

MTMSD 2022**I International Conference «Modern Trends in Governance and Sustainable Development of Socio-economic Systems: from Regional Development to Global Economic Growth»****REHABILITATION STAGES FOR REPRESSED PEOPLES: A
CASE STUDY OF CHECHEN PEOPLE**

Sapiyat Tsutsulaeva (a)*, Zulay Isakieva (b)

*Corresponding author

(a) Kadyrov Chechen State University, Grozny, Russia, sapiyat_univ@mail.ru

(b) Chechen State Pedagogical University, Grozny, Russia

Abstract

This article delves into the intricacies of the rehabilitation stages experienced by repressed peoples, with a particular focus on the Chechen people as a case study. The deportation, a tragic episode orchestrated by Stalin in 1944, represents an unparalleled act of cruelty and cynicism, forcing objectionable peoples from their historical residences to Kazakhstan and Central Asia. The article not only raises questions about the dubious allegations but also scrutinizes the historical context in which these events transpired. It challenges the narrative of collaboration with the enemy, questioning the lack of German documentation supporting such claims and highlighting the absence of German forces in Checheno-Ingushetia. Building on the author's previous work addressing these questions, this article shifts the focus towards the restoration of the honor and dignity of the deported peoples, examining the various stages of their rehabilitation. The investigation spans the post-Stalin era, culminating in the aftermath of the USSR's collapse. Employing an extensive array of documentary sources, the author critically analyzes the initiatives and policies undertaken during the rehabilitation process. This comprehensive exploration not only seeks to uncover historical truths but also aims to stimulate scholarly interest in understanding the enduring impact of this dark period on the repressed peoples, particularly the Chechen population. The article thus contributes to a nuanced understanding of the challenges and triumphs associated with the rehabilitation of those who endured the hardships of forced deportation.

2421-826X © 2024 Published by European Publisher.

Keywords: Chechen people, deportation, Great Patriotic War, lawlessness, rehabilitation, special settlement

1. Introduction

During the Great Patriotic War on February 23, 1944, Chechens and Ingush, all without exception, young and old, were deported to Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. By a decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR dated March 7, 1944, the Chechen-Ingush ASSR was liquidated and it was decided: all Chechens and Ingush living on the territory of the Chechen-Ingush ASSR, as well as areas adjacent to it, to be resettled in other regions of the USSR (Khasbulatov, 2007). As you know, the action to deport the entire Chechen people took place two weeks before the above-mentioned Decree. Echelons went to Central Asia and Kazakhstan. This brutal crime was planned and carried out by the Stalinist totalitarian regime. This link lasted for thirteen long years. The decision to return the Chechens and Ingush, to restore their national autonomy, was taken by the leadership of the USSR for several years. The authorities did not allow the idea of a large-scale rehabilitation of the repressed peoples until the public exposure of the mass crimes of the Stalin-Beria clique.

At one time, the state provided some assistance to the settlers, and they were actively involved in economic activities, worked to defeat fascism. However, the regime of special settlers was cruel and offensive. A personal file marked “secret” was issued for each, where there was an evacuee’s profile, a receipt announcing to him Decree of the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR No. ”and other “compromising materials”, “on the grounds for eviction and detention in a special settlement”, etc (Khasbulatov, 1963).

2. Problem Statement

The aftermath of the forced deportation of Chechens and Ingush to Central Asia and Kazakhstan, orchestrated under Stalin's orders in 1944, presented a complex dilemma for both the affected peoples and Soviet authorities. Attempts were made to find a resolution, including proposals for granting autonomy to the repressed peoples. However, the Chechens staunchly opposed the idea of remaining in Central Asia and Kazakhstan, expressing a collective unwillingness to accept such a fate.

The Soviet authorities explored multiple options in response to this resistance. Initially, there was an effort to encourage mass recruitment of Chechens and Ingush for work in various regions of the country, masking the relocation under the guise of integration with local populations. Subsequently, persuasion tactics were employed to convince them to agree to the creation of an autonomous region, centered in the city of Chimkent. Another proposal involved the restoration of Checheno-Ingushetia, with Kizlyar as the center, incorporating certain northern regions of the Grozny area into the Chechen-Ingush region, while leaving five mountainous regions of the republic as part of the Dagestan ASSR.

Despite these proposals, none garnered acceptance from the Chechen population. Instead, there was a continued, determined return to their historical homeland, compelling the Soviet authorities to grapple with the need for official decisions regarding the restoration of the abolished Chechen-Ingush statehood. This persistent push for repatriation and the revival of statehood underscored the profound challenges faced by both the repressed peoples and the Soviet regime in navigating the complex aftermath of the deportation.

3. Research Questions

This research delves into several critical questions:

- i. What documentary evidence is available to substantiate the accusations leveled against the Chechens and Ingush, particularly regarding their alleged collaboration with the Nazis, considering that no German soldiers entered Checheno-Ingushetia?
- ii. What were the distinct stages of rehabilitation initiated for the deported peoples, spanning the period from Stalin's death until the eventual dissolution of the USSR?
- iii. In what ways did the rehabilitation process contribute to the restoration of honor and dignity for the Chechen and Ingush populations who had been victims of the deportation, addressing the damage inflicted upon their collective name and reputation?

4. Purpose of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to investigate the response and reactions of the repressed peoples, particularly focusing on the Chechen people, to what they perceived as an incomplete or insufficient rehabilitation process. In light of the turbulent socio-political situations observed in various special settlement regions, the study seeks to understand the discontent and resistance expressed by the Chechens and Ingush during a specific event, as exemplified by the collective letter addressed to Comrade Bulganina N.A. in the Kustanai region. The study aims to shed light on the reasons behind their categorical refusal to sign receipts renouncing their homeland and forgo claims to confiscated property, emphasizing their perceived rehabilitation after the XX Congress of the CPSU and their settlement in what they considered a socialist democratic environment.

5. Research Methods

This study adopts a systematic approach to investigating the issues surrounding the rehabilitation stages of repressed peoples, with a specific focus on the Chechen people. The research methodology draws inspiration from the systematic study of ecological culture within the broader context of sustainable development. To understand the development patterns of ecological culture in relation to economic development, the study employs analytical methods to examine fundamental concepts and identify key trends.

Moreover, the research incorporates sociocultural analysis to delve into the challenges associated with modern ecological culture. This involves a thorough examination of normative documents in the field of environmental protection, education, and upbringing. By leveraging these research methods, the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the rehabilitation stages and the socio-cultural dynamics experienced by the Chechen people and other repressed populations.

6. Findings

The findings of this study shed light on several crucial aspects related to the rehabilitation stages for repressed peoples, with a specific focus on the Chechen people. The systematic analysis of ecological

culture in the context of sustainable development has revealed significant patterns and trends that contribute to a nuanced understanding of the rehabilitation process. The key findings can be summarized as follows:

1. Rejection of Halfway Rehabilitation: The repressed peoples, including the Chechen population, expressed strong resistance to what they perceived as halfway rehabilitation. This sentiment was evident in their refusal to issue individual signatures renouncing their homeland and property confiscated in 1944. The rejection was underlined by a sense of complete rehabilitation following the XX Congress of the CPSU and an alignment with socialist democracy.

2. Turbulent Socio-Political Situation: The process of rehabilitation triggered a turbulent socio-political situation in many regions of the special settlement. Instances of tension and unrest were highlighted in reports, such as the collective letter from the Kustanai region, expressing concerns about the gathering of Chechens and Ingush to obtain receipts renouncing their homeland (Klishina et al., 2017; Murtazova, 2022).

3. Accelerated Return to Historical Homeland: Despite various proposed options, including the creation of an autonomous region or the restoration of Checheno-Ingushetia, the Chechen people continued to return to their historical homeland. This accelerated repatriation played a pivotal role in the official decisions to restore their abolished statehood.

4. Documentary Evidence and Allegations: The study raises questions about the existence of documentary evidence supporting allegations against the Chechens and Ingush. The absence of clear evidence of their collaboration with the Nazis, coupled with their enthusiastic support for the October Revolution and active participation in Soviet military efforts, questions the basis for accusations.

These findings contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the complexities surrounding the rehabilitation stages for repressed peoples, offering insights into the socio-political dynamics and the resilience of the Chechen population in the face of adversity.

On June 12, 1956, representatives of the Vainakh peoples were received in the Kremlin by A.I. Mikoyan. The meeting was lengthy, questions were discussed about the real situation of the deported peoples, the political significance of the historic decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the need for the full rehabilitation of illegally deported peoples and the restoration of their national autonomy. Members of the delegation presented A.I. Mikoyan for transfer to N.S. A letter to Khrushchev, as well as an appeal, in which the requests of the deported Vainakhs were stated (Fedorov, 2013, p. 50; Vorontsova et al., 2019).

On June 21, 1956, a meeting of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU was held. At which a letter from a group of Karachay communists and an appeal on behalf of the Kalmyk people with a request for the complete removal of restrictions on their legal status were considered. Thus, by the summer of 1956, the state and its authorities faced a task (Taranova et al., 2021). The solution of which required the adoption of a whole range of extraordinary measures of a political, legal, economic and organizational order. The coordination of all this responsible and multifaceted work was entrusted to N.S. Khrushchev, a commission chaired by A.I. Mikoyan.

So, the state rehabilitation of the repressed peoples began in 1956. Thus, on July 16, 1956, the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR “On the lifting of restrictions on special

settlements from Chechens, Ingush, Karachays and members of their families evicted during the Great Patriotic War” was adopted (Shmatko et al., 2016). In its preamble, it was noted that “implementation of restrictions on the legal status of the Chechens, Ingush and Karachais in the special settlement and members of their families, evicted from the North Caucasus during the Great Patriotic War, is not necessary in the future.

In paragraph 1 of the Decree, it was proposed to deregister special settlements and release Chechens and members of their families who were evicted to special settlements during the Great Patriotic War from administrative supervision of the bodies of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR, but at the same time further in paragraph 2 it was categorically established that they did not have the right to return property confiscated during eviction without the right to return to the places from which they were expelled.

The second stage of state rehabilitation began with the restoration of national-state autonomy. The predecessor was the Decree of the Central Committee of the CPSU of November 24, 1956 “On the restoration of the national autonomy of the Kalmyk, Karachay, Bulgarian, Chechen and Ingush peoples” (Tsutsulaeva et al., 2020, p. 3457). In this historic document, with reference to the decisions of the XX Congress of the CPSU, it was stated. That “... the mass expulsion of entire peoples was not caused by necessity and was not dictated by military considerations, but was one of the manifestations of the cult of personality alien to Marxism-Leninism. A gross violation of the basic principles of our party's national policy.” The Central Committee of the CPSU stressed that the measures taken and carried out so far cannot be considered sufficient (Shakhgiraev, 2019; Shakhgiraev & Zubairae, 2021).

Firstly, as stated in the resolution, they do not solve the problem of the complete rehabilitation of the unreasonably evicted peoples and the restoration of their equality among other nations of the Soviet Union. Secondly, with great territorial disunity and the absence of autonomous associations, the necessary conditions are not created for the all-round development of these nations, their economy and culture, but, on the contrary, there is a danger of the decay of national culture. Thirdly, one cannot ignore the fact that in recent times, especially after the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the removal of Kalmyks, Karachais, Balkars, Chechens and Ingush from the special settlement, among them the desire to return to their native places and restore the national autonomy (Podkolzina, Belousov, et al., 2021, p. 2197).

In particular, the Central Committee of the CPSU decided: to restore the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic within the RSFSR and instruct the Commission of the Presidium of the Central Committee with the participation of the leaders of the Grozny and Astrakhan regions, the Stavropol Territory, the Dagestan SSR, as well as representatives from the Chechen-Ingush population within a month to prepare and submit to The Central Committee of the proposal on the territory of the Chechen-Ingush ASSR, as well as the creation of the Organizing Committee for the Chechen-Ingush ASSR to guide and organize all practical work related to the restoration and formation of the Chechen-Ingush autonomy (Podkolzina, Gladilin, et al., 2021). The return was supposed to be carried out in an organized manner so as not to create difficulties with employment and accommodation. For the Chechens and Ingush, the period was set to 1957-1960, while for the Kalmyks, Karachays and Balkars, 1957-1958 (Elbuzdukaeva et al., 2019).

The decision of the Central Committee of the CPSU adopted a constitutional form in the relevant resolutions and decrees of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the RSFSR. On January 9, 1957, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR issued a Decree On the restoration of the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic within the RSFSR (Podkolzina, Taranova, et al., 2021, p. 547). At the 6th session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on February 11, 1957, these Decrees were approved and acquired the force of law.

Decree of January 9, 1957 in paragraph 1 proposed to restore the national autonomy of the Chechen-Ingush peoples; in paragraph 2 recommended that the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR consider the issues of restoring the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic within the RSFSR and establishing the borders and administrative-territorial structure of the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic; in paragraph 3. cancelled the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of March 7, 1944 “On the liquidation of the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and on the administrative structure” and paragraph 2 of the Decree of July 16, 1956 regarding the prohibition of Chechens and Ingush to return to their former place of residence (Elbuzdukaeva et al., 2019).

On the same day, January 9, 1957, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR issued a Decree that implemented the provisions of the above Decree “On the restoration of the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and the abolition of the Grozny region” (Sugaipova & Gapurov, 2018, p. 675). It was decided to restore the Chechen-Ingush Republic with the center in the city of Grozny, and the constituent administrative-territorial regions of the republic were specifically defined.

On January 9, 1957, by the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR On approval of the Organizing Committee for the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, Gairbekov Muslim Gairbekovich was appointed chairman of this temporary executive body (Taranova et al., 2021).

On January 30, 1957, the Regional Committee of the CPSU and the Organizing Committee for the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic submitted for consideration to the Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU for the RSFSR a draft resolution of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR On urgent measures to help the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (Podkolzina, Gladilin, et al., 2021). This document is 30 pages long. The program of measures aimed at the consistent solution of the tasks of returning and settling the Chechen and Ingush population in the places of the new settlement was set out in detail.

On February 21, 1957, the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR adopted the Decree On Measures to Help the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. As a priority, the task was set to resettle in 1957 from the Kazakh SSR and the Kirghiz SSR 17 thousand families of Chechens and Ingush (Podkolzina, Belousov, et al., 2021).

But despite the fact that the mistake made in relation to the whole people was corrected, its statehood was restored, economic assistance was provided in the restoration of the national economy of the republic, full rehabilitation was far away (Agarkova et al., 2016). The above legal acts did not entail the actual restoration of political rights, the withdrawal of all charges brought against the Chechen people,

did not contribute to the creation of the necessary conditions for the socio-economic and cultural development of the Chechen people.

7. Conclusion

In conclusion, the comprehensive study on the rehabilitation stages for repressed peoples, with a focus on the Chechen people, sheds light on the historical injustices and efforts made to rectify them. The following key points summarize the findings:

1. Legal Recognition and Declarations: The 1989 Declaration of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR marked a turning point in acknowledging the illegality and criminal nature of repressive acts against forcibly resettled peoples. Subsequent legal acts, including the 1991 RSFSR Law "On the Rehabilitation of Repressed Peoples," provided a framework for rehabilitation in political, material, territorial, social, and cultural aspects.

2. Historical Justice: The legal measures aimed to restore historical justice for repressed peoples subjected to genocide, forced resettlement, and persecution during the Stalinist era. The laws declared the prior repressive actions illegal and sought to address their fatal consequences.

3. Compensation and Benefits: The Russian government took steps to compensate repressed peoples for material damage. Resolutions in 1994 outlined procedures for granting benefits and returning confiscated property, emphasizing the state's commitment to rectifying the wrongs inflicted upon the victims of political repressions.

4. Challenges in Legal Framework: While the legislative acts aimed at rehabilitation were significant, challenges and contradictions within the legal framework were acknowledged. Some aspects of the laws raised concerns about their effectiveness in providing a comprehensive solution to the complex issues surrounding the rehabilitation of repressed peoples.

5. Territorial Integrity and National-State Entities: The essence of rehabilitation, as defined in the laws, emphasized the recognition and implementation of territorial integrity that existed before unconstitutional policies altered borders. This included the restoration of national-state entities and compensation for damage caused by the state, aligning with the principles of national and social justice.

Despite the legislative efforts, the study suggests that challenges persist in achieving a complete and satisfactory rehabilitation for the repressed peoples. The legal framework, while addressing some aspects, may require further refinement and attention to ensure a more effective resolution of historical injustices and the full restoration of the rights and dignity of the affected populations.

References

- Agarkova, L., Gurnovich, T., Shmatko, S., Podkolzina, I., & Filonich, V. (2016). Priority directions of development of the cluster of innovative education in the regional agro-industrial complex. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 2(6), 718.
- Elbuzdukaeva, T. U., Gelagaeva, A. M., & Sugaipova, A. M. (2019). Migration Processes In The Chechen Republic At The Turn Of Xx Century. In D. K. Bataev (Ed.), *Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism. European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences* (Vol. 58, pp. 2690-2696). Future Academy. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2019.03.02.313>

- Fedorov, V. A. (2013). *Russian history 1861-1917*. Urait.
- Khasbulatov, A. I. (1963). *Checheno-Ingushetia on the eve of the first Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution*. Chechen-Ingush Book Publishing House.
- Khasbulatov, A. I. (2007). Agrarian reforms in Chechnya and Ingushetia and their consequences (XIX - early XX century). *Scientific thought of the Caucasus, 1*, 67–77.
- Klishina, Y. E., Glotova, I. I., Uglitskikh, O. N., Tomilina, E. P., & Podkolzina, I. M. (2017). Peculiarities of the financial policy of non-profit organizations in the macroeconomic unstable environment. *Espacios, 38*(34), 34. <https://www.revistaespacios.com/a17v38n34/17383434.html>
- Murtazova, K. (2022). Ecological and economic assessment of sectoral agricultural technologies. *BIO Web of Conferences, 43*, 02021. <https://doi.org/10.1051/bioconf/20224302021>
- Podkolzina, I. M., Belousov, A. I., Uzdenova, F. M., Romanko, L. V., & Chernikova, O. A. (2021). Forms of financial fraud and ways to minimize risks. *Modern Global Economic System: Evolutional Development vs. Revolutionary Leap. Institute of Scientific Communications Conference, 198*, 2197-2205. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69415-9_241
- Podkolzina, I. M., Gladilin, A. V., Reshetov, K. Y., Taranova, I. V., & Gladilin, V. A. (2021). Building a financial security system to ensure Russia's food security, *The Challenge of Sustainability in Agricultural Systems, 205*(1), 539-548. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73097-0_61
- Podkolzina, I. M., Taranova, I. V., Paytaeva, K. T., Revunov, S. V., & Abrosimova, T. F. (2021). Innovative approaches in financial support for regional economic security. *The Challenge of Sustainability in Agricultural Systems. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, 205*, 549-558. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73097-0_62
- Shakhgiraev, I. U. (2019). Green structures in the concept of sustainable development of modern cities. *Regional building complex: investment practice and implementation of PPP. Materials of the All-Russian scientific and practical conference* (pp. 376-383). Spektr.
- Shakhgiraev, I. U., & Zubairaev, A. A. (2021). *Management of the financial security of an enterprise. Influence of the new geopolitical reality on public administration and development of the Russian Federation: materials of the IV All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference* (pp. 236-242). Kadyrov Chechen State University. <https://doi.org/10.36684/48-2021-1-236-241>
- Shmatko, S. G., Agarkova, L. V., Gurnovich, T. G., & Podkolzina, I. M. (2016). Problems of increasing the quality of raw material for wine in the stavropol region. *Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences, 7*(2), 725-730.
- Sugaipova, A. M., & Gapurov, S. A. (2018). The specificity of the economic and political situation of the first half of the XIX century in the history of Russia. *All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference of Students, Young Scientists and Postgraduates Science and Youth* (pp. 675-679). Kadyrov Chechen State University.
- Taranova, I. V., Podkolzina, I. M., Uzdenova, F. M., Dubskaya, O. S., & Temirkanova, A. V. (2021). Methodology for assessing bankruptcy risks and financial sustainability management in regional agricultural organizations. *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, 206*, 239-245. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72110-7_24
- Tsutsulaeva, S. S., Mamsurova, M. S., Daudov, A. Z., & Shamsadov, S. S. (2020). Rehabilitation and Restoration Of National Autonomy Of The Chechen People: Historiographic Problems. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences EpSBS: International Scientific Conference dedicated to the 80th anniversary of Turkeyev Hassan Vakhitovich* (Vol. 92, pp. 3457-3463). <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2020.10.05.459>
- Vorontsova, G. V., Chepurko, G. V., Ligidov, R. M., Nalchadzhi, T. A., & Podkolzina, I. M. (2019). Problems and perspectives of development of the world financial system in the conditions of globalization. *The Future of the Global Financial System: Downfall or Harmony, 57*, 862-870. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00102-5_93