

Concepts of Ethnos and Nation in Scientific and Theoretical Studies

N. Omelaenko

Institute of service and industry management,
Department of foreign languages,
Tyumen industrial university,
Volodarskogo 38, Tyumen 625000, Russia
omnv2011@mail.ru

Abstract— The article touches upon the issue of the concepts of ethnos and nation in theoretical studies. An analysis of available sources has shown that there is no uniform understanding of such categories as ethnos and nation in the academic community, some researchers differentiate them, and others identify them. Ethnos is a sociocultural community and originated much earlier than the nation. Ethnos was formed and developed a much longer period than the nation. The ethnos includes representatives of one ethnic group, which are united by a sense of blood relationship, language, customs and traditions, stereotypes of behavior, awareness of their unity and differences from other ethnic groups. The nation consists of representatives of one ethnic group and several ethnic communities, and all of them are united by historical, cultural, economic and political factors, a common ideology and an awareness of belonging to a single state. Nations are the result of a political union of different ethnic groups, as a result of which a new state is being created. The state forms a common national identity and a common sense of belonging to the political, economic and cultural community of the country.

Keywords – *people; ethnos; ethnogenesis; ethnicity; nation.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Initially, the word ethnos originated in the ancient Greek language and had several meanings: the people, the tribe, the pagans, the herd, the genus. Until the end of the XVIII century researchers rarely used the definition of ethnos. This term was used in the scientific literature in the sense of "people" only in the XIX century.

The notion of "ethnos" was introduced because the word "people" denoted different social groups - nations, nationalities, tribes. The use of the term "ethnos" made it possible to avoid this polysemy.

The concept of ethnos is often associated with the term of ethnicity. A significant number of publications on the issue of "ethnos" appeared in the 60-70s in the world scientific literature. Categories of ethnos and the nation were considered in philosophy, sociology, cultural studies, philology, ethnology and other social and human sciences.

Nation is a classic problem in Philosophy. The nation is a community of people for whom certain objective and subjective prerequisites are necessary: the commonality of language, culture, territory, history and self-awareness. Under the ethnos, we understand the community of people which are united by specific features of culture and technology, as well

as general self-awareness and self-identification (Tuaeva, 2014).

The term "ethnos" is used in a narrow and broad sense in the cultural context. "Ethnos" is a collective concept and includes all types of ethnic communities in a broad sense. Ethnic groups are the basic units of the ethnic classification of humanity, with which one can identify ethnic communities of greater or lesser complexity. This understanding suggests that each person refers to some kind of ethnic community, to some ethnic culture.

Ethnos is one of the forms of ethnic community in the narrow sense. It has historically evolved in a certain territory. It represents a stable intergenerational community of people that have stable features of culture, psyche and self-consciousness that allows members of the ethnos to distinguish themselves from all other ethnic entities (Antoniuk, 2013).

According to some researchers in the domestic science there are two approaches for determining the nation. The first approach defines a nation as an ethnos, and the second as citizen group. The representative of the first approach Tishkov believed that a person could have only one citizenship, and the nationality could be double, triple or none.

A supporter of the second approach was Volkov that believed that the concepts of ethnos and nation were different in nature. A nation was polyethnic and it was both an objective and subjective ethnic phenomenon because it had such properties as spirituality, national spirit and consciousness.

Volkov was convinced that two opposing approaches to the interpretation of a nation (a nation was - an ethnos and a nation was - a state) couldn't contrast each other since this affected the formation of the national policy of the state and the state of interethnic relations (Kochenkova, Yurina, 2015).

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

For the first time the concept of "ethnos" was introduced by Shirokogorov (Shirokogorov, (1923) in Russian science. This definition appeared due to Weber in the foreign science (Weber, 2004).

Unfortunately, Shirokogorov's scientific research was interrupted and forgotten. Only in the 50s of the XX century this term began to appear again in ethnographic publications.

In the 60s of the XX century our country conducted research on the history of ethnic groups, traditions and

customs, ethnic processes, ethnogenesis of ethnic groups. During these years the primordial theory of ethnos presented by academician Bromley received a deep and comprehensive development.

At present, there are various approaches to the study of ethnos, ethnicity and the nation: primordial, constructivist and instrumentalist ones.

Considerable studies of scientists have been carried on the issues of ethnogenesis, development and interaction of ethnoses, its structure and basic forms of existence. These ideas were projected in the writings of Arutyunov, 1989; Arutyunyan, 2008; Bromley, 1983; Danilevsky, 2008; Dugin, 2011; Gadzhiev, 2013; Gumilev, 1994; Rybakov, 2001, Shirokogorov, 1923; Sorokin, 1992; Tishkov, 1997; Viner, 2005;

The formation of the nation and ethnos made appearance in the works of Anderson, Bauer, Chrokh, 2002; Belokhvostova, 2007; Drobizhevoy, 2008; Kolev, 2005; Zaripov and Faizullin, 2000; Zdravomyslov, 1999; Valkov, 1996.

Thus, it can be stated that to date, there are different and often contradictory approaches and points of view that are antithetical. They cover different aspects of ethnos, ethnicity and nation. However, some questions that arise during the research remain unanswered.

The main questions addressed in this paper are: a) How is the ethnos formed? b) Why do ethnic groups arise and disappear? c) What are the main signs for determining the ethnos and the nation? d) Why do nations appear? This paper seeks to remedy these problems by analyzing the literature concerning the issue of ethnos and nation.

III. FINDINGS

As it was mentioned in the literature review, in scientific community there was no clear differentiation of the concepts of ethnos, nation and people. They were often used in the same sense.

So, for example, studying the laws of development and movement of different ethnic groups Danilevsky, used the term of the people distributing them according to different cultural and historical types. Throughout history there were several civilizations that lived according to certain laws.

Law 1. Every tribe or family of peoples was characterized by a separate language or a group of languages that are quite close to each other.

Law 2. Political independence was necessary for the birth of civilizations.

Law 3. The beginning of a civilization of one cultural-historical type was not transferred to peoples of a different type. Each type created its civilization under the influence of other early or subsequent civilizations.

Law 4. Civilization achieved prosperity, diversity and wealth when ethnographic elements were independent and constituted a federation or political system of the state.

Law 5. The age of civilizations was not long; they appeared, blossomed and then perished (Danilevsky, 2008).

The identification of the ethnos, the people and the nation is pointed in the definition which is represented by

Horuzhenko. Ethnos, ethnic community (Greek ethnos - tribe, people) is a historically arisen a stable group of people, represented by a tribe, a nationality, a nation. The term is close to the concept of the people in the ethnographic sense. A total area, language, and common psychological traits are necessary for the emergence of an ethnos. Its characteristic features are: 1) self-name (ethnonym) associated with the name of the territory of residence (toponym) in certain cases; 2) territorial integrity as a condition for the formation and existence of an ethnos; 3) the presence of anthropological (racial) traits; 4) manifestation of the characteristics of culture (material, spiritual) (Khoruzhenko, 1997).

The first definition of ethnos was presented by Shirokogorov. His main achievement was that the concept of "ethnos" was presented as an independent and sociological scientific category. Shirokogorov proposed two theories of the origin of the ethnos. The first theory considered the ethnos as a group of people that had special cultural features, spoke the same language, recognized its one origin, had a set of customs, a way of life, kept and consecrated traditions and that differed from other groups (Shirokogorov, 1923).

The term "ethnos" was applied by Shirokogorov to the processes of the emergence and development of an ethnic group in the second theory. This process was expressed in the formation of ethnic communities. Studying the ethnos, the researcher combined primordialist and constructivist theories of its origin. He recognized the biological basis of the ethnos, the role of the material components of culture and social organization, and put forward the theory of the psycho-complex.

Shirokogorov like Danilevsky compared the ethnos with a living organism which was going through periods of growth, prosperity and decline. He believed that the life forces of an ethnos could be determined by increasing the number of members of an ethnos. The expansion of the territory or the use of scientific and technical innovations occurred only with growth of the vital forces of the ethnos. The decline of the ethnos was expressed in the reduction of the population, or in the reduction of the cultural and technical level.

Later, the integral concept of the origin of the ethnos was formulated by Academician Bromley. He defined the ethnos as a historically established population of people with a relatively stable culture. It included language and psyche, as well as a consciousness of their unity and difference from all other similar entities (self-consciousness), and a fixed self-name (ethnonym) (Bromley, 1983).

A similar definition of ethnos was given by Rybakov. Considering the ethnos the scientist wrote that the concept of ethnos (ethnic group) showed the objective existence of certain groups of people united by the realization of their own unity and difference from others.

The definition proposed by Bromley was significantly supplemented. Namely, he suggested that the ethnos was formed spontaneously and presented an unstructured amorphous community with different borders and constantly changing membership in the ethnic group (Rybakov, 2012).

A study of ethnos and ethnic processes was carried out by Gumilev who defined the ethnos as a collective of individuals having a unique internal structure and an original stereotype of behavior.

He suggested that the structure and stereotype of behavior were constantly changing. According to Gumilev, the ethnos did not belong to either the sociological, or biological, or geographical phenomenon (Gumilev, 1994).

The form of existence of the species *Homo sapiens* was a collective of individuals which opposed itself to all other collectives. It was more or less stable although it arose and disappeared in historical time. It was the problem of ethnogenesis.

All collectives differed among themselves, sometimes in language, sometimes according to customs, according to the system of ideology. But their main distinguishing feature was their different origins and historical destiny.

Consequently, on the one hand, the ethnos originated from a historical process, and on the other hand, (through productive activities - the economy) was associated with the biocoenosis of the landscape in which it was formed (Gumilev, 1994).

Gumilev wrote, "The ethnos was more or less stable, although it arose and disappeared in historical time. There was no single real sign for the definition of an ethnos applicable to all cases known to us. Language, origin, customs, material culture, ideology were sometimes the defining moments, and sometimes not. To take out the brackets, we could have only one thing - the recognition of each individual, "We were such, and all the others were different" (Gumilev, 1994).

To find out their differences, it was important to consistently describe the stereotype of the behavior of certain ethnic groups. However, it was necessary to remember that the behavior of the ethnos was changing depending on its age. This age would be convenient to determine from the moment when the ethnos left the historical stage.

The phenomenon of ethnos was the behavior of the individuals who made it up. In other words, the phenomenon of ethnos was not in the bodies of people, but it existed in their actions and relationships. Consequently, there was no person outside the ethnos, except the newborn baby. Every person had to behave in some way, and it was the nature of the behavior that determined his ethnicity.

Thus, the emergence of a new ethnos presented the creation of a new stereotype of behavior, different from the previous ethnos (Gumilev, 1994).

Analyzing the variants of ethnic contacts, Gumilev believed that ethnic groups did not exist in isolation in a real historical process but there were different variants of ethnic contacts that appeared in territories populated by different ethnic groups politically united in polyethnic states. When studying their relationship, four variants might be mentioned:

a) coexistence is a process, in which ethnoses did not mix and imitate each other borrowing only technical innovations;

b) assimilation is the absorption of one ethnic group by another with dark oblivion of origin and former traditions;

c) miscegenation meant conservation of traditions and their combination with previous ethnic groups, and the memory of ancestors. These variations were usually unstable and existed due to the replenishment of new half-breeds;

d) a merger assumed a process in which the traditions of both primary components were forgotten, and a new, third ethnos arose next to the two preceding (or instead of them). This was essentially the main version of ethnogenesis. For some reason, it was observed less often than all others (Gumilev, 1994).

Living in one territory all ethnic groups were constantly interacting with each other in various fields of activity. Various interethnic conflicts came into existence in the process of interethnic interaction. With regard to Sorokin, a common ethnic identity was one of the factors that had a positive impact on the interaction process. Sorokin was convinced that the interaction between individuals of the same race, nationality, tribe, territorial group, family, sex, or age, which had the same socio-cultural values, varied from the interaction between individuals differing in these qualities (Sorokin, 1992).

Unlike Gumilev, Gajiyev believed that the ethnos was not a natural and a biological phenomenon. Ethnicity was formed historically in a certain geographical environment, in a collective of related people who were in endogamous relations. The human collective became an ethnos only when its members formed ethnic self-consciousness. This opinion was shared by representatives of the primordial and constructivist research directions.

Ethnic self-identification occurred only on the basis of common cultural values. The cultural components of ethnicity were language, mentality, traditions, and other phenomena of spiritual life. To keep the values of the ethnos, it was essential to have relationships among the members of the collective, socialize the person, and communicate with the next generations. Thus, the ethnos has become a socio-cultural phenomenon (Gajiyev, 2013).

The constructivist approach to the definition of ethnos was presented by Tishkov. Tishkov proposed the following definition of an ethnic group, "A community that was based on cultural self-identification in regard to other communities with which it was in fundamental relations". Further, he wrote that in this case the concept of an ethnic group was synonymous with the concept of people (in the ethnocultural sense), ethnic community (ethnos) or nationality.

Tishkov believed that the sign of ethnic community was not a common origin but a representation or a myth about the common historical fate of members of this community (Tishkov, 2005).

The notion of ethnos was given by Weber in foreign science. Weber suggested the definition "ethnic group" instead of "ethnos". Ethnic groups were groups of people who had a subjective belief in common origin. This belief became important for creation of community. Weber considered that these groups could be called as ethnic groups regardless of whether there was between them an objective unity of blood or not.

Weber gave great importance to ethnic unity. He wrote that, on the one hand, ethnic unity provided the formation of a political community; on the other hand, a political community evoked faith in ethnic unity that could be kept even after its disintegration. The common language and similar religious beliefs created strong feelings of "ethnic kinship". At the same time racial qualities did not play a big role (Weber, 2004).

New forms of social community - the nations have been emerged in the process of long historical development. In connection with this, there were different theories of origin and definition of a nation. Some researchers distinguished the concepts of "ethnos" and "nation", others identified them.

The cultural approach to the definition of a nation was presented in the study of Anderson, Bauer, and Chroch. According to Bauer, a nation was defined as a community of character. The community of the character consisted in a set of the physical and spiritual attributes. They were illustrative of each nation and united it into a whole and distinguished it from other nations.

A common character originated from active reasons that created the same character and common destiny. The common destiny meant living together, the same fate on the basis of permanent relations and uninterrupted interaction (Anderson, Bauer, Chroch, 2002).

Verderi examined the concept of "nation" as an aspect of the political and symbolic (ideological) order, as well as the world of social interaction and feeling.

According to the researcher, "In the modern era, the nation has become a symbol and the basis of classification in the international system of national states. Relations between states and subjects were denoted by nation, as well as between one state and others. A nation was an ideological construct that played an important role in determining the positions of actors, both as a part of the modern state, and as a part of international law" (Anderson, Bauer, Hroch, 2002).

Chrokh defined the nation as a large social group, associated with the whole combination of types of objective relations (economic, political, linguistic, cultural, religious, geographical, and historical) and their subjective reflection in a collective name.

Many of these ties might vary, but three of them remained unchanged. They comprised the memory of the common past, interpreted as the "fate" of the group, the density and intensity of linguistic and cultural ties that provided a higher level of social communication within the group than outside, the concentration of equality of all members of the group organized in civil society (Anderson, Bauer, Chrokh, 2002).

Having studied the works devoted to the nation, the author of the paper can conclude that foreign scientists consider the category of a nation within the framework of the cultural theories of identify - a nation and an ethnos.

The variety of definitions of a nation allows us to analyse them studying various scientific approaches.

For example, Marx, Engels, and Lenin highlighted the class-social origin and socio-economic essence of the nation. A nation was determined as an integral phenomenon in

Marxist theory. The Marxist tradition defined a nation through a common language, territory, features of culture, consciousness and psychology. Such a theory of the nation could be applied to representatives of a single ethnic community (Kolev, 2005)

Zaripov and Fayzullin pointed out the psychological, etatized and ethnological theories of the nation (Zaripov, Fayzullin, 2000).

The psychological concept of the nation was the subject of study in auto-Marxism. The representative of this approach was Springer who termed the nation as a union of alike thinking individuals. They spoke a common language and were not connected with the land. The main elements creating a nation were historical and sociological ones. He represented the nation as a cultural union of individuals.

According to the ethatized theory of the nation, nations were considered as the part of citizens of the state. This theory identified the nation and the state. It included a politicized idea uniting citizens in the state. The starting point of this concept was the identification of the nation and the state.

Now the ethnological conception of nations is developing. Ethnic differences of communities are at the center of attention in this concept which enter into one economic, political, territorial, administrative organization and have a single ethnic identity.

Domestic scientists also offer various interpretations of the nation. So, Belokhvostova defined the nation as a symbolic field, which was built by society and supported the self-identification of its members. This field was formed by creation, transmission and assimilation of the symbols of oneself and others (Belokhvostova, 2007).

The constructivist approach to the definition of a nation has received considerable attention in Tishkov's works. He wrote, "A nation could be seen as a social construct and as an imaginary collective whose members did not personally know each other and did not interact, nevertheless they considered themselves as a single community with a common character, hopes and destiny" (Tishkov, 1998).

Relying on the "French" model of the nation, Academician Pozdnyakov believed that the nation manifested itself through the duality of the state and civil society, and the formation of a nation was a political process although the nation was not based on the ethnic community but on the political activity of the state which followed the national idea (Kolev, 2005).

A similar point of view was presented in Dugin's studies (Dugin, 2011).

Dugin believed that the nation - is a political concept, and was closely associated with the modern bourgeois state of modern times. It could be defined as the second derivative of an ethnos.

The nation was a society that was more complex and differentiated. Comparing the structure of the nation and the people Dugin noted the following features. There were two models of identity - ethnic and individual in the people. There was only an individual identity in the nation that has extended to all members of the nation. The individuals were heroes and

aristocracy in the people. Individuals were merchants and generally all sections of population in the nation.

The individual identification that underlay the nation was expressed in the legal sign - citizenship. Element of the nation was a citizen of this state. This form of identity was legal, political and fixed.

Civil identity displaced other forms of identity with the ethnos and the people. From a legal point of view, neither the ethnos nor the people were legal categories and were not recorded in legal and official documents. However, ethnicity and belonging to the people have always been kept as a whole.

Many researchers shared the concepts of ethnos and nation. So, Rybakov said that the ethnos was mainly a socio-cultural community. All the greatest creations of human culture were deeply ethnic. A nation was a socio-political community, a subject of politics by its definition (Rybakov, 2001).

According to Boroday, the specificity of the ethnos as a community of the first type was that it was based on anthropogenetic features; therefore it was self-sufficient and did not need a state in the normal course of events.

A nation was a community of the second type, a product of the state and a political-civil unity where the internal regulator was no longer a custom as a reflection of moral values in the ethnic consciousness but a right. The first important sign of a nation was that it was original, by its nature, polyethnic, or more precisely, sub-ethnic (Rybakov, 2001).

Koliev proposed not to divide the concepts of ethnos and the nation, "The patrimonial, cultural and political mechanisms of the community were connected with each other leaving different phenomena that we defined as ethnos, others as a nation, in some cases. The generic (local) origin was the dominant in the first case and political (state) origin was in the second case. We had mainly mythical identification in the first case, rationalistic one in the second case. But the mythical and scientific-practical rationality did not displace each other because it was impossible to separate them from each other, how it was impossible to divide the ethnos and the nation" (Kolev, 2005).

And absolutely extreme position was taken by Valkov. At first he wrote that the concept of a nation did not exist at all, since it was a working concept, a logical tool used for philosophical and scientific analysis. And yet later the researcher considered the nation as a social form of the development of the human spirit taken in all the diversity of its manifestations to a certain degree of development (Valkov, 1996).

The author of this paper is of one mind with the relativistic concept presented by Zdravomyslov. He defined the nation as a component of modern mankind. Its specificity consists in language and culture, in the range of historical habitat, in the real contribution to the formation of the community of peoples inhabiting the earth (Zdravomyslov, 1998).

It should be noted that at the present time such concepts as "Russians", "Russian identity" are used in Russia.

IV. CONCLUSION

The analysis of available sources shows that in the scientific community there is no common understanding regarding such categories as ethnos and nation, some researchers differentiate them, others identify them.

According to the author of this work, the ethnos is a sociocultural community and arose much earlier than the nation. The process of the formation of nations is connected with the transition from a primitive society to a class, capitalist society.

Ethnos was formed and developed a much longer period than the nation. The ethnos included representatives of one ethnic group which were united by a sense of blood relationship, language, customs and traditions, stereotypes of behavior, awareness of their unity, and differences from other ethnic groups.

The nation can comprise both representatives of one ethnic community and several ethnic communities, and all of them are united by historical, cultural, economic and political factors, a common ideology and an awareness of belonging to a single state.

Nations are the result of a political union of different ethnic groups. Due to this union a new state is created. A common national identity of different ethnic groups and a common sense of belonging to the political, economic and cultural community of the country is established in this state.

Relations formed within an ethnos are based on moral and ethical norms. Relations are created in a nation-state exist due legal laws and unity of supreme power.

References

- [1] B. Anderson, O. Bauer, M. Chrokh. Nations and nationalism. Moscow: Praxis, 2002, pp. 74-122.
- [2] E. Antonyuk, Interpretation of the concept of "ethnos" in cultural studies. Proceedings of Volgograd State University, vol. 8 (83), pp.20-23, 2013.
- [3] S. Arutyunov, Peoples and Cultures: Development and Interaction. Moscow: Nauka, 1989, 247 pp.
- [4] Yu. Arutyunyan, L. Drobizheva. Ethnosociology before the challenges of time. Sociological research, vol. 7, pp.85-95, 2008.
- [5] O. Belokhvostova, Production and consumption of the symbols of "otherness" in Russia. Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology, vol.10, pp.160-161, 2007.
- [6] Yu. Bromley, Essays on the theory of ethnos. Moscow: The Publishing House, " Science", 1983, 152 pp.
- [7] Yu. Bromley, R. Podolny, Mankind are peoples. Moscow: Thought, 1990, 391pp.
- [8] N. Danilevsky, Russia and Europe. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2008, pp. 113-139.
- [9] L. Drobizheva, Integration processes in a multi-ethnic Russian society (trends and problems). Social Sciences and Modernity, vol.2, pp. 68-77, 2008.
- [10] A. Dugin, Ethnosociology. Moscow: Academic project; Fund "Peace" 2011, pp.168-169.
- [11] R. Gadjiyev, To the typological classification of the main ethnic communities. // Proceedings of Saratov State University. Series Philosophy, Psychology, Pedagogy, vol.13, no. 3-1, pp.11-15, 2013.
- [12] L. Gumilev, K. Ivanov. Ethnic processes: two approaches to the study. Sociological research, vol.1, pp. 50-57, 1992.

- [13] L. Gumilev, *Ethnogenesis and the Earth's biosphere*. International almanac. Moscow: Tanais Di – DIC, vol.3, pp. 36-107, 1994.
- [14] K. Khoruzhenko, *Cultural Studies*. Encyclopedic Dictionary. Rostov - on - Don: Publishing house "Phoenix", p. 573, 1997.
- [15] A. Kolev, *The Nation and the State. The theory of conservative reconstruction*. Moscow: Logos, pp. 366-371, 2005.
- [16] L. Kochenkova, A. Yurina, *Analysis of concepts related to the phenomenon of ethnic identity in a multicultural society*. Herald of Maikop State Technological University, no.1, pp. 93-99, 2015.
- [17] S. Rybakov, *The fate of the theory of ethnos. In memory of Yu. Bromley*. Ethnographic Review, vol.1, pp. 3-22, 2001. Рыбаков С. Е.
- [18] S. Rybakov, *To the question of the ethnic phenomenon. Monitoring of public opinion: economic and social changes*. Vol. 2 (108), pp.147-156, 2012.
- [19] C. Shirokogorov. *Study of the basic principles of changing ethnic and ethnographic phenomena*. Shanghai, pp. 13-14, 1923.
- [20] P. Sorokin, *The Man. Civilization. Society*. Moscow: Publishing House of Political Literature, pp.191-192, 1992.
- [21] V. Tishkov, *On the phenomenon of ethnicity* Ethnographic Review, vol.3, pp. 3 – 21, 1997.
- [22] V. Tishkov, *To forget about the nation (post-nationalist understanding of nationalism)*. Ethnographic Review, vol. 5, pp. 3-27, 1998.
- [23] V. Tishkov, *About cultural diversity*. Ethnographic Review, vol.1, pp. 3-22, 2005.
- [24] K. Tuaeua, *Philosophical Foundations of National Identity*. Herold of University, vol. 8, pp. 287-292, 2014.
- [25] A. Valkov, *The idea of a nation in the light of Russian social and philosophical thought*. Ufa: Publishing house of the Bashkir University, 1996. pp. 38-39.
- [26] B. Viner, *Forms of ethnicity, does the ethnos have an essence and what supporters of Academician Bromley can take from new theories?* Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology, vol. VIII, No. 2 (31), pp. 142-164, 2005.
- [27] M. Weber, *Relations of ethnic community*. Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology, vol. VII, pp.1-16, 2004.
- [28] A. Zarirov, F. Faizullin . *Ethnic consciousness and ethnic self-knowledge*. Ufa: Gilem, 2000, pp. 30-32.
- [29] A.Zdravomyslov, *Sociology of the Russian crisis: Articles and reports of the 90s*. Moscow: Science, 1999, p. 91- 92.