I. Nationalities Problem before the October Revolution

The nationality problem was there even before the formation of Soviet Union. The nationality problems were of rudimentary in nature. It was not widespread. But the national-movements were among the non-Russian minorities. The national movements among the minorities represented one of the many forms which their intellectual and social ferment assumed. "Because the traditions and socio-economic interests of various groups of subjects, including minorities were highly diversified, their cultural and political development tended to take on a local, and in some cases, national-colouring" Romantic philosophy which first affected Russia in 1820s, stimulated among minority intellectuals an interest in their own languages and past traditions, and led directly to the evolution of cultural nationalism, the first manifestation of the national movement in the Russian borderland.¹

In the 1860's and 1870's, the spread of Russian populism provided minority intellectuals with the social ideology and encouraged them to have contact with the rural masses. They were putting emphasis on the

customs, and institutions of the peasantry on the line of Russian populism. So the customs and traditions of rural mass became the focal-point of nationality feeling.

The formation of political parties of Russia in 1900, led to the creation of modern political parties among various minorities. Like their Russian counterpart, they adopted liberal and socialistic programme and co-operated with Russian parties. Political parties both of minorities and Russians fought for parliamentary rights, local-autonomy and socio-economic reforms. Minorities parties fought for their respective local or regional interests unlike their Russian counterpart which fought for the whole country. The fact that minorities in Russia developed a national consciousness before their fellow nationals across the border was a result of the more rapid intellectual and economic growth of Russian empire\(^2\).

The nationalism among non-Russians was somewhat late due to some socio-economic factors. The first most important nationalistic movement among slavic non-Russian nationalities was among Ukrainians. Ukrainians separated from Russians due to Mongolian invasion and Polish-Lithuanian conquest in thirteenth century. Since then they developed

\(^2\) Ibid., p.8.
different culture, traditions, folklore and own dialects. They had the idea of unlimited freedom which became deterministic factor in the rising consciousness of independent Ukrainian state.

As a result of the presence of Tatars in Crimea, it became necessary in a significant development to defend the southern Ukrainian frontier. The responsibility was fulfilled in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by the Zaporozhian kozaks of Eastern Ukraine who bore arms, in addition to engaging in agriculture and over whom the Polish government could not usually exercise authority. The term Kozak (Cossack) is of Turkic origin and refers to a guardian, a free and independent man. The Ukrainian Kozaks, who possessed their own administration and elected their commander (hetman), revolted against Polish rule in 1648 under the leadership of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky.3 Unable to face Polish and Crimean Tatar opposition, they concluded treaty with Tsar in 1654. Tsar abolished all their earlier privilege and introduced serfdom. Inspite of various attempts they could not get independence from Tsarist rule.

There was a rapid growth of agriculture after the liberation of serfs. Ukraine became the grain surplus area in the Tsarist empire. The

emergence of prosperous peasantry due to the individual type of land ownership created some conditions for the development of nationalistic feeling. During the eighteenth and part of nineteenth century, it was still an open question whether the cultural and economic peculiarities of the Ukrainian people would lead to the formation of a separate nation. The absence of a Ukrainian intelligentsia and centripetal economic forces militated against the cossack tradition and interests of Ukrainian peasants.\footnote{Pipes, n.l, p.9.}

Despite oppressive conditions of Tsarist rule, the cultural phase of Ukrainian nationalism started under the poet Taras Shevchenko. He developed the peasant dialect into national language and literature. In 1864, some writers and students at Kiev established methodius society-a secret organization, which was influenced by the spirit of utopian socialism, German idealism, and notions of international brotherhood. But it was suppressed by Tsarist rule.

Then in second half of nineteenth century, it adhered to populism and devoted to the social problems of peasantry. Russian government banned the printing in Ukrainian language. In 1900, Ukrainian founded their political organization, the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party. Extreme nationalist of RUP demanded unconditional independence for "Greater
Ukraine" extending between Don and San river in 1900. It stimulated idea about ukrainian nationalism and created mass peasant movement. Revolutionary Ukrainian Party was divided in to various groups. Some joined Russian Socialist Party and some in Cadets. The separatist founded National Ukrainian Party (NUP) in 1902. They fought for the total separation of Ukraine from Russia. So separatist organized mass movement against Tsarist rule. They also conducted some terrorist activities. But other factions of the RUP later identified with the various main Russian parties reconciling to the demand of autonomy. After the collapse of Russian empire, there was nationalistic fervour in ukraine, but it was very short due to the absorption of Ukraine by Bolshevik power.

The development of Belorussian nationalistic feelings was very slow. The beginning of Belorussian nationalism was cultural. The first publication in Belorussian language was Nash Niva (Ourland). The Beloruesian national party, (Belorussian Revolutionary Hromada) was founded by some students in 1902. Later it changed its name to Belorussian Socialist Hromada which also demanded introduction of federal relation in Russia, territorial autonomy for province and national cultural autonomy for all minorities. But the Belorussian nationalism was too weak to stir up nationalistic feelings for the separate state.
The nationalities problems among Turkic groups were initially not so much intense and widespread. Initially, the native revolts were against Tsarist rule in Central Asia. So the various sporadic revolts were anti-Russian in character. Initial calmness after the conquest of Central Asia led many observers, Russian and foreign alike, into the believing that it reflected the real nature of people, but behind the scene, there was less certainty.\(^5\) Tsarist administration was apprehensive of native uprising. So military service for Tsar by Central Asian was not allowed.

The spectre of native revolt was also present, we have seen in the deliberations of Igntyev's Commission 1884 over the drafting the statute for the administration of Turkestan. More important still, the ethnic and cultural diversity of peoples of the region, their diffused geographical distributions, and feudal economic and political conditions under which they lived had never permitted the growth of other than local patriotism\(^6\). The old despotic rule in the region accustomed them to any outsider rule. So they were obliged to the new master as a matter of habit.


\(^6\) Ibid., p.222.
The one uniting force for them was Islam. More than religion, it was a way of life. The traditions of earlier conquests, which lived on in the mind of adherents, gave an equivalent of national pride. The violent overthrow of power, moreover, was part of the political pattern of the region. The revolt by defiant Kazakh sultans in 1868 to new administration was having a greater implications among the region. Uzbeks were most volatile in this respect due to their political, cultural and economic advancement. There are some sects who were advocating Dervishinism and Mahadism. It advocated in the belief in coming of Saviour. So they had stirred up some-revolts against Russian rule. Sometime wandering dervish proclaimed himself khan. The uprising in 1885 of Dervish-khan Tiuria, a former official in the Kokand Khanate, affected Andizan, Osh, and Margelan uezds, but quickly quelled by punitive action. The various uprisings were supported by the peasants and nomadic groups. Tashkent cholera riots in 1892 created rumour among natives about Russian design of "extinction of native by cholera". Andizan uprising of 1898 by religious leaders to restore former khanates of Kokand changed attitude of Russian regime about the native people.

7. Ibid., p.223.
8. Ibid., 223.
Later Muslim people became aware that they could not keep their national individuality and cultural heritage by remaining aloof from the rest of world. They found their answer in the new secular method of education. Developments rising from this awareness transcended not only reactionary Pan-Islamic movement but the goal of Pan-Turkic movement. The national awakening of Turks in Russia had its beginning by Ismail bey-Gaspriniskii (Gaspraly or Gaspirach), a crimean Tatar, established in his native city of Bakhchi-Sarai, a Turkish language news paper, Terdzhiman (Tereiiman, meaning interpreter) which before long became the prototype for all the Muslim periodical publications in Russia and served as a organ of Muslims throughout entire Central Asia.\(^9\)

He established new schools on modern line by various native languages instead of old Madrasa system. It created a new intelligentsia who fought against all sort of religious fanaticism and conservatism. They established many new schools and newspapers despite opposition from Qadimists (Traditionalist). But the movement did not remain confined to educational and cultural activity. After the Ruso-Japanse war, it transformed into a political movement. It stimulated political awakening

---

in numerable nationalities which were herded together in Russian-Empire.10

The publication of various papers like Aina, Sadoi Turkestan and Bukhara-i-Sharif aroused national consciousness. But those publications were restricted by tsarist rule. Notwithstanding their contribution to the secularization of education and cultural change, the political ideology of Djadidist was romantic revivalist. The Djadidists worked for syncretization of new and old values. They glorified the virtues of Islam and sought to absorb certain traits of modernity.11 Djadidists tried to awaken the cultural-nationalism of whole central Asia to the ultimate creation of "United States of Turkestan". But they were not successful in their mission due to opposition from Tsarist rule. Their influence was restricted to urban areas. So it was not widespread mass movement.

Qadimists on the otherhand stood for the preservation of the Islamic orthodoxy and unity of Islamiat and opposed to reforms which sought to


modernise native society on modern lines. They were controlling majority of the educational institutions. Their support base was widespread comprising Muslim clergy, land lords, wealthy merchants and peasantry.

Qudimists were conservative and reactionary in character. They put a resistance to the Russian regime and organized an armed rebellion against it from 1899 to 1916. They were widespread in the rural areas and to a great extent instigating various uprising. As the precursor of great uprisings of natives in 1916, they had been the source of encouragement to continue the rebellion by Basmachis against the Soviet regime. They were successful in checking the growth of Djadidists, but could be not effective in creating a national awakening among the people of Central Asia.

The most important event in central Asia was the native rebellion in 1916. It was the most intense and common throughout Central Asia. It was against the decree for labour in the rear of fighting in the war. It was spontaneous, and violent without a leadership. The target of masses was the outsiders mainly Russian population. The loss of life and property was heavy. The riots were widespread. Many people were killed while

\[12.\quad \text{Vaidnath, n. 10, p.52.}\]
attacking the Russians and troops. Due to heavy crackdown by Tsarist rule, many peoples migrated to the neighboring areas. Many people died on the way to other country. There is no reliable source in number of deaths.

But the 1916 rebellion was suppressed by Tsarist administration. To an important degree, uprising retain significance even today for Soviet historian. They have never been able satisfactorily to answer the question involved in the native uprising, directed not against Imperial regime, but frequently against Russian peoples. There are many versions to this. Some says, it was the handiwork of Russian administration to finish the native and take away lands. Other interprets it as the national liberation movement. Soviet accused it to be handiwork of German and Turkish authorities. But many modern writers see in it the spontaneous national liberation movement.

Extraordinary All Muslim conference in Tashkent demanded autonomy for Turkestan within Russian federation. The resolution taken at the fourth. Extraordinary Regional Muslim Congress to set up a autonomous Turkestan was the first sign of a corporate national consciousness shown by the peoples of Turkestan and first and last attempt

---

13 Pierce, n. 5. P.295.
to attain their ends by constitutional means.¹⁴

Then All-Russian Muslim movement tried to unite sixteen million Muslims in Russia on the basis of religious identity. It was a reform movement. It tried to secularize and democratise the Muslim life in Russia. First All-Russian Muslim Congress discussed national question. While Volga-Tatars supported national-cultural-autonomy, others put forward the idea of federalism. It established special organ for regulation and co-ordination of spiritual problems. But later after the second congress, the Bolshevik assumed power. It was looked in suspicion by Russian. So it got strong resistance from Bolsheviks. Politically the movement was weak. It was dissolved by communist regime.

The Turks in Russia were conscious about their religion than the common ethnic origin. The religion was the most important factor in arousing the national awakening among the peoples of Turkestan. But it was also a hindrance to a great extent. Because, Turks in Russia tried to become westernized and secular by the new method, which was opposed to religious uprising. So at the same time, there was no such solid ground of assimilation among peoples for common national consciousness. The

lack of effective leadership and mass based movement were the factors inhibiting the nationalism in Central Asia.

II. Nationalities Problem After Reforms

The Nationality question posed one of the most serious challenges to the very survival of the USSR as a united country. And ultimately nationalities problems played an important role in the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Though Soviet scholars claimed that the nationality question had been solved, it proved false after the introduction of the radical reforms by Mikhail S. Gorbachev.

After reforms, suppressed nationality feelings of many ethnic groups expressed in various forms to the forefront. In the beginning, nationalities problems were manifested on the grounds like demand for socio-economic development, restoration of national languages, protection of environment, religious, and cultural autonomy. But with every passing days, the various nationalities became more assertive in demanding the political autonomy for their republics. Many ethnic groups began to claim for a separate administrative unit out of present one. The manifestation of the nationalism was more acute among non-Russians. Inspite of ethnic tensions, no new comprehensive nationalities policies were declared to deal with the rising violent manifestation. The nationalistic fervour reached its
peak in some republics. Baltic republics were first to clamour for independence politically. So the only hope of averting the disintegration of the Soviet-Union was the formulation and adoption of new treaty which would have replaced USSR in some other form like federation or confederation of sovereign states. However, before it could be concluded, the abortive coup in August 1991 led to the rapid disintegration of the USSR, the largest multi-national state in the World.

A new atmosphere was created by Gorbachev with the introduction of "perestroika" and "glasnost". The aim of these reforms was regeneration of the Soviet-economy, to wipe out corruption and to give a human-face to socialism by the granting civil liberties to the people, freedom of expression, political participation and freedom of religion which had been denied since mid-twenties when Stalin consolidated the personal dictatorship in the name of proletarian dictatorship. The radical reforms created fissures among nationalities and dormant ethnic discontent of the past surfaced in that period. Day by day, it became endemic covering almost all the non-Russian republics.

Then it appeared that "people of the Soviet-Union who were kept under control by the pragmatic use of force, took the advantages of "Perestroika" and 'Glasnost' and expressed their genuine but long-
neglected demands. Initially, nationalistic protests were directed against excessive centralization, economic stagnation and unequal treatment to the minorities. These were reflected in the inter-ethnic conflicts in Nagorno-Karabakh, Tblish, Abkhazia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Kirghizia. Manifestation of nationalism in Baltic republics was against the Soviet-regime for forcefully annexation of their territory by Stalin. Ukrainian and Byelorussians started demanding the restoration of their national language, culture and preservation of environment.

Thus, a serious threat to the reform minded Gorbachev-leadership and to the success of perestroika had been the reemergence of the "national-question". Since Late 1986, nationalist unrest occurred on a large-scale unprecedented in the Soviet history affecting hitherto tranquil as well as assertive nationality regions. The anti-Soviet protest and clashes between Latvian and Russian Youth is said to be fist manifestation of nationalism, which was not reported in Soviet press due to the localized character of incident.

The first-ever manifestation of nationalism was Alma-ata riots of Kazakhstan. For the first-time in Soviet-Union, it was violent in nature. The large-scale protest was the outburst of dormant nationalities discontents among Kazakhs towards Soviet-authority. The riots showed how nationalities discontents were deep in Central Asian republics. The cause of trouble was the removal of Kazakhstan Fist Party Secretary, Dinmukhmed Kunaev in December 1986 and his replacement by a Russian Genadii Kolbin. He was removed on the ground of alleged corruption and inefficiency.\(^\text{16}\) Then violent riots followed resulting in many deaths and arrests.

According to Soviet reports, A group of students incited by the nationalist elements in the evening of December 17, 1986 and on December 18 took to the Streets of Alma-Ata, expressing disapproval of decisions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan. Hooligans, parasites and other anti-Social elements made use of the situation and resorted to unlawful actions against representative of law and order. They set-fire to the food store and private cars, and insulted town people.\(^\text{17}\) Moscow, however, stated that shortage of housing, food, and other service not to mention of other gross-injustice in their allocation had played their

\(^{16}\) Decan Herald (Bangalore), 3rd July, 1987.

part in the troubles. But they denied the death of any rioter, except one public order volunteer.

According to Western reports, the incident was different to some extent. Xinhua cited western diplomatic reports that resentment had been growing in the Asian republics over the increasing presence of Russians in local-leadership and said that Kunaev had been criticized for sometime by Soviet authorities on alleged corruption and poor economic performance. The removal of Kunaev was the immediate cause for the eruption of clashes.18

On 17 December, some 10000 people took to the streets in Alma-Ata. Demonstrators were armed with sticks and iron rods and shouted nationalist slogan, "Kazakhstan is only for Kazaks" and attacked innocent persons. Barricades were put near the university. On the first day, police did not use force, but cadets were attacked by demonstrators.19 On the night, they marched to communist party headquarter, broke into building and ransacked it. It was alleged that they broke into prisons and freed the inmates. The Russians were attacked. The bewildered police forces, who

were facing their first-crowd-control experiences in more than fifty years, responded opening fire on the rioters. Some two hundred people were injured in the firing and several people were killed. Within two days, riots spread to twelve other cities in republic. Troops were called till the demonstration subsided. By that time at least seventeen people had been killed, including three members of security forces. Chimkent and Jambunul, two of the worst hit town, were to remain under martial law until the end of 1987.20 The demonstrators carried the banner with slogan "Autonomy and separate seat for Kazakhstan in U.N. and Kolbin Go back to Russia".

But Nazarbayev was different in the presentation of the incident from the Soviet version. While Soviet regime denounced the rioters as hooligans and parasites, he did not agree with Soviet version. On the fist day, he told the Journalist, "there were no drunkards or drug addicts. The protests by students had been a "manifestation of nationalism" though social-economic factors might also have played a part.21 The students were not against Kolbin but for Kunaev. Some advocated for Lenin's policy of right to national self determination.

---


Alma-Ala riot was presented from different angle by different source. But Soviet authorities took the incident seriously. They tried to adopt resolute measures to get the normalcy. Later, there were conciliatory measures to remove the nationalist upsurge. The Soviet authorities said that the rioters had been inspired by "mistaken nationalist feelings" and demanded that in future, communist party should work harder to eliminate nationalism.\textsuperscript{22} The party changed its stand on many key issues. It advocated making Kazakh the state language in the republic, eliminating the "blank pages" of Kazakh history, supporting the revitalization of Islam preserving the republic's natural resources and instituting economic autonomy for Kazakhstan.\textsuperscript{23} Inspite of denial by Soviet authorities the riot as nationalistic manifestation, the measures by party were not retributory in nature, rather it was a conciliatory. Soviet authorities got a warning that suppressed nationalistic discontents were there which could be overt in the atmosphere of openness. So nationality question came to the the party agenda.

On 6 July 1986, Crimean Tatars held demonstration in Red Square for their return to ancient homeland. In all the Baltic-republics, peaceful

\textsuperscript{22} Decan Herald, (Bhangalore), 3 January, 1987.

demonstration were held in August 23, to publish Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. Moldovian and Russian demonstration in Kishinev led to heated situation prior to the opening of official permitted meeting of the Inter-front in Kishinev on 9th July. The central square of the city was occupied by many representatives of that democratic movement waving tricolour flags, chanting the nationalist slogans, Soviet television reported on that day. The situation was very complex.24

In November 1, 1987, a demonstration was organized by two "informal" associations of nationally minded Byelorussian youth. They were against Russification. They demanded the restoration of Byelorussian language and culture.25 On 19th October, Armenian demonstrated for the return of two territories now located in Azerbaijan SSR. The demand for transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous oblast and, Nakhichevan oblast to Armenia created tensions.

Since the protests began in mid-February, at least, 200000, possibly as many as a million, Armenians have joined the demonstrations in solidarity with fellow Armenians demanding the transfer of the Nogorno-

Karabakh to Armenian SSR. Then on 24th February 1988, Estonians demonstrated in Tallin to mark the anniversary of Estonian independence. Despite the ban for the first time, a new opposition party was formed, which gave call for independence. The Lithuanians also celebrated anniversary of the independence despite the ban.

Soviet leadership failed to anticipate that reform would inevitably reignite the nationalities question. The complexity of nationality question in Soviet politics stems from the fact that key actors are not dispersed ethnic groups. Rather nations and nationalities inhabits or lay claim to historical territorial homelands. The political-administrative boundaries in the USSR tend to coincide with ethnic boundaries which infuses centre-periphery relations with heightened emotional intensity and injecting the nationalities question into virtually every aspect of Soviet Policy.

The conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over the Nogorno-Karabakh enclave became a full-fledged armed fighting. Then bloody riots followed in various areas of republics. Tass reported from Stepanakert on July-89 that hatred between Armenian and Azerbaijanis were rising. Both sides set-up the road-blocks for the further fighting. Tass said 19 servicemen were injured while clearing road-block. Two Azerbaijanis were killed by the Armenians. Helicopters were used to curb the violence in the
affected area. Both nationalities were protesting against discriminating attitude of Moscow to the solution of the problem.

Then Abkhazia became trouble-spot in the Transcaucasia after Nogorno-Karabakh. On 18 March a rally of thousands of Abkhazians organized by the popular front "Aidgilar" was held at Lychny village, in Gudauta Region (the only region in Abkhazia which has a concentration of Abkhaz population). The only item on the agenda was demand for the status of the Abkhaz ASSR to be changed to that of a union republic. On 25 March, there was a counter-rally in the capital of Abkhazia - Sukhumi by Georgians protesting against the Akhazian demands. In 9 April, Tbilish was the trouble spot due to death of young people in the firing by regular forces.

On 3 and 4 June 1989, riots erupted in Ferghana, Margilan, Tashlak and Kuvasai, between Uzbeks and Meskhetian Turks. A dispute in a market place in Kuvasai, Ferghana oblast between an Uzbek woman and Meskhetian man over the price of strawberries was the explanation for the

---

outbursts of violence. Bladyriots stated between two communities. Many people were injured in the firing by security forces. On 8th June, most dramatic situation developed on the outskirts of Kokand. On Lenin square in Kokand, a mob of many thousand people periodically attacked the building of town’s internal affairs department for seven hours. As a result militia workers were forced to release from cells 12 people who had been temporarily detained. The attackers managed to seize the militiamen’s weapons - three pistols. Having freed the people who had been arrested, mob advanced on to the quarters densely inhabited by Meskhetian Turks and staged pogroms. Approximately in 80 hours, six vehicles were set alighted and co-operative shop was looted. Two Kiskos were burnt down. In the fighting with militiamen, five died. Again fighting started, in neighbouring part of town with security force and one died. Total death was nearly 80. Even some Uzbek boys were reportedly killed who refused to Join in the rioting.

The Soviet-government’s report says that it has begun evacuating Meskhetian Turk minority from refugee camps near Ferghana in Uzbekistan. About 14,500 people have taken shelter in the camp. Over 400

---

29. Summary of World Broadcast, 12 June -89.
of them have been air lifted from the republic. Soviet press were of the opinion that riots were "not manifestation of nationalism", but actions of corrupt well-organized mafia-groups whose purpose was to belittle the role of local government, and intimidate public in the name of new democracy.\(^{30}\)

The riots were probably the manifestation of nationalism. But Soviet authorities assigned various other causes to the so-called mafia-riots. The nationalist fervour had economic factor. The rumour of allocation of best lands and official posts to Meskhetians by government created the feeling of ethnic discontent. The cotton monoculture of Uzbekistan had raised the unemployment rate. The environment was highly polluted with recurring health hazards to local population. The standard of living of Uzbek population was declining. Meskhetians were settled by Stalin had better standard of living then natives. Then special treatment of Soviet-authorities to Meskhetians created animosity among Uzbeks. The market place incident was just a immediate cause for the eruption of oppressed discontents. So riots cannot be dismissed as a artificial one created by some people. If it would not have been a spontaneous outburst, then it would have ended within somedays. But continuance of the riots to the such a long spell was pointer to the simmering discontents brewing among

\(^{30}\) Ibid., 12 June, 1989.
various Central Asian ethnic groups, particularly Uzbeks. So that was probably the manifestation of nationalism due to economic cause.

A group of Meskhetian Turks demonstrated on 19th June outside the reception of the USSR supreme Soviet in support of their demand to return home in Georgia, according to Moscow radio’s service in British Isles. It noted: "The Soviet of Nationalities is to consider the possibility of bringing Meskhetan Turks to their 'forefathers land'."31

Disturbance in Kazakhstan at Novy-Uzen began on the night of 16th/17th June after a gang fight on a dance floor between some young Kazakhs and caucasians. Militia stopped the fights, but the crowd of 1000 people armed with stones and sticks rampaged through the towns towards internal affairs department, on being pushed back after warning shots had been fired into air. On the 18th June, 200 people gathered outside town party committee but were dispersed by "Cheremukhia gas" and warning shorts: that night some 700 caucasians were evacuated from town. A group of 150 Kazakhs started sit-down strike outside the town executive committee demanding departure of caucasians and closure of their co-operatives. Two battalions of internal troops were-deployed on

19th June to quell fighting after 700 people gathered on the square. The three-people were dead and 53 injured.\textsuperscript{32}

Novy-Uzen riots were anti-caucasian in nature, (Lezgins, Chechens, Ingush and Ossetians) who were settled in town. Their number were not more than 20,000. They met with similar fate as the Meskhetians. Those outsiders had got the housing and job facilities in that town.\textsuperscript{33} In the riot, socio-economic factor was most important which created the nationalities discontents. Interethnic conflicts started also in Ashkhabad and Neibt-Dag of Turkmenia in May. It was also anti Armenian in nature. But in Turkmenia, the disturbance was said to have been least nationalist in colour, though some of the shops attacked belonged to Armenians.

A declaration approved at the meeting of Sajudis Seimas Council on 19th and 20th June 1989, called for gradual withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania. The declaration also said that it was necessary to set aside the 1940 elections to People's Seimas and all its acts and summon all its political forces in Lithuania to discuss how independent state might be restored.\textsuperscript{34} So the call for independence became more strong in Lithuania.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 22 June, 1989.

\textsuperscript{33} International Herald Tribune (Paris), 20 June, 1989.

\textsuperscript{34} Summary World Broadcast, 21 June 1989.
An armed clashes between thousands of Tajiks and Kirghizs occurred on 13 July 1989 in a dispute over the land and water rights, in border areas of Isfara of Tajikistan. The cause of conflict was due to communal use of the Matchoi irrigation channel. The water sharing between two republics was discriminatory. So due to the conflict, severe damage to crops in the areas occurred. In the clash, 19 people were wounded and one was died. Then a conflict started between Abkhazians and Georgians over setting up a branch of Tbilish state University. Eleven people were killed. There was a demonstration in Daghestan against Soviet authorities.

The riots took place in Dushanbe, the capital of Tajikistan in 11 February, 1990. From the it continued for three days; rioting occurred in Dushanbe, and according to some reports, also in other towns in Tadjikstan on the ground that many thousands of Armenian refugees from Azerbaidzhan, where Armenian had been massacred in January, had arrived in town and were being given priority in housing. There was mass protest against authority. The protesters were demanding change in leadership, restoration to Tajikstan of profits from cotton, making Tajik as

the state language and control over the Samarkand, and Bukhara, greater economic autonomy and better living conditions in the impoverished city of Dushanbe.

Then mass-gathering turned violent inspite of presence of 7,000 troops. Dushanbe remained unstable and number of Mujahiddens from Afghanistan were suspected to be there. Mass riots erupted at Samarkand in Uzbekistan between Tajiks and Armenians. It was alleged to be a fall-out of riot in Tajikstan. Later curfew was imposed in city of Samarkand. In the meantime some leaflets were distributed in Tashkent and in areas bordering Tajikstan calling the Russians to leave Central Asia by the end of month,\footnote{\textit{Times of India}, (New Delhi) 18 February, 1990.} which was denied by Soviet official. More than dozen people died in the riots.

In Alma-Ata, capital of Kazakhstan, many people demonstrated against Soviet authorities for economic exploitation and demanding a ban on all the nuclear weapons testing in republic. It was a peaceful movement than that of 1986 riots. The protest was organized by the non-political association, Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement. The demands of movement were the concern of the whole-world.
In the June 1990, the fighting broke out between two ethnic groups in Osh regions of Kirghizia, an area bordering Uzbekistan where a large-minority of Uzbek people live. The disturbance began in June with a dispute over the allocation of land for housing; a group of Kirghiz occupied farmland in the suburbs of town Osh in order to build private houses, a move opposed by Uzbek population who objected in principle to the allocation of irrigated farmland for housing and demanded that the housing land should also be distributed to them. The conflict between the two groups quickly escalated into violence, as a result of which a curfew was imposed in Osh and surrounding region. 38

The situation turned into war between two nationalities. Thousands of Uzbeks armed with firearms, sticks and stones attempted to cross the border to avenge the national dishonour while Kirghizis in Frunze were demanding to be transported to the Osh for the fighting. In riots, 139 people were killed, and 486 were reported injured Soviet authorities said that disturbances were "planned and organized" by the anti-social elements. The republican authorities were held responsible for the incident.

The final event in that year took place in the Uzbek town of Namagan in early December. According to radio-Moscow, a conflict arose when "a group of local youth" provoked clash with MVD servicemen who

were returning on a bus from the city center to their unit Radio-moscow, however, admitted that there were as many versions as how it all started as there were many people. Local authorities in fact maintained that the soldiers were drunk and accosted a local-girls on the bus. Then the bus was taken to different place by crowd and four of the soldiers were beaten to death.39 The authorities sent reinforcement who were compelled to fire at mobs. Then following day crowds appeared in the city. The Security forces fired at mob in which number of service men and civilians were killed. According to Moscow, situation was under control. But the media in republic refrained from reporting the incident due to ban on press. While most local people told that riot was spontaneous, but official version dismissed it and termed it as the most planned instigation to create disorder. But absence of media coverage created problem of getting the actual picture. It showed that situation was not same according to Soviet authorities. It was rather very bleak.

The manifestation of nationalism after the 1985 was very widespread in character. Though it was acute among non-Russians, Russian nationalism was also rising as a reaction to the general-awakening in Soviet-Union. Non-Russians were complaining of discrimination by

---
Russians in various field. But the victim of ethnic discontent had not always been Russians. The attack against Meskhetian Turks establishes the economic factor in the uprising. The nationalities feeling got mixed with various other problems and immediate target of outburst were minority alleged to be favoured by authorities. The demographic factor played a great role in creating the fear of population change. Historical memories of oppression by alien ruler became fresh. Sometime, superiority complex of some nationalities played a part. The Uzbek tried to average the national dishonour by attacking Kirghizs was a case in point. Inspite of ethnic conflicts, there was no clamour for independence in Central Asia like some Baltic republics. There were many grievances to be redressed by authorities. The demand for political-cultural-autonomy was the slogan not total independence. But the manifestation of nationalism was not artificially created. It was spontaneous outburst which was taken seriously by the communist party later.

III. Its relationship with 'Glasnost' and Perestroika

The manifestation of nationalism was widespread in the whole Soviet-Union after the introduction of reforms. The sudden outbursts of ethnic discontents in violent way in many non-Russian republics surprised even the western scholars. Then what was the cause behind these eruptions? The introduction of 'glasnot' and "Perestroika" might have been strong
factors in manifestation of dormant nationalist discontent. Though the "glasnot" and "perestroika" were not the direct causes, but helped in creating the atmosphere conducive for outburst. It only helped in opening up the suppressed discontents. Inspite of claim by Bolshevik leaders about the non-existence of any nationalities problems, it was there in dormant stage, because the nationalities discontents were suppressed by command and control administration of the Soviet-Union.

Lenin's policy on nationalities was only in theory. The right to national self-determination was observed more in its violation. The federal structure was only in theory. In practice Soviet-Union was considered as one centralized country. The centralized administrative structure blocked the rising aspirations of various nationalities after the October revolution. Stalin again changed the system into regimented one by strict command and control. The deportation of various nationalities from their ancient lands to different other republics created demographic change in many republics. The forced collectivization, Russification, and suppression of religion and culture created discontent among them. But they were unable to protest to the authorities. There was no chance of their problems being solved by the authorities. Rather the protest had a risk of being severely punished. The Bolshevik pronounced their proletarian internationalism than new system. So nationalist discontents were suppressed in that time.
due to repressive measures. The question of overt sign of protest even by major nationality was remote possibility.

But Mikhail S. Gorbachev's reforms unleashed an unprecedented tide of protests and demonstrations across the USSR in which national grievances occupied a central place alongside economic unrest. With the reforms, those nationalities tried to show their problems in the atmosphere of openness. Since Gorbachev came to power, much of the system changed; the risk of participating in demonstrations have declined and changes of achieving one's demands had gone up dramatically as Moscow and Republic leadership have proved willingness to negotiate with demonstrators.40

From Alma-Ata to Abkhazia, from Tallin to Tbilisi, virtually no region of this vast and complex multi-national society appeared immune to the rising tide of national self assertion. Whether in the form of anti-Russian demonstrations, as in Kazakhstan and Georgia, or in the emergence of new socio-political movements demanding greater economic and political-autonomy, such as the popular fronts of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, or in more volatile outbursts of communal violence that have

resulted in the tragic loss of lives and many thousands of refugees in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan posed a threat to reforms. The increasing intensity of ethnonationalism among Russians and non-Russians alike, had not only provoked increasing alarm among soviet-citizens and leaders, it has also precipitated a sharp controversy over the Soviet policy towards 'nationalities question' and over the nature and future of the Soviet-federal system itself.41

Invertently, by lessening controls in order to facilitate economic modernization, Gorbachev let the genie out of bottle. Just as on the previous occasion when controls had been relaxed, (by Khrushchev in 1956-58) non-Russians began air their grievances and calling on the Kremlin to honour the forms of original national-contract, on the basis of which the Soviet Union was supposedly founded. Just as non-Russians dissidents for years insisted that for them the idea of human-rights was inseparable from that of national rights, so the new defenders of national rights stressed that there could be no genuine democratization without substantive change in nationalities policy or more precisely, in the nature

of imperial relationship between Russians and non-Russians. Glasnot revealed that nationalities problems existed on two planes, vertical and horizontal. The first was the relation between Russians and non-Russians. The second was the relation between non-Russians nationalities which was exposed in the Nogorno-Karabakh conflicts, Georgia and Abkhazia conflict, and fight between Uzbeks and Kirghizs.

In the view of Soviet reformers, by contrast, glasnost and democratization - compounded by sharply deteriorating economic conditions have simply brought to the surface long-simmering resentments and grievances and provided legitimate outlets for their expression. The eruption of national-tensions in the past few years is for them dramatic evidence that traditional ways of managing the multi-national Soviet system have reached the dead end. It demonstrated the urgency of fundamental restructuring of Nationality policy. But Gorbachev failed to formulate new nationalities policy. So with the passing days, even smaller ethnic people who did not have their own nominal Soviet-republics started demanding the separate national or ethnic administrative unit. So the impact of 'glasnost' gave an enormous impetus to the expression of long simmering grievances by legitimizing public discussion of the issues that

were previously a taboo and allowing soviet-media to become trendsetter for genuine public debate. Then various groups were formed on different causes.

Informal and unofficial organizations devoted to variety of political and social causes while these new political movements embraced a broad spectrum of causes and orientations, common-nationality and shared historical grievances were among the most powerful of all potential bonds, and the scale of the national republics and density of contacts among their intellectual elites offered a natural basis for organization. The emergence of popular fronts in three Baltic republics, the most organizationally and programmatically cohesive of all the new political movements, served as both inspiration and model to other groups, not only in number of non-Russian republics, including Byelorussia, Moldavia and Georgia, but in many cities of Russian Republic itself. At the same time, these new movements provoked counter organizations among the increasingly alarmed and hostile Russians who had settled in non-Russian republics.43

Political democratization changed the status and attitude of local leaders. In the past, they were dependent on their boss in Moscow, later

43. Lapidus, n.27, p.101.
their careers were dependent on the local people. They became responsive to the local needs. So they tried to articulate various interests of public on the nationality lines. Even the Communist Party itself fragmented in some republics along clearly on nationality lines. By mid 1989, while newly elected Congress of People’s Deputies was debating the virtues of a multiparty systems, many Soviet citizens were claiming that, de-facto one already existed. In every republic embryonic political organizations had emerged, embracing a broad spectrum of political positions, from explicitly separatist parties in some the non-Russian republics to extreme Russian chauvinist organizations like Pamyat, and the Progressive Popular Fronts, to Christian Social Democratic, Parties "Green" and other movements.

Thousands of ecological, political, human-rights, trade-union, cultural and educational organizations had also sprung up in the non-Russian republics. Among the most influential were cultural organizations like the Estonian Heritage Society and Ukrainian Association of Independent creative intelligentsia; human rights groups like the anti-Stalinist memorial organizations, which documented the abuses of Stalinism and its neo-Stalinist successors; and ecological movement like Tajikstan’s "Askh arva‘ (openness) group, Kazakhstan’s "Nevada" movement, and Green World Association of Ukraine. All these groups
were planning to dislodge communists from positions of power. So the pluralistic tradition in the soviet system started slowly, though these groups were sometimes competing among themselves for their contradictory interest.

In Central Asia, all the groups could not be characterized as political, nationalist or independence movement, although all had a political dimension. These groups fall in to following categories, Professional grouping, youth organizations and Literary associations. These included the Kazakh Writers Union in Kazakhstan; Baku Center for Arts; Gola, a group formed to preserve and restore historical and architectural movements in Azerbaijan; Chanlibel, a group promoting Azerbaijan’s culture and history; Tajikistan’s principal scientific group, Khazina, and its cultural group, Tajik Language Fund, whose goal was to stress the connection between Tajik and Persian culture, promote classical Tajik literature and restore Tajik traditions.

44. Nadia Diuk and Adrian Karatnycky, The Soviet Predicament, Nationalism part of the Solution Station, Orbis, (Philadelphia) vol. 34, no,9, fall - 99, p.534.

Environmental or "green" movements: Among them were the Green Front in Alma-Ata and Azerbaijan Green Party, gradual reform movement like Yavaran-e-Perestroika (the helpers of Perestroika) was in Tajikstan Groups in Azerbaijan and Armenia had names likes popular front or National front. Other had names that suggest unity. Like Birlik in Uzbekistan) renaissance (Like Rastokhis in Tajikstan). There were also a number of political parties in the pattern of those in Western Democracies, especially in Georgia.46

There was a wide range of tendencies and some sharp differences within these groups. But they shared certain objectives, including political and economic independence; (although different groups wanted different degree of independence); economic and social regeneration the fight against corruption, political liberalization and cultural identity. Thus, popular movements in these republics had an important social and economic content and essentially were reform movement.

The formation of Uzbekistan’s people’s Front (Birlik) had been in November 1988. It was the trendsetter in that region. From the inception, it tried to take the leadership in the Central Asia. It tried for legitimacy

46. Ibid., p.327.
among the people. The group fought for the official status to the Uzbek language, because language issue was the focal point in all republics of Central Asia at that time. Then it became successful in highlighting the issue.47

One can criticise many aspects of Soviet-language policy, particularly as it evolved under Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev. Yet in a sense the whole pattern of modern development has been on the side of Russian and against other languages. Moscow's great mistake has been to link language as a means of multi-ethnic communication with the attempt to impose an alien ideology and way of life on half the population of the country. On the other hand, its earlier campaigns, such as the provision of the writing system and the eradication of illiteracy fostered a sense of national pride among many ethnic groups and inspired in them a love and respect for their language which had not been there before. There is thus a dialectical irony at play. Earlier Soviet encouragement of ethnic diversity, manifested most obviously in linguistic diversity, have been strengthened by later Soviet attempt to eradicate it. The result is an impasse. As in so many other aspect of Soviet life, the Stalinist mould will prove difficult to

The organization of Birlik was fairly moderate. It called for independence but not secession. So it was for the independent Uzbekistan within the Union. But its long-term goal was total independence. The other objectives were agricultural reforms (especially an end to cotton monoculture, privatization and decentralization), the creation of textile industries, the establishment of direct trade links between Uzbekistan and other Soviet republics or foreign countries, local control over the republic’s natural resources, the reform of the language policy, the reinstitution of original Uzbek names, revival of Uzbek history and culture, the expansion of cultural relations with other countries and environmental protection. Considering these, Government of Uzbekistan declared its sovereignty on 21 June, 1990.49

Birlik had been successful in highlighting the language policy in Soviet-union which was discriminatory. It was abused by Soviet-authority in a arbitrary way. Stalin changed Arabic script of Central Asian languages in to Cyrillic scripts between 1938-41. Literary development was hampered

49. Hunter, n.45, p.327.
to a great extent. To make remedy, Birlik suggested training in Arabic by students in the university and making the native language in Arabic script as the medium of instruction.

It has protested the outmigration from the region of Central Asia, immigration of Russians to the region, bureaucratic practice of Central Asian leadership and hazing of Uzbeks in the Soviet armed forces. It arranged prayers for Azeri victims in Nogorno-Karabakh conflict. It tried to rehabilitate the writers and political personalities condemned in 1920's and 1930's as bourgeois nationalist and counter-revolutionaries.

In the early days of Birlik's existence, such founders as Ahmed Azam, Zahir A'lam and Muhammad Salih recognized the need to broaden the base. Therefore, they invited the physicist Abdurahim Polatov to join with them. But from the beginning difference started among the leaders. The radicals led by Polatov favoured more direct confrontation with communist the party leadership. In contrast, moderates shied shifted away from direct confrontations. Inspite of attempts for reconciliation between two groups in February 1990, some of the 'moderates' established a new organization independent of Birlik which they called "Erk", On 11 March, they declared 'Erk' as a political party, which held its first congress on 30 April, 1990. It had only 4000 members in June 1990. Its leader was
Muhammad Salih. It criticized Birlik for not utilizing the political opportunity created by democratization. It clarified that nationalities problems could not be solved only by 'spreading false rumours', making false accusations against people, instigating them into disturbances, and simultaneously creating enmity among various nationalities. So it resolved to promote the parliamentary means of action for the fulfillment of its objective. In the long-term goals, both parties were by and large similar. But in methods for achieving the goals, there were differences. Both parties were for the redressal of the various problems of Uzbekistan. Birlik was a mass-based party. Erk was full of intelligentsia. It was an elite party. Its membership was mainly in urban areas. Birlik remained a ultra-nationalist organization even after the disintegration of soviet-Union.

The Rastokhez Popular Front founded in September 1989 by Tajik writers and intellectuals was sympathetic to Islamic revival, but agitated for parliamentary system and democracy. The democratic party of Tajikistan (DPT) was founded after February 1990 crackdown by a 42 year old Professor of Philosophy, Shodmon Yousuf. The party claimed the membership of 15,000 people and advocated a mixture of Islamic

---

revivalism, Tajik nationalism and parliamentary democracy. In February, another opposition party, Popular Unit Front, was founded by a group of businessmen in order to push for quicker transition towards market-economy. Its chairman was Otakhon Latifi, a former journalist for Pravda.\(^5\) The aim of these groups was also overthrowing soviet-power.

Yavaran-e-Perestroika (the helpers of perestroika) is a coalition of Tajik intellectuals led by Askar Hakim, editor in chief of the Journal Adabiyyat-va-Sanat (literature and Art), and Loik Sherali, editor in chief of the Tajik language literary Journal Sedai-e-Shergh (The voice of East), this group had been engaged in creating Tajik Popular Front along lines of Baltic republics; it also had a much more cautious attitude towards national independence.\(^5\)

In autumn 1989, some six hundred academics and intellectuals formed the first informal group, named "Agzybirlik" or 'Unity' in Turkmenistan. It was a democratic group which tried to bring glasnost to the republic and end of cycle of poverty in the republic. It appealed to the deputies and people of Turkmenistan to declare "memorial day" for

\(^5\) Rashid, n.20, p.174.
\(^5\) Hunter, n.45, p.328.
massacre of Goek Tepe in 1881 (when General Skobelev exterminated Teke tribesmen in 1881) and criticized central committee for inaction in this regard. But government declared the meeting illegal and denounced the group as ultra-nationalist. Then, the group tried to raise the health and ecological issues problems. But due to severe pressure by government, it went underground.

The most popular Kazakh opposition movements that spearheaded the growth of political parties had been anti-nuclear and green movements. The best known was "Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement, or (Nevada for short) which had subsequently developed into People's Congress Party, the most important opposition. Party. It was founded in 1989 by two former supreme Soviet deputies: Olzhas Suleimenov and Mukhtar Shakhanov, who headed official commission that looked into 1986 riots. It protested against pollution of lake Balkhas, and demanded ban of nuclear test in Kazakhstan.\(^{53}\)

Similarly, one of the political and social activists group was formed, namely 'Adilet', in Kazakhstan which sought to preserve the memory of Stalinist repression. Another society namely 'Atmaken' was interested in

\(^{53}\) Liever, n.19, pp.122-123.
promotion of Kazakh language and culture. Alma-Ata popular front tried to unite diverse groups but was not successful.

The establishment of various informal groups led to the unprecedented upsurge of nationalism throughout Central Asia. The local writers, artists and academicians had been idealizing the past through work of history, art and culture. The old places of squares and streets were renamed after the various national leaders. The status of native language had been upgraded to that of official one in all the republics. Many problems which were not given importance were highlighted and adequate measures were taken for their redressal.

The 'glaşnost' and 'perestroika' had enormous influences on the religion. The floodgates of Islamic revival opened in 1989. It was a cultural, religious and social phenomenon, as people publicly wanted to demonstrate their separateness from communist system and Slavic culture. Gorbachev's perestroika and loosening of communist control allowed the revival to take place. The impact of the Afghan mujhehiddin's defeat of the Soviet army through a jihad, something the Basmachis had not achieved created an even greater sense of awe and curiosity about Islam than might otherwise have developed.54

54 Rashid, n.20, p.244.
The survival of Islam in Soviet-Union would have been difficult, if believers had to rely on the official religious establishment. Most of the basic needs of the believers have been assumed in areas where official Islam is weak by what we call "Parallel Islam", represented in most cases by Sufi Tariq. Since 1989, popular Islam under the aegis of non-official mullahs reemerged in Central Asia after the introduction of reforms.

One of the most important admissions of Soviet-specialist in recent years is that in Central Asia and the caucasus, the notions of Islam and nationalism are inextricably mixed. Although Islam heightens the "Muslims national awareness as shown by the often heard expression "you cannot be Kazakh or Uzbek or Kirghiz without being Muslim", it also in USSR has one original aspect in most cases, nationalism does not remain narrow ethnic concept but leads to Pan-Islamic feelings of solidarity among Soviet Muslims. In other words, Islamic components had become a fundamental facet of nationalism in Central Asian republics.

The politicization of Islam became fact in Central Asian republics. The manifestation of nationalism in some Central Asian republics displayed some Islamic and extremist colour. In Tajikistan, the elements of
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fanaticism and political commitment to Islam were blended. According to Soviet-Scholar, it was religious political movement, extremely reactionary and nationalistic. A Wahhabi Mullah, Abduvallo Saidov, was said to have urged his followers to petition 27th CPSU Congress (in 1986) to establish an Islamic state in Tajikistan (an idea he had been nurturing for sometime). Failing in the mission, he allegedly asked his followers in April 1986 "to virtually take up arms" to achieve their goal. The slogans bearing Islamic leanings were used in various demonstrations. In Azerbaijan and Tajikistan, protesters were carrying the photos of Ayatollah Khomeni. Even some groups had called for "Jihad" against communist party. The extremist expressions of Islamic nationalism was very strong in South Central Asia. It gave an impetus for the Islamic influence on political movement on other areas. Their message was also anti-Russian in character.

It is wrong to point out that only Islamic factor contributed to the rising manifestation of nationalism in Central Asia. The socio-economic and political factors intermixed with religious factors which appeared religious in character. The cotton monoculture in Central Asian republics had ruined the economy. The economy of Central Asia was not diversified. The exclusive dependent on one crop for raw-material without producing value

added items in that area created a sluggish economy. The result was shift of unemployment from Russian part to periphery. Again the available employment opportunity was absorbed by coming highly qualified Russians. The forced collectivization created a bitter memory due to social and economic hardships.

The "ecological problems" had been serious in the areas due to reckless industrialization, unwise irrigation system. The drying up Aral sea had been catastrophic in nature for the large area. All the major rivers were polluted due to the excessive use of pesticides in cotton cultivation. The nuclear explosion in Kazakhstan increased the level radiation. It was alleged by western scholars that some earthquakes in Kazakhstan were due to the vibration caused by underground nuclear testing. The increasing desert threatened lives of many people. The salt-percentage had increased to a great extent in the soil. The people were drinking polluted water of the rivers. So various waterborne diseases were common among the people. All these problems got mixed with religious demands. So articulation of these demands by religious leaders were common. The increasing vacuum created by decreasing role of the communist party was filled by Islamic ideology.
We cannot say that Islam cemented various national movements. We can tentatively conclude that weaker the bonds of national identity, the more fundamental was the role of Islam as it became one of the components of national identity. Tajiks were for establishment of Islamic state. But in reality, it was to create the state oriented on the Tajik national heritage and culture then a Russian one. Islam might had given a special identity to the Central Asians in contrast to the Slavic people or particularly Russians. The only unifying factor in the Central Asian region was the Islam. But there was no co-ordination or consensus regarding establishment at Islamic state. Rather, the nationality feelings had been very strong after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The idea of "Greater Uzbekistan" or "Kazakhstan" had falsified the impression that all the Central Asian republic were for the establishment of Islamic state.

So from all these incidents, it can be said that reforms had a great relationship with manifestation of nationalism in the Soviet Union. The 'glasnost' and 'perestroika' created free and fearless atmosphere which was not before the reforms. The dormant nationalities discontents were there due to the oppressive regime. Then the various groups taking advantages of reforms articulated the various interests. The complex situation of minority within minority were there in Soviet-Union. So all the ethnic groups started to demand various facilities from the respective authorities.
The non-Russians nationality were most vocal in expressing their suppressed anger against Soviet-authority. But later, Russian nationalism also increased as a reaction to other nationalism. So without the introduction of reforms by Gorbachev, the manifestation of nationalism would have not been possible. Till the 1985, there was no such open manifestation of nationalism in Soviet-Union. This does not mean that there were no nationality problems, as claimed by Soviet Scholars. Then it is not true that suddenly people will complain about discrimination without past misdeeds. The scale in which nationalistic troubles began confirmed to the fact of dormant nationalities problems which manifested, after to the introduction of the "Glasnost' and "Perestroika".

Aim of Gorbachev was not to create negative trend. Perestroika instead of stimulating socialist renewal, had encouraged the disruptive trend, Gorbachev blamed it on the on the anti-perestroika forces. Glasnost by encouraging a reexamination of both present and past, had focussed attention on ethnic and regional injustices and accentuated latent animosities and created a nationalist fervour in every ethnic groups to a great extent. The end result of nationalism was disintegration of Soviet-union. So the role of the glasnost' and 'Perestroika' should not be underestimated in creating the free atmosphere conductive for the articulation of the various nationalist demands, dormant in the totalitarian Soviet regime.