

UDC 165.243

B. Petruniok, post-graduate student
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)

THE PROBLEM OF INTERPRETATION OF THE CRIMEAN TATARS' HISTORY IN THE CONTEXT OF SELF-IDENTIFICATION OF THE CRIMEAN-TATARS

In the article the author attempts to compare the interpretation of the basic identifying elements of the history of the Crimean Tatars in some scholarly and publicist sources.

Keywords: Identity, Self-identification, Crimean Tatars, History

The fact that any ethnic history of some nation cannot be neutral to the producer of it in modern ethno-political science was undisputed. This applies to both ethnic history and, above all, political history. Referring to the Anthony D. Smith classical thesis that the ethnic history (as well as cultural, linguistic, territorial community) is one of the key elements in the definition of the nation and national identity, therefore, in this perspective can be seen and the history of the Crimea, and the history of the Crimean Tatars. Ethnic history should analyze in the context of well-known position that every ethnic group has 6 key features, including: "...A common origin myth: a myth rather than fact – a myth that contains the idea of a common leaks in time and space and that gives a sense of ethnic imaginary affinity... common historical memory or, better memory of the past... including memory about the heroes and their perpetuation" [4, p. 215]. In the present situation statement of such issues acquires the special actuality in connection with the formation of certain ideas about it in citizens who do not have serious fundamental knowledge on this subject.

And an ancient history of Crimea and current events covered in a very large number of scientific and scientific-publicistic works. Given the specificity of the region, as well as several large ethnic and cultural certain groups accommodations and their claims (including on vision history), clear picture of the political history of the peninsula today is not formed. Overall, among the most popular texts on the history of Crimea can distinguish solid double volume work Smirnova, written in 1880, and, in fact, because quite a lot of popularity reprinted (with adaptation text) already today. Valuable, first of all, is author analysis of many ancient Turkic sources that are difficult for wide audience. Among other can distinguish works of authorship A. Jacobson and A. Andreyev (1964 and 1936 editions respectively). Most of such literature, which was published in the Soviet period, especially since 1940–1950 years cannot be used as has obviously engaged nature in the context of the deportation of Crimean Tatars accused them in collaboration with Nazis. So of the history of the Crimean Khanate era earlier period literature should allocate, as more objective. With recent editions worth noting solid 4 volumes work of V. Vozhrin (2013), which actually is a supplement book published in 1992, and Scientific and publicist 2-volumes work authorship by A. Haivoronskyi ("Lord of the two mainland" (2008)).

Generally, in this situation should consider common origins of ethnic history of the Crimean Tatars as it is taught in these sources. The basic setting here is the link to the signs that ethnic group above. For general interpretation, vision of the logic of the historical process, even when we speak about one ethnic group (Crimean Tatars) may sufficiently vary depending on the position of interpreter which can not be completely neutral, even when we talking about the academic literature. Also is necessary consider the current status of the Crimean Tatars, who at level regulatory framework defined sufficiently blurred. Thus we can talk about all the grounds that in the

ethno-political theory Crimean Tatars are full ethnic community, have in this regard a subjectivity which in the future will be the need to sell or as a national autonomy in the Crimea, or through meaningful content the legal concept of "indigenous people" or otherwise. For the Ukrainian state is a key aspect that Crimean Tatars have to get implementation mechanisms such subjectivity while maintaining loyalty to the State (within its sovereignty).

The first question that arises when considering Crimean Tatars history- is the question of ethnogenesis. This case has several aspects. From the perspective of anthropology, the study of objects of material and spiritual culture, language dialects to 1940 in Crimea could outline three sub-ethnic group of Crimean Tatars: "1. The Crimean Tatars southern coast of Crimea (self Yaly Boyle – coastal)... 2. Crimean Tatar population between the two ridges of the Crimean Mountains, the so-called Tats, tatlar... 3. Steppe Crimean Tatars – Nogais (self manhyt) "[2 p.193-195]. It is generally recognized division, which is the traditional. Moreover, for the problems analyzed in the article is important that all groups are defined have serious pronounced anthropological, cultural (origin of language dialects, traditional forms of economy, the specifics of the material and spiritual culture in general) differences. That, however, allows uniquely characterize them as representatives of one ethnic community that was formed during Crimean Khanate. And though that in fact deportation of Crimean Tatars in 1944 currently these sub-ethnic groups sometimes difficult to identify at their representatives level, but it is their historical availability and determined empirically cultural heterogeneity, allows us to reach second key issue interpretation of the history of the people and the state.

From the analysis of literature can distinguish two conditionally "polar" visions of the history of the Crimean Tatars in context general history of Crimea. In fact, here we are talking about imaginary and symbolic things in terms of ethnic policy. The first – is a vision of the history of Crimea and Crimean Tatars in most Russian and pro-Russian sources, both academic and publicist. We must reject outright promotional things, mostly written in 1950-y years to justify the act of deportation as justification slavish population rights in certain "indigenous status" and score the Russian-Turkish wars as a "return of ancestral territories", establishing direct ethnogenetical continuity and relationship between the Scythians and the slavish population, etc. (P. Nadynskyy, P. Schultz et al.). The Russian academic sources focus is on how to present the history of the Crimean Tatar ethnic group as the group that is the direct successor of the Golden Horde. Emphasizing the historically accurate facts origin statist elite Crimean Khanate (dynasty Giray, beyskyh families), but at the same time somehow ignoring some other symbolic points that are significant for the history of the Crimean Tatars question of their identity and distinction from other related Turkic peoples (eg, Volga Tatars with the peoples of North Caucasus, etc.).

“Crimean-born Arabic author produced “Reliance history” (Umrat al-Tawarikh) al-Haji AbdGafar al Qirimi indicates that personal Tokhtamysh guards made up of four representatives of Turkic tribes Shirin, Barin, Argyn and Kipchak... Therefore, Crimean Khanate nucleus tribal system consisted of the Golden Horde Turkic tribes, representing former Mamajulus, and own ulus of Tokhtamyshin which laid the foundations of the Crimean autonomy on ulus “[5, p. 158].

At the same time, the authors of this study operate certain controversial wording on the definition of the nature of the Crimean Khanate. For example, “contemporary Crimean Tatars represent the different origin ethnoses population of the Crimean peninsula, the union which was the result of historical events 1774-1783’s., shortly before the Crimea was accessed to Russia. If the relative unity of origin of the Crimean Tatars characterized before 1778, the Tats, the former subjects of the Sultan, who joined in their composition and living in the south-western and south coastal part of the peninsula, have created ethnic diversity of a new entity, for which is valid the term “Crimeans” which combined population on the basis of Muslim confession and common territory of residence”[5, p. 143].

If we compare the history of the Crimean Tatars and Ukrainians, we can say that they, despite the neighborhood, not be the obvious antagonists. We can trace both positive and negative mutual contacts. Thus both one and the other seriously affected by the Russian imperial aggression, although the negative consequences of such losses in relative terms for the Crimean Tatars is much more tragic. For the Ukrainian scientists at this stage primary important to develop scientific and educational programs which could integrate national Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar history. Definitely positive effect while the, would be the familiarity of people with other friendly history and culture. This cultural interchange would be very useful to develop a joint nation-state and civil patriotism.

References

1. VOZGRIN, V. E. (1992) *Istoricheskie sud'by krymskikh tatar*. Moscow: Mysl', 448 p. [in Rus.]
2. VOITOVYCH, L. (2009) *Formuvannia krymskotatarskoho narodu: vstup do etnogenezu*. Bila Tserkva, 214 p. [in Ukr.]
3. GAYVORONSKIY, O. (2007) *Poveliteli dvukh materikov*. Kyiv. [in Rus.]
4. HUTCHINSON D., SMITH A. D. (2006) *What is ethnicity*. In: *Natsionalizm: Teorii natsii ta natsionalizmu vid Yohana Fikhte do Ernesta Helnera: antolohiia*. K.: Smoloskyp, 684 p. [in Ukr.]
5. TYURKSKIE NARODY KRYMA: KARAIMY. KRYMSKIE TATARY. KRYMCHAKI. (2003) Moscow: Nauka, 459 p. [in Rus.]