

This article was published in the Scientific Journal NovaUm.Ru №45 in 2023 in Russian.

This article has been translated into English by its author Shchemelinin K. S.

The original article on Russian can be read at:

<http://www.schemelinin.com/KS-ethnos-state-2023.pdf>

<https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=54921550>

Konstantin Sergeevich Shchemelinin (rus: Константин Сергеевич Щемелинин)

ORCID:0000-0002-3636-1583

THE AXIOM ABOUT AN ETHNOS AND ITS OWN STATE.

TWO LAWS ABOUT THE STATE-FORMING ETHNOS.

Abstract. A connection has been found between the relative size of the state-forming ethnos, the increase in the level of tension in interethnic relations and the collapse of the country. It has been determined that the nationalism of the state-forming ethnos is the force that preserves the state, and the nationalism of all other ethnoses in the country is the force that destroys the state. The ethnic reasons for the collapse of the USSR, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, the gaining of stability by Kazakhstan, as well as political instability in the Middle East region, including and surrounding Israel, have been identified. It is predicted that Russia will not disintegrate in the XXI century, and the United States will most likely collapse in the second half of the XXI century.

Keywords: *ethnos, nationalism, separatism, the collapse of the USSR, interethnic intervention, interethnic relations, multinational relations; state, power, politics*

Table of contents

Part I. Definitions

Part II. Source data

§1. The Russian Empire

§2. The Soviet Union

§3. Yugoslavia

4. Czechoslovakia

§5. Kazakhstan

Part III. An axiom about an ethnos and its own state

§1. Formulation of the axiom about an ethnos and its own state, as well as its two consequences

§2. Fundamental goals of the activities of state-forming and non-state-forming ethnoses

Part IV. Formulations of two laws on the size of the state-forming ethnos and their consequences

Part V. Examples of the operation of the law on the level of interethnic tension and the relative size of the state-forming ethnos

Part VI. Relationship between the relative size of a state-forming ethnos or a coalition of related ethnoses and the cycles of nationalism and patrioseparatism

Appendix 1. Questions and answers on modern Russia

Appendix 2. Q & A in the modern United States

Appendix 3. Q & A on contemporary Arab-Israeli conflicts

Part I. Definitions

State-forming ethnos

Definition №1. A state-forming nation is such a nation (ethnos), the absence of which is critical for the existence of this state [16, p.250].

What is a non-state-forming nation, why the main expenditures of the state budget should go to meet the needs of the state-forming people, and what should be the migration policy, taking into account the ethnic differences between the state-forming ethnos and emigrants, is described in my book "Money" [16, p. 250-256]. In particular, the non-state-forming people are described as follows: *"To understand the essence "of the state-forming people" it is possible through its opposite- "non-state-forming people". If all representatives of a certain people leave the state, for example, within a month or a year, and nothing changes dramatically in the state, then such a people is non-state-forming for this country."*

Remark 1. With the concept of "state-forming", the word "ethnos" should be used, and not "people", as in my book "Money", because there is such a concept as "people of a given state", which shifts the emphasis from ethnic content to national content; and a state-forming ethnos is precisely an ethnos that has its own ethnic identity. Also, with the concept of "non-state-forming", the concept of "ethnos" should be applied, and not "people".

Definition №2. A state-forming ethnos is one that dominates the State in question and has given it its name, religion, culture, and borders.

Definition №3. A union of state-forming ethnoses is a group of two or three ethnically similar ethnoses that dominate the state in question and have given it its name, religion, culture, and borders.

Definition №4. A non-state-forming ethnos is an ethnos that lives in the state under consideration and is not a state-forming ethnos of this country.

Ethnic proximity

Definition №5. Ethnic proximity is the sum of the differences in the system of racial, religious, cultural, behavioral, and historical characteristics of two different peoples from each other [18].

Part II. Source data

§1. The Russian Empire

According to the data of the All-Russian Population Census held in 1897, 69.3% of Orthodox people lived in the empire; 11.1% of Muslims; 9.2% of Catholics; 4.2% of Jews, as well as many representatives of other faiths [8].

At that time, the separation of Ukrainians-Little Russians into a separate ethnos had not yet occurred [20, p. 325], Belarusians were also not a separate people, so, in general, all 70% of the Orthodox population can be considered a Russian or Orthodox ethnos.

Further historical events are as follows: as a result of the First World War and the subsequent Civil War, the Russian Empire ceased to exist, and the Soviet Union emerged on its lands, from which the following lands of the Russian Empire, inhabited mainly by non-Orthodox populations, fell away: Finland, Poland and large territories of Turkey.

§2. The Soviet Union

In the 1920s and 1930s, the Soviet Union pursued a policy of Korenization, in particular Ukrainization [10] and Belorussization [6], which eventually led to the separation of the Ukrainian and Belarusian ethnoses from the single Orthodox or Russian ethnos of the Russian Empire:

Great Russians, Little Russians, Cossacks and other ethnoses at that time were not separate ethnoses, but subethnoses of a single Russian people. By the end of the 20th century, the formerly unified Russian people had split into Russians and Ukrainians (or Little Russians) in the following process:

1. Formation of the Ukrainian subethnos of the Russian people: from 1917 to 1941.

2. Formation of the ethnos of Ukrainians from the Ukrainian subethnos of the Russian people: from 1945 to 1991 [20, p. 325].

Table 1. Relative numbers of Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians in the USSR

| № | Ethnic | Population census of 1937, million people [12] | % | 1970 Census, million people. [3] | % | Population census of 1989, million people. [5] | % |
|---|----------------------------|--|------|----------------------------------|------|--|------|
| 1 | Russians | 93.9 | 58.0 | 129.0 | 53.4 | 145.2 | 50.8 |
| 2 | Ukrainians | 26.4 | 16.3 | 40.8 | 16.9 | 44.2 | 15.5 |
| 3 | Belarusians | 4.9 | 3.0 | 9.1 | 3.8 | 10.0 | 3.5 |
| 4 | All population of the USSR | 161.8 | 100 | 241.7 | 100 | 285.7 | 100 |

Table 2. Total relative number of Russians, Ukrainians and Belarusians in the USSR to the total population of the Soviet Union

| № | Ethnic | Population census of 1937, million people [12] | % | 1970 Census, million people. [3] | % | Population census of 1989, million people. [5] | % |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------|----------------------------------|------|--|------|
| 1 | Russians, Ukrainians and Belarusians | 125.2 | 77.3 | 178.9 | 74.1 | 1994.4 | 69.8 |
| 2 | All population of the USSR | 161.8 | 100 | 241.7 | 100 | 285.7 | 100 |

§3. Yugoslavia

Table 3. Relative numbers of Serbs, Croats, Muslims, Albanians and Slovenes in Yugoslavia

| № | Ethnic | Population in 1918, % [25, Apendix 1] | 1961 Census, % [25, Apendix 2] | 1981 Census, % [23] | 1991 Census, % [23] |
|---|---------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Serbs | 38.8 | 42.1 | 36.3 | 36.2 |
| 2 | Croats | 23.8 | 23.2 | 19.8 | 19.7 |
| 3 | Muslims | 6.1 | 5.3 | 8.9 | 10.0 |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 4 | Albanians | 3.7 | 4.9 | 7.7 | 9.3 |
| 5 | Slovenes | 8.5 | 8.6 | 7.8 | 7.5 |

Table 4. Total relative numbers of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes on the one hand and Muslims and Albanians on the other

| № | Groups of related ethnic | Population in 1918, % [25, Apendix 1] | 1961 Census, % [25, Apendix 2] | 1981 Census, % [23] | 1991 Census, % [23] |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Serbs, Croats and Slovenes | 71.1 | 73.9 | 63.9 | 63.4 |
| 2 | Muslims and Albanians | 9.8 | 10.2 | 16.6 | 19.3 |

4. Czechoslovakia

Table 5. Relative numbers of Czechs, Slovaks, Germans, and Hungarians in Czechoslovakia [15]

| № | Date | Czechs, % | Slovaks, % | Germans, % | Hungarians, % |
|---|------|-----------|------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1 | 1930 | 34 | 23 | 22 | 5 |
| 2 | 1991 | 63 | 31 | Less than 1 | 4 |

§5. Kazakhstan

Table 6. Relative number of Kazakhs and Russians in Kazakhstan

| № | Census and year of its implementation | Kazakhs | Russians | Total in the Republic |
|---|---|----------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1 | All-Union Population Census of 1989, million people [4] | 6.5 | 6.2 | 16.5 |
| 2 | All-Union Population Census of 1989, in % | 39.4 | 37.6 | 100.0 |
| 3 | Population Census of 1999, in % [7] | 53.4 | 30.0 | 100.0 |
| 4 | Preliminary results of the population Census 2021, in % | 70,2 [1] | ~ 18 [22] | 100,0 |

Part III. An axiom about an ethnos and its own state

§1. Formulation of the axiom about an ethnos and its own state, as well as its two consequences

An axiom about an ethnos and its own state

Any ethnos always wants to live in its own state

This axiom is confirmed by history – as soon as the opportunity is given, any ethnos (people) tries to form its own state, where it will play the main, often dominant role.

Corollary 1 of the axiom about an ethnos and its own state.

The position of a non-state-forming ethnos.

Every non-state-forming ethnos at any given time considers its existence to be more or less uncomfortable.

Corollary 2 of the axiom about an ethnos and its own state.

Duality of the position of a non-state-forming ethnos.

A non-state-forming ethnos can criticize a state-forming ethnos for what the non-state-forming ethnos itself will do or is already doing in another, but its own state.

Corollary 2 is an illustration of the operation of the first law of dialectics on the unity and struggle of opposites: in a non-state-forming ethnos, there are two principles: a foreign state that denies the state and a state that strives for its own state.

Also, in the state-forming ethnos, there are two opposite principles-the desire for one's own state and the denial of the state, which suppresses some manifestations of the ethnicity of the state-forming ethnos for the sake of interethnic peace in the country.

§2. Fundamental goals of the activities of state-forming and non-state-forming ethnoses

Since any non-state-forming ethnos always wants to live in its own state, it is not quite comfortable to live in a foreign state, in particular:

1. It is necessary to know and use the language of the state-forming ethnos, for which it is necessary to learn a foreign language, and this is difficult.

2. Conflict of interests between a state-forming ethnos and a non-state-forming ethnos due to a difference in goals.

Goals of a state-forming ethnos living in its own state:

A. The desire to preserve one's State.

B. The desire to preserve oneself.

Goals of a non-state ethnos living in a foreign country:

I. The desire to preserve yourself.

II. The desire to form their own state.

As you can see, the goals of a state-forming ethnos or a union of two or three state-forming ethnoses and all other non-state-forming ethnoses in a given country are different.

Part IV. Formulations of two laws on the size of the state-forming ethnos and their consequences

Law on the level of Interethnic tension and the relative size of the State-forming ethnos

The lower the relative size of the state-forming ethnos or the total size of the union of two or three ethnically close to each other, the higher the level of interethnic tension in the country.

Law on the Disintegration of the State

When the relative size of the state-forming ethnos or the total size of the union of two or three ethnically close ethnoses falls to 60%, there is a tendency to break up the state, which can be realized in the next few decades.

Consequence. Nationalism from the point of view of preserving or destroying the state

The nationalism of a state-forming ethnos or a union of two or three ethnically close ethnoses is a force that preserves the country, and the nationalism of representatives of all other ethnoses of the state is a force that destroys the country.

Part V.. Examples of the operation of the law on the level of interethnic tension and the relative size of the state-forming ethnos

Analysis of the reasons for the collapse of the USSR. Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians, despite their high degree of ethnic affinity, XXwere unable to organize a stable coalition of state-forming ethnoses in the second half of the twentieth century, as a result of which the burden of control over the USSR fell exclusively on the shoulders of the Russian ethnos, and its numbers were insufficient for this; therefore, in 1991, the suburbs fell away from Russia, in the form of the collapse of the USSR [17], as a result of which territories populated mainly by non-Russian ethnoses turned out to be independent states, and Russians became one of the largest divided ethnoses in the world: the number of Russians in Russia in 2010 was 111 million people, the number of Russians on the mainland of Ukraine in 2013 was 21.3-27.0 The number of Russians in Crimea and Sevastopol in 2014 was 1.8 million [20, pp. 324-325].

Analysis of the reasons for the breakup of Yugoslavia. Ethnically close Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes maintained unity throughout the twentieth century, forming a coalition of state-forming ethnoses that controlled Yugoslavia. By the end of the twentieth century, the size of this union was not enough to control the country, as a result of which Yugoslavia collapsed.

Analysis of the reasons for the collapse of Czechoslovakia. In the first half of the 20th century, Czechoslovakia was governed by a coalition of three ethnically close state-forming ethnoses-Czechs, Slovaks and Germans. In the second half of the twentieth century, the state-forming ethnos of Czechoslovakia became the Czechs, who failed to organize a stable coalition with another major ethnos – the Slovaks, as a result of which Czechoslovakia collapsed.

Analysis of Kazakhstan's sustainability. At the time of its formation, Kazakhstan was inhabited mainly by two ethnically distant peoples-Kazakhs and Russians. Later, the number of Russians in Kazakhstan decreased from 6.2 million in 1989 to 3.4 million at the beginning of 2022 (and 1.8 million people emigrated) [13], as a result of which at the beginning of the XXI century Kazakhs became the only state-forming ethnos of Kazakhstan.

Part VI. *Relationship between the relative size of a state-forming ethnos or a coalition of related ethnoses and the cycles of nationalism and patrioseparatism* [19]

1. When the size of a state-forming ethnos or a union of ethnically close ethnoses is from 90% to 100% of the country's population, the state goes through the first two stages of the cycles of nationalism and patrioseparatism: the creation of its own state and the expansion of a new state.

2. When the size of a state-forming ethnos or a union of ethnically close ethnoses is about 80% of the country's population, in accordance with the cycles of nationalism and patrioseparatism, the state is in the stage of the old state.

3. With the size of a state-forming ethnos or a union of ethnically close ethnoses in the order of 60% to 70% of the country's population, the state is at the fourth stage of the cycles of

nationalism and patrioseparatism: an increase in the share of the population that cannot be assimilated in the country.

4. When the size of a state-forming ethnos or a union of ethnically close ethnoses is about 60% or less of the country's population, the state passes through the fifth and sixth stages of the cycles of nationalism and patrioseparatism: the defeated became the winners and the death of the state.

The main conclusion. For a successful multi-hundred-year existence of a state without significant problems on national grounds, as well as without disintegration, it is necessary to observe the correct balance between the size of the state-forming ethnos or the union of ethnically close state-forming ethnoses and the number of all other ethnoses in the country.

Table 7. Characteristics of the country by ethnic stability of the state

| № | Relative size of the state-forming ethnos or union of state-forming ethnic | groups Ethnic stability of the state | Country characteristic |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | From 80% to 100% | High | The state is stable |
| 2 | From 60% to 80% | Low | The state has a high level of interethnic tension |
| 3 | Less than 60% | The missing | State is in the process of preparing the country for disintegration |

Appendix 1. Questions and answers on modern Russia

Initial calculations. At the end of 2020, 80.85% of the Russian population was Russian [2, p. 97], with the total population of 145.2 million people. [2, p. 49], which means that 117.4 million Russians and 27.8 million people of other nationalities lived in Russia.

1. Why did the USSR collapse?

It broke up due to the division of the single ethnos "Orthodox" with the sub-ethnoses of Great Russians and Little Russians into two separate ethnoses – Russians and Ukrainians.

2. Will Russia break up?

Most likely, in the XXI century, Russia will not disintegrate, since the number of the state-forming ethnos-Russians-is enough to control Russia.

Appendix 2. Q & A in the modern United States

Initial calculations. The US censuses do not indicate nationality, but indicate race, so it is almost impossible to determine the exact number of the state-forming ethnos. According to the 2020 United States Census, 61.6% of the population was white, and 10.2% of the population indicated two or more races. [14] The state-forming ethnos of the United States is Americans, that is, descendants of immigrants from Europe who are Protestants. Thus, white Catholics, Orthodox Christians, Muslims, and Jews, as well as some other ethnoses, do not belong to the state-forming ethnos of the United States. It is estimated that the number of the state-forming ethnos of Americans in the modern United States is about 60%.

Will the US break up?

Most likely, during the XXI century, the United States will break up into separate parts, since the number of the state – forming ethnos-White Protestant Americans – is about 60% of the total number, which is not enough for stable control over the United States. The most likely time period for the collapse is from 2050 and later.

Appendix 3. Q & A on contemporary Arab-Israeli conflicts

Initial calculations. In 2022c, there were 7.45 million Jews and 7.53 million Israeli Arabs and Palestinians living in the territories of Israel, the West Bank, and the Gaza Strip. Of Israel's 9.7 million inhabitants, 5.5% of the population is non-Jewish and non-Arab [11] or approximately 0.53 million people. Thus, the total number of the entire population of the region is 15.5 million people, of which the number of Jews is 48%, and Arabs-48.5%.

What is the cause of instability in the region of Israel plus the West Bank and plus the Gaza Strip [9]?

The lack of relative numbers of Arabs and Jews for control over the entire region under consideration, since both ethnoses have significantly less than the necessary 70-90% of the population of this region.

Conclusions:

1. A link was found between the relative size of the state-forming ethnos, the growing level of tension in interethnic relations, and the collapse of the country.

2. It is determined that the nationalism of the state-forming ethnos is a force that preserves the state, and the nationalism of all other ethnoses of the country is a force that destroys the state.

3. The reason for the collapse of the USSR is the division of a single Orthodox ethnos into ethnoses of Russians and Ukrainians.

4. Yugoslavia collapsed due to the insufficient size of the union of three state-forming ethnoses-Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

5. Czechoslovakia broke up because the Czechs could not form an alliance with the Slovaks, and the Czechs themselves were not large enough.

6. After the collapse of the USSR, the Kazakhs were able to reduce the relative and absolute number of Russians in their country, as a result of which Kazakhstan avoided disintegration and today looks quite stable.

7. From the middle of the twenty-first century to the end of the twenty-first century, the United States is likely to break up.

8. Instability in the region encompassing Israel, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip is caused by the lack of Arab and Jewish populations to control the entire region in question.

9. In order to preserve the integrity of the state and minimize problems at the national level, the country should maintain a balance between the size of the state-forming ethnos or union of state-forming ethnoses and the size of all other ethnoses in the country.

References

1. The Head of State received Prime Minister Askar Mamin // President of the Republic of Kazakhstan (official website). URL: <https://www.akorda.kz/ru/glava-gosudarstva-prinyal-premer-ministra-askara-mamina-8114741://www.akorda.kz/ru/glava-gosudarstva-prinyal-premer-ministra-askara-mamina-8114741> (date accessed: 29.05.2022, in Russian).

2. Galkin S. S. et al. Russian Statistical Yearbook, 2022. Stat. sat / Rosstat. Moscow, 2022 (in Russian)

3. All-Union Population Census of 1970. National composition of the population by the republics of the USSR. Republic: USSR // Email media "Demoscope Weekly" URL: http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/sng_nac_70.php (date accessed: 25.05.2022, in Russian).
4. All-Union Population Census of 1989. National composition of the population by the republics of the USSR. Republic: Kazakh SSR // Email media "Demoscope Weekly" URL: http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/sng_nac_89.php?reg=5 (date accessed: 29.05.2022, in Russian).
5. All-Union Population Census of 1989. National composition of the population by the republics of the USSR. Republic: USSR // Email media "Demoscope Weekly" URL: http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/sng_nac_89.php (date accessed: 25.05.2022, in Russian).
6. Grigorieva R. A., Varfolomeeva T. B. et al. Belarusians. BRE. Electronic version (2020). URL: <https://old.bigenc.ru/ethnology/text/5621578> (accessed: 01.11.2023, in Russian).
7. Danshin A. I., Bely A.V. et al. Kazakhstan. The Great Russian Encyclopedia. Volume 12. Moscow, 2008. P. 415 (in Russian)
8. Zubkov I. V. All-Russian population census of 1897. The Great Russian Encyclopedia. Volume 6. Moscow, 2006. P. 56-57 (in Russian)
9. M. Makarychev How the conflict between Israel and Palestine began and why it cannot be ended. Publication date 17.10.2023 / / Rossiyskaya gazeta. URL: <https://rg.ru/2023/10/17/zemlia-vojna-izgnanie.html> (date accessed: 21.10.2023, in Russian). Print version: Rossiyskaya Gazeta-Nedelya-Federal Issue: № 236(9181). P. 12
10. Oleg Nazarov. Ukrainization as it was (Interview with the Candidate of Historical Sciences, Head of the Department of Eastern Slavism of the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences E. Y. Borisenok) / / Literaturnaya gazeta № 10 (6453) of 12.03.2014. URL: <http://lgz.ru/article/-10-6453-12-03-2014/ukrainizatsiya-kak-ona-byla/> (date accessed: 04.12.2018, in Russian).
11. The population of Israel on the 75th Independence Day. 25.04.2023 // Ministry of Foreign Affairs. URL: <https://www.gov.il/ru/departments/news/israel-population-at-75-th-independence-day> (date accessed: 09.10.2023, in Russian).
12. National composition of the USSR based on the materials of the All-Union Population Census of 1937 / / Electronic Library of Historical documents. URL: <http://docs.historyrussia.org/ru/nodes/47598-natsionalnyy-sostav-sssr-po-materialam-vsesoyuznoy-perepisi-naseleniya-1937-g> (date accessed: 25.05.2022, in Russian).
13. Sokolov A. How the Russians became a "small people" in Kazakhstan. January 16, 2022 / / Vedomosti. URL: <https://www.vedomosti.ru/society/articles/2022/01/17/904990-kak-russkie-stali-malim-narodom://www.vedomosti.ru/society/articles/2022/01/17/904990-kak-russkie-stali-malim-narodom> (date accessed: 29.05.2022, in Russian).
14. Ward Kingcade. Some results of the US Census of 2020 // Population and Society № 2 (107) 2022. Newsletter of the Vishnevsky Institute of Demography, National Research University Higher School of Economics. URL: http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/2022/0935/population_and_society01.php (date accessed: 29.01.2023, in Russian).
15. Czechoslovakia // Encyclopedia of Circumnavigation of the World. URL: <https://www.krugosvet.ru/enc/istoriya/CHEHOSLOVAKIYA.html> (date accessed: 10.05.2022, in Russian).

16. Shchemelinin K. S. Money. Simferopol.: IT "Arial". 2014. P. 254-255 (in Russian).
17. Schemelinin K.S. Not the desintegration of the USSR, but the departure of the regional territories from Russia // Scientific journal NovaUm.Ru. 2020. №28. P. 16-18 (in Russian).
18. Shchemelinin K. S. Theory and laws of civil wars // Synergy of Sciences. 2018. № 20. P. 918 (in Russian)
19. Shchemelinin K. S. Cycles of nationalism and patriotism-separatism // Electronic scientific journal "Arkhont". 2019. №5 (14). P. 58-61 (in Russian)
20. Shchemelinin K. S. Ethnic potentials of Russians and other peoples of the world in the beginning of the XXI century // Alley of Science. 2019. № 7 (34) (in Russian).
21. Yugoslavia // Encyclopedia of Circumnavigation of the World. URL: <https://www.krugosvet.ru/enc/istoriya/YUGOSLAVIYA.html://www.krugosvet.ru/enc/istoriya/YUGOSLAVIYA.html> (date accessed: 10.05.2022, in Russian).
22. How Kazakhstan became more Kazakh. 21 January 2022. // The Economist. URL: <https://www.economist.com/asia/2022/01/29/how-kazakhstan-became-more-kazakh> (date accessed: 29.05.2022, in Russian).
23. Lane Anne. Yugoslavia: When Ideals Collide. PALGRAVE MACMILLAN 2004. P.173.
24. Jews now a 47% minority in Israel and the territories, demographer says. 30 August 2022 // The Times of Israel by Arnon Soffer. URL: <https://www.timesofisrael.com/jews-now-a-minority-in-israel-and-the-territories-demographer-says/> (date accessed: 09.10.2022).
25. Judah Tim. The Serbs: History, Mith and the Destruction of Yugoslavia. Yale Universtity Press. Third Edition. 2009.