the problem of interethnic relations, which are at the core of national state policy, has always remained one of the priority directions both in the past and in modern development of statehood, regardless of its orientation in politics, economy and culture.

Vectors of development of this sphere are very diverse, but in general they form an independent direction of state policy. If we evaluate it as a whole, it is necessary, in our opinion, to consider many issues that would allow to have a more complete idea of its content, and the change of established stereotypes in order to understand the complex and contradictory picture of the multinational world. Here is the experience of institutionalization of the process, its implementation in this or that period, results and perspective. Of course, for analysis it is still necessary to turn to priority areas. It allows to apply the results to many other areas of existence of ethnic communities on the scale of the state and individual components.

If to consider the problem in general, the state national policy is a more capacious concept, and it is often interpreted in a wrong way. It is hardly possible to equate state national policy, which primarily involves state interests at the international level, including the sphere of management (development of territory, transport communications, development of various sectors of the national economy, education, trade, etc.), and politics of interethnic relations, that is, a policy of relations between peoples, groups of people living in the territory of one state. Of course, the second direction is narrower in its content and focus, but it extends to people belonging to different ethnic communities, identifying themselves with this or that people and state.

Interethnic relations are a component of the process of social development, which includes relations primarily between people related to their mentality, specificity, territory of residence, occupation, skills, work, traditions, customs as one of the most important components of the culture of the peoples of Russia, their original culture, level of education, literacy, degree of interaction with others, goals and objectives. In our opinion, they are the most receptive and easily vulnerable sphere.

In this case, the policy becomes more precise, clearly understandable, and purposeful. It allows not only to concentrate attention, but also to develop adequate administrative decisions and mechanisms for their implementation. Hence, all this implies a higher level of effectiveness of such a policy, the possibility of a more perfect orientation in determining the primary tasks in the development of this direction both at the state and regional scales.

Unfortunately, in the Soviet Union, and in the conditions of the existence of the Russian Federation, there are still attempts not to see this feature. In practice, the notion of "national state policy" can be tampered with the economy sector, the relations between ethnic communities in it, and the international aspect, which ultimately leads to a lack of positive results in both directions.

Interethnic relations are, first of all, the sphere of the state ideology, directed precisely at the solution of such priority tasks as the consolidation of the population, the improvement of its position, the education of self-consciousness and national consciousness, the formation of patriotism and

cohesion of society. What is especially important in this situation is the wide involvement of representatives of different ethnic communities in participating the governing of the state, socio-political work, the education of a culture of interethnic communication in the new conditions of existence of Russia, the formation of conditions for preserving the integrity of the country and its security.

In this regard, it is important to understand that from time to time it is necessary not only to sum up the development of the problem, but also to determine its new directions, which are connected with the economic sector and with the cultural development of the multinational community. The Russian historiography of the problem collapsed in conjunction with the ongoing processes in the sphere of state national policy.

Basic research of the problem on the eve of the 1990s

Research works of the problem on the eve of the 1990s of Yu.V. Bromley are rich [Bromley, 1983; Bromley, 1987; Bromley, 1988; Bromley, Kozlov, 1987]. They differ in the breadth of the formulation of problems, assessments of what was done in terms of reassessing the state of interethnic relations in the state, and they also point to shortcomings in this direction. He did a lot to summarize implementation of national policies on a national scale.

In the late 1980s it became obvious that there was a need to reform the sphere of national state policy. There were some forecasts in this direction, assessments of the situation adequate to the conditions in which Soviet society was. Careful analysis of the situation was typical, especially in order not to damage the main thing – the restructuring of the state, and in accordance with this the process of democratization of the multinational community.

Proceeding from the above mentioned premises, the main efforts were focused on the national component with the aim to solve the issue of harmonization of interethnic relations, increasing the role of the republics in the life of the state, the importance of ethnic minorities, and eliminating the emerging contradictions on the interethnic ground. It was not by chance that the wider application of the principle of the internationalization of society was recommended in practice.

However, five years later, this idea, due to certain reasons, had to be abandoned, and in this direction the principle of globalization of processes became the defining one. It should be noted that scientists warned society against all sorts of twists and turns. This also involved a total rejection of the prevailing stereotypes in national politics. It was hardly necessary to completely disassociate from certain relations in it. Unequivocally, the matter was in those fundamental changes that ethnic communities underwent.

The new Russian multinational community did not refuse from the experience that was accumulated during the formation of the nation under the collective name "Soviet people". With regard to this issue, a certain difference was primarily in the time cut. Still, the first concept was formed over half a century, the second one was attempted to be introduced into the consciousness of society in two decades. As a result, Russian society was not ready for such steps.

The conclusion is obvious: it is necessary to ripen the idea in the mind, rather than imposing it. These actions are measures to regulate national processes and call for the need to improve this direction, its new content, the development of new mechanisms that include, first of all, the elimination of negative phenomena in the life of ethnic communities, the achievement of equal rights for peoples, and comprehensive economic and cultural development. An important component of these processes, of course, will be national-state construction in new conditions of the existence of statehood – the Federation of the Russian republics, market relations.

The analysis of scientific works before the new state of Russia (early 1990s) also makes it possible to determine what still did not take place in the sphere of interethnic relations and could influence the development of national politics in the future or come forward at a certain evolutionary stage as its components.

Theoretically, consideration of the proposed discussion problem of including the republics in the RSFSR is a "model" worked out by I. Stalin during the constitutive period of the formation of Soviet statehood and, of course, not supported by V. Lenin. As the subsequent practice of the development of a multinational state showed, this measure proved to be ineffective. In science, this situation was assessed as a "simplistic approach" [Bromley, Kozlov, 1987, 22-23]. Undoubtedly, the problem of forming both bodies of legislative and executive power, as well as civil society institutions, free from politicization of activities and characterized by active participation in law-making work, interaction with state authorities, should be included among the important issues.

Among the priority tasks the author considered a complete rejection of the methods of managing the system of interethnic relations, characteristic mainly for command and administrative policy, replacing them with a complex of mechanisms for regulating processes in interethnic relations [Bromley, Kozlov, 1987]. The author pointed out the continuing need for a comprehensive assessment of the forced migrations of peoples. The mechanisms of this measure were assessed as mechanisms for the implementation of national policy in the emergency situation during the war period of 1941-1945 and also in future.

The departure from the characterization of the sphere of interethnic relations is important, as from the "problem-free sphere" to the elaboration of mechanisms for the transfer of interethnic relations to a legal basis, which was carried out only in the 1990s. It is necessary timely to identify and respond to the "hidden" exacerbated facts of interethnic relations both at the interstate level and within the state. All this is accumulated in a set of problems for scientists to study, prepare recommendations for implementation, develop management decisions, and meet the needs of ethnic communities in the new Russian statehood.

The problem of federalism in the research of the 2000s

M.V. Stolyarov, the theoretician on national relations, in his scientific work "Federalism in the Russian Dimension: Notes by a Political Scientist, 1998-2009" (M., 2010), analyzes the main pain

points in the Russian space in the last two decades. These are four: 1) the relationship between the federal center and the subjects of the Federation, which are accompanied by the necessity of the region's survival, the resolution of political, financial, social and legal issues; 2) excessive fragmentation and unexplained complexity of the federal system; 3) electivity of the heads of executive power, the way of forming the Council of Federation; 4) the interpretation of agreements on the delimitation of powers between the executive bodies of the Federation and its subjects [Stolyarov, 2010]. The question of this fragmentation of the federal system deserves special attention.

The problem attracts by its versatility and acute contradictions between subjects and the center (Republic of Adygea, Karachay-Cherkess Republic and earlier – Ingush Republic). In our opinion, the issue remained a somewhat undeveloped in practical terms. If to consider it on the example of one of their Russian republics – Karachay-Cherkessia, the relapses of the past state national policy that corresponded to the existence of the union state were not eliminated. Undoubtedly, certain reforms were needed, which would indicate the unity of the Russian state, which could function without republics and have a uniform administrative and territorial arrangement. This will entail a certain reduction of the state apparatus in the subjects, the formation of a unified administrative system, the strengthening of the vertical of power, the reduction of monetary costs, and so on.

It would be possible to correct some other provisions in the administrative and state building. For example, the name Krasnodar Territory no longer corresponds to the administrative structure of the territory, since the Krai is "an administrative territory, which includes a national administrative entity (autonomous region) subordinate to the leadership of the regional center". After the release of Adygea from the territory of the region it would be logical to impart the status of the region, but the status was upgraded to the republican one. Already in the Soviet era, the criterion for distinguishing between the Krai and the region became non-strict (simplistic): there were no autonomous regions in the Primorsky Territory.

In our opinion, society in this sphere remains at the mercy of old stereotypes, overcoming them in tough interethnic contradictions, which is obvious, especially in multi-national autonomous republics (Karachaevo-Cherkessia, Kabardino-Balkaria, etc.). This was avoided for known reasons only in the former Chechen-Ingush Republic. Under the new conditions, peoples create their own material and spiritual values independently and use them. Of course, such measures should be carried out with deep study, have a justification, and not be implemented on the basis of the well-known slogan "take as much as you want sovereignty". Of course, this is not a state approach.

It is necessary to develop ways to improve federal relations in parallel. Such transformations do not happen quickly. The realization of such a task is possible only in conditions of peace, stability and civic harmony. Probably, according to academician V.A. Tishkov, the Russian community is not ready for this and for the perception of the concept of "Russian nation".

V.V. Savelyev, Professor of RAGS, noted it more broadly: "Such identification of characteristics outstrips realities, for the degree of disunity existing in our economic and political life is far

from the civil unity and integrity of the population that can and should be called the Russian nation" [Savelyev, 2015, 21].

In this connection V.V. Savelyev also presents his vision of the discussed question about the concepts "state-civilization" and "state-nation". At the same time, he notes both positive and negative factors, relying on the method of comparative analysis, argues for the advantages and necessity of striving for a state-civilization, a polyethnic civilization, fastened by the Russian cultural core, which, in his opinion, provides wider opportunities for the state itself and meets the needs of the people. The author comes to the conclusion that "in the theory of federal-national relations, the social education that is maximally broad and optimal for Russia is not a civil nation, but a polyethnic civilization" [Ibid, 22].

In short, it is necessary to correct the mistakes – legacies of past times. Therefore, the assertion that "one should not insist on changing the status of individual sovereign subjects" is unlikely to be acceptable in today's conditions. As for the transfer of rights and powers to the places, it leads to self-isolation, an increased tendency not to reckon with the center. In the concrete case, M.V. Stolyarov is right when he argues that "the optimal model for the federal development of the Russian Federation has not yet been found, since neither the Constitution of the Russian Federation nor the Federative Treaty became unifying factors in the approaches of the center and the subjects to the problem of optimal separation of power vertically" [Stolyarov, 2010, 66].

The solution of many problems in this sphere, in our opinion, would be more effective in the context of the creation of one-status entities on the territory of the Russian Federation corresponding to the existence of Russia in a new format. The remaining layering of the six categories of subjects of the Federation makes the solution of the problems difficult.

Undoubtedly, the main directions of state national policy were outlined in the Constitution of the Russian Federation in 1993. They were specifically expressed in the Concept of the State National Policy of the Russian Federation (1996). At the same time, it is unlikely that the Concept should be viewed as a document that can not be changed. Life made amendments to the development of social processes, interethnic relations, therefore, already in the early 2000s some adjustment of the document was required. It became obvious that some tasks had already been implemented and that certain provisions could be omitted.

Therefore, the statement of some researchers of the history of federative relations in Russia, that the Concept of the State National Policy of the Russian Federation "failed", can be considered absurd. Strategic document, which contains the basic directions of development of interethnic relations, reconciled with the previous period of development of society, taking into account the features of the 1990s (mostly the first half) and determining the prospect of their development, can not be a "failure". However, for example, M.V. Stolyarov, makes the opposite conclusion, he sees the "failed" state of the Concept in the fact that it does not take into account the fight against extremism and the manifestation of xenophobia.

It seems that the Russian community did not know similar phenomena until the end of the 1990s. Although it is necessary to note that these phenomena are the result of more processes of

the 1990s. Thus, it is necessary to argue, otherwise the author's assessments are denounced with his own conclusions that "state national policy in the conditions of a multinational state is not a conjuncture moment, but a strategic line for the development of the Russian community, statehood."

A significant contribution to the development of the problem was made by F.L. Sinitsyn [Sinitsyn, 2010]. The rich factual material in the book analyzes the success of the USSR in the Great Patriotic War, submitted through the presentation of the state policy, and shows its general state after October 1917. New archival documents revealed by the author made it possible to refute the false statements that "Russia was at all times a" prison of nations". In connection with this, the author points out the conditions for the maturing of a completely new state national policy in the context of the war of 1941-1945, defined by Stalin in May 1941 as "a healthy, correctly understood nationalism".

F.L. Sinitsyn draws attention to the known forms and methods of struggle, which the Soviet leadership used with the aim of mobilizing the country's population to preserve the integrity of the state itself, the protection of its Motherland. In this regard, it was necessary to solve a difficult task in a multinational state – an organization to combat the alternative force, "anti-Soviet manifestations".

The book shows how not only the church, but also its parts were involved in solving problems, and other aspects of this complex problem. Of course, not all the author's ideas can be accepted. One can hardly agree with the fact that "after the October Revolution, the national policy in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was completely reduced to certain internationalism".

The author emphasizes the importance for such a multiethnic state of such ideological attitudes as "healthy, correct nationalism" and "Soviet patriotism". The study shows the significance of the "Russian factor" in the war of 1941-1945, the consolidation and unification of efforts of the peoples of the USSR, who acted as a unity against the fascists, and the role of the Russian people in strengthening relations with "non-Russian nationalities" in order to achieve victory over fascism. In our opinion, the author makes the correct conclusion that "national policy began to use the concept of "the Soviet people" as a new historical community, first expressed in the speech of Professor M.V. Nechkina at a meeting of historians in the Central Committee of the CPSU (B) in the summer of 1944" [Ibid, 225].

N.N. Konstantinov (Ekaterinburg) presented in the monograph a detailed analysis of the polyethnic community in 50 years before the collapse of the USSR [Konstantinov, 2012, 19-46]. The work analyzes both works of scientists and publicists. The study was carried out in the form of essays related to each other and reflecting the general state of polyethnicity in the territory of the USSR, with particular attention to one of its components – the Central Asian region. In general, the factor of multinationality of the community in the state is analyzed, as well as such generalizing concepts as "the formation of the Soviet people", "empire", the political heterogeneity of the USSR.

The research of N.N. Konstantinov can be regarded as the initial stage of studying a new period of history after the collapse of the USSR and its entry into a new state. At that time, according to archaeologists, a peculiar redeposition of the territory of the former state occurred in a new state. In this regard, the corresponding analysis of many trends in the development of society is presented. Among them are such areas of Soviet statehood as repression of ethnic groups of the USSR during the late Stalinism, ethnopolitics in the USSR, the role and position of Russian and other ethnic communities, the cultural aspect, ethnic conflicts of the individual in history, the conflict state of the community itself. At the same time, the RSFSR was singled out specifically as the main unifying territory around which the process of forming the USSR was taking place. The author defines the beginning of the 1990s as a turning point, when "the insolvency of the postulates about the friendship of peoples", "the inviolability of the peoples of the USSR" and the striking discrepancy between rhetoric about the results of socialist transformations and practice life" are completely revealed.

In 2012 V.Yu. Zorin, Doctor of Historical Sciences published a book "Ethnopolitics in modern Russia: articles, speeches, interviews" (Saratov) with a foreword by Academician V.A. Tishkov. The book is distinguished by the availability of voluminous information material and the author's thoughts about the very essence of the concept of "national policy", especially its understanding in the last two decades of the existence of Russia.

According to Zorin, "the national question as a problem of social relations is and always will be" [Zorin, 2012, 66], and further the author states that "there can not be a final solution to this question". On this occasion, the author also disagrees with the assertion of the Bolsheviks. "The Bolsheviks," he writes, "declared the national question definitively and completely resolved". But it really was so, if we compare it with the state, situation of ethnic communities (aliens, natives) in the Russian Empire. Later this conclusion was fixed in practice, however, the methods of this action, the mechanism in some cases were savage. All this enabled us to conclude that the national question was resolved in the discussions of the 1960s.

In our opinion, such a statement still belongs to the category of contentious. The national question in full understanding of the content of this design applied to Russia (the USSR) was solved, and Soviet scientists came to this conclusion back in the 1960s. The same fact is recorded in foreign historiography.

Nevertheless, the lack of clear criteria in the practice of transition to interethnic relations causes some confusion in affirming the existence of a "national question". If you think deeply about the term "national", then it is more relevant to the definition of the characteristics of a policy derived from the concepts of "nation" and "national", but does not reflect the essence of the relations between its constituent ethnic communities in a multinational community, or rather, is not specific in its content. Therefore, it would be appropriate to talk about "interethnic relations": they are just being formed into a system of relations between ethnic communities; they represent something real, that is, the definition of the relations of societies that differ from one another.

The author also responds to the discussions that took place during this period in the country on the content of the ingredients of the theory of national policy [Savelyev, 2010; Savelyev, 2012; Savelyev, 2013; Savelyev, 2015], in particular on the constituent parts of the theory of federal-national relations, on the Russian civil nation, on the state-civilization and nation-state, about the "natural conflict of the Caucasian (North Caucasian) mentality", i.e., the national policy on the North Caucasus, one of the tense regions of the state, which is distinguished by its multi-ethnicity and multi-confessionality. This, of course, determined the ethno-cultural homogeneity of the considered part of the country's territory both in the 1990's and in future. First of all, the literature draws attention to the factor of spatiality, the location of the region between two civilizations – Islamic and Christian.

Thus, the question of ethnic identity as a component of the national policy, including the formation of self-consciousness and national consciousness, the formation of the behavioral "model", symbols, traditional values in the conditions of socio-political ties, is also closed. Hence the identity, including the North Caucasian, Crimean, etc., acquires new types, such as geopolitical and territorial [Bugai, Russian Koreans ..., 2014; Dashdamirov, 1997].

In this regard, it is advisable to consider the points of some Russian authors. Thus, Professor A.F. Dashdamirov focuses on the problem of identity in the ethno-confessional mosaic and ethno-cultural heterogeneity of the Caucasus regions as the main source of interethnic contradictions and conflicts, discussed by E. Gellner and S. Huntington. The author denies existing assertions that, for example, the main reason for the conflict situation is rooted allegedly only in the fact that "a new line of cultural rift between different civilizations" is taking place in the territory of the Caucasus and the North Caucasus".

A.F. Dashdamirov considers the possibility of living together of different denominations of the peoples of the Caucasus, proves the ability to protect the foundations of their religions (both Christianity and Islam), while pointing out the need to take into account not only the differences in cultural identity, but also the parameters of the territories of other regions, communities, the level of economic ties, the experience of joint living of peoples accumulated over the years, the existence of adequate strategies for the development of ethnopolitical security (Shturba, Bugai), sociocultural quality and other ingredients [Dashdamirov, 2017, 24-25; Shturba, 2009].

The independent direction of the national policy in the Russian Federation in the 1990s was the liquidation of the legacy of past times associated with the ongoing forcible resettlement of peoples (from the 1920s to the mid-1950s). Over the past two decades, Russian historiography in the solution of this problem has been enriched by many scientific works performed both on a national scale [Bugai, 1992; Bugai, Peoples of Ukraine ..., 2006; Bugai, Mamaev, 2015], and in relation to its individual regions [Bugai, 1990; Bugai, 1992; Bugai, 1998; Bugai, Broev, Broev, 1993; Bugai, Gonov, 1997; Ibragimov, 2015]. In this connection, the situation in the sphere of economy and culture was considered [Bezugolny, Bugay, Krinko, 2012; Bugai, 2007; Bugai, Koreans of the South of Russia ..., 2015; Ibragimov, 2015], the implementation of social policies related to the organiza-

tion of the life of immigrants. Their contribution to the enhancement of economic potential and the spiritual revival of peoples, the solution of security issues and the preservation of statehood itself was evaluated [Bugai, Security Issue ..., 2015; Bugai, Shturba, 2016; Vozgenikov, 2000; Metelev, 2006; Radikov, 2004], participation in the fight against fascism and in ensuring the country's security [Bugai, Security issue ..., 2015; Contribution of the repressed peoples of the USSR ..., 2010, v. 1; They fought for their Motherland ..., 2005].

The study of the problem in the context of further democratization of society: rehabilitation, civil society institutions

The focus was on the rehabilitation of victims due to the destructive impact on the people by public authorities [Bugai, 2005; Bugai, Rehabilitation of repressed Russian citizens ..., 2006; Bugai, 2012] and the closely related issue of territories of forced relocation.

Although civil society institutions already appeared in the late 1980s and early 1990s, they were not legislated by the state, they did not define the forms of their relationship with the structures of the legislative and executive branches both in the center and in the places. It took place only in 1995 in connection with the adoption of the Federal Law No. 82-FZ "On Public Associations". With the first normative-legal act, the relations between civil society institutions and public authorities began to be built. This law later became the basis for the creation of national public associations, and since 1996 the system of such civil society institutions as the NCA (based on the Federal Law No. 74-FZ "On National and Cultural Autonomy") has been formed. In parallel, there was also a process of research into the problem of the place and role of these institutions in the consolidation of society and the protection of the interests of ethnic minorities in Russia, their interaction with all institutions of civil society [Bugai, "His Secret in Life ..." ..., 2015; Bugai, 2017; Bugai, O Son Hwan, 2004; Kim, Stadnik, 2013].

Since 1990s up to XXI century there was a number of general historiographical reviews of the topic, which undoubtedly helped researchers to correctly place the accents of this complex social phenomenon in society, to determine the priority tasks for further study of the national state policy, to predict its further development [Amanzholova, 2007; Bugai, Etenko, 1988; Bugai, 2005; Bugai, 2008].

In fact, since the 1990s society has received answers to many questions of this difficult period of development of Soviet statehood. However, this does not mean that all issues have been resolved. In this respect, the question arises about the role and actions of the state, in particular the Russian Federation, in promoting the self-realization of "punished" peoples and groups of the population. This aspect is worth special attention. The conclusion is unequivocal: the solution of these problems is possible, but only with the active participation of the structures of state power.

The research clarified many quantitative characteristics, spheres of labor utilization, the solution of the problem of employment, the organization of living conditions for special settlers both

at the national and regional levels, their daily activities, employment, the nature of labor, which contributed to the multiplication of the branches of the national economy, to the struggle against fascism during the war years.

The study of migration in Russia

The study of the problem of migrations in Russia in the 1990s-2015 was noticeably advanced. In everyday life there appeared such a notion as "compulsory migration of the population", which was connected with the migration of peoples and population groups in the 1940s and later. Undoubtedly, the main part in the development of the topic belonged to ethnologists. They published rich scientific research in the 1900s-2017 [Vitkovskaya, 1993; Contribution of the repressed peoples of the USSR ..., 2010, v. 1; Ivanov, 1997; Nazarova, 1999; Peoples of Russia ..., 1997; Tishkov, 1997].

They analyzed in their works on a documentary basis theoretical and practical aspects of migration, employment of the population; regional aspects of migration; internal and external intellectual migration, its impact on the quality of labor resources; the dynamics of different groups of the population, including the unemployed, and many other aspects, including the national component. The issue in the Russian Federation was urgent, therefore, studies on this problem were in demand, literally following the latest developments of the 1990s [Bugai, 2002; Bugai, the Chechen Republic ..., 2006; Bugai, Sim Hon Hon, 2004; Pak, Bugai, 2004]. In the 1990s there was published a large volume of scientific articles on various aspects of national policy [Aliev, Kurbanov, Yusupov, 1994; Bugai, Ingush and Chechen republics ..., 2014; Bugai, Soviet Italians ..., 2014; Bugai, Security issue ..., 2015; Bugai, 2016; Vashchuk, Chernolutsкая, 2014; Kobleva, 2006; Korkmazova, 2009; Rvacheva, 2014; Takhnaeva, 2017]. However, they differ more in the form of questions and do not reveal the essence of the given topic, which, of course, does not allow to judge the significance of the article itself, and thus the contribution to the development of such a complicated problem.

Nevertheless, publications of this kind determine research directions, offer additional material for a more comprehensive study of the problem, disclose the situation in the sphere of national policy by regions of the country, the state of interethnic relations, the position of the constituent national policies (Cossacks, migrants, repressed peoples and population groups, representatives of civil society institutions, ethnic minorities, etc.).

In 2014, a number of events took place in the development of Russian statehood, primarily related to the return of the Republic of Crimea to Russia following a referendum of citizens of the republic held in March 2014. As a reaction to them, there appeared such a form of exchange of views as "telebridges" among the public, scientists, practitioners of the national policy sphere. This was also due to the publication on April 21, 2014 by the President of Russia V.V. Putin's Decree No. 268 "On measures to rehabilitate the Armenian, Bulgarian, Greek, Crimean-Tatar and German

peoples and state support for their revival and development" [Bugai, Forced Relocation of the Crimean Tatars ..., 2015].

Conclusion

Ethnologists and sociologists have been engaged mainly in the development of the problem of interethnic relations in the Russian Federation. Since the early 2000's many scientific works were published which summarize work with arriving migrants' flows, the influence of migration on the internal processes of interethnic relations in Russian statehood, and the issue of forms and methods of working with migrants, etc.,

Undoubtedly, the problems of interethnic relations on the territory of Russia in the 1990s – 2017 are still poorly represented in Russian historiography, which is largely due to the weakness of the accumulated material, i.e., the formation of a source base. There are few published collections of regulations and materials on various components of the system of interethnic relations in the Russian statehood. Scientists-historians still have a lot to research. A meaningful and constructive answer is needed to all the challenges of our time.

References

1. Aliev K.A., Kurbanov M.R., Yusupov G.I. (1994) *Chechentsy-akkintsy Dagestana: k probleme reabilitatsii* [The Akkin Chechens in Dagestan: the problem of rehabilitation]. Moscow: Regional Centre for Ethno-Political Studies.
2. Amanzholova D.A. (2007) Stalinizm v natsional'noi politike: nekotorye voprosy istoriografii [Stalinism in the national policy: some issues of historiography]. In: Simoniya N.A. (ed.) *Istoriografiya stalinizma* [The historiography of Stalinism]. Moscow: ROSSPEN Publ., pp. 321-355.
3. Bezugol'nyi A.Yu., Bugai N.F., Krinko E.F. (2012) *Gortsy Severnogo Kavkaza v Velikoi Otechestvennoi voine 1941-1945 gg.: problemy istoriografii i istochnikovedeniya* [The mountaineers of the North Caucasus in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945: the problems of historiography and source studies]. Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf Publ.
4. Bromlei Yu.V (1987) *Etnonatsional'nye protsessy: teoriya, istoriya, sovremennost'* [Ethnonational processes: theory, history, modernity]. Moscow: Nauka Publ.
5. Bromlei Yu.V. (1988) *Natsional'nye protsessy v SSSR: v poiskakh novykh podkhodov* [National processes in the USSR: in search of new approaches]. Moscow: Nauka Publ.
6. Bromlei Yu.V. (1983) *Ocherki teorii etnosa* [Essays on the theory of ethnos]. Moscow: Nauka Publ.
7. Bromlei Yu.V., Kozlov V.I. (1987) Natsional'nye protsessy pri sotsializme v svete leninskikh idei [National processes under socialism in the light of Lenin's ideas]. In: *Leninizm i problemy etnografii* [Leninism and problems of ethnography]. Leningrad: Nauka Publ., pp. 18-37.

8. Bugai N.F. (2015) *“Ego sekret v zhiznelyubii...” Lider obshchestvennogo ob`edineniya koreitsev Rossii – Vasilii Tso* [“His cheerfulness is the key to success...” Vasily Tso as the leader of the public association of the Russian Koreans]. Moscow: Akvarius Publ.
9. Bugai N.F. (1998) *“Pereselit’ vse koreiskoe naselenie... V. Molotov. I. Stalin”* [“Relocate all Koreans... V. Molotov. J. Stalin”]. Seoul.
10. Bugai N.F. (2006) *Chechenskaya Respublika: konfrontatsiya, stabil’nost’, mir* [The Chechen Republic: confrontation, stability, peace]. Moscow: Grif Publ.
11. Bugai N.F. (1992) *Deportatsiya krymskikh tatar v 1944 godu* [The deportation of the Crimean Tatars in 1944]. *Ukrains’kii istorichnii zhurnal* [Ukrainian historical journal], 1.
12. Bugai N.F. (2014) *Ingushskaya i Chechenskaya respubliki: Sunzhenskii raion i drugie sopredel’nye territorii ne est’ osnova dlya sporov...* [The Ingush and Chechen Republics: the Sunzha district and other neighboring areas are not a subject of debate...] In: *Mir glazami istorika: pamyati akademika Yuriya Aleksandrovicha Polyakova* [The world through the eyes of the historian: in memory of Academician Yury Polyakov]. Moscow: Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, pp. 120-131.
13. Bugai N.F. (2015) *Kazachestvo Rossii: mir na granitse, spokoistvie v gosudarstve, sluzhenie Otechestvu...* [The Cossacks in Russia: peace on the border, order in the country, service to the Fatherland...] *“Belye pyatna” rossiiskoi i mirovoi istorii* [“White Spots” of the Russian and World History], 3, pp. 21-46.
14. Bugai N.F. (2007) *Koreitsy stran SNG: obshchestvenno-“geograficheskii” sintez (nachalo XXI veka)* [The Koreans of the CIS countries: a socio-“geographical” synthesis (the early 21st century)]. Moscow: Grif Publ.
15. Bugai N.F. (2015) *Koreitsy Yuga Rossii: mezhetnicheskoe soglasie, dialog, doverie* [The Koreans of the South of Russia: interethnic harmony, dialogue, trust]. Moscow: Grif Publ.
16. Bugai N.F. (2006) *Narody Ukrainy v “Osoboii papke Stalina”* [The peoples of Ukraine in the “Special folder of Stalin”]. Moscow: Nauka Publ.
17. Bugai N.F. (1990) *Pravda o deportatsii chechenskogo i ingushskogo narodov* [The truth about the deportation of the Chechen and Ingush peoples]. *Voprosy istorii* [Issues of history], 7, pp. 32-44.
18. Bugai N.F. (comp.) (2015) *Prinuditel’noe pereselenie krymskikh tatar: put’k rehabilitatsii (materialy i dokumenty)* [Forced relocation of the Crimean Tatars: the path to rehabilitation (materials and documents)]. Moscow: Akvarius Publ.
19. Bugai N.F. (2015) *Problema bezopasnosti v mezhetnicheskikh otnosheniyakh: sostavlyayushchie, evolyutsiya, reshenie* [The problem of security in interethnic relations: components, evolution, solution]. *Istoricheskaya i sotsial’no-obrazovatel’naya mysl’* [Historical and socio-educational ideas], 7 (5-1), pp. 90-107.
20. Bugai N.F. (2008) *Problema deportatsii i rehabilitatsii grazhdan Sovetskogo Soyuza, Rossii v istoriografii stran blizhnego i dal’nego zarubezh’ya* [The problem of the deportation and rehabilitation of the citizens of the Soviet Union, Russia in the historiography of the countries of near and far

- abroad]. In: *Istoriya i istoriki. Istoriograficheskii vestnik* [History and historians. Historiographical bulletin]. Moscow: Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, pp. 130-166.
21. Bugai N.F. (2016) Problema etnicheskikh men'shinstv v rossiiskoi istoriografii (na primere finnov-ingermanlandtsev) [The problem of ethnic minorities in Russian historiography (a case study of the Ingrian Finns)]. *Privolzhskii nauchnyi vestnik* [Privolzhsky scientific journal], 8 (60), pp. 47-68.
 22. Bugai N.F. (2005) Problemy reabilitatsii etnosov Soyuzo SSR v rossiiskoi istoriografii [The problems of the rehabilitation of the ethnic groups of the USSR in Russian historiography]. In: *Istoriya i istoriki. Istoriograficheskii vestnik* [History and historians. Historiographical bulletin]. Moscow: Nauka Publ., pp. 223-264.
 23. Bugai N.F. (2012) *Problemy repressii i reabilitatsii grazhdan: istoriya i istoriografiya (XX v. – nachalo XXI v.)* [The problems of the repression and rehabilitation of citizens: history and historiography (the 20th and the early 21st centuries)]. Moscow: Grif Publ.
 24. Bugai N.F. (2006) *Reabilitatsiya repressirovannykh grazhdan Rossii (XX – nachalo XXI veka)* [The rehabilitation of repressed Russian citizens (the 20th and the early 21st centuries)]. Moscow: MSNK-press Publ.
 25. Bugai N.F. (2002) *Rossiiskie koreitsy i politika "solnechnogo tepla"* [The Russian Koreans and the policy of "the warmth of the sun"]. Moscow: Gotika Publ.
 26. Bugai N.F. (2014) *Rossiiskie koreitsy: peremeny, priority, perspektiva* [The Russian Koreans: changes, priorities, prospects]. Moscow: Akvarius Publ.
 27. Bugai N.F. (2014) Sovetskie ital'yantsy: transformatsii etnicheskoi obshchnosti. 1930-e – 2010-e gody [The Soviet Italians: the transformation of an ethnic community. The 1930s to the 2010s]. *Istoricheskaya i sotsial'no-obrazovatel'naya mysl'* [Historical and socio-educational ideas], 6 (6-1), pp. 41-55.
 28. Bugai N.F. (2017) *Vladimir Zorin – ministr Pravitel'stva Rossiiskoi Federatsii: obshchestvo, lichnost', vremya* [The Minister of the Government of the Russian Federation Vladimir Zorin: society, personality, time]. Moscow: Akvarius Publ.
 29. Bugai N.F., Broev T.M., Broev R.M. (1993) *Sovetskie kurdy: vremya peremen* [The Soviet Kurds: times of change]. Moscow: Kap' Publ.
 30. Bugai N.F., Etenko L.A. (1988) Mezhnatsional'nye otnosheniya na Severnom Kavkaze v osveshchenii noveishei istoriografii [Interethnic relations in the North Caucasus in recent historiography]. *Izvestiya Severo-Kavkazskogo nauchnogo tsentra vysshei shkoly* [Proceedings of the North Caucasus Scientific Centre of Higher School], 1, pp. 58-64.
 31. Bugai N.F., Gonov A.M. (1997) *V Kazakhstan i Kirgiziyu iz Priel'brus'ya (20-50-e gg.)* [From the Elbrus region to Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan (the 1920s to the 1950s)]. Nalchik: El'brus Publ.
 32. Bugai N.F., Mamaev M.I. (2015) *Kabardino-Balkarskaya ASSR: "Spasenie v edinenii i nadezhde..." 1920-1960-e gody* [The Kabardino-Balkar ASSR: "Salvation in unity and hope..." The 1920s to the 1960s]. Moscow: Akvarius Publ.

33. Bugai N.F., O Son Khvan (2004) *Ispytanie vremenem. Rossiiskie koreitsy v otsenkakh diplomatov i politikov. Konets XX – nachalo XXI vv.* [The test of time. The Russian Koreans in the assessments given by diplomats and politicians. The end of 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century]. Moscow: Grif Publ.
34. Bugai N.F., Shturba E.V. (2016) *Kazaki Rossii v obespechenii bezopasnosti: problemy vnutrennikh ugroz. 1990-e – 2015 gg.* [The Cossacks of Russia in ensuring security: the problems of internal threats. The 1990s to 2015]. Moscow – Krasnodar: Institute of Social and Educational Management.
35. Bugai N.F., Sim Khon Eng (2004) *Obshchestvennye ob"edineniya koreitsev Rossii: konstitutivnost', evolyutsiya, priznanie* [The public associations of the Russian Koreans: constitutiveness, evolution, recognition]. Moscow: Novyi Khronograf Publ.
36. Dashdamirov A.F. (1997) *Kavkazskaya identichnost' i dialog kul'tur* [Caucasian identity and the dialogue of cultures]. In: *Moskovskoe ekho Kavkaza* [Moscow echo of the Caucasus]. Moscow: Etnosfera Publ., pp. 17-32.
37. Dashdamirov A.F. (2017) *Kavkazskaya territoriya v usloviyakh prinuditel'nogo pereseleniya narodov: teoriya, praktika* [The Caucasian territory under conditions of forced displacement: theory, practice]. Moscow.
38. Ibragimov M.M. (2015) *Chechentsy: vyselenie, vyzhivanie, vozvrashchenie (1940-1950-e gody)* [The Chechens: eviction, survival, return (the 1940s to the 1950s)]. Grozny: Groznenskii rabochii Publ.
39. Ivanov V.N. (1997) *Rossiiskaya Federatsii: natsional'nye i regional'nye problemy* [The Russian Federation: national and regional problems]. Moscow.
40. Kim A.S., Stadnik V.Yu. (2013) *Natsional'nye obshchestvennye ob"edineniya sovremennoi Rossii: konflikt i konsensus* [National public associations in modern Russia: conflict and consensus]. *Sotsial'nye i gumanitarnye napravleniya na Dal'nem Vostoke* [The humanities and social studies in the Far East], 3 (39), pp. 34-42.
41. Kobleva Z.Kh. (2006) *Osnovnye problemy natsional'noi politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii (Severo-Kavkazskii region)* [The main problems of the national policy in the Russian Federation (the North Caucasus region)]. *Novye tekhnologii* [New technologies], 1, pp. 39-41.
42. Konstantinov N.N. (2012) *Sovetskii Soyuz 1944-1991 godov v istoriografii: reprezentatsiya polietnicheskogo politicheskogo obshchestva* [The Soviet Union of 1944-1991 in historiography: the representation of a multi-ethnic political society]. Ekaterinburg: Grif Publ.
43. Korkmazova Z.A. (2009) *Migratsionnye protsessy i problema bezopasnosti na Severnom Kavkaze* [Migration processes and security issues in the North Caucasus]. *Vestnik Stavropol'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* [Bulletin of Stavropol State University], 5, pp. 196-202.
44. Metelev V.L. (2006) *Natsional'naya bezopasnost' i priority razvitiya Rossii: sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie i pravovye aspekty* [National security and priorities in the development of Russia: socio-economic and legal aspects]. Moscow: Yuniti-Dana Publ.

45. *Narody Rossii: problemy deportatsii i reabilitatsii* [The peoples of Russia: the problems of deportation and rehabilitation] (1997). Maykop: Meoty Publ.
46. Nazarova E.A. (1999) *Sotsial'naya adaptatsiya vynuzhdennykh pereselentsev i bezhentsev v kontekste sovremennoi migratsionnoi politiki Rossii: sotsiologicheskii analiz* [The social adaptation of internally displaced persons and refugees in the context of Russia's modern migration policy: a sociological analysis]. Moscow: Soyuz Publ.
47. *Oni srazhalis' za Rodinu: predstaviteli repressirovannykh narodov SSSR na frontakh Velikoi Otechestvennoi voiny* [They fought for their Motherland: representatives of the repressed peoples of the USSR on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War] (2005). Moscow: Novyi Khronograf Publ.
48. Pak B.D., Bugai N.F. (2004) *140 let v Rossii: ocherk istorii rossiiskikh koreitsev* [140 years in Russia: an outline of the history of the Russian Koreans]. Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
49. Radikov I.V. (2004) *Politika i natsional'naya bezopasnost'* [Policy and national security]. St. Petersburg: Asterion Publ.
50. Rvacheva O.V. (2014) *Kazachestvo v sovremennom sotsiokul'turnom prostranstve Yuga Rossii: problemy vozrozhdeniya i vzaimodeistviya s drugimi narodami* [The Cossacks in the modern socio-cultural space of the South of Russia: problems of revival and interaction with other peoples]. *Primo Aspectu*, 17 (13), pp. 98-101.
51. Savel'ev V.V. (2012) *Grazhdanskoe edinstvo kak attraktor vnutrennei politiki* [Civic unity as an attractor of internal policy]. In: *Rossiya: tendentsii i perspektivy razvitiya* [Russia: trends and prospects for development], Vol. 7-2. Moscow: Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences of the Russian Academy of Sciences, pp. 242-248.
52. Savel'ev V.V. (2015) *K voprosu o razrabotke teorii federativno-natsional'nykh otnoshenii* [On the development of the theory of federative-ethnic relations]. *Etnosotsium i mezhnatsional'nye kul'tury* [Ethnosocium and ethnic culture], 12 (90), pp. 11-26.
53. Savel'ev V.V. (2013) *K voprosu ob evolyutsii vnutrennei politiki v Rossiiskoi Federatsii* [On the evolution of the domestic policy in the Russian Federation]. *Trudy Vserossiiskoi nauchnoi konferentsii "Sovremennye problemy gosudarstvennoi politiki i upravleniya"* [Proc. Conf. "Contemporary problems of state policy and administration"]. Moscow: Nauchnyi ekspert Publ., pp. 297-308.
54. Savel'ev V.V. (2010) *Model' samoopredeleniya narodov v Rossii* [A model of the self-determination of peoples in Russia]. Moscow: Russian Academy of Public Administration.
55. Shturba E.V. (2009) *Formirovanie i realizatsiya Kontseptsii natsional'noi bezopasnosti Rossiiskoi Federatsii v 1992-2004 gg. Doct. Diss.* [The development and implementation of the National Security Concept of the Russian Federation in 1992-2004. Doct. Diss.] Moscow.
56. Sinitsyn F.L. (2010) *Za russkii narod! Natsional'nyi vopros v Velikoi Otechestvennoi voine* [For Russian people! The national question in the Great Patriotic War]. Moscow: Yauza Publ.

57. Stolyarov M.V. (2010) *Federalizm v rossiiskom izmerenii: zapiski politologa, 1998-2009* [Federalism in the Russian dimensions: notes of a political scientist, 1998-2009]. Moscow: Russian Academy of Public Administration.
58. Takhnaeva P.I. (2017) K voprosu nesostoyavsheisya deportatsii dagestantsev v 1944 g. [On the failed attempt to deport the Dagestanis in 1944]. *Istoricheskaya ekspertiza* [Historical examination], 1, pp. 72-95.
59. Tishkov V.A. (ed.) (1997) *Vynuzhdennyye migranty: integratsiya i vozvrashchenie* [Forced migrants: integration and return]. Moscow: Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
60. Vashchuk A.S., Chernolutsкая E.N. (2014) O nekotorykh problemakh izucheniya prinuditel'nykh migratsii i "vlasti terminov" v nauke: otklik na stat'yu N.F. Bugaya [On some problems of carrying out research on forced migration and the "power of terms" in science: a response to the article by N.F. Bugai]. *Istoricheskaya i sotsial'no-obrazovatel'naya mysl'* [Historical and socio-educational ideas], 3, pp. 70-76.
61. Vitkovskaya G.S. (1993) *Vynuzhdennaya migratsiya: problemy i perspektivy* [Forced migration: problems and prospects]. Moscow.
62. *Vklad repressirovannykh narodov SSSR v pobedu v Velikoi Otechestvennoi voine 1941-1945 gg.* [The contribution of the repressed peoples of the USSR to the victory in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945] (2010), Vol. 1. Elista: Dzhangar Publ.
63. Vozzhenikov A.V. (2000) *Natsional'naya bezopasnost': teoriya, politika, strategiya* [National security: theory, policy, strategy]. Moscow: Modul' Publ.
64. Zorin V.Yu. (2012) *Etnopolitika v sovremennoi Rossii: stat'i, vystupleniya, interv'yu* [Ethnopolitics in modern Russia: articles, speeches, interviews]. Saratov: Povolzhsky Institute of Management.

Проблема межэтнических отношений Российской Федерации в современной историографии. 1990-е – 2017 гг.

Бугай Николай Федорович

Доктор исторических наук, профессор,
главный научный сотрудник,

Институт российской истории Российской академии наук,
117336, Российская Федерация, Москва, ул. Дмитрия Ульянова, 19;
e-mail: nikolay401@yandex.ru

Аннотация

Статья посвящена актуальной проблеме многонационального сообщества – состоянию межэтнических отношений, их разработке в российской историографии. Целями статьи являются рассмотрение состояния историографии самой проблемы на сегодняшний день. Стоит отметить, что события в этой сфере всегда развиваются на грани исторического и психологического факторов. В связи с этим должны бы проявляться повышенное внимание и ответственность. Посредством анализа изданной литературы по проблеме национальной государственной политики принимается попытка определиться в комплексе с такими аспектами темы, как состояние многонационального объединения России, экономика, сфера культуры, состояние условий для формирования самосознания и национального сознания граждан, реализации принципов демократизации сообществ, а также состояние степени разработки названных проблем в исторической науке. Анализ представленных научных трудов позволяет сделать выводы о происходящем процессе удовлетворения интересов граждан, консолидации национальных сообществ в государстве с целью решения их собственных житейских вопросов, формирования самосознания и национального сознания, конструкции новых форм и «моделей» работы с населением. Также стоит указать и на выработку новых социальных схем регулирования национальных процессов в стране, формирование таких условий, в которых многонациональному объединению народов Российской Федерации жилось бы удобно.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

Бугай Н.Ф. Проблема межэтнических отношений Российской Федерации в современной историографии. 1990-е – 2017 гг. // «Белые пятна» российской и мировой истории. 2018. № 3. С. 52-73.

Ключевые слова

Межэтнические отношения, национальная политика, нациестроительство, институт гражданского общества, автономия, регламент, миграция, демократизация.

Библиография

1. Алиев К.А., Курбанов М.Р., Юсупов Г.И. Чеченцы-аккинцы Дагестана: к проблеме реабилитации. М.: Региональный центр этнополитических исследований, 1994. 59 с.
2. Аманжолова Д.А. Сталинизм в национальной политике: некоторые вопросы историографии // Симония Н.А. (ред.) Историография сталинизма. М.: РОССПЭН, 2007. С. 321-355.
3. Безугольный А.Ю., Бугай Н.Ф., Кринко Е.Ф. Горцы Северного Кавказа в Великой Отечественной войне 1941-1945 гг.: проблемы историографии и источниковедения. М.: Центрполиграф, 2012. 256 с.

4. Бромлей Ю.В. Национальные процессы в СССР: в поисках новых подходов. М.: Наука, 1988. 208 с.
5. Бромлей Ю.В. Очерки теории этноса. М.: Наука, 1983. 412 с.
6. Бромлей Ю.В. Этнонациональные процессы: теория, история, современность. М.: Наука, 1987.
7. Бромлей Ю.В., Козлов В.И. Национальные процессы при социализме в свете ленинских идей // Ленинизм и проблемы этнографии. Л.: Наука, 1987. С. 18-37.
8. Бугай Н.Ф. «Его секрет в жизнелюбии...» Лидер общественного объединения корейцев России – Василий Цо. М.: Аквариус, 2015. 348 с.
9. Бугай Н.Ф. «Переселить все корейское население... В. Молотов. И. Сталин». Сеул, 1998.
10. Бугай Н.Ф. Владимир Зорин – министр Правительства Российской Федерации: общество, личность, время. М.: Аквариус, 2017. 226 с.
11. Бугай Н.Ф. Депортация крымских татар в 1944 году // Український історичний журнал. 1992. № 1.
12. Бугай Н.Ф. Ингушская и Чеченская республики: Сунженский район и другие сопредельные территории не есть основа для споров... // Мир глазами историка: памяти академика Юрия Александровича Полякова. М.: Институт Российской истории РАН, 2014. С. 120-131.
13. Бугай Н.Ф. Казачество России: мир на границе, спокойствие в государстве, служение Отечеству... // «Белые пятна» российской и мировой истории. 2015. № 3. С. 21-46.
14. Бугай Н.Ф. Корейцы стран СНГ: общественно-«географический» синтез (начало XXI века). М.: Гриф, 2007. 360 с.
15. Бугай Н.Ф. Корейцы Юга России: межэтническое согласие, диалог, доверие. М.: Гриф, 2015. 512 с.
16. Бугай Н.Ф. Народы Украины в «Особой папке Сталина». М.: Наука, 2006. 271 с.
17. Бугай Н.Ф. Правда о депортации чеченского и ингушского народов // Вопросы истории. 1990. № 7. С. 32-44.
18. Бугай Н.Ф. (сост.) Принудительное переселение крымских татар: путь к реабилитации (материалы и документы). М.: Аквариус, 2015. 256 с.
19. Бугай Н.Ф. Проблема безопасности в межэтнических отношениях: составляющие, эволюция, решение // Историческая и социально-образовательная мысль. 2015. Т. 7. № 5-1. С. 90-107.
20. Бугай Н.Ф. Проблема депортации и реабилитации граждан Советского Союза, России в историографии стран ближнего и дальнего зарубежья // История и историки. Историографический вестник. М.: Институт Российской истории РАН, 2008. С. 130-166.
21. Бугай Н.Ф. Проблема этнических меньшинств в российской историографии (на примере финнов-ингерманландцев) // Приволжский научный вестник. 2016. № 8 (60). С. 47-68.

22. Бугай Н.Ф. Проблемы реабилитации этносов Союза ССР в российской историографии // История и историки. Историографический вестник. М.: Наука, 2005. С. 223-264.
23. Бугай Н.Ф. Проблемы репрессий и реабилитации граждан: история и историография (XX в. – начало XXI в.). М.: Гриф, 2012. 480 с.
24. Бугай Н.Ф. Реабилитация репрессированных граждан России (XX – начало XXI века). М.: МСНК-пресс, 2006. 464 с.
25. Бугай Н.Ф. Российские корейцы и политика «солнечного тепла». М.: Готика, 2002. 253 с.
26. Бугай Н.Ф. Российские корейцы: перемены, приоритеты, перспектива. М.: Аквариус, 2014. 456 с.
27. Бугай Н.Ф. Советские итальянцы: трансформации этнической общности. 1930-е – 2010-е годы // Историческая и социально-образовательная мысль. 2014. Т. 6. № 6-1. С. 41-55.
28. Бугай Н.Ф. Чеченская Республика: конфронтация, стабильность, мир. М.: Гриф, 2006. 476 с.
29. Бугай Н.Ф., Броев Т.М., Броев Р.М. Советские курды: время перемен. М.: Капь, 1993. 192 с.
30. Бугай Н.Ф., Гонов А.М. В Казахстан и Киргизию из Приэльбрусья (20-50-е гг.). Нальчик: Эльбрус, 1997.
31. Бугай Н.Ф., Мамаев М.И. Кабардино-Балкарская АССР: «Спасение в единении и надежде...» 1920-1960-е годы. М.: Аквариус, 2015. 416 с.
32. Бугай Н.Ф., О Сон Хван. Испытание временем. Российские корейцы в оценках дипломатов и политиков. Конец XX – начало XXI вв. М.: Гриф, 2004. 172 с.
33. Бугай Н.Ф., Сим Хон Енг. Общественные объединения корейцев России: конститутивность, эволюция, признание. М.: Новый Хронограф, 2004. 374 с.
34. Бугай Н.Ф., Штурба Е.В. Казаки России в обеспечении безопасности: проблемы внутренних угроз. 1990-е – 2015 гг. М. – Краснодар: ИСОМ, 2016. 287 с.
35. Бугай Н.Ф., Этенко Л.А. Межнациональные отношения на Северном Кавказе в освещении новейшей историографии // Известия Северо-Кавказского научного центра высшей школы. 1988. № 1. С. 58-64.
36. Ващук А.С., Чернолуцкая Е.Н. О некоторых проблемах изучения принудительных миграций и «власти терминов» в науке: отклик на статью Н.Ф. Бугая // Историческая и социально-образовательная мысль. 2014. № 3. С. 70-76.
37. Витковская Г.С. Вынужденная миграция: проблемы и перспективы. М., 1993. 174 с.
38. Вклад репрессированных народов СССР в победу в Великой Отечественной войне 1941-1945 гг. Элиста: Джангар, 2010. Т. 1. 575 с.
39. Возжеников А.В. Национальная безопасность: теория, политика, стратегия. М.: Модуль, 2000. 234 с.

40. Дашдамиров А.Ф. Кавказская идентичность и диалог культур // Московское эхо Кавказа. М.: Этносфера, 1997. С. 17-32.
41. Дашдамиров А.Ф. Кавказская территория в условиях принудительного переселения народов: теория, практика. М., 2017.
42. Зорин В.Ю. Этнополитика в современной России: статьи, выступления, интервью. Саратов: Поволжский институт им. П.А. Столыпина, 2012. 132 с.
43. Ибрагимов М.М. Чеченцы: выселение, выживание, возвращение (1940-1950-е годы). Грозный: Грозненский рабочий, 2015. 270 с.
44. Иванов В.Н. Российская Федерация: национальные и региональные проблемы. М., 1997. 54 с.
45. Ким А.С., Стадник В.Ю. Национальные общественные объединения современной России: конфликт и консенсус // Социальные и гуманитарные направления на Дальнем Востоке. 2013. № 3 (39). С. 34-42.
46. Коблева З.Х. Основные проблемы национальной политики Российской Федерации (Северо-Кавказский регион) // Новые технологии. 2006. № 1. С. 39-41.
47. Константинов Н.Н. Советский Союз 1944-1991 годов в историографии: репрезентация полиэтнического политического общества. Екатеринбург: Гриф, 2012. 250 с.
48. Коркмазова З.А. Миграционные процессы и проблема безопасности на Северном Кавказе // Вестник Ставропольского государственного университета. 2009. № 5. С. 196-202.
49. Метелев В.Л. Национальная безопасность и приоритеты развития России: социально-экономические и правовые аспекты. М.: Юнити-Дана, 2006. 223 с.
50. Назарова Е.А. Социальная адаптация вынужденных переселенцев и беженцев в контексте современной миграционной политики России: социологический анализ. М.: Союз, 1999. 137 с.
51. Народы России: проблемы депортации и реабилитации. Майкоп: Меоты, 1997. 198 с.
52. Они сражались за Родину: представители репрессированных народов СССР на фронтах Великой Отечественной войны. М.: Новый Хронограф, 2005. 341 с.
53. Пак Б.Д., Бугай Н.Ф. 140 лет в России: очерк истории российских корейцев. М.: ИВ РАН, 2004. 462 с.
54. Радиков И.В. Политика и национальная безопасность. СПб.: Астерион, 2004. 346 с.
55. Рвачева О.В. Казачество в современном социокультурном пространстве Юга России: проблемы возрождения и взаимодействия с другими народами // Primo Aspectu. 2014. Т. 17. № 13. С. 98-101.
56. Савельев В.В. Гражданское единство как аттрактор внутренней политики // Россия: тенденции и перспективы развития. М.: ИНИОН РАН, 2012. Вып. 7. Ч. 2. С. 242-248.
57. Савельев В.В. К вопросу о разработке теории федеративно-национальных отношений // Этносоциум и межнациональные культуры. 2015. № 12 (90). С. 11-26.

58. Савельев В.В. К вопросу об эволюции внутренней политики в Российской Федерации // Труды Всероссийской научной конференции «Современные проблемы государственной политики и управления». М.: Научный эксперт, 2013. С. 297-308.
59. Савельев В.В. Модель самоопределения народов в России. М.: РАГС, 2010. 116 с.
60. Синицын Ф.Л. За русский народ! Национальный вопрос в Великой Отечественной войне. М.: Яуза, 2010. 416 с.
61. Столяров М.В. Федерализм в российском измерении: записки политолога, 1998-2009. М.: РАГС, 2010. 687 с.
62. Тахнаева П.И. К вопросу несостоявшейся депортации дагестанцев в 1944 г. // Историческая экспертиза. 2017. № 1. С. 72-95.
63. Тишков В.А. (ред.) Вынужденные мигранты: интеграция и возвращение. М.: Институт этнологии и антропологии им. Н.Н. Миклухо-Маклая РАН, 1997. 308 с.
64. Штурба Е.В. Формирование и реализация Концепции национальной безопасности Российской Федерации в 1992-2004 гг.: дис. ... д-ра ист. наук. М., 2009. 466 с.