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The Soviet concept of Federalism is rooted in the Marxist-Leninist ideology of the right to self-determination of nations which provided for every nationality, the right to determine its own state political form and unite with other nationalities. It seems to repudiate the Western notion of state and its form. Though both Western and Soviet scholars share a consensus on the broad features of federalism, i.e. division of power between the centre and the units, a written constitution and a Supreme Court to act as a guardian, yet the class aims behind the concept of federalism as perceived in the west and in the Soviet Union are widely divergent.

Federalism in the Western democracy is based largely on administrative considerations whereas for the Soviet Union, national territorial principle and functional interdependence has been the strategic factor in working out the form of state construction. The concept of autonomy for nationalities living compactly on a definite territory has been the underlying feature of Soviet federation. The nation acquire independence
in deciding questions of local and purely national (ethnic) significance. This concept of autonomy, as I argue, differs from the concept of cultural national autonomy evolved by Austrian social democrats like Otto Bauer and Springer and supported by the Bundists in Russia.

Lenin exposed the opportunistic nature of this plan and opposed its application to the multi-national Russian states. He viewed the plan of cultural national autonomy as a plan for dividing the working class and the plan for division of schools and other cultural institutions on the basis of nationality as something harmful for international unity of the working class and against the interests of class struggle. But we find certain principles of national territorial autonomy violated during the civil war and the foreign intervention. Soviet autonomy, based on the national territorial principle was recognised once the emergency conditions disappeared.

Economic principle for the division of boundaries of the autonomous units were given prime importance
in the formation of the Soviet autonomy. The Soviet federation as we see in the second chapter developed through two main stages—formation of autonomous republics, majority of which could not form nation states due to peculiar conditions. This was the first stage which lasted up to the first half of 1918 followed by the process of construction of Soviet autonomy in various forms leading to the emergence of the federal relations between various independent sovereign national republics.

As we have seen, three factors played a significant part in the development of Soviet federation: unstable international situation, dangers of fresh attacks and the subsequent need to ensure external security and the setting up of a united front of the Soviet republics, the urge to develop a common socialist economy to strengthen the cultural unity among the various nationalities and finally the need to find a just and democratic solution of the vexed nationality question by forging fraternal bonds between the hither-nations to oppressed and oppressing on the basis of right to self-determination.
The concept of autonomy was concretised in the form of autonomous region in Turkestan (Autonomy was the primary principle of Federalism). Here, I have argued how in 1917, creation of national republics for the people's of Central Asia was out of the question as the administrative division of the three states viz., Turkestan, Bukhara and Khiva did not coincide with the national ethnic boundaries. The self-determination of the Central Asian people could not therefore have been national either in form or content. Nevertheless, it was definitely anti-colonial and anti-feudal. Hence administrative realignment was a pre-requisite for national unity. But at that juncture self defence rather than self determination was their priority.

In these circumstances, the third Congress of Soviets of Workers and Peasants and Soldiers Deputies was convened in Tashkent proclaiming the foundation of the Soviet Government in Turkestan. This Congress as critics pointed out ignored the question of autonomy and took a negative approach to the Muslim participation in the higher organs. The Great Russian Chauvinism characterising the policies of the Tashkent Soviet and the way it handled the autonomous government of
Turkestan dealt a fatal blow to the Bolshevik prestige in Central Asia and rendered it difficult to reconcile the local populace to the Soviet rule. Despite the centre's attempt to contain the reckless policies of the local Russian Bolsheviks and draw the indigenous people into the fold of the party and the government, the nationalities policy of the Soviet Government was shelved until the arrival of the Turkestan Commission. The Commission and the Turkestan Bureau of Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party became the media to implement the Soviet policies in Central Asia. Their objective was to re-establish Central control over the region as also to broaden the base of the local Soviet regime by attracting the indigenous people within its fold. The fifth territorial congress of Soviets in April 1918 declared the autonomy of Turkestan, while the sixth Congress held on October 1918 confirmed the constitution of the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.

Autonomous Soviet Turkestan was a multi-national republic forming part of RSFSR. The constitution left charges of defence, foreign affairs, post and telegraph
and Navy to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Central Government. This made it obligatory for the Centre to carry on the administration in these spheres not through its own Commissariats but through the appropriate Commissariats functioning in the Turkestan Council of People's Commissars. Inevitably the Central Government refused to accept this constitution. The dispute between the Centre and Turkestan Republic on the question of the competence of their Commissariats was not resolved until April 1921. In September 1920, under the guidance of Turkestan Commission, a new constitution was adopted which delegated foreign relations and the defence to the federal government. Further, it widened the scope of the decrees and the directives of the Central Government over the administration of post, telegraph & communication. On April 1922, the Russian Central Executive Committee gave the final legal affirmation to the constitution of the Turkestan. In setting up of a new constitution, the IX Congress of the Soviets derived a series of practical measures to ensure the implementation of the autonomy. The Turkestan Commission, as seen earlier in the thesis not only normalised the
political situation within the Turkestan USSR but also succeeded in extending the Bolshevik influence over Khiva and Bukhara. As a result of the revolution in Khiva and Bukhara, the aristocratic power of the Khans was overthrown giving way to the establishment of the People's Soviet Republics of Khorezm and Bukhara in 1920. From 1922 onwards the process of Sovietizing Bukhara and Khorezm was started in a thoroughgoing manner which reduced the so-called independence of these states to a mere fiction. The purge campaigns were conducted, at the insistence of the Central Bureau, within the communist parties of Bukhara and Khorezm while in 1922 and 1923 led to the expulsions of all those erstwhile Djadists who still nursed the ambitions of attaining Bukhara and Khorezm as independent states and succeeded in bringing the policies of these two republics in line with the Bolshevik principles. Between October 1923 and September 1924, they were replaced by Soviet socialist republics of Khorezm and Bukhara.

Therefore, we see that in the process of forming an autonomous state, both the government of RSFSR and the Communist Party had established multiple links in
the Central Asian Republics. Although centralisation had been dominant trend in all policies followed by the Central Asian Republics, it was however, ensured that these policies were implemented by the indigenous people. This marked the end of the stage of the struggle of the party for the implementation of its Communist Nationality Policy. In granting autonomy to the republic here, the pendulum swung more in favour of centralisation rather than decentralisation, in that the local agencies were only involved in implementing the policies rather than its formation.

The implementation of the national delimitation plan in Central Asia as contended in the third chapter completed the process of conferring national statehood on Central Asian people. The Uzbek and Turkmen people were given the status of union republics with the USSR. The Tadjik formed the autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic within the Uzbek SSR. But the process was incomplete as far as the Kirghiz and Kazakh peoples were concerned. They were to acquire their full nation statehood in 1936 when the Tadjiks were also elevated to the same status. The legal status of the Union Republics, the main subject of the Soviet Federation
was fixed up by the 1936 Union Constitution and by the constitution of the Union Republic enacted after 1936 in complete conformity with the union constitution. The developmental changes which took place in the socio-economic structure of the republics since 1936 reflected to some extent the profound transformation which had taken place in the USSR itself. When the new constitution of the USSR was adopted, this made it necessary to revise the constitutions of the Union Republic. Thus as analysed earlier it may be reiterated here that the local conditions had decisive impact on the evolution of federalism in the Soviet Central Asian Republics.

Finally, I have discussed the gradual development of Soviet federal policy from the politico-legal to its economic and cultural dimensions. While critically analysing the Soviet federation in Central Asia, there has been a striking success in promoting the status and improving the conditions of the Central Asian people. The constitutional measures on federalism available in the Soviet constitution has provided the mechanism of regionalisation of the socio-economic levels of the ethnic minorities. The adequate indicators of the level of general development of the
population have been achieved in Central Asian republics and to some extent they were higher in Uzbekistan. However, the qualitative indicators of technical education and special training of local populace of Central Asia were lower in comparison to other republics. This affected the professional competence of the candidates. The economic and the cultural objectives of the Soviet nationalities policy viz. the elimination of the economic disparity between the Central Asian region and other well developed region of Russia had not been realised till then. Possibly this could be broadly due to the so-called "Administrative-Command" management system and other spheres of social development in the economy which led to an inevitable tendency towards centralisation, this policy has worked for the union as a whole, rather than the individual nationalities. This policy of centralisation in the formative stage of republics was necessary to cope with the transitional stage of building socialism. Since it had yielded substantial results in achieving its common objective, i.e., the consolidation of the Soviet state. These policies, however, became redundant or regressive in later decades. With the advent of the Khrushchev era, Soviet Federalism saw new period of decentralisation
of state control and extension of the rights to the union republics. The Sovnarkhoz system, introduced by him, provided the Soviet republics a real opportunity to control their own economies, and move ahead towards a genuine federal structure. During the 1960s, the process of decentralisation which began in 1954 was stalled and a reverse tendency became apparent. The abolition of Sovnarkhoz and the formation of the Central Asian economic control marked the end of the period of the expansion of union republic's rights in the sphere of industrial administration as well as the cultural sphere. These problems exerted negative influence on the Centre-state relations. Its negative legal implication was due to the absence of an effective regulatory mechanism. There were no safeguards for the sovereignty of the republics against the arbitrariness of central ministries and departments regarding location of productive capacities or management of the economy as a whole. The Central Ministries imposed its policies on the republics in the economic sphere regardless of both the interests of the republics and the dangers posed to the environment.
Another problem of the existing system of regulation was that there was no clear cut segregation of authority between the centre and the republic in the most significant branches of the economy. The existing mechanism of interaction between the Central bodies of management and its members were not effective because they undermined the participation of the representative of the republics in the meetings of the Central Bodies Council of Ministers, Gosplan. All these considerably limit the power of republics and exert negative influence on the socio economic conditions of the region.