
POLITICAL **ISSUE 3(33), 2019**
SCIENCE ISSUES

Academic journal

MOSCOW, 2019

POLITICAL SCIENCE ISSUES

Academic journal

Nikolay P. MEDVEDEV,

Chairman of the Editorial Board, Doctor of Political Sciences,
Professor of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Peoples' Friendship
University of Russia (RUDN University) (Russia, Moscow)

Editorial Board:

BOZHANOV Vladimir A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of World and National Literature, Belorussia National Technical University (Belorussia, Minsk)
DONAJ Lukasz	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Faculty of Political Science And Journalism, Department of International Relations (Poland, Poznan)
IRKHIN Yuri V.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Professor, Chair of Politology and Political Administration, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (Russia, Moscow)
KARAGZE Tatiana V.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Head of the Chair of Politology and Sociology of the Moscow State Pedagogical University (Russia, Moscow)
KOVALENKO Valery I.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Head of the Chair of Russian Politics of the Moscow State Lomonosov University (Russia, Moscow)
KOSIKOV Igor G.	Doctor of History Sciences, Chief Researcher, Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Russia, Moscow)
KRIVOKAPIC Boris	Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor, Business and Law Faculty, University "Union – Nikola Tesla" (Serbia, Belgrade)
MIKHAILOV Vyacheslav A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Head of the Chair of National and Federative Relations of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (Russia, Moscow)
NASIMOVA Gulnara O.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of Politology, School of Philosophy and Politology, Kazakh National University named after El-Farabi (Kazakhstan, Almaty)
NISNEVICH Yuli A.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, National Research University – Higher School of Economics (Russia, Moscow)
PAKHRUTDINOV Shukritdin I.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of Department "National interests and the stability of society" of the Academy of State and Social Construction under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)
PLYAYS Yakov A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of Politology of the Finance University under the Government of the Russian Federation (Russia, Moscow)
PRYAKHIN Vladimir F.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Chair of World Politics and Foreign Relations, Russian State Humanitarian University (Russia, Moscow)
PUSKO Vitaliy S.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Professor of the Chair of Politology, Moscow State Technical University named after N.E. Bauman (Russia, Moscow)
SALKIEWICZ- MUNNERLYN Ewa	Ph.D., MFA, Academy Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski (Poland, Krakow)
Olivier VEDRINE	Chief Editor of the Russian Edition of the French Review "Revue Défense Nationale", Speaker of the European Commission, Editor of the Franco-German Magazine on Foreign Politics "European Union Foreign Affairs Journal" and Rector of the Continental University in Kiev (France, Paris)

Editor-in Chief of the Review – Nikolay P. MEDVEDEV,
Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor of Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia
(RUDN University) (Russia, Moscow)

**ESTABLISHED BY LLC
"PUBLISHING HOUSE
"SCIENCE TODAY"**

The Journal is published with the participation of the Institute of modern policy of the Peoples' Friendship University (RUDN)

The Journal is registered by the Federal Service for Supervision of Mass Media, Communications and Protection of Cultural Heritage

Reg. Number PI No.FS77–46176
of August 12, 2011
The Journal is published quarterly

The journal is included in the database of the Russian Science Citation Index

The Five-year Journal's impact factor is 0,808

The Journal is included in Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

Academic papers published in the journal undergo obligatory editorial checking.

The authors' opinion not always coincides with the opinion of the Editorial Board.

At reprint of the article or a part of it the reference to the Journal is obligatory.

Address of the editorial office:
10, Zagoryevskaya street, building 4,
office 4, Moscow, Russia, 115598
Tel: (910) 463-53-42
www.voprospolitolog.ru,
www.souzpolitolog.ru
E-mail: voprospolitolog@yandex.ru,
souzpolitolog@yandex.ru

Executive Secretary
Shkurina S.S.

Computer-aided makeup by
Antsiferova A.S.

Translated by
Chernyshova E.V.

Signed for printing on 25.09.2019
Format 60x84/16. Offset paper.
Offset print.
Number of printed sheets
Circulation 500 copies.
Order 48105.

Printed at the LLC "PrintUP"
Nagorny drive, 12c1,
Moscow, Russia, 117105
Tel.: +7 (495) 925-00-06

ISSN 2225-8922 (print)

12 issues a year plus

4 issues a year of the translated (eng.) version

Languages: Russian and English

<http://voprosplitolog>

Included in the list of peer-reviewed scientific publications of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Federation

Included in the Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

Materials of the journal are placed on the RSCI platform of the Russian scientific electronic library – Electronic Journals Library Cyberleninka

Subscription index of the journal in the Rospechat Agency catalogue is: 70035

Objectives and themes

Academic journal “Political Science Issues” is an international peer-reviewed scientific periodical in the field of political studies. The journal has an international character because of the composition of its Editorial Board, its editors, its contributing authors and topics of its publications.

The scientific journal is published since 2011 at the “Publishing House “Science Today”. Translated (eng.) version of the journal is published since 2016. Since its inception, the journal was guided by high scientific and ethical standards and today it is one of the leading political science journals in Russia.

The purpose of the journal is to promote scientific exchange and cooperation between Russian and foreign political scientists.

The journal is intended for the publication of the results of fundamental and applied scientific research. Thematic focus of the journal is reflected in the following permanent headings: “History and philosophy of politics,” “Political institutions, processes and technologies,” “Political regionalism and ethno-politics,” “Political culture and ideologies,” “Political problems of international relations and globalization.”

Format of publications: scientific articles, reviews, scientific materials, materials of round tables, scientific reviews, scientific reports devoted to research problems in the field of politics and political science.

The Editorial Board and the editors of the journal in their activities are guided by the principles defined by VAK of Russia for scientific journals, including: presence of the institute of peer review for the expert quality assessment of scientific articles; information openness of the publications; availability and compliance with the rules and ethical standards for the submission of manuscripts by the authors.

The target audience of the journal is Russian and foreign specialists-political scientists, as well as graduate students and masters in the fields of political science, state and municipal management and international relations.

The journal strictly adheres to the international publishing standards and publication ethics identified in the *COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics)* document. <http://publicationethics.org>.

Full details of the journal and its editorial policy, requirements to the preparation and publication of articles, archive (issues since 2011) and additional information are available on the website: <http://voprosplitolog.ru>

E-mail address: voprosplitolog@yandex.ru

CONTENTS

POLITICAL PROCESS IN RUSSIA

- Boltenkova L.F., Alekhnovich S.O.** To the Question of Continuity of the Russian Statehood 239
- Velikaya N.M.** Transformation of Local Self-Governance in Small and Medium Cities of Russia Through the Eyes of the Expert Community 246
- Astvatsaturova M.A.** Ethnopolitical Notes from the Diary of the North Caucasus Federal District 253

PROBLEMS OF EURASIAN AND POST-SOVIET COOPERATION

- Brusilovskiy D.A., Esipov I.I.** Two Worlds – Two Integrations: The Specificity of Connection of Civilizations with Islamophobia..... 261
- Musaev O.R., Karshiev Sh.C.** Some Aspects of Strengthening International Relations in Polyethnic States (On the Example of Uzbekistan)..... 272
- Shamarov P.V.** Russian Peacekeeping Model in the Post-Soviet Space 279

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND WORLD POLITICS

- Sardaryan G.T.** Reasons for the Crisis of Christian Democracy in Western Europe..... 285
- Milka Malfait, Chernyavskiy S.I.** The Russia-EU Perspective: National Security and Counterterrorism from a Different Angle..... 293
- Rustamova L.R.** Social and Humanitarian Cooperation Between Russia and Germany in the Conditions Of Sanctions 304
- Dubrovina O.V., Salamov R.R.** Paradiplomacy as a New Architecture of International Relations 311
- Haddad Mohannad** Strategies of Main Actors of World Policy Regarding the Middle East and Modern Syria (On the Example of the USA and the European Union)..... 316
- Jia Yuanpey** Experience, Prospects and Problems of Cooperation Between China and Turkmenistan in the Field of Natural Gas 323
- Burda M.A., Horeva E.E., Larkina M.A., Belyaeva V.P.** National-State Identity in Modern Europe in the Context of Migration and Political Processes..... 330
- Rodionova M.E.** Cooperation of Russia and Bulgaria: from History to Modernity. Dynamics of Relations in the Context of European Integration (On the 140th Anniversary of Diplomatic Relations Between Russia and Bulgaria)..... 337

REVIEWS

- Slizovskiy D.E., Medvedev N.P.** Reflections on the Read 342

OUR AUTHORS 349

AUTHORS' GUIDELINES 351

DOI 10.35775/PSI.2019.33.3.015

D. E. SLIZOVSKIY

*Doctor of Sciences (history), Professor,
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia,
Moscow, Russia*

N. P. MEDVEDEV

*Doctor of Sciences (political sciences), Professor,
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia,
Moscow, Russia*

REFLECTIONS ON THE READ

*The review analyzes not only the content of the article “Russian roots in Crimea” written by the famous scientist-researcher L. F. Boltenkova and published in journal *Issues of National and Federative Relations* No. 8, Vol. 9, 2019, but also explores the logic of presentation. An attempt is made to answer the question why such studies appear in the scientific literature today. The article, albeit briefly, but clearly traces a historical connection of the territories that form modern Russia: Crimea, the North Caucasus, the Volga region, Siberia, etc. since the time B.C. Historically, Russian roots appeared in Crimea naturally, in the period before Kiev Rus, they strengthened during the Kiev period of the Ancient Russian state. Due to the loss of sovereignty by Kiev and its entry into the Lithuanian-Polish state, successive Russian relations with Crimea were historically carried out by North-Eastern Russia (Moscow). Although the main form of communications was “attack-defense,” but they forged the victory of Russia (Moscow) at the cost of incredible victims.*

Key words: *geopolitics, history, Crimea, Russia, “Scythia”, Khazar Khanate, Byzantium, Tmutarakan Principality, Chersonese (Kherson), Moscow.*

The article “Russian roots in Crimea” written by the famous scientist-researcher L. F. Boltenkova and published in journal *Issues of National and Federative Relations* No. 8, Vol. 9, 2019, from our point of view, has several levels of analysis: the first level is the geopolitical view and the narrative about the habitation “since the time B.C.” and the movement of numerous tribes in these territories, some of which are now part of the Russian Federation. We see an attempt to explain the historical relationship of the “territories forming modern Russia,” where Crimea is naturally included. This level of analysis has already been partially tested, including in relation to Crimea (1).

Another level is the author’s personal reaction in respect of historical subjects, facts and events, real and mythical, given in documents, and presented in historical studies by masters of the word and historical science. We believe that

we can say with full confidence that the article has a cognitive, explanatory and assertive value. The essence of this value is that the reader has an opportunity to observe the author's creative search and together with the author be in the position of an analyst-researcher. Together they can mutually formulate the answer as an imperative of living and natural intersections and connections of the past and the actual present. This imperative formula is given by the author in the following sentence: *"although the main form of communications was "attack-defense," but they forged the victory of Russia (Moscow) at the cost of incredible victims."*

It should be emphasized that the works of Russian authors published in recent years cover a wide range of issues in this subject [4; 17; 10. Pp. 157-172; 12; 14. Pp. 80-90; 15; 11. Pp. 20-26].

We would like to add to the above the efforts and circumstances that have not only shaped the "attack and defense" relationship for many centuries, but also modified this formula of relations and ties, laying the foundation for the present time federative relations. The degree of recognition or denial of such relations by some people does not seem to put an end to this historical process and discussions about it. Will the "attack and defense" relations be the eternal shadow and phantom pain of such ties and relations, and will these shadows and pains be materialized in politics, economy, behavior and reactions of future generations of the one people and its branches?

Somebody may not agree with the answer given in the article and with the explanation of the Russian roots in Crimea. But even that somebody cannot but detect an acute and urgent importance of the issue connected with the current status and future of Crimea, a part of the Russian territory and state, not only for the present, but of the actual presence of the past in the present. The past, addressing the present as both a tradition and a legend. As a tradition to reproduce the features of culture of the European-Atlantic, Byzantine thinking, as a tradition to support the culture of the native Russian (old Russian) way of cognition, including this issue.

When the author writes in the abstract that: *"historically, Russian roots appeared in Crimea naturally, in the period before Kiev Rus, they strengthened during the Kiev period of the Ancient Russian state,"* we should pay attention not only to the physical presence of Russian roots in this territory, but also to the emergence, even the source of the Russian religious consciousness in the territory of Crimea. We speak of course, about the baptism of Prince Vladimir and the subsequent history of the spread of the Orthodoxy in the Russian land. Here, we not only support the author's approach in substantiating her main idea, but also draw attention to the fact that before us in about 1037 to 1050 this mission was fulfilled by the monk, ascetic, philosopher, poet and the first Russian Metropolitan Hilarion of Kiev, the author of the immortal work "The Word about Law and Grace..." Saint Hilarion, who timed "The Word" to the 50th anniversary of the Baptism of Rus, thought it necessary to say that the Law, Grace, and Truth "filled the whole

earth and faith spread to all peoples, and reached our Russian people. And we praise our Prince Vladimir, who has baptized us” [19]. Eschatological, religious Russian consciousness was at that time based on the tradition, which could not ignore all that was connected with Crimea and the city of Korsun (Chersonese). The deep meaning of such events, pointing to the Russian roots in Crimea and the Crimean roots in Russia and among the Russians, is that they go deep into the distant historical (even prehistoric) past, and Hilarion of Kiev was well aware of it. And if we do not follow this meaning, then these are our problems, our shortcomings and miscalculations.

L. F. Boltenkova’s turning to the distant past is important because it explains much in the ties between Crimea and Rus and the Russians roots in Crimea through the ties and relations of the changing and mobile population of Crimea and the adjacent Russ-Russian territories where population (tribes) were also mobile and successively changing during the huge historical period of time. In the historical narrative, the author confidently uses terms and concepts already proven by the historical science, but controversial and not completely understood, the semantic meanings of which are hidden behind them. This is especially true, when it concerns the connection of these concepts and their real historical subjects to the particular historical era and specific historical period. The most used in the article are terms and concepts that explain the location of the proto-state or state (Khaganate), city, geographical name, population (tribe) of the past eras, appearing in the territory of modern Crimea and Russ-Russia: Alans, Arabs, Scythians, Sarmatians, Huns, Goths, Greeks, Ugric peoples, Budins, Fissagets, Issedons, Tatars, Tauris, Kallipids, Alazones, Scythians- ploughmen, Persians, the tribe of Sinids, Slavs, Khazars, and nomads-Pechenegs. In order to understand not only the presence of the Russian roots in Crimea, but their natural, historical significance for the Russian tribe and for the population of Crimea, the author cites dozens or hundreds of tribes, each of which has always fought for its existence and thus created material and spiritual values. In the process of this historical creativity, these tribes left imperishable monuments of their activity, or the reality, destroyed and plunged, proofs lost even in memory. Some of these tribes turned into an artifact, and lost their value as actual facts or subjects of history. And, in our opinion, formed a conviction and a firm view, emphasizing the importance of vitality and survival of the tribe “Rus,” which could not but appear in Crimea.

The emergence of the Russian roots in Crimea is a natural and irresistible historical process that developed by someone’s command in a specific (extant in memory and writing) historical time and mentally delineated boundaries and territories. It is possible to ignore this fact, or to shy away from it, to grimace about it or to distort such event and phenomenon (such tricks are in trend now), but even then its value and explanation would only strengthen because at sound judgments it is a right direction of thought reflecting the only correct interpretation of the historical past which has passed to the present. The author immediately, at the

beginning of the article, in one phrase claims her position: "Let's pay attention that Russians in Crimea are recorded historically from the IX century. That is, it is not a guess or an assumption, it is a historical fact." All subsequent rhetoric and analysis is a confirmation of this position.

For this purpose, a wide picture of territorial spaces and subjects of historical process unfolds before us: from the Caspian sea to the Dnieper Nadporozhye, from the Volga region to the Northern part of the Black Sea coast, territories at the Kuban and Don rivers, the North Caucasus, even Western Siberia and Altai, the rivers (Volga, Oka, Vyatka), the cities (Kiev, Moscow, Sevastopol, Chersonese), the countries, proto-states and states (Scythia, Bosphorus, Olbia, steppe and mountain Crimea, Tavria (Tavrika, Tavrida), Taman, Tmutarakan, Kuban, Kiev Rus, Moscow Rus, Siberia, Uzbek, Kazan, Astrakhan and Crimean khanates, Khazar Khaganate, Turkey, Rzeczpospolita). Introduction to the analysis and factography of such events and phenomena serve as the basis for an impartial analysis of the Russian roots in Crimea. How can it be otherwise, since from the ancient times the Crimean Peninsula has been the crossroad of not only sea transit routes, but the territory of movement for hundreds of ethnic groups and tribes. Anyway, even if you can find some flaws in the historical sequence of changes of the historical periods experienced by Crimea and its population, we still see a clear line that explains the rapid nature of movement of the population in its territory from the prehistoric period to the ancient time (Greek colonies, Roman protectorate), through the middle ages (the Crimean khanate, Ottoman influence) and up to the inclusion of Crimea in the Russian Empire, to the time of new and modern history, when Crimea was Ukrainian and then again Russian. It is not necessary to look for an existential essence in these historical transitions, let it remain the lot of scientists, if it were not biased by the political flair. Yet, we agree with the author that whatever was the degree and nature of the Russian roots in Crimea, no matter how historians and we determine their nature, it remains an imperishable fact and phenomenon. It is possible that the author's explanation and interpretation are of interest only to those who treat the historical past and the contemporary events in which the population of the Crimea is involved with the same sincere empathy, sympathy and compassion, with which the author's consciousness and feelings are permeated.

Yes, in the article, the author talks about the Russian roots in Crimea! It is undoubtedly the phenomenon difficult to explain and difficult to argue one's position. To get out of such difficulties, L. F. Boltenkova has chosen, in our belief, the most optimal and effective way. Explaining her position, L. F. Boltenkova does not enter into a dispute with her opponents. We would like to emphasize again, that, perhaps, this is the most convenient and effective method: the topic and any aspect of it have been and will remain the subject of heated discussions for a long time, probably indefinitely. There is a reason and a pretext for this [1. Pp. 16-22; 2. P. 279-343; 3; 9. Pp. 184-226, 388-436; 8. Pp. 37-68; 7. Pp. 14-15; 13; 16;

6. Pp. 18-60; 5. Pp. 30-66]. There are at least two important aspects of this issue or topic that remain debatable: a) whether the tribe “Rus” or the tribe Russy are related to the Russian people. That is, whether the modern Russians are direct heirs of the tribe Rus or its associations. b) How deep go the roots of the Russian presence in Crimea? Is there a more or less clear period of the Russian appearance in Crimea? Can it be traced to a particular era or a particular time? Is it possible to date the emergence of Russians in Crimea?

The logic of L. F. Boltenkova’s judgments and statements is based on the provision of the sufficient and high quality evidence confirming the presence of the Russian roots in Crimea. This is the level of a detached objective analysis of the germination of Russian roots in Crimea since the pre-Kiev period. And the Russian tribe (Rus), which, as L. F. Boltenkova writes, in the VI-VII centuries appeared on the political map of the world at first not as a state, but as militant groups (Slavic tribes) that attacked Byzantium. At that period, they were scattered.

In the aggregate, the author’s judgments and reasoning are a kind of virtual conclusions that can reflect more or less accurately the real historical events and facts or can contradict the historical reality. In conclusion, we insist that from the standpoint of geopolitics and the historical process, the presented analysis is objective. All other shades of the content, approaches to the interpretation of the history of the subject, a selection of facts and arguments are possibly colored with emotions. The transition from history to modernity in the emotional presentation, which is implicit, but still present in the article, was in the essence made under the practical imperative, at the intersection of the desired and the actual.

All of us together, including Prof. L. F. Boltenkova and many of those who happen to get acquainted with the text of the article, shall not be ashamed to feel involved in the mental empathy of the geopolitical and broad historical canvas, in those acts and processes that collectively experienced Russians in Crimea and “Crimeans” in the Russian expanses. Is it not there that we have to look for the causes of modern changes in the life of Crimea, modern Russia and Ukraine? Changes have been always taking place! But no one’s vitality was undermined by anything, because, as L. F. Boltenkova says in the conclusion: “the history of ancient Russia, Moscow Russia, and the Russian (Russ) state is closely connected with Crimea since the beginning of our era: the Scythians, Sarmatians, Issedons, Khazars, Huns, etc., no matter what was its form and under whose influence it was. But most of all Moscow was provoked by the Crimean Tatars to war with them. Willing to turn the Russian state into their ulus, the Crimean khans eventually turned into Russian subjects. It happened in the process of bloody battles and attacks by the Crimean Tatars, but it happened.”

Only an unshakable vitality can explain the unfading creativity of Russians about Crimea, and the population of Crimea within Kiev and Moscow Russia. Their creative spirit did not rest then or after, when “... even Peter the Great failed to join Crimea. This was done by Catherine the Second only in 1783. She issued

the Manifesto of April 8, 1783 “On the acceptance under the Russian power of the Crimean Peninsula, Taman and all Kuban lands.” ... G. A. Potemkin was appointed its Governor-General. In an extremely short time, new cities were built on the new site: Odessa, Sevastopol, Simferopol, Kherson, Nikolaev, they are all Russian cities.”

Of course, the described historical events, phenomena and processes were also very painful for everyone. The author of the article says: “In its purest form, Russia had to fight for Crimea for 26 years, straining the whole country. Where there were fights, Russian blood permeated the land.” Many times the roots of the Russian presence in Crimea were cut. And many times, it seemed that the emerging unity of material, economic, trade, and human relations, intertribal and personal relationships disintegrated under the countless manifested diseases. What can be done with these diseases in history, in present or in future? Is it appropriate to treat such diseases the way human diseases are treated by applying the rule that there is no disease in general, only an individual disease of organs and cells [18. P. 418]. Starting from this initial position, applying it to the article reviewed by us, and to the author’s judgments and approaches, we can also say, that Prof. L. F. Boltenkova, like a doctor, makes the correct diagnosis and gives names to the historical subjects (diseases). In this way, she performs her professional duty. This is the essence of the profession for the doctor and, we assume, for the historian. Correction of historical errors, their healing will take place in future by itself with the help of techniques appropriate for the case. If not by itself then by the agents (subjects) known to the science and social practice, the historian has no direct relation to them. The author of the article is also outside the subjects and methods of healing and recovery of the Russian roots in Crimea. She has only diagnosed the case and named what has been diagnosed.

NOTES:

(1) See: L. Lvov Relations between Zaporozhye and Crimea. Odessa, 1895. The book tells its readers about the relationship between Zaporozhye and Crimea after the Tatar invasion, about the factors of convergence (political, economic), it also contains comments to the news about these relations that has survived// <https://runivers.ru/lib/book3114/9791/>

REFERENCES:

1. *Antonovich M.* History of Ukraine. V. 1. Prague, 1942 (In Ukrainian).
2. *Arkas M.* History of the Black Sea region. V. 1. Toronto, 1969 (In Ukrainian).
3. *Boltenkova L. F., Ryabova E. I.* Territorial'naya osnova Rusi – polyan [Territorial basis of Russia-Polyans] // Issues of National and Federative Relations. 2019. V. 9. No. 4 (49) (In Russ.).
4. *Boltenkova L. F.* «Zadumka Boga» o Drevney Rusi [“God’s idea” about Ancient Russia] // Issues of National and Federative Relations. 2019. V. 9. No. 7 (52) (In Russ.).

5. Chirovsky N. Introduction to Ukrainian History. Vol. 1. N.Y. 1981.
6. Chubatiy M. Principality of Rus-Ukraine and emergence of the three East Slavic Nations. New-York – Paris, 1964 (In Ukrainian).
7. Dobryanskiy M. D. Ukraine and Russia. Rome, 1989 (In Ukrainian).
8. Doroshenko D. Essay on the history of Ukraine. V. 1. Warsaw, 1932 (In Ukrainian).
9. Grushevski M. S. History of Ukraine – Rus. V. 1. Kiev, 1913 (In Ukrainian).
10. Medvedev N. P., Nesterchuk O. A., Slizovskiy D. E. *Postsovetskoye sodruzhestvo (SNG). Ostalis' li resursy dlya novoy reintegratsii?* [Post-Soviet Commonwealth (CIS). Are there any resources left for a new reintegration?] // *Przeglad Strategiczny*. 2018. V. 11 (In Russ.).
11. Medvedev N.P., Glebov V.A., Madatov A.S. To the Question of Typologization of the Russian Regions // *Political Science Issues*. 2018. T. 8. № 1 (29).
12. Medvedev N. P., Maistat M. A., Krasnov L. N., Geleransky P. S., Ivaina M., Makukhin A. V., Vysotsky A. V., Kamara S. B., Medvedev V. N., Ketsyan G. V., Perkova D. V., Chan H. T. *Etnopoliticheskaya regionalistika: avtonomiya i separatizm. Kollektivnaya monografiya / Moskva, 2018. Ser. Trudy nauchnoy shkoly professora N. P. Medvedeva. Vypusk 11* [Ethnopolitical regionalism: autonomy and separatism. The collective monography / Moscow, 2018. Series: Works by Professor N. P. Medvedev's scientific school. Issue 11]. M., 2018 (In Russ.).
13. Nasonov A. N. «*Russkaya zemlya*» i obrazovaniye territorii Drevnerusskogo gosudarstva [“Russian land” and the formation of the territory of the old Russian state]. M., 1951 (In Russ.).
14. Slizovskiy D. E., Glebov V.A., Medvedev N. P. *Retsenziya na stat'yu L.F. Boltenkoy «K voprosu ob ukrainskoy gosudarstvennosti» bez strakha i uzhasa ob ukrainskoy gosudarstvennosti* [Review of L. F. Boltenkova's article “On the question of Ukrainian statehood” without fear and horror about Ukrainian statehood] // *Eurasian Union: Issues of International Relations*. 2018. No. 3 (25) (In Russ.).
15. Slizovskiy D. E., Medvedev N. P., Kornouhov D. *Retsenziya na stat'yu L.F. Boltenkoy «Kakoye slavyanskoye plemya pervym nazvalo sebya Rus'yu?»* [Review of L. F. Boltenkova's article “What Slavic tribe was the first to call itself Russ?”] // *Issues of National and Federative Relations*. 2019. V. 9. No. 3 (48) (In Russ.).
16. Tikhomirov M. N. *Proiskhozhdeniye nazvaniya «Rus'» i «Russkaya zemlya»* [Origin of the names “Rus” and “Russian land”] // *Soviet Ethnography*. 1947. No. 6-7 (In Russ.).
17. Yermachenkova V. D. *Vliyaniye politicheskogo statusa Kryma na rossiysko-ukrainskiye otnosheniya* [Influence of the political status of Crimea on the Russian-Ukrainian relations] // *Political Science Issues*. 2019. V. 9. No. 7 (47) (In Russ.).
18. Zweig S. *Istoricheskiye portrety* [Historical portraits]. M.: ACT: Astrel, 2011 (In Russ.).
19. https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Illarion_Kievskij/slovo_o_zakone_i_blagodati/