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The article reveals the philosophic potential of “Idel-Ural” essay by Gayaz Iskhaki. It presents the writer’s reflection of the Soviet national-state building practice in the Ural-Volga region. “Idel-Ural” essay has become a political and journalistic manifesto of Tatar statehood.

Geopolitical space of “Idel-Ural” is represented as a dualistic myth describing the unity of the opposite phenomena and symbols – the Earth and the Water. The Ural space is the Earth (Жир), the Idel space is the Water (Su). “Idel-Ural” essay understanding keeps within the base of “the cultural nests” conception. A cultural center is born on the base of a cultural nest when a cultural initiative has acquired an official status and state support. Cultural flows in the cultural center can collide and merge creating a multifaceted picture of spiritual life like in modern Ural-Volga region – Tatarstan and Bashkortostan.

In a genetic aspect the “Idel-Ural” mythologem is regarded as an integral world outlook. It keeps the tradition of struggle between the Good (the Turkic land) and the Evil (the Russian state). Understanding the meanings of “Idel-Ural” essay is possible in multi-dimensional coordinates. Ethnic legitimation is a converted form of ethnic consciousness objectified as a set of texts that reflect an ethnic picture of the world and express values and value orientations.
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In 2013 it will be 80 years since the publication of “Idel-Ural” essay written by Gayaz Iskhaki (1878 – 1954), an outstanding figure of the Tatar national movement, writer, publicist, publisher and politician. The essay consists of two parts (“Idel-Ural History” and “Idel-Ural under the Russian yoke”) containing nine paragraphs. It traces the history of material and spiritual culture of the Volga Bulgaria, Golden Horde, Kazan khanate in detail. As a historian, the author sets scientific and educational purposes for himself. But they have to ground the political and legal aims of the Turkic national liberation movement witnessed by Gayaz Iskhaki. In 1933 “Idel-Ural” was published in Paris in Russian and French, a year later – in Tokyo in Japanese, and in 1938 – in Warsaw in Polish (Minnegulov, 2004). In Russia the book appeared in the Tatar language, but this
happened only in the 1990s. During the Soviet period the publication of this essay was out of the question. Iskhaki did not accept the Soviet power and became a significant figure of anti-Sovietism. Only six decades later the essay reached its readers: in 1992 in Naberezhniye Chelny of the Tatarstan Republic it was republished as a separate book (Iskhaki, 1992). Republication of the essay was caused by an objective need to legitimize a reviving new statehood of the Tatar people.

The birth of our scientific interest in Idel-Ural has the exact date. On May 31, 2010 a round-table discussion “Idel-Ural: what is it?” was held in the Ural State University named after A.M. Gorky. It was jointly organized by the university chair of religious studies and the chair of philosophy of the Ural Law Institute of the Russian Ministry of Internal Affairs («Idel-Ural»…). Polar points of view were expressed during the discussion, but the participants of the round-table discussion failed to define Idel-Ural. However, they stated that since the times of Gayaz Iskhaki, who was the first to formulate this concept clearly in his book, it had substantially transformed and acquired totally different perceptions. Iskhaki’s publicistic work arouses a broad interest: in July 2010 Google found 19 900 sites at “Idel-Ural” essay” request, Nigma.ru gave out 3,9 thousand results.

The need to study the problems posed in the essay is demanded by the necessity to overcome the traditions of the Soviet social science, its historiography, which were stated in the resolution of the Central Committee of All-Russian Bolshevik’s Communist Party “On condition and measures of mass-political work improvement in the Tatar party organization” (August 9, 1944 (CPSU in resolutions… V. 7. P. 513 – 520.). According to academic historians, this resolution caused a considerable damage to scientific research in history and culture of the Tatar people. It had a negative impact on the creative work of writers, composers and artists (Tagirov, 1999). (At the beginning of 1945 a similar resolution was adopted in relation to the Bashkir party organization (CPSU in resolutions … V. 7. P. 539 – 543). The party decision suggested that the Tatar regional committee should “organize a scientific elaboration of Tartaria’s history, eliminate serious shortcomings and mistakes in its coverage”. On February 24-27, 1945 a plenum of the regional committee was held to discuss the issue of implementing the resolution of the Central Committee. The scientists were accused that “instead of studying a joint struggle of the Russian and Tatar people against foreign invaders they have been engaged in researching the literature monuments of the XII – XVI centuries”. The report pointed out that “they were wrong to recognize the Golden Horde as a progressive state with highly developed culture and economy; the aggressiveness of the Golden Horde, predatory attacks on the Russian lands, merciless oppression of the people therein were exposed”. “Idegey” dastan was characterized the following way: “For several years ... this epos has totally unreasonably been popularized as a heroic epos of the Tatar people. At the same time not a word was said about the expression of nationalist ideas in “Idegey” epos”.

Speaking about the urgency of the topic, we propose, in addition, that the current interest in the historical locus of Idel-Ural in Russia could not have appeared if it were not for at least two reasons.

Firstly, in 1920 – 1940s Idel-Ural was mentioned in the list of geopolitical objectives of the German Reich. In 1942 Germany started the publication of the “Library of eastern territories” book series, containing brochures devoted not only to specific areas of the USSR, but also to certain groups of people. “Peoples of the eastern territories” book contains the “Idel-Ural dwellers” chapter on the peoples of the Volga and
Ural regions (Leibbrandt, 1942). In March 1944, in Greifswald they even held Kurultai of the Idel-Ural people.

Secondly, according to L.R. Usmanova (PhD in Sociology, Kazan), “we find it curious that the first works on the importance and role of the Turkic-Tatar diaspora in Japan and North-East Asia (in particular, its influence on the development of Turkish-Japanese, Islamic-Japanese connections, impact on the development of Japanese nationalism), which appeared in English, belong to Turkish but not Russian researchers (Tatar or Bashkir)” (Usmanova, 2005). There is no question of talking about some advances in domestic authors’ researches before the early 1990s, the time when the article on the Idel-Ural (Turkic) emigration in the 1920-40s written by I.A. Gilyazov, a historian, was published (Gilyazov, 1994).

In modern Russia the topic of “Idel-Ural” is like a reaction of the body to these “external stimuli”. It’s a sort of the scientific community’s reflection to the research lacuna.

Gayaz Ishaki’s biography is quite typical for public figures of the late XIX and early XX centuries. By the time of “Idel-Ural” essay, within the period from 1905 to 1917 he had written about 30 novels, created several original stories, narratives, dramatic works, in which the problems of an individual’s moral perfection in cruel conditions of the surrounding world are raised.

Formation of the writer’s epistemology is associated with the initial pages of his biography. Up to 26 years of age, his life had been connected with preparation for Islamic service. Being a mullah’s son, Gayaz Iskhaki received a religious education. Up to 12, he studied with his father in a madrasah in his native village, in 1890 – 1893 – in a madrasah in Chistopol, in 1893-97 – in “Kasimiya” madrasah in Kazan. After finishing the Kazan Tatar teachers’ schools in 1902, he taught at “Husainiya” madrasah in Orenburg. In summer 1903 he returned to Kazan to enter the university, but at his parents’ insistence he went to his native village and served as a mullah.

In the first half of the XX century Gayaz Iskhaki was known, without exaggeration, to the entire Tatar (and not only) world. He was first written about in “From the Life of Muslims” news story published in the “Kazan Telegraph” (1898, 15 January). The great Tatar poet Gabdulla Tukai wrote a poem “Kem ul?” (Who is he?, El-gasrel Jadid, 1907), devoted to Gayaz Iskhaki. This writer is compared with the authors of Leo Tolstoy’s level. In his correspondence of 1914 Maxim Gorky suggested that being a big connoisseur Gayaz Iskhaki should write an essay on Tatar literature (Nurullin, 1988). (This fact, mentioned in “Issues of Literature” journal in the late 1980s, largely contributed to the writer’s creative rehabilitation).

The February Revolution of 1917 dramatically changed the situation in the national movement. Gayaz Iskhaki’s views changed, too. The problem of national unity became the main topic in his writing. He worked out a platform according to which “the Muslims of Russia is a political organism capable and entitled to develop a common culture and build its life on its basis; in their actions they are guided by a common opinion and advance under united management”.

Gayaz Iskhaki didn’t accept the Soviet power and thus became a symbolic figure of anti-Sovietism. Pursued by the Bolsheviks, he found himself in Siberia. In 1919 Gayaz Iskhaki went to the Versailles peace conference as a representative of “Idel-Ural” state and did not return to Russia any more. From March 1920 till summer 1922 he lived in Paris first, then in Berlin. Since 1925 his place of residence had been Turkey, in 1927 he moved to Poland. From 1939 till the end of his life he stayed in Turkey. He gave speeches everywhere, published Tatar
newspapers in Mukden and Berlin, established political organizations in Manchuria, Germany and Turkey. In Warsaw he united the emigrants of different nationalities into “Prometheus” organization of anti-Stalinist orientation, the motto of which was a famous slogan “For your freedom and ours!” This personality is given the following characteristics by the People’s Commissariat of Internal Affairs (NKVD): “Since the early 20s he had been an ideologist and leader of “Idel-Ural”, lived in Turkey, Japan, Germany, Poland. Iskhakov acted in contact with the Japanese and Polish intelligence services, published several newspapers in Poland, Manchuria and Japan for their monetary funds. During the Second World War he actively cooperated with the Nazis”.

One can understand why the debates about Iskhaki reached their high intensity. ‘Just imagine,’ Azat Akhunov writes ‘that a writer of Leo Tolstoy’s level was discovered quite unexpectedly in the end of the XX century’. Dozens of novels, narratives and plays, hundreds of articles – all of them unknown, unread” (Akhunov). For seventy years the name of Iskhaki has been strictly forbidden and several generations of Tatars grew up, having never heard the name of this giant of the Tatar literature.

Iskhaki’s essay “Idel-Ural” was Gayaz Iskhaki’s publicistic reflection of Soviet nation-state building in the Ural-Volga region. Gayaz Iskhaki wrote: ‘Fighting with the Turks for centuries the Russian governments and missionaries aimed exactly at that. But what the Russian missionaries failed to do is being done by the Bolsheviks now. That is why the Soviet power established a number of republics and autonomous regions on Idel-Ural territory: Tatar, Bashkir, Chuvash, German republics, Mari, Votskaya and other autonomous regions. Such a situation, neither in its internal content nor its outward appearance can meet and satisfy the requirements of the Turk-Tatar nation, striving for independent state existence”.

The analysis of “Idel-Ural” text is based on an “anthropocentric approach to the text study” recommended by professor L.G. Babenko (2004). From methodological positions there are three stages of the text existence: 1) text creation by the author (“birth”, creative act), 2) fixed consciousness, 3) perception by the addressee (“life of the text”, according to Bakhtin (Trofimova, 2006). An anthropocentric approach (or the aspect of “author – text – reader” correlation) is represented by the following areas: psycholinguistic, pragmatic, derivational, communicative, linguistic (genre-style). An anthropocentric approach to the text with simultaneous acknowledgement of an “integrated” model of text generation allows the researchers to declare that “the text can be considered as a product, as something designed and especially created by a man” and that “in general culture exists in the form of texts – symbolic works of a human’s spiritual activity”.

Understanding the meaning of “Idel-Ural” essay is possible in multi-dimensional coordinates. It is based on M.L. Kasparov’s textual criticism and G.D. Gachev’s theory of the peoples’ of the world mentality (Cosmo-Psycho-Logos), as well as on E.S. Kulpin’s theory of socio-natural history.

Ethnic journalism is an artifact of an ethnic picture of the world, a derivative from ethnic consciousness. Even the ascertaining of tendencies in the development of ethnic subject matter requires from the researcher a set of representative cognitive tools. According to M.K. Mamardashvili, a Soviet philosopher, to analyze the complex empirical systems, ethnic journalism being undoubtedly one of them, “one needs to assume a generalized causality of a special kind of determinism – action conversion
Ethnic picture of the world is a set of basic, usually not realized and not discussed assumptions and suppositions that guide and structure the behavior of the representatives of this community almost similar to grammar rules, of which the majority of people are not conscious, that structure and guide their linguistic behavior. An ethnic picture of the world is a view on the universe, typical for the certain people.

Recently, an ethnic picture of the world has been marked and examined through the concepts of value and value orientation. Value in this case means a series of proposals about the world stimulating and regulating the preferred type of behavior. Value orientation is a way of differentiating the objects by an individual according to their importance.

Ethnic journalism is a converted form of ethnic consciousness materialized in a set of texts reflecting an ethnic picture of the world and thus expressing values and value orientations. In Turkic journalism, like in any ethnic journalism, a special human determinant is represented by such ethnic settings in a creative process as readiness, predisposition of an author’s personality that occur when he anticipates the appearance of a particular ethnus as an object and provides for a steady targeted character of creative activity progress in relation to this object. They also manifest themselves at ethno-psychological and ethno-social levels. These features associated with Gayaz Iskhaki’s eastern mentality should be taken into account.

A tendency towards mythological-literary techniques is connected not only with Gayaz Iskhaki’s extensive humanitarian and theological training, but also with peculiarities of his epistemology. The latter is characteristic of a theological mind of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin’s epistemology, for example, for whom “the object and subject interweave and mutually interlace in the act of cognition. Like it or not, a man comes to himself and examines himself in everything he sees” (*P. T. Chardin de*, 1987). His essay reflects the turning points in the development of the Tatar nation: times of the Volga Bulgaria, Golden Horde and Kazan khanate, troubles after the Kazan conquest by Ivan the Terrible, pre-revolutionary and post-revolutionary years, prospects of the people’s development. “Idel-Ural” is written in a direct chronicle sequence: the author lined up the story according to a historical course of events described in his work. In the index one can already recognize the main milestones of the narration: the Turkic peoples (Bulgars, Khazars, Kipchaks); Golden Horde; the 1905 Revolution; the World War; the Bolsheviks.

One gets the impression that Gayaz Iskhaki conceived a very simple, linear, historically correct work, but “permitted” a utopian fantasy, which he never realized, to its end. He hoped: “Nationalities striving for liberation still have a hard and long struggle for independence ahead of them. <...> If the great French Revolution brought national liberation to the peoples of Western Europe, the Russian Revolution will bring liberation to the peoples of the Eastern Europe” (Iskhaki).

Geopolitical space of Idel-Ural region had been formed for several centuries. Idel-Ural is a Turk-Islamic region in Eastern Europe, covering the territories of contemporary Tatarstan and Bashkortostan. In the Tatar-language literature this term is used to refer to all thirteen subjects of the Volga and Urals territories: Chuvashia, Mari El, Tatarstan, Bashkortostan, Mordovia, Udmurtia; Samara, Ulyanovsk, Chelyabinsk, Orenburg, Saratov, Volgograd and Astrakhan regions, being the historical homeland of the Ural-Volga Turks. Today they are subjects of the Russian Federation, parts of the Volga federal district. (Although indigenous Idel-Ural lands
are, in fact, three of these – Chuvashia, Tatarstan and Bashkortostan).

The autonomous entity, defended by Iskhaki, was called “Idel-Ural olkәse”. The Tatar word “olkә” in different meanings represents “region/regional” (Tatarcha-ruscha... 1992). In the Tatar-language publicism Iskhaki used such synonymic words as “Idel yorty” (“Volga House”), “olkә” (region, territory), “жәмәhүriyat» (republic), “мәmlәkәt” (state)

2. So what is “Idel-Ural”? The concept of “Idel-Ural” is represented as a dualistic myth describing the universe as a unity of opposite phenomena and symbols of the Earth and the Water3. At a mythological level Idel-Ural is an outcome of two fundamental elements of the universe: Җир-Su / the Earth and the Water. At a mythological level Idel-Ural is an outcome of two fundamental elements of the universe: Җир-Su / the Earth and the Water, the main motives of mythology.

Ural is the Earth (Җир), Idol is the Water (Su). The Earth in mythology is one of fundamental elements of the universe. In cosmogonical myths the Earth is described as a dissection of chaos, separation of top and bottom. The Water in mythology is also one of thorough elements of the universe, the source, initial state of all things, equivalent of primordial chaos. Many cosmogonical myths are characterized by the motif of raising the world (earth) from the bottom of the primary ocean. The Water is a symbol of fertility, conception and birth. It is analogous to a maternal bosom and womb.

In ancient times the name “Atil” was appointed to the river Volga. Later it acquired a new lexical meaning – “river” and in the course of time it extended to several hydrographic facilities of the Volga-Kama basin. In modern Tatar the term “idәl” has two meanings – “Volga” and “river”, in Bashkir it means “a big river” and “White”. In the toponymy of Bashkortostan seven hydronyms include “idәl”. Other modern Turkic languages are not familiar with the word “idәl” [“itil() / atil()”].

In a genetic aspect we regard “Idel-Ural” mythologema as an integral world outlook. The ancient Turks perceived the integrity of the world-relations by mental division of the world into the pairs of opposites, summed up afterwards. As it was shown by E.V. Ivanova, binary oppositions as parts of a dyad exist not only in a static state, but also as four forms of dynamic interaction: 1) coexistence, 2) transition, 3) simultaneous parallel coexistence, 4) conflict resolution through a mediator⁶. Antagonistic conflict between A and Ā is solved through X mediator, i.e. within A ↔ X ↔ Ā triad, the triad being an archetype, mythema, mythologema at a higher level of abstraction.

The triad unites opponents, eliminates the gap between them, joints them into a living whole. The integrated appeases its conflicting sources. According to E.V. Ivanova’s methodology, “Idel-Ural” is a mediator of a dynamic interaction between such binary oppositions in an atheistic state as “Russians” – “non-Russians”, “Russian state” – “Turkic state”, “post-Orthodox society” – “post-Islamic society”.

“Idel-Ural” can be also presented as a mediator of a dynamic interaction between the binary oppositions of Russian Turkism – “Chagatai” and “Bulgar”.

Ahmed-Zaki Validi, the chairman of the Turkestan National Association (Federation of Muslim national societies of Middle Asia), a leader of the Bashkir national movement, was a supporter of Chagatai Turkism that found its reflection in the program documents of “Alash”, “Erk” political parties, Khiva, Bukhara intelligentsia, Turkestan kaltamans (i.e. basmatch). Bashkortostan declared itself the center of Chagatai Turkism.

Gayaz Iskhaki and others were among the supporters of the Bulgar line of Turkism. Professor O.N. Senyutkina (Nizhniy Novgorod) calls this trend with the term “tatarizm”, and Kazan becomes its center.
“Idel-Ural” state acting as a mediator reconciled Chagatai and Bulgar Turkisms.

“Idel-Ural” mythologema keeps the tradition of struggle between the Good (Turkic land) and the Evil (the Russian state). According to Z.S. Amanbaeva, this struggle is the main conflict of “Ural-batyr” epos. Therefore, there are two halves in Idel-Ural mythologema: Ural and Idel, “the elixir of life”.

The hero’s search for the elixir of life giving immortality is the main leitmotif of “Ural-batyr” epos. This epos is a monument of artistic and philosophical self-consciousness among the ancestors of modern Bashkirs, a reflection of their world outlook and understanding. It is also a source, beginning of formation and establishment of a new trend in the people’s epic artistic thought. A.B. Nazirova (Ufa) compares it with “Ramayana”, the Indian epos, and “Mahabharata”, encyclopedia of the Indian mythology.

Compositionally it consists of three parts, narrating about the deeds of three generations of heroes. Initially it tells about the Flood, the first people Yanbirde and Yanbike, birth of their sons, Ural and Shulgan. As the story develops, there happens a transition from an archaic myth to a specific-historical comprehension of reality. Ural and Shulgan leave home in search of immortality. On the way Ural-batyr annihilates a cruel conqueror khan Katil and the kingdom of the serpent’s king Kahkahi, kills Azraq, the king of the Underground and Underwater kingdom, fights with his brother Shulgan who has gone over to the Evil’s side, sprinkles the Bashkirs’ land with the elixir of life, thus making it immortal.

The third part of the epos narrates about the birth of Ural’s and Shulgan’s sons, who continue Ural’s deed – they fight with the devas, procure elixir of life (yanshishma). The events in the epos finish with Ural’s death after which the batyr’s body turns into Uraltau mountain symbolizing the homeland of the Bashkirs. The poem expresses the idea of the people’s eternal life. S.S. Parsamov comments on the immortality in the epos: “Immortality is recognized, however, it is not as physical immortality of one personality, but its glory, gratitude of the descendants for the good deeds. In the literal sense, the poem says, it’s not a personality that is immortal, but the nation as a whole – in the form of change and continuity of generations”.

The motif of Elixir of life acquires a deep symbolic meaning. Ural-batyr strives for observing the community interests. It is especially vividly expressed in the episode when the hero refuses to drink the Elixir of life and thereby gains personal immortality. This displays his moral qualities, such as heroism, justice, respect for the elders, protection for the youth, etc. The Elixir of life acts as a peculiar determinant of morality when Ural-batyr faced with the problem of a moral choice, isn’t untrue to himself and takes his death with dignity. Having sprinkled the earth with the Elixir of life, the hero establishes an eternal order in nature.

Some motifs and images of “Ural-batyr” can be found in other Bashkir eposes as well (“Ziyatulyak and Huyhylu”, “Kungyr-buga”, “Alpamysha and Barsynhylu”, “Kuzyikurpyas and Mayanhylu”). The eposes “Akbuzat” and “Kusyak-biy” continue the storyline of “Ural-batyr” and form a single cycle of epic tales. In the XIX century I.I. Lepekhin, V.I. Dal, M.V. Lossievsky, Russian scientists collecting legends among the Bashkirs, revealed similarities between the legends and eposes.

In our opinion, understanding the concept of “Idel-Ural” keeps within the base of the “cultural nests” conception. The history of establishing the “cultural nest” concept in the works of ethnographers, historians, literary critics is considered in detail in the article by V.N. Alekseev and E.I. Dergacheva-Skop. The idea of applying the “cultural nest” category
to the regional culture research sounded repeatedly at scientific conferences not only in the Urals, but also in Siberia. This approach is of great importance for the research of Idel-Ural culture which is caused by the Eurasian geo-strategic position. Its “marginality” reflects the fact that this region is Asia for the Europeans and western extremity of Europe for the Asian peoples. In his “Letter from the province” A.I. Herzen wrote: “The meaning of Kazan is great: it’s a place of meeting and rendezvous of two worlds. That’s why it has two sources: the western and the eastern. You will find them on every street corner; here they became friends, began making up something original in character”12.

“The history tells us that since the ancient times this territory has belonged to the Turkic peoples”, G. Iskhaki writes. He presents the history of Idel-Ural as a sequence: Volga Bulgaria – Khazar khanate – Golden Horde – Astrakhan, Nogai Horde and the Kazan khanates. It was planned to establish a large state formation with a population of 15,351 million people (1926 census), “of which the Turko-Tatars make up 7,848 million people, Russians – 4,290 million people, peoples of Finno-Mongol tribe – 2,712 million people, Germans – 0,502 million people) (according to the essay text – R.I.). Proposals to include the territories of the Samara and Astrakhan provinces into the Ural-Volga state in order to get the access to the Caspian Sea were also expressed. All peoples of the state, their languages and religions were recognized as equal.

The relevance of “Idel-Ural” essay is defined by a constant, non-fading interest of the Russian public mind to the problems of national statehood. According to the forecasts of the American geographer S. Kohan, by the early 30s of the XXI century the number of states in the world will increase by 50 percent, more than 300 independent countries will appear on the globe13. And Russia will be one of the regions with the growing number of states.

The ethno-political condition of former USSR republics, including Russia, is usually called “post-Soviet statehood”. There is a spasmodic historical period between post-Soviet statehood and national state. It is the period of self-organization, figuratively called “the orange revolution” by the publicists. The end and a new beginning meet in one event. Post-Soviet statehood ceases its existence as exactly post-Soviet, that is originating from its country’s history as a former union republic. A modern statehood in the same capacity simultaneously starts at the termination point.

On June 12, 1990 the I Congress of People’s Deputies of the RSFSR adopted the Declaration on the RSFSR state sovereignty. In August – October 1990 the “parade of sovereignties” started in the union and autonomous republics. The first of these – the Declaration on state sovereignty of the North-Ossetian SSR – was adopted during the work of I Congress of People’s Deputies of the RSFSR. The Declaration on state sovereignty of the Karelian ASSR was adopted, the Komi SSR, Tatar SSR state sovereignty was proclaimed, Gagauz Republic was proclaimed a part of the USSR (Moldova), the Declaration on Abkhazia (Georgia) sovereignty was adopted, state sovereignties of the Udmurt Republic and Yakut-Sakha SSR were proclaimed, Declaration on creating the Dniester Moldavian SSR was adopted, Chukotka autonomous district declared its sovereignty in the status of an autonomous republic, Declarations on state sovereignty were adopted in the Bashkir SSR, Buryat SSR, Kalmyk SSR, Mari SSR, Chuvash SSR, Declarations on sovereignty and status of an autonomous republic were adopted in the Yamalo-Nenetsky and Gorno-Altai autonomous districts, Declaration on the Irkutsk region sovereignty was adopted, etc.
Walter Derzko, a Canadian political scientist from Toronto, adduced 40 signs of inexorably approaching end of Russia in his blog. “Orange revolution” is an imitation of a new beginning, a clean sheet where it’s possible to draw a new national statehood – and at the same time a ready national project.

Retroalternativity can reveal the essence of “orange revolutions” on the example of “Idel-Ural”: statehood is a national history plus a national project. National history is a setting to which the state (represented by its leaders and elites) adheres in reality. National project is what they actually intend to carry out.

A cultural center is born on the basis of a cultural nest when a cultural initiative acquires an official status and state support. This allows to consider “Idel-Ural” essay as a manifesto, a way to unbalance the system and transfer it to a new stage of development. In many ways the birth of a cultural center is determined by the tasks set on the culture by the power. In a cultural center there may be colliding and merging cultural flows creating a multifaceted picture of spiritual life like in modern Ural-Volga region – Tatarstan and Bashkortostan.

At the 1st All-Russian Muslim Congress in Moscow (May 1-11, 1917) Gayaz Iskhaki put forward an idea of a national-cultural autonomy for the Turko-Tatars of the Volga and Ural regions – establishing the Ural-Volga state (Idel-Ural States). This idea of Gayaz Iskhaki was supported by both the 2nd All-Russian Muslim Congress (Kazan, July 21 – August 2, 1917), and the national parliament – National Assembly of the Turko-Tatars of the Inner Russia and Siberia (Millәt Majlisi) in Ufa (November 20, 1917 – January 11, 1918). The National parliament Millәt Mejlisi decided to create a national state (the Ural-Volga state, or Idel-Ural state); the calendar showed November 29, 1917. According to the project, submitted on January 3, 1918 by Galimzyan Sharif and adopted by Millәt Mejlisi, this state was supposed to include the Kazan and Ufa provinces, as well as parts of Vyatka, Orenburg, Perm, Samara, Simbirsk provinces. The idea of “Idel-Ural” for modern Russian statehood is seen, first of all, as a prototype of the federal district.

Gayaz Iskhaki’s essay “Idel-Ural” is a reference point in the literary landscape of Russia. The example of Gayaz Iskhaki, like the fates of V. Nabokov, I. Shmelev, B. Zaitsev, A. Remizov, M. Aldanov, A. Averchenko, Vl. Khodasevich and others, shows that there are new discoveries ahead of the Russian philology (literature, journalism) – “returned literature” of the Russian peoples. In 1951 Gayaz Iskhaki made up a bibliography of his own literary works. The list includes 58 names of works and 11 periodical titles. The Institute of the Literature Language and Art named after G. Ibragimov (Kazan) has been preparing a 15-volume collected works of Iskhaki. Five volumes have already been published, and intensive work is in progress to complete this project. However, life and creative work, social activities of the Tatar writers and poets from abroad have not yet received a proper scientific analysis – Husain Gabdyush, Saniya Giffat, Hasan Hamidullah, Nailа Binark, Rashit Rahmati Arat, Shagvali Keleuli Ilder, Mingaz Ismagili, Ahmat Girey, Gauhar Tuganay, Shigap Nigmati, Ahmat Lyabib Karan, Leila Sadri.

An essay like “all written speech works, i.e. fixed on a material carrier, first of all, paper,” writes O.V. Trofimova (Tyumen), “represents “still” (L.R. Zinder’s term) discourses, i.e. remained in the eternity in the form of a text".

The text is no longer perceived only as a certain material object stored in a fixed form. The scientists have admitted that the text is: principally situational (dependent on a communicative situation); discrete (has component parts, as a rule); continual (the text is not equal to a simple
sum of sentences in its structure); the text comes into syntagmatic relations (for example, a writer’s collected works); paradigmatic relations (different texts can describe the same referent and be conditionally equivalent)\(^7\).

One of the most famous foreign theories describing general properties of the text is R.-A. de Bogrand and W. Dressler’s conception on the seven “criteria of textuality”, inherent in the text: 1) cohesion, 2) coherence, 3) intentionality, 4) perceptibility, 5) informativity, 6) situativity, 7) intertextuality\(^8\).

**Cohesion.** This criterion affects the way of forming the surface structure of the text. In other words, it reflects how the text components relate to each other.

**Coherence.** This criterion covers purely content (more exactly, cognitive) interconnections in the text. The text coherence is based on the semantic continuity of the “text world”, i.e. semantic relations that underlie the text. “The text world” does not necessarily have to correspond to the real world. “The text world” consists of concepts and relationships between them.

**Intentionality.** By this sign we mean an intention of the text producer to construct a coherent text. This text serves a definite purpose (for example, to render some knowledge or to achieve a goal).

By perceptibility we understand the recipient’s expectation to obtain a coherent and meaningful text which is necessary and important for him. Perceptibility also implies the appropriateness of used linguistic means in a particular communicative situation.

**Informativity.** This term means a degree of novelty or unexpectedness of presented text elements for the recipient.

**Situativity.** The text always bears the imprint of the situation in which it occurs and is used.

**Intertextuality.** This criterion can be interpreted in two ways: as a correlation of a specific text copy with a certain type of the text and, secondly, as its correlation with another/other texts.

Translated into French, Russian, Japanese, Polish, English “Idel-Ural” has become a political and publicistic manifesto of the Tatar statehood.

Texts-manifestos regularly appeared in a domestic history. This fact is confirmed by such publicistic manifestos as “I cannot waive the principles” by Nina Andreeva, “How shall we arrange Russia” by A.I. Solzhenitsyn, “Manifesto of free labor” by Svyatoslav Fedorov, “The right and the truth. Manifesto of enlightened conservatism” by N.S. Mikhalkov. “Today the genre of a manifesto is perhaps more urgent than ever, – declared Victor Vakhstein, the dean of the Faculty of Sociology and Political Science of MSES (Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences), in his interview for the “Russian Journal”. – But it’s not only a political urgency”\(^9\).

V. Vakhstein notes an ambivalent (from lat. *ambo* – both and *valentia* – force) dichotomy of the manifesto. Manifesto, first of all, is something manifested, that is displayed. According to V. Vakhstein, it is a display of something previously hidden which unites an artistic manifesto, a political manifesto and a scientific one. On the other hand, manifesto is a claim. “Display” and “claim” are two very different derivatives of “show”. Accordingly, manifesto has two objectives: to show and to claim.

A publicistic manifesto is not a change of the existing state of affairs. It’s a change of the community, which made this manifesto. Manifesto, first of all, is something manifested, that is displayed. According to V. Vakhstein, it is a display of something previously hidden which unites an artistic manifesto, a political manifesto and a scientific one. On the other hand, manifesto is a claim. “Display” and “claim” are two very different derivatives of “show”. Accordingly, manifesto has two objectives: to show and to claim.

A publicistic manifesto is not a change of the existing state of affairs. It’s a change of the community, which made this manifesto. That is, not the change of the surrounding world comes in the forefront, but the change of a collective author himself, his redefinition. Manifesto is a break with a special “oneself”. It transforms the authors’ subjectivity, i.e. their subjectivity ceases
to be narrowly individual or collective, it becomes available for appropriation by the others, on the one hand, and able to appropriate others, on the other hand.

Any manifesto opens the way for such struggles for subjectivity, for identity. Those manifesting say: “We are such and such, and you – such and such”. And the readers begin a desperate struggle against such and such and for such and such at their discretion.

Regarding “Idel-Ural” essay, there is a sense to apply the term “a political publicism”. But the heuristic potential of the essay’s philosophy is much richer. The meanings of the text are significant for the political philosophy, social philosophy, theory of myths, state history, ethnic history, ethno-sociology, theory of discourse, philological science (journalism, literary criticism) as well as for the practice of philosophic publicism, political publicism.
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Философский потенциал публицистики Гаяза Исхаки
(Легитимация национальной государственности в очерке «Идель-Урал»)
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Автор статьи раскрывает философский потенциал очерка Гаяза Исхаки «Идель-Урал», представляя его как публицистическую рефлексию писателя на практику советского национально-государственного строительства в Урало-Поволжье. Очерк «Идель-Урал» стал политико-публицистическим манифестом татарской государственности.

Геополитическое пространство «Идель-Урал» представлено как дуалистический миф, который описывает единство противоположных явлений и символов – Земли и Воды. Урал суть Земля (Җир), Идель суть Вода (Су). Понимание концепта «Идель-Урал» укладывается в лоно концепции «культурных гнезд». На основе культурного гнезда при обретении культурной инициативой официального статуса и ее государственной поддержки рождается культурный центр. В культурном центре могут сталкиваться и сливаться культурные потоки, что создает многоликую картину духовной жизни, как в современном Урало-Поволжье – Татарстане и Башкортостане.

Мифологема «Идель-Урал» представляется нам в его генетическом аспекте как целостное мировоззрение. Она хранит традицию борьбы Добра (тюркская земля) со Злом (русское государство). Понимание смыслов очерка «Идель-Урал» возможно в координатах многомерности. Этническая легитимация есть превращенная форма этнического сознания, объективирующаяся в виде совокупности отражающих этническую картину мира текстов, в которых выражаются ценности и ценностные ориентации.

Ключевые слова: Гаяз Исхаки, Штат Идель-Урал, Культурное гнездо, Миф Земля-Вода, Медиатор, Публицистический манифест, Этническая легитимация.