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This report is based on the theory of socio-cultural systems (SCS) developed by the author. As a matter of fact, it is one of its possible, numerous applications. First of all - several words about the theory itself as far as it is still a relatively new thing for Western colleagues.

We work on the SCS theory approximately since 1984. Its developing moves quite slowly. Between 1984-97 we finished no single book, though wrote and keep on our PC several thousands of pages on Russian, Western, Chinese and Black African SCS-s. These texts are mainly just preliminary materials. Many times we’ve tried to complete the general theory as well as more specific texts on various SCS-s, but until very recently - without much success.

Our current problem with the SCS theory is that its abstract description would be unconvincing and looking more like usual scientific speculation (that is not right). It’s necessary to compile a specific analysis of the existing SCS-s, but such analysis of one distinct SCS is highly difficult to be made: all the socio-cultural systems are closely connected, and the correct understanding of each one is only possible in case of taking into account all their interrelations. So, we have to bring out descriptions of all the SCS-s, plus the theory in general at the same time, that is extremely complicated task: each SCS is a special kind of reality, with its own logic and rules, and it’s simply impossible to describe all the existing and existed SCS-s in an observable future. Such work would require a lot of time and in general seems unlikely to be done by two people. Not only the scale of the task itself is the point, but one surely cannot correctly depict all the SCS-s in principle. In fact, being the people of the Russian SCS, we can examine and accurately describe only it. Muslim, Chinese, Black African SCS-s and others still remain not entirely understandable; to characterise them in all details we’d have to explain many nuances of their past and present - but to do so we have to be the people of these SCS-s. It doesn’t mean one cannot understand another SCS at all: the point is detailed examination of the SCS's evolution only - at least, so we think at the moment.

The SCS theory has numerous applications in the field of geopolitics and analysis of the space assimilation processes. In this report we'll consider only some aspects, and more specifically - socio-cultural foundations of East-European and Russian geopolitics. More systematically these were presented in our publications [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7].

**1.** Socio-cultural processes of the space assimilation do have their own logic that unfolds for centuries. Geopolitical processes are just the individual manifestations of these fundamental socio-cultural phenomena. The geopolitical level does usually attract most attention and provoke the most sharp reaction that often leads to its incorrect interpretation. The SCS theory allows for a more accurate description of the space assimilation processes. Geopolitics, as from the positions of the theory, become just one of its particular applications.

We won't repeat here all ideas and principles of the SCS theory - just refer to the respective appendixes to this report:

* APPENDIX 1. THE TERMINOLOGY AND CONCEPTS USED: DEFINITIONS
* APPENDIX 2. TYPES OF THE SOCIO-CULTURAL FORMATIONS; SOCIO-CULTURAL TYPE'S INDICATIONS / QUALITIES
* APPENDIX 3. PERIODS OF THE SOCIO-CULTURAL SYSTEMS' EVOLUTION
* APPENDIX 4. PERIODS AND SUBPERIODS OF THE SOCIO-CULTURAL SYSTEMS' EVOLUTION

The above presents the general concept of the SCS theory as well as principal facts of the socio-cultural evolution and dynamics.

**2.** We've performed comparative analysis of the European and Asia Minor external buffer zones' evolution. The result of the analysis - atlas of the computer generated space-time models (kartoids) that reflects the logic of this space evolution. Geopolitical problems of the region and its conflicts appear as particular consequences of the general evolution. Suggested system of the computer generated space-time models creates a principally new foundation for further geopolitical processes' forecasting / prognosis.

The atlas serves as a foundation for forecasting geopolitical processes in the entire European external buffer zone. It also reflects and correctly explains the processes in the Balkans, the essence and state of the current crisis there. We insist that these processes don't possess chaotic geopolitical character, but are consequences of the regular evolution of the region.

Some results of such analysis are presented in the papers of my colleague - Tatiana Nikolaenko.

Here is just the periodization for all the European external buffer zone's socio-cultural regions and Asia Minor.

**Asia Minor as external buffer zone. General description**

**Subperiod N 1.**

As from ancient times up to VIII century BC.

**Subperiod N 2.**

From VIII century BC until 327 BC.

**Subperiod N 3.**

From 327 until 180-s BC.

**Subperiod N 4.**

From 180-s BC until 110 AD.

**Subperiod N 5.**

From 110 until 380 AD.

**Subperiod N 6.**

From 380 until 610.

**Subperiod N 7.**

From 610 until 870-s.

**Subperiod N 8.**

From 870-s until early XI century.

**Subperiod N 9.**

From early XI century until late XIII century.

**Subperiod N 10.**

From second half of the XIII century until 1453.

**Subperiod N 11.**

From 1453 until 1680-s.

**Subperiod N 12.**

From 1680-s until 1770-s.

**Subperiod N 13.**

From 1770-s until 1856.

**Subperiod N 14.**

From 1856 until 1908.

**Subperiod N 15.**

From 1908 until 1980-s.

**Subperiod N 16.**

From late 1980-s and for some future.

**Subperiod N 17.**

Prognosis: more distant future

**European external buffer zone. General analysis**

**Subperiod 1.**

As from ancient times up until 113 BC

**Subperiod 2.**

From 113 BC until 110 AD

**Subperiod 3.**

From 110 until 380

**Subperiod 4.**

From 380-s until mid VI century

**Subperiod 5.**

From mid VI century until mid VIII century

**Subperiod 6.**

From mid VIII century until late X century

**Subperiod 7.**

From late X century until 1241

**Subperiod 8.**

From 1241 until 1380

**Subperiod 9.**

From 1380 until 1570-s

**Subperiod 10.**

From 1570-s until 1700

**Subperiod 11.**

From 1700 until 1772

**Subperiod 12.**

From 1772 until 1831

**Subperiod 13.**

From 1832 until 1870

**Subperiod 14.**

From 1871 until 1917

**Subperiod 15.**

From 1917 until 1945

**Subperiod 16.**

From 1945 until late 1980-s

**Subperiod 17.**

From late 1980-s and for some future

**Cycle 5. Subperiods 18 - 19 - 20. Prognosis**

**Finnish region**

**Stage 1-1.**

As from ancient times up until early IX century

**Stage 1-2.**

From early IX century until early XIII century

**Stage 2-1.**

From early XIII century until late XVI century

**Stage 2-2.**

From late XVI century until late XVII century

**Stage 2-3.**

From late XVII century until 1721

**Subperiod N 3.**

From 1721 until early XIX century

**Subperiod N 4.**

From early XIX century until 1917

**Stage 5-1.**

From 1917 until 1920

**Stage 5-2.**

From 1920 until 1939

**Stage 5-3.**

From 1939 until 1945

**Stage 5-4.**

From 1945 until 1991

**Subperiod N 6.**

From 1991 and for some future

**Norwegian - Swedish - Danish region**

**Subperiod N 1.**

As from ancient times up until late VIII century AD

**Subperiod N 2.**

From late VIII century until early XI century

**Subperiod N 3.**

From early XI century until early - mid XIII century

**Subperiod N 4.**

From early - mid XIII century until 1471

**Subperiod N 5.**

From 1471 until late XVII century

**Subperiod N 6.**

From late XVII century until early XIX century

**Subperiod N 7.**

From early XIX century until early XX century

**Stage 8-1.**

From early XX century until 1920

**Stage 8-2.**

From 1920 until 1939

**Stage 8-3.**

From 1939 until 1945

**Stage 8-4.**

From 1945 until 1991

**Subperiod N 9.**

From late XX century and for some future

**Latvian - Estonian region**

**Stage 1-1.**

As from ancient times up until early VIII century AD

**Stage 1-2.**

From early VIII century until early XIII century

**Stage 2-1.**

From early XIII century until 1370

**Stage 2-2.**

From 1370 until 1570-s

**Stage 3-1.**

From 1570-s until 1580-s

**Stage 3-2.**

From 1580-s until 1700

**Stage 3-3.**

From 1700 until 1721

**Subperiod N 4.**

From 1721 until 1914

**Stage 5-1.**

From 1914 until 1920

**Stage 5-2.**

From 1920 until 1939

**Stage 5-3.**

From 1939 until 1945

**Stage 5-4.**

From 1945 until 1991

**Subperiod N 6.**

From 1991 and for some future

**Lithuanian region**

**Stage 1-1.**

As from ancient times up until early VIII century AD

**Stage 1-2.**

From early VIII century until early XI century

**Stage 1-3.**

From early XI century until mid XIII century

**Subperiod N 2.**

From mid XIII century until 1386

**Subperiod N 3.**

From 1386 until 1462

**Stage 4-1.**

From 1462 until 1569

**Stage 4-2.**

From 1569 until 1650-s

**Stage 4-3.**

From 1650-s until 1795

**Stage 5-1.**

From 1795 until 1831

**Stage 5-2.**

From 1831 until 1861

**Stage 5-3.**

From 1861 until 1914

**Stage 5-4.**

From 1914 until 1920

**Stage 6-1.**

From 1920 until 1939

**Stage 6-2.**

From 1939 until 1945

**Stage 6-3.**

From 1945 until 1991

**Stage 7-1.**

From 1991 and for some future

**Polish region**

**Subperiod N 1.**

As from ancient times up until VIII century AD

**Subperiod N 2.**

From VIII century until 966

**Subperiod N 3.**

From 966 until 1241

**Subperiod N 4.**

From 1241 until 1386

**Subperiod N 5.**

From 1386 until 1570-s

**Subperiod N 6.**

From 1570-s until 1667

**Subperiod N 7.**

From 1667 until 1772

**Subperiod N 8.**

From 1772 until 1831

**Subperiod N 9.**

From 1831 until 1918

**Stage 9-1.**

From 1831 until 1861

**Stage 9-2.**

From 1861 until 1914

**Stage 9-3.**

From 1914 until 1918

**Subperiod N 10.**

From 1918 until 1980-s

**Stage 10-1.**

From 1918 until 1921

**Stage 10-2.**

From 1921 until 1939

**Stage 10-3.**

From 1939 until 1945

**Stage 10-4.**

From 1945 until 1980-s

**Subperiod N 11.**

From 1980-s and for some future

**Czech-Slovakian region**

**Subperiod N 1.**

As from ancient times up until VIII century AD

**Subperiod N 2.**

From VIII century until late X century

**Subperiod N 3.**

From late X century until 1241

**Subperiod N 4.**

From 1241 until 1380-s

**Subperiod N 5.**

From 1380-s until 1485

**Subperiod N 6.**

From 1485 until 1648

**Subperiod N 7.**

From 1648 until 1848

**Subperiod N 8.**

From 1848 until 1914

**Stage 9-1.**

From 1914 until 1919

**Stage 9-2.**

From 1919 until 1938

**Stage 9-3.**

From 1938 until 1945

**Stage 9-4.**

From 1945 until 1968

**Stage 9-5.**

From 1968 until 1980-s

**Subperiod N 10.**

From 1980-s and for some future

**Hungarian region**

**Stage 1-1.**

As from ancient times up until mid VI century AD

**Stage 1-2.**

From mid VI century until late VIII century

**Subperiod N 2.**

From late VIII century until early XI century

**Subperiod N 3.**

From early XI century until 1241

**Subperiod N 4.**

From 1241 until 1380-s

**Subperiod N 5.**

From 1380-s until 1541

**Subperiod N 6.**

From 1541 until late XVII century

**Subperiod N 7.**

From late XVII century until late XVIII century

**Subperiod N 8.**

From late XVIII century until 1830

**Subperiod N 9.**

From 1830 until 1917

**Stage 9-2.**

From 1848 until 1867

**Stage 9-3.**

From 1867 until 1914

**Stage 9-4.**

From 1914 until 1918

**Subperiod N 10.**

From 1918 until late 1980-s

**Stage 10-1.**

From 1918 until 1920

**Stage 10-2.**

From 1920 until 1939

**Stage 10-3.**

From 1939 until 1945

**Stage 10-4.**

From 1945 until 1980-s

**Subperiod N 11.**

From late 1980-s and for some future

**Romanian - Bulgarian - Moldavian region**

**Subperiod N 1.**

As from ancient times up until AD

**Subperiod N 2.**

AD until 370-s

**Subperiod N 3.**

From 370-s until late VII century

**Subperiod N 4.**

From late VII century until late X century

**Subperiod N 5.**

From late X century until late XIV century

**Subperiod N 6.**

From late XIV century until 1480-s

**Subperiod N 7.**

From 1480-s until 1774

**Subperiod N 8.**

From mid 1770-s until 1878

**Subperiod N 9.**

From 1878 until early XX century

**Stage 10-1.**

From 1908 until 1914

**Stage 10-2.**

From 1914 until 1918

**Stage 10-3.**

From 1918 until 1940

**Stage 10-4.**

From 1940 until 1945

**Stage 10-5.**

From 1945 until late 1980-s

**Subperiod N 11.**

From late 1980-s and for some future

**Balkan region**

**Subperiod N 1.**

As from ancient times up until mid II century BC

**Subperiod N 2.**

From II century BC until 370-s AD

**Subperiod N 3.**

From 370-s until early IX century

**Subperiod N 4.**

From early IX century until late XII century

**Subperiod N 5.**

From late XII century until late XIV century

**Subperiod N 6.**

From late XIV century until late XVII century

**Subperiod N 7.**

From late XVII century until 1870-s

**Subperiod N 8.**

From 1870-s until early XX century

**Stage 9-1.**

From 1908 until 1913

**Stage 9-2.**

From 1914 until 1918

**Stage 9-3.**

From 1918 until 1939

**Stage 9-4.**

From 1939 until 1945

**Stage 9-5.**

From 1945 until 1980-s

**Subperiod N 10.**

From late 1980-s and for some future

**3.** One of the most essential points here is existence of clear correlation in evolution of the European external buffer zone and Asia Minor as external buffer zone. No detailed description of all these correlations here - only combined general tables.

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVOLUTION:**

**EUROPEAN EXTERNAL BUFFER ZONE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cycle** | **Subperiod** | **Dates** | **Duration of a subperiod**  **(years)** | **Average**  **duration of subperiods within**  **a cycle**  **(years)** | **Duration of a cycle**  **(years)** |
| **Cycle #1** | 1 (1.1) | From ancient times until 113 BC | Indefinite | Around 218 years (without 1st subperiod) | As far as it's known, around 650 years |
|  | 2 (1.2) | From 113 BC until 110 AD | 223 |  |  |
|  | 3 (1.3) | From 110 until 380-s | 270 |  |  |
|  | 4 (1.4) | From 380-s until mid VI century | Around 160 |  |  |
| **Cycle #2** | 5 (2.1) | From mid VI century until mid VIII century | 200 | Around 207 years | Around 830 years |
|  | 6 (2.2) | From mid VIII century until late X century | 230 |  |  |
|  | 7 (2.3) | From late X century until 1241 | 260 |  |  |
|  | 8 (2.4) | From 1241 until 1380 | 139 |  |  |
| **Cycle #3** | 9 (3.1) | From 1380 until 1570-s | 190 | Around 113 years | Around 450 years |
|  | 10 (3.2) | From 1570-s until 1700 | 130 |  |  |
|  | 11 (3.3) | From 1700 until 1772 | 72 |  |  |
|  | 12 (3.4) | From 1772 until 1831 | 59 |  |  |
| **Cycle #4** | 13 (4.1) | From 1832 until 1870 | 38 | Around 39 years | Around 156 years |
|  | 14 (4.2) | From 1871 until 1917 | 46 |  |  |
|  | 15 (4.3) | From 1917 until 1945 | 28 |  |  |
|  | 16 (4.4) | From 1945 until late 1980-s | 44 |  |  |
| **Cycle #5** | **17 (5.1)** | **Is still going on currently** | - | Current  cycle | Current  cycle |
|  | 18  19  20 | Prognosis | - |  |  |
| **Described duration of the buffer zone evolution**  **- around 2100 years** | | | | | |

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVOLUTION:**

**ASIA MINOR AS EXTERNAL BUFFER ZONE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cycle** | **Subperiod** | **Dates** | **Duration of a subperiod**  **(years)** | **Average**  **duration of subperiods within**  **a cycle**  **(years)** | **Duration of a cycle**  **(years)** |
| **Cycle #1** | 1 (1.1) | From ancient times until VIII century BC | Indefinite | Around 303 years (without 1st subperiod) | As far as it's known, around 910 year |
|  | 2 (1.2) | From VIII century BC until 327 BC | 473 |  |  |
|  | 3 (1.3) | From 327 until 180 BC | 147 |  |  |
|  | 4 (1.4) | From 180 BC until 110 AD | 290 |  |  |
| **Cycle #2** | 5 (2.1) | From 110 AD until 380 | 270 | Around 228 years | Around 910 years |
|  | 6 (2.2) | From 380 until 610 | 230 |  |  |
|  | 7 (2.3) | From 610 until 870-s | 260 |  |  |
|  | 8 (2.4) | From 870-s until early XI century | Around 150 |  |  |
| **Cycle #3** | 9 (3.1) | From early XI century until late XIII century | 260 | Around 187 years | Around 750 years |
|  | 10 (3.2) | From late XIII century until 1453 | Around 170 |  |  |
|  | 11 (3.3) | From 1453 until 1680-s | 227 |  |  |
|  | 12 (3.4) | From 1680-s until 1770-s | Around 90 |  |  |
| **Cycle #4** | 13 (4.1) | From 1770-s until 1856 | 86 | Current cycle. As per three completed subperiods - 70 years | Current cycle. As per three completed subperiods - around 210 years |
|  | 14 (4.2) | From 1856 until 1908 | 52 |  |  |
|  | 15 (4.3) | From 1908 until 1980-s | 72 |  |  |
|  | **16 (4.4)** | **From 1980-s and for some future - is still going on currently** | - |  |  |
| **Cycle #5** | 17 (5.1)  18 (5.2)  19 (5.3)  20 (5.4) | Prognosis | - | - | - |
| **Described duration of the buffer zone evolution**  **- around 2800 years** | | | | | |

**4.** Socio-cultural methodology is completely applicable to the analysis of the Russian Empire - USSR - CIS (or Russian SCS, according to our terminology) space evolution. We suggest our own version of the socio-cultural zonation of the Russian SCS's space: by the late XX century, there are 20 (twenty) socio-cultural regions and 8 (eight) enclaves. Below is the periodization of the Russian SCS's socio-cultural regions (Russian enclaves' periodization is given in the Tatiana Nikolaenko papers; for definitions see Appendix 1).

**SOCIO-CULTURAL EVOLUTION OF THE REGIONS**

**WITHIN RUSSIAN SCS: SUBPERIODS**

**I. Central Russian region**

Number of cycles - 1

Number of subperiods - 10:

1. From ancient times up until VIII century AD

2. From VIII century until mid XI century

3. From mid XI until early XIII century

4. From early XIII century until 1380-s

5. From 1380-s until 1470-s

6. From 1470-s until 1572

7. From 1572 to 1690-s

8. From 1690-s to 1917

9. From 1917 to 1991

10. From 1991 and for some future

**II. Pskov - Novgorod - Petersburg region**

Number of cycles - 1

Number of subperiods - 10:

1. From ancient times up until VIII century AD

2. From VIII until mid XI century

3. From mid XI until early XIII century

4. From early XIII and until late XIII century

5. From late XIII century until 1471

6. From 1471 to 1572

7. From 1572 to 1700-s

8. From early XVIII century until 1917

9. From 1917 to 1991

10. From 1991 and for some future

**III. Northern European region**

Number of cycles - 1

Number of subperiods - 7:

1.1. From ancient times up until VIII century AD

1.2. From VIII until mid XI century

2. From mid XI until 1470

3. From 1470 to 1572

4. From 1572 until early XVIII century

5. From early XVIII until early XX century

6. From early XX and until late XX century

7. From late XX century and for some future

**IV. Smolensk - Bryansk - Chernigov - Sumy region** (southern part of this socio-cultural region belongs at present to Ukrainian state)

Number of cycles - 1

Number of subperiods - 11:

1. From ancient times up until VIII century AD

2. From VIII until mid XI century

3. From mid XI until early XIII century

4. From early XIII until mid XIV century

5. From mid XIV century until 1514

6. From 1514 until early XVII century

7. From early XVII century until 1667

8. From 1667 to 1772

9. From 1772 to 1917

10. From 1917 to 1991

11. From 1991 and for some future

**V. Central Ukrainian region**

Number of cycles - 1

Number of subperiods - 9:

1. From ancient times up until IX century AD

2. From IX until mid XI century

3. From mid XI century until 1160-s

4. From 1160-s to 1380

5. From 1380 to 1667

6. From 1667 to 1770

7. From 1770 to 1917

8. From 1917 to 1991

9. From 1991 and for some future

**VI. Southern Russian region** (south-western part of this socio-cultural region belongs at present to Ukrainian state)

Number of cycles - 2

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 13 subperiods of socio-cultural evolution within the Barbarian-Nomadic SCS

2nd cycle - 4 subperiods:

1. From early - mid XVI century until 1700

2. From 1700 to 1917

3. From 1917 to 1991

4. From 1991 and for some future

**VII. Eastern Ukrainian region** (the most eastern part of this socio-cultural region belongs at present to the Russian Federation)

Number of cycles - 2

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 13 subperiods of socio-cultural evolution within the Barbarian-Nomadic SCS

2nd cycle - 5 subperiods:

1. From mid XVI until XVII century

2. From late XVII century until 1870-s

3. From 1870-s to 1917

4. From 1917 to 1991

5. From 1991 and for some future

**VIII. Southern Ukrainian region**

Number of cycles - 2

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 14 subperiods of socio-cultural evolution within the Barbarian-Nomadic SCS; as from 15 century it's a part of the Crimean Khanate

2nd cycle - 4 subperiods:

1. From early XVIII century until 1791

2. From 1791 to 1917

3. From 1917 to 1991

4. From 1991 and for some future

**IX. Western Ukrainian region**

Number of cycles - 1

Number of subperiods - 12:

1. From ancient times up until 9 century AD

2. From IX until mid XI century

3. From mid XI century until 1160-s

4. From 1160-s to 1380

5. From 1380 to 1660

6. From 1660 to 1770

7. From 1770 to 1815

8. From 1815 to 1860

9. From 1860 to 1918

10. From 1918 to 1945

11. From 1945 to 1991

12. From 1991 and for some future

**X. White-Russian (Belarus) region**

Number of cycles - 1

Number of subperiods - 9:

1. From ancient times up until mid IX century AD

2. From mid IX until mid XI century

3. From mid XI until early XIV century

4. From early XIV century until 1650-s

5. From 1650-s to 1772

6. From 1772 to 1795

7. From 1795 to 1920

8. From 1920 to 1991

9. From 1991 and for some future

**XI. Urals region**

Number of cycles - 2

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 2 subperiods:

1. From ancient times up until XII - XIII centuries

2. From XII - XIII centuries until 1480-s

2nd cycle - 6 subperiods:

1. From 1480-s to 1572

2. From 1572 to 1700

3. From 1700 to 1870-s

4. From 1870-s to 1917

5. From 1917 to 1991

6. From 1991 and for some future

**XII. Trans-Volga region**

Number of cycles - 2

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 13 subperiods of socio-cultural evolution within the Barbarian-Nomadic SCS

2nd cycle - 4 subperiods:

1. From mid XVI century until 1700

2. From 1700 to 1917

3. From 1917 to 1991

4. From 1991 and for some future

**XIII. Northern Asian region**

Number of cycles - 2

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 13 periods:

From ancient times up until late XV century.

2nd cycle - 4 subperiods:

1. Stage 1.1. From late XV until late XVI century

Stage 1.2. From late XVI (1570-s) until early 18 century

2. From early XVIII until early XX century

3. From early XX and up until late XX century

4. From late XX century and for some future

**XIV. Southern-Siberian - Far-Eastern region**

Number of cycles - 2

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 13 subperiods of socio-cultural evolution within the Barbarian-Nomadic SCS

2nd cycle - 4 subperiods:

1. Stage 1.1. From late XVI until late XVII century

Stage 1.2. From late XVII until mid XIX century

2. From mid XIX century until 1917

3. From 1917 to 1991

4. From 1991 and for some future

**XV. Northern-Kazakh region**

Number of cycles - 2

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 14 subperiods of socio-cultural evolution within the Barbarian-Nomadic SCS

2nd cycle - 4 subperiods:

1. From late XVIII until mid XIX century

2. From mid XIX century until 1917

3. From 1917 to 1991

4. From 1991 and for some future

**XVI-1. Kazakh -Central Asian region - Southern zone**

Number of cycles - 2

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 6 subperiods:

1. From ancient times up until VI century BC

2. From VI century BC until VIII century AD

3. From VIII until early XIII century

4. From early XIII until early XV century

5. From early XV until early XVII century

6. From early XVII until mid XIX century

2nd cycle - 3 subperiods:

7. From mid XIX century until 1917

8. From 1917 to 1991

9. From 1991 and for some future

**XVI-2. Kazakh -Central Asian region - Northern zone**

Number of cycles - 2

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 4 subperiods:

1. From ancient times up until VIII century AD

2. From VIII until early XIII century

3. From early XIII until early XV century

4. From early XV until early XVII century

2nd cycle - 4 subperiods:

5. From early XVII until mid XIX century

6. From mid XIX century until 1917

7. From 1917 to 1991

8. From 1991 and for some future

**XVII. Caucasian region**

Number of cycles - 3

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 2 subperiods:

Structure with three types of subregions was being formed, with "Internal" Caucasus as the first subregion, coastal areas as the second subregion (where Greek, Roman and Byzantine enclaves have been generated), and Trans-Caucasus as the third subregion.

1. From ancient times until VIII - VII centuries BC

2. From VIII - VII centuries BC until XVI century AD

2nd cycle - 1 subperiod:

The entire territory controlled by the Ottoman Empire.

1. From XVI until early XIX century

3rd cycle - 4 subperiods:

1. From early XIX century until 1859

2. From 1859 to 1917

3. From 1917 to 1989

4. From 1989 and for some future

**XVIII. Northern-Caucasian region**

Number of cycles - 2

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 13 subperiods of socio-cultural evolution within the Barbarian-Nomadic SCS:

From ancient times until mid XVI century

2nd cycle - 4 subperiods:

1. From mid XVI until late XVIII century

2. From late XVIII century until 1917

3. From 1917 to 1991

4. From 1991 and for some future

**XIX. Moldavian region**

Number of subperiods - 11:

1. From ancient times until AD

2. From AD until 370-s

3. From 370-s until late VII century

4. From late VII until late X century

5. From late X until late XIV century

6. From late XIV century until 1480-s

7. From 1480-s until 1774

8. From 1774 to 1856

9. From 1856 until early XX century

10. From 1908 until late 1980-s

11. From late 1980-s and for some future

**XX-1. Baltic region - Lithuanian zone**

Number of cycles – 2.

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 4 subperiods:

1. Stage 1. From ancient times until early VIII century AD

1. Stage 2. From VIII until early XI century

1. Stage 3. From early XI until mid XIII century

2. From mid XIII century until 1386

3. From 1386 to 1462

4. Stage 1. From 1462 to 1569

4. Stage 2. From 1569 to 1650-s

4. Stage 3. From 1650-s until 1795

2nd cycle - 3 subperiods:

1. From 1795 to 1920

2. From 1920 to 1991

3. From 1991 and for some future

**XX-2. Baltic region - Latvian-Estonian zone**

Number of cycles – 2.

Number of subperiods -

1st cycle - 3 subperiods:

1. Stage 1. From ancient times up until early VIII century AD

1. Stage 2. From VIII until early XIII century

2. Stage 1. From early XIII century until 1370-s

2. Stage 2. From 1370-s until 1550-s

3. Stage 1. From 1550-s until 1580-s

3. Stage 2. From 1580-s until 1700

3. Stage 3. From 1700 to 1721

2nd cycle - 3 subperiods:

1. From 1721 to 1917

2. From 1914 to 1991

3. From 1991 and for some future

The above data are exceptionally important for correct interpretation of the spatial processes within Russian Empire - USSR - CIS. Life term of the particular socio-cultural region far exceeds the specific forms of the state organization within this space. Processes of space assimilation indeed have their own rules and logic, and these directly relate to the current events within the CIS space.

For instance, to understand correctly present situation in Ukraine, it is especially important to take into account the fact that of its six socio-cultural regions only three are completely within the borders of the modern Ukrainian state (Central Ukrainian, Western Ukrainian and Southern Ukrainian regions). Territories of the three others extend over the state borders and - to a greater or smaller degree - are located within the Russian Federation space (Southern Russian, Eastern Ukrainian and Smolensk -Bryansk -Chernigov -Sumy regions). Thus, modern political boundaries of Ukraine do not completely correspond with the boundaries of the socio-cultural regions within its territory. It's possible to talk for as long as one wishes about Ukraine's political independence, but it makes sense to take into consideration the fact that the socio-cultural regions within its "formal" territory, for centuries were being integrated into the common space of the Russian SCS.

**5.** We present below the typology of the boundaries within Russian SCS space as well as their brief description, where accent is made on the problems of Ukraine and its Crimean region in particular.

In general, we identify 11 (eleven) types of the state (political) boundaries within the Russian Empire - USSR - CIS space [1]. They are:

**First type –** external boundary between Russian Empire - USSR - CIS and states representing alien socio-cultural formations.

**Second type –** boundary between Russian enclaves and their environment / neighbors. Example: boundary between Kaliningrad Region (as Russian enclave) and Lithuania. We have the same type of boundary in the Crimean case: Southern Ukrainian socio-cultural region does essentially differ from Crimea as Russian socio-cultural enclave.

In case of Crimea, even nature itself assists forming such type of a boundary: take Sivash lagoon that separates Crimea from the rest of Ukraine. Notably, Sivash is a relatively young natural formation, but it quite furthers such a separation. What is even more remarkable is that within the boundary zone of the Crimean enclave and Ukraine, in a strict accordance with the dominant (Russian) standards of the territories' assimilation, local ecological crisis is being generated: intensive growth of a chemical industry enterprises in the area and most recent experiments with the Sivash "open economic zone" should lead, in a historically brief time, to a degradation of the area's natural environment. The area should become highly unattractive for both living there and businesses / any sort of economic activity. Phenomena of such kind are being correctly described and explained in terms of the SCS theory.

**Third type –** boundary between Russian homeland and internal buffer zones. Example: boundary between Pskov region and Estonia. Another example gives Ukraine.

**Fourth type –** boundary between the states of the Russian homeland itself; it bears internal character and runs along the relic external buffer zone. Such is, for instance, the boundary between Belarus (White Russia) and Russian Federation in their present borders. Such boundary, as a rule, separates / divides the regions that are homogeneous in socio-cultural respect, and divides them in such way that they become belonging to politically different states within Russian socio-cultural system.

**Fifth type –** indefinite in a socio-cultural respect, boundary of internal character in the areas of historically young (pioneer) colonization. Example: Eastern Ukraine in the neighborhood of Russian Federation, with characteristic absence of definite boundary lines in the space organization.

**Sixth type –** not well-grounded, quite undefined and never before existed boundaries between states of Russian SCS that have been originated only recently. Example: boundaries between the states of Middle / Central Asia - former Soviet Republics. This type is only characteristic for internal boundaries within Russian SCS space. All external boundaries - with alien socio-cultural formations and SCS-s in particular - are still extremely stable and well-defined.

**Seventh type** – relatively clear boundary, with greater or lesser numbers of disputable (and sometimes disputed) sections, each of those may become a reason and basis for respective regional conflict and essential revision of the entire boundary line. Example: the boundary between Belarus (White Russia) and Lithuania.

**Eighth type –** recently formed boundary between the CIS state and enclave within its territory. Example: the boundary between Moldova and Transnistrian Republic (PMR).

**Ninth type –** internal boundaries between territorial-administrative units within Russian Federation. This type also includes boundaries of the autonomous republics.

**Tenth type –** boundary that doesn't bear the status of a stateone, but separates internal buffer zone from the Russian homeland. It has clearly defined character only in a Western part of the Russian Empire - USSR - CIS space.

**Eleventh type –** stable and well-defined boundaries between naturally dependent vassals within borders of the internal buffer zone of Russian SCS. These boundaries may be quite stable, because they never play significant role in themselves. Example: boundaries between the Baltic states.

Specific of the modern Ukrainian state lies in the combination of the heterogeneous structure of its territory and heterogeneity of its political borders. State boundary of Ukraine is represented by 7 (seven) different types of borders with each one possessing own specific qualities and dynamics of changes. Here we have the following types of the state (political) boundaries: **First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Eighth, and Tenth**. Generally speaking, seven of the existing within Russian SCS types of state (political) boundaries are being represented in modern Ukraine. That's simply too much for a single state... No other post-Soviet state has to deal with such a situation. Once more, each type of a state (political) boundaries is characterized by specific evolution.

Heterogeneity of a state (political) boundaries - and especially in a combination with the heterogeneous space structure - guarantees Ukrainian state all sorts of instability for an observable future. As a form of organization (of a social and political life), state usually has essentially shorter life term compare to that of socio-cultural boundaries and regions (not to mention a socio-cultural formations). And in such conditions reforms (and economic reforms in particular) become practically impossible: any successive measures would lead only to a number of unforeseen and hardly remediable consequences. Each type of the Ukrainian state boundaries may react to a radical reform / changes in its own way.

**6.** Socio-cultural regions and boundaries between them are very dynamic, but their dynamics may be quite strictly described theoretically. Here are some results of our 1998 researches in this regard.

**THEORETICAL EVOLUTIONARY MODEL OF SPACE SOCIO-CULTURAL**

**ASSIMILATION & GEOPOLITICAL PROCESSES WITHIN RUSSIAN SCS**

Having analysed the evolution of the socio-cultural systems, we've discovered that, when it comes to forming their own spaces, they do display some common qualities. These qualities are being reflected in the model that demonstrates a series of logically succeeding one another stages of the SCS's space self-organization.

The model is presented in the **APPENDIX 5: GENERAL MODEL OF THE PROCESS OF SPACE ASSIMILATION WITHIN SCS** (all graphics are designed in Word 7.0 for Windows 95).

This theoretical model fully applies to the Russian SCS analysis. The latter's present-day condition, as from our point of view, may be interpreted as a beginning of the fifth stage. At this point, situation develops, for the most part, in a direction of increasing the state heterogeneity / diversity on the SCS's periphery. And thus, the transition from one unitary state to a bigger number of states is quite natural. It's significant that all new states are located on the SCS's periphery. Some of these peripheral states may be extremely unstable, and during a brief historical perspective (within fifth and sixth stages of the SCS's space evolution) can easily disintegrate into even greater numbers of a smaller states. In a chronological sense, it may take from around ten years to a good few decades.

Principal differences of this stage also lie in a growing quantity of enclaves. Before, there were not so many of them, but at the fifth stage the number of enclaves increases drastically. In the specific conditions of Russian SCS, it's also being expressed in a considerably grown importance of enclaves. Within boundaries of the unitary state of the past, they have just been forming. During the fifth and sixth stages, all enclaves should reveal their full potential.

The other novelty of the present stage is the rise of the demarcating socio-cultural formations that separate states of the Russian SCS's internal buffer zone. Outwardly, they look as a territories that are not really considerable in width, but quite extended in length. Their configuration is completely determined by the necessity to separate some two (or more) states of the internal buffer zone. And in this connection, their shape may be of any character. Transnistrian Republic would be an appropriate example here. It is indeed formation of the new type. Such spatial units do appear only at this, fifth stage when they play the most important role for further evolution of the buffer zone and its transformation in accordance with the dominating SCS's standards. Thus, these creations shouldn't be considered as a sort of the Nature's misunderstanding.

As a rule, state formations of an enclave type as well as demarcating socio-cultural formations may be very weak and equivocal in all respects; they are to an extreme degree complicated to contact. These territories also distinguish themselves with a great instability. They may possess whatever entangled international and inter-socio-cultural statuses and connections, and flirt freely with any states and territories in the World. But in reality, they are firmly tied only to the SCS that had actually caused these formations to exist. Successfully established connection of some enclave with a foreign state formation (a part of an alien SCS) can be destroyed very fast and efficiently by the dominating (maternal) SCS.

Within the following, sixth stage (according to the theory) utmost spatial diversity will find place within SCS - with maximum numbers of enclaves and demarcating socio-cultural formations, highly complicated political situation, numerous weak and frequently mutating states that may maintain extravagantly intricate internal relationships and often even imitate "leaving" their own SCS. At this stage, feeling of the SCS's total breakdown arises, but it's more of a deceptive illusion: socio-cultural system simply cannot change itself, and especially perish, due to the reasons of just geopolitical character. Socio-cultural and geopolitical levels are different, and their connection is quite relative. Beyond the question, geopolitical processes just follow in fundamental socio-cultural trends, and whatever happens at the political and geopolitical levels, evolutionary process of the SCS's space socio-cultural assimilation is in progress as usual.

Let's note once more that, from our point of view, in the late XX century, painful (in a geopolitical sense) fifth and sixth stages take place within Russian SCS. But these stages are natural and logically integrated into general process of the entire Russian SCS's evolution.

**7. DYNAMICS OF THE SOCIO-CULTURAL REGIONS & ENCLAVES WITHIN THE RUSSIAN SCS's SPACE**

Based on the above theses and researches we referred to earlier, the following general conclusions as to dynamics of regions and enclaves within Russian SCS can be made:

**First**

As for socio-cultural regions and enclaves, highly changeable situation takes place within the Russian SCS's space. Russian socio-cultural space - depending on the period of the Russian SCS's evolution - possesses strictly determinate set of regions and enclaves. Direct correspondence between the period of the Russian SCS's evolution and the existing set of (as well as current processes in) regions and enclaves within its space should be noted: own specific set of socio-cultural regions and enclaves corresponds to each and every period of the socio-cultural evolution.

External restrictions to the extensive growth of the regions' and enclaves' number in any SCS are determined by the fact of reaching the spaces of alien SCS-s' control. In Russian SCS, this was achieved by the late XIX century.

**Second**

Regular, natural socio-cultural evolution of the Russian SCS's space self-organization takes place. It is not linked directly to the geopolitical conditions of Russian state(-s). Within Russian SCS, forms of state(-s) may change drastically. At one stage, a huge powerful unitary state may exist; then it may disintegrate into a great number of smaller (and weaker) states; then again, it may unite all these into one strong unitary state - and so on, and on, and on. There may be not much logical connection between the Russian state's transformations of that kind. In any case, it (the logic of transformation) doesn't come to light if only state formations' evolution is being analysed. The state's bankruptcy (say, due to its wrong policy or ideology) may be seen as an apparent cause, but that's just the geopolitical level.

However, the natural logic is present in socio-cultural organization of the SCS's space and in the way the combination of regions' and enclaves' joint space is being formed. Their transformations do usually develop in two directions:

Where the first one is incorporation of the new socio-cultural regions and enclaves into the Russian SCS's space. New socio-cultural regions and enclaves are being included into Russian state's space control (as a rule) at the time of its transition to the next period of a socio-cultural evolution. The limitations here are the alien SCS-s' spaces only;

And the second one being the reformation of the already existing within Russian SCS regions' and enclaves' character. These may essentially modify both their character and socio-cultural functions. This aspect is determined only by the internal logic of the Russian SCS's evolution.

**Third**

Changes within Russian SCS in practice do not necessarily involve spatial fluctuations of the socio-cultural regions' boundaries. As far as the opinion could be formed at the modern level of knowledge, it is characteristic of all the types of boundaries within Russian SCS. Let's remind that there are eleven types of the boundaries within Russian socio-cultural space, and all of them are being exuded just empirically.

Configuration of the Russian SCS's regions' and enclaves' boundaries turned out to be quite static. It changes very slowly and insignificantly, and the transformations that really happen are rather exceptions - not a rule. The main direction of the boundaries' evolution within Russian SCS is determined by dramatic changes of the boundaries' socio-cultural nature, or character, without modification of their exterior configuration. They retain certain configuration and, separating one and the same region from its socio-cultural environment / neighbours, a boundary may drastically change its own character and type. That's the essence of the boundaries' dynamics - not just their fluctuations all round the territory. Modification of the region's boundary type is well co-ordinated with the socio-cultural transformations of the region itself.

This consideration concerns only socio-cultural boundaries: it's their configuration that is fairly static. Having been formed once, these boundaries do change to a very insignificant extent. They become a foundation for initial development of a certain socio-cultural region or enclave; then this region or enclave develops and transforms in accordance with the general logic of the Russian SCS's evolution.

**Fourth**

There is no direct connection between geopolitical and socio-cultural processes within Russian SCS. Obvious dominants in Russian SCS - as in any other - are socio-cultural processes. That's they determine state's forms (the number and character of states within SCS, configuration of their boundaries, etc.).

Static condition isn't characteristic of a state (political) boundaries: these may fluctuate in space very considerably, but it doesn't play a principal role for the SCS. Geopolitical process here is being directed by socio-cultural specifics of the space assimilation.

Depending on specific qualities of the current period of the Russian socio-cultural space assimilation, Russian state may acquire essentially different forms. It may exist as one unitary state, with only capital and hard policy of centralisation; and there may be great number of states, with no centralisation and no unitary policy at all. All these are just external manifestations of the process of SCS's space socio-cultural conversion. Transformations of such kind may correctly be understood only in general context of the Russian space evolution.

It is especially important that existence - during certain intervals of the history - of a big number of states within Russian SCS doesn't really influence the state (condition) of its socio-cultural regions and enclaves. This phenomenon has no connection with the state of their boundaries, too. It's only linked to forming a set of strictly definite types of regions and enclaves. Further step in a process of the Russian space self-organization is being made, and a certain form of a state - appropriate to the tasks of the period of evolution - emerges.

In this respect, disintegration of the USSR and rise of 15 independent states and potential possibility of this geopolitical process further progress - revealing itself, for instance, in the transformation of Ukraine and some Central-Asian CIS republics (Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan in particular) into new and numerous state formations - have almost nothing to do with evolution of socio-cultural regions and enclaves. All these still remain the Russian SCS's space that's going now through the next stage of its evolution. It categorically isn't linked to a unitary state status only. Numerous regional conflicts are not the signs of the Russian state's weakness and degradation, but of the Russian SCS's space subsequent socio-cultural transformation.

**Fifth**

Suggested model of the territories' socio-cultural assimilation within Russian SCS allows for well-grounded long-term prognosis of the geopolitical processes. Geopolitical dynamics are determined by the socio-cultural processes. Process of the Russian SCS's space self-organization is still going on, and the state's evolution - rise of a new type of a state formations in particular - is a perfectly natural phenomenon.

\* \* \*

These are the results of the studies conducted during 1991/99, partly jointly with Tatiana Nikolaenko.

In practice, it's a basis for creating the analytical system to support decision-making (DSS), in geopolitical questions in particular.
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