

К.Р. Koltsov^{1*} , К.Р. Koltsova¹ 

B.B. Gorodovikov Kalmyk State University
Elista, 358000, Republic of Kalmykia
*e-mail: petrkoltsov52@mail.ru

PARTY AND POLITICAL SYSTEM OF THE FIFTH REPUBLIC AND PROBLEMS OF INTEGRATION IN EUROPE (50-60 YEARS. XX CENTURY)

Abstract.

Modern France is a republic of a mixed parliamentary-presidential type. The Fifth French Republic's political system has several advantages and disadvantages, but it has proven its viability in modern times. France is one of the leading countries in the European Union, disputing the leadership of neighboring Germany. Interestingly, the mixed form of government was combined in the history of France with bright leaders, and the founder of the Fifth Republic was Charles de Gaulle. Historical development predetermined a strong presidential power in France - the president has significant constitutional rights, and he forms the government, which, however, cannot function normally without the support of the National Assembly. In general, despite the mixed type of republic, the advantage of the president of the country is obvious. An appeal to the history of France, therefore, is an important point in understanding the transformation of the party-political system in the context of European integration.

The article considers the party-political system of the Fifth Republic and the problems of integration in Europe (50-60s of the XX century) in the context of European integration and civilizational features of Western Europe. It also presents the party-political system of France in the context of the new system of international relations, as one of the main participants in the process of European integration. At the same time, the development and expansion of European construction influence the dynamics of systemic transformations in France and change its political system.

Key words: the New Republic, party-political system, constitutional program, parliament, new Constitution, historical memory, society.

Introduction.

In France, European policy has always been important, as it has allowed it to find its rightful place in the European system of states. Thanks to its active participation in the EU integration structure, France has managed to strengthen its leading position in Europe.

The transition from an industrial society to a post-industrial one, characterized by an increase in the standard of living and education, geographical mobility, the widespread use of mass media, and the development of the tertiary sector, also had consequences in the political sphere. One of them was an increase in the average level of political competence, the other was an increase in the importance of «post-material values», which attach importance to freedom of expression, rather than purely physical and economic security.

For France, the shift in the center of gravity of the political struggle from the basic principles of socio-economic development to the solution of specific issues has led to a new institutionalization of political parties. The study of the experience of the socio-political system of the V Republic and the problems of integration in Europe in the 50-60 years XX century is interesting and does not lose its relevance, but also takes on an additional meaning in our days.

The relevance of the study is determined by the systemic transformation of the party-political system of France in the context of European integration in the 50s-60s, the experience of which allows us to derive certain mechanisms of interaction with the system's politics.

Of great importance in the development of theoretical and methodological aspects of the study of the evolution of the French political system are the works devoted to the political history

of France in the period of the III, IV, and V Republics, including the works of French authors Fr. Gogel [1], S. Sur [2], N. Copen [3] and others.

To study the transformation of the French party-political system and the influence of integration processes on its evolution, the works containing an analysis of the influence of civilizational features of Western Europe on the formation of the French model of party-political construction are of great interest.

Materials and methods of research.

The party-political system of society refers to social systems that interact with each other, as well as with natural systems, forming complex macro-socio-ecosystems. They develop both according to statistical laws and trends and according to dynamic laws. According to some experts, the political system is a real mechanism for the formation and functioning of power in society, which includes the «state», as well as parties, mass media, political associations and associations, and various political entities (groups and individuals) and their relationships, political consciousness and culture, and political norms.

When considering the party-political system of France, we focus on some initial propositions that have theoretical and methodological significance. One of these propositions is that the political system is considered a relatively independent and self-regulating social organism, immersed in the social environment and responding to external impulses (signals). Being a subsystem of a more general social system, the political system is not absorbed by the environment but has boundaries separating it from the environment. In this context, the problem of party-political construction is analyzed by a well-known specialist, political scientist M. Duverger [4]. And the political system and activity of governments, from the XVIII century to the middle of the XX century, are considered in the work of the French specialist P. Avril [5].

Results and its discussion.

The collapse of the Fourth Republic and its replacement by the V Republic was a natural process. The V Republic stems from the crisis, the undermining and inability of the parliamentary regime to deal with the problems facing France, most notably the decolonization of Algeria. The colonial war of 1954-1962 in Algeria brought the regime of the IV Republic to a standstill, split French society into two opposing camps, («Algeria French») and («Algeria Independent»), and after the military coup of May 13, 1958, the top military and civilian «ultra» in Algeria put France in danger of democratic institutions in France itself.

In this situation, some of the ruling circles decided to call General Charles de Gaulle to power again, as the «supreme arbiter», who had left the country's political arena since 1953. General de Gaulle made a fundamental change in the regime of the IV Republic an indispensable condition for this «arbitration», demanding the adoption of a new constitution. Its terms were accepted in record time. Charles de Gaulle had a «historic chance» of the concept of a «strong state». The general's inner circle, led by M. Debre and R. Kapitan, developed a draft of a new constitution. M. Debre is a prominent political theorist and statesman. During the Second World War, he published a number of works devoted to the constitutional problem of France.

During the years of the IV Republic, M. Debre strongly criticized the constitutional regime. With the coming to power of Gaullism, the nature of his political writings changed somewhat, as he tried to make the Gaullist doctrine more universal. When he was removed from power, M. Debray continued to defend the principles of the native policy of France in his works [6].

As you know, the constitutional program of Charles de Gaulle was outlined by him back in 1946 on June 16 in a famous speech in Bayeux: «From the head of state, placed above the parties and elected by an expanded board... the executive power must emanate». In his speech at Bayeux, Sh. de Gaulle, as he later admitted, deliberately omitted to mention that he had always considered it necessary to seek the election of the President of the Republic by direct and universal suffrage. In the context of the first post-war years, he considered it «inappropriate» to advocate for the implementation of the basic principle of «direct democracy». However, he noted that «... the key

to the code of our regime is the institution of the president of the republic, who is elevated to his post by the mind and feelings of the French in order to be the head of the state and the leader of France» [7].

The new constitution brought to its logical conclusion the main provisions of the Gaullist doctrine of the state, which were formed over many years and expressed by Sh. Both by de Gaulle and his supporters. The Constitution of 1958 became the basis of the new regime-the Fifth Republic. It replaced in France a republic of parliamentary type with a republic of presidential type of government.

The main difference from the Constitution of the Fourth Republic is a significant expansion of the prerogatives of the executive branch (president and government) at the expense of the legislative (parliament) [8].

Parliament has lost many of its most important prerogatives, in particular, the prerogative to form a government. With the general weakening of the role of the Parliament in the system of power, the traditional balance of powers within the Parliament was also disrupted, since the second chamber (the Senate) was given more opportunities than before to block decisions of the National Assembly. At the same time, the President of the Republic, who, in accordance with the Constitution, appoints and directs the Government alone, has enormous powers (Articles 8, 12). The National Assembly retained the right to pass a vote of confidence in the Government (Article 49). However, the President can use such formidable weapons as dissolving the Parliament and calling early elections in response. The President of the Republic became a key figure in French politics.

Under the new Constitution, he has the right to appoint the Prime Minister and, on his proposal, individual ministers, to return bills passed by Parliament for new discussion, and to refer to a general referendum, on the proposal of the Government or both chambers, any bill concerning the organization of State power or approval of international agreements that may affect the activities of State institutions. Article 16 of the Constitution gives the President of the Republic the right to assume full power in the country in emergency situations. When the institutions of the republic, the independence of the nation, the integrity of its territory or the fulfillment of international obligations are under serious and immediate threat, and the normal functioning of the constitutional bodies of State power is disrupted, the President of the Republic takes measures that are dictated by these circumstances. A simple consultation with the Prime Minister, the Presidents of both Houses of Parliament and the Constitutional Council is sufficient.

In the historical memory of each nation запечатлелись, the names of people who rendered extremely important services to their fatherland are imprinted. These names usually became symbolic: they were written on banners by political forces who wanted to give their ideas and policies greater weight, to introduce them into the mainstream of a certain historical continuity. Naturally, this could be done with the greatest justification by political movements and parties that were created on the initiative or with the participation of this historical person.

In France, the most typical example of the connection between a historical name and a specific political activity is the Gaullist party.

It was founded by General de Gaulle, who played a huge role in restoring France as an independent state after the defeat in the war with Hitler's Germany. Charles de Gaulle personally led the Union of the French People (RPF), a party that operated in the Fourth Republic and was dissolved in 1953. Under the auspices of de Gaulle, the Union for the Defense of the New Republic (UNR) party was formed in 1958, which later changed its name several times: In 1964-1967-Union for the Defense of the New Republic-Democratic Union of Labor (UNR – UDT); 1967-1968-Union for the Defense of the Republic (YDR); 1968 – Union for the Defense of the Republic (YDR). in defense of the Fifth Republic (YD-V); 1968-1976-again YDR; 1976-Association in Support of the Republic (OPR).

Until 1974 (when the leader of the Independent Republican Party V. Giscard d'Estaing was elected President of France) It was the party and political pillar of the Fifth Republic regime created by Charles de Gaulle.

In the politics of the political parties of the Fifth Republic in these years, the attitude to the problem of «European» and «Atlantic» integration was an actual problem.

Based on the concept of a «Europe of States» and a «European Europe», UNR-UDT expressed its belief that in the near future only if there are nations... effective political action aimed at creating political unity can be developed. The party expressed confidence that European unity should be created gradually, not only in the economic and social fields, but also in the political one.

At the same time, the de Gaulleites resolutely opposed the immediate integration of Western Europe into the «Atlantic system». De Gaulle criticized the supporters of Atlantic integration at a press conference on July 23, 1964. He noted that «among the Gauls, Germans and Latins, many are exclaiming: 'Let's create Europe!' But what Europe?» asked de Gaulle. «This is the essence of the discussion» [9].

He stressed that the government defends the concept of «European Europe». «European Europe», de Gaulle said, «means that it exists by itself and for itself, in other words, it has its own policy in the world».

Sh.de Gaulle noted that there is a concept that excludes an independent European policy and calls for Europe in the field of politics, economy and defense to an Atlantic, i.e. American, system and subordinate, therefore, to what the United States calls the word «leadership».

Responding to Europeans, that is supporters of the immediate political integration of Western Europe, Charles de Gaulle said: «Of course, it is not forbidden to imagine that one day all the peoples of our continent will become one and there will be a European government, but it would be ridiculous to think that this day has come». He stressed that in modern conditions, political integration «cannot lead to anything other than an American protectorate» [10].

It is necessary to note that, in our opinion, E. Jouve rightly points out in his book, that de Gaulle and the supporters Ch. De Gaulle did not look at the question of the terms and form of the European federation supporters Ch. De Gaulle the same way. The statements of the head of state do not give grounds to judge with certainty about his ultimate goals in «European construction». On the contrary, the government representatives, in their dispute with the «European» opposition, explicitly stated their desire to create a «European federation», i.e., to achieve the political integration of Western Europe. However, the divergence of views on the further ways of «European construction» did not prevent the supporters Ch. De Gaulle from unanimously defending the policy of General de Gaulle.

Moreover, to Europeans, primarily the centrist opposition, defended the «Atlantic» form of integration. The issue of the European Parliament and, more generally, the creation of a European political power (and, of course, a common government) leading to the emergence of a single Western European State has taken an important place in this discussion. In response to the proposal of supporters of immediate political integration to elect the European Parliament by universal suffrage, the supporters Ch. De Gaulle developed the thesis that in modern conditions all the most important decisions in all areas are made by national governments.

«If governments cannot resolve various problems within their own countries, the European Parliament cannot either» (Jean de Lipkowski). The main arguments of the JNR party were: differences in history; geography; military policy; economy; diplomacy; and national traditions.

But at the same time, the UNR (Couv de Murville, de Lipkowski, and others) considered it necessary in principle to create a European parliament, provided that such a parliament would arise as the completion of the political restructuring of Western Europe, and not as its starting point. According to supporters Ch. De Gaulle, an agreement on the principle of a common European policy is more important than reaching an agreement on the creation of a European parliament. In

this regard, supporters Ch. De Gaulle repeatedly stressed that the real obstacle to «European development» is the lack of desire in Western European countries to create «cooperation, association, union and move together to the future».

It is not surprising that, due to the openly «Atlantic» views of France's Western European allies, primarily the FRG, the government was unable to create a «Europe of states» that would adhere to the concept of a «European Europe». In this regard, A. Grosser noted with irony that «the great failure of de Gaulle's European policy in 1963 was the erroneous assessment of the horses: the Trojan horse of the United States in Europe is the Federal Republic of Germany» (and not England).

The Gaullists had already understood this by the end of 1964. On November 3, in the National Assembly, Jean de Lipkowski stated unequivocally that «it was in Bonn that the spirit of the community was struck, not in Paris». He accused the FRG of not giving Europe the opportunity to «resist American pressure» [11].

One cannot seriously talk about nationalist ambitions, de Montale noted, if these ambitions must be shared by others in order to be realized. On November 3, 1964, in the National Assembly, a prominent expert on the Government's foreign policy, Christian de la Malaine, said: «Being a European means giving an advantage to Europe. If this advantage is denied, then the policy that is being implemented can have all the names and all the shades, except for the European one». He stressed that the only nationalism that the government defends is «European nationalism» [12].

While expressing their agreement in principle to the creation of a «political Europe», the Supporters Ch. De Gaulle also proposed concrete steps that, in their opinion, could ultimately lead to the creation of a «European Europe». On November 3, 1964, Jean de Lipkowski presented a plan for such measures to the National Assembly Lipkowski. He proposed the creation of a «council that regularly brings together the heads of Government of the six countries; a permanent secretariat capable of ensuring continuity of actions; a political commission responsible for preparing council decisions and monitoring their implementation».

Thus, despite the failure of the «Fouche plan» on April 6, 1962, the de Gaulleites did not lose hope that at least part of this plan would be implemented.

The question of the political integration of Western Europe, according to supporters Ch. De Gaulle can be resolved only when «the question of the political structure of Europe is resolved, that is, when Europeans acquire the habit of coordinating their interests and demands together, when European patriotism arises, which does not yet exist, and when the European nation can be founded» (speech to the National Assembly on October 29, 1965 by Alexander Sanguinetti).

Supporters Ch. De Gaulle repeatedly stressed that they disagree with the supporters of immediate political integration «in the ways of action», but strive «for the same ultimate goal».

The question of the relationship between the «European» and «Atlantic» forms of integration of Western Europe was again raised by Foreign Minister Couve de Murville in the spring of 1966. During the discussion on France's withdrawal from NATO, he admitted that none of France's partners share its views on European policy issues. Emphasizing the difference between the «European» and «Atlantic» concepts of integration, he said that with «Atlantic» integration, «European countries ipso facto lose their face and all independence». The concept of an «Atlantic» Europe, the Foreign Minister stressed, «does not stand up to three minutes of serious analysis and even less to the test of facts» B. Unlike in previous years, Couve de Murville admitted that to supporters Ch. De Gaulle, compared to the centrist and social reformist opposition, spoke of a «different idea of Europe».

While supporting the government's foreign policy, particularly European policy, the Independent Republicans have consistently emphasized that political integration is «the goal that all actions should strive for - first cooperation, then association, and finally federation». The main difference between the Supporters of Ch. De Gaulle and the «independent Republicans» on the issue of Western European integration were the following: first, the «independent Republicans»

considered it necessary to start political integration shortly (the supporters Ch. De Gaulle believed that political integration was unlikely in the near future), and, secondly, a way out of the crisis The «independent Republicans» proposed to find relations between France and its Atlantic partners within the framework of close ties that unite us with our Anglo-Saxon allies.

During the crisis of «European construction» in 1965, the «independent republicans» openly declared that they shared «some ideas of Maurice Faure», known for his «Atlanticism» and «Europeanism».

Thus, in the area of «European construction», the government majority generally supported de Gaulle's policy. Although, unlike the President of the Republic, the supporters Ch. De Gaulle demonstrated their desire for the political integration of Western Europe, they at the same time stubbornly defended the ideas of «Europe of States» and «European Europe».

Conclusion.

Thus, the French - the supporters of the «European» Europe noticeably prevail over the supporters of the «Atlantic». In France, there was also a large number of people who spoke out against both types of integration.

Moreover, polls showed that most French people saw de Gaulle as a strong supporter of a «European» Europe. In October 1964, 40% of French people believed that the government was right to question France's membership in the Common Market if agricultural issues were not resolved by 30 June 1965. Twenty percent accused de Gaulle of being wrong, and 40% did not express their opinion 36.

During the Common Market crisis in the summer of 1965, only 13% of those polled held the French government responsible, and 16% disapproved of the intransigence of its representatives at the Brussels talks.

In the course of a sharp political struggle, the supporters Ch. De Gaulle and their allies, speaking for a «European» Europe, refused immediate political integration, which would lead to even greater dependence on the United States. The non-communist left opposition, as well as the centrist parties, although from different positions, advocated the earliest «Atlantic» integration of Western Europe. Only the Communist Party, denying the reality of the existence of the «Common Market» and the objective tendency to the internationalization of production, stood for the strict preservation of national independence, against capitalist integration, for the broad development of good-neighborly cooperation with all European countries.

REFERENCES

- 1 Gogel Fr. La politique en France. Paris: Armand Colin. 1980. 300 p.
- 2 On S. Political life in France under the V Republic. Paris: Montchestien. 1982. 185 p.
- 3 Copin N. French political life: the president, the government, the parliament and the parties. Paris. 1978. 195 p.
- 4 Duverger M. Les constitution de la France. Paris: PUF. 1964. 124 p.
- 5 April P. Political evolution and constitutions of the V Republic. Paris: Pichon and Durand-Auzias, 1964. 344 p.
- 6 Debré M. The Republic and his neighbor. Bets: Nagel. 1950. P. 182-185.
- 7 Debré M. These princes who govern us. Paris: Plon, 1957. 22 p.
- 8 Gaulle Ch.de. Discours et messages. Paris: Plon. 1970. Vol.1. 678 p.; Vol.2. 664 p.; Vol.3. 443 p.
- 9 Gonidec P.F., Charvin R. International Relations. Paris. 1984. 435 p.
- 10 La France du XX s. Documents d'histoire présentes par O. Wieviorka et Ch. Prichasson. Paris. 1994. 734 p.
- 11 Tournoux J.-R. La Tragedie du general. Paris. 1967. 494 p.
- 12 Debré M. The French constitutional problem. Politique notebooks. 1944. №8. P. 13-17.

БЕСІНШІ РЕСПУБЛИКАНЫҢ ПАРТИЯЛЫҚ-САЯСИ ЖҮЙЕСІ ЖӘНЕ ЕУРОПАДАҒЫ ИНТЕГРАЦИЯ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ (50-60 ЖЖ. XX ҒАСЫР)

Андатпа.

Қазіргі Франция-аралас парламенттік-президенттік типтегі Республика. Бесінші Француз Республикасының саяси жүйесі бірқатар артықшылықтар мен кемшіліктерге ие, бірақ ол өзінің өміршеңдігін қазіргі уақытта дәлелдеді. Франция көрші Германиямен көшбасшылыққа таласып, Еуропалық одақтың жетекші елдерінің бірі болып табылады. Бір қызығы, аралас басқару формасы Франция тарихында жарқын көшбасшылармен үйлескен, ал бесінші республиканың атасы-Шарль де Голль. Тарихи даму Францияда күшті президенттік билікті алдын – ала анықтады. Президенттің айтарлықтай конституциялық құқықтары бар, ол үкіметті қалыптастырады, бірақ ол Ұлттық Ассамблеяның қолдауынсыз қалыпты жұмыс істей алмайды. Жалпы, республиканың аралас түріне қарамастан, ел Президентінің артықшылығы айқын. Франция тарихына үндеу, осылайша, еуропалық интеграция контекстіндегі партиялық-саяси жүйенің өзгеруін түсінудегі маңызды сәт болып табылады. Мақалада Бесінші Республиканың партиялық-саяси жүйесі және Еуропадағы интеграция мәселелері (XX ғасырдың 50-60 жылдары) еуропалық интеграция контекстінде, Батыс Еуропаның өркениеттік ерекшеліктері қарастырылады. Ол сонымен қатар еуропалық интеграция процесінің негізгі қатысушыларының бірі ретінде халықаралық қатынастардың жаңа жүйесі аясында Францияның партиялық-саяси жүйесін ұсынады. Сонымен қатар, Еуропалық құрылыстың дамуы мен кеңеюі Франциядағы жүйелік өзгерістердің динамикасына әсер етеді және оның саяси жүйесін өзгертеді.

Негізгі сөздер: Жаңа Республика, партиялық-саяси жүйе, конституциялық бағдарлама, парламент, жаңа Конституция, тарихи жады, қоғам.

ПАРТИЙНО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ СИСТЕМА ПЯТОЙ РЕСПУБЛИКИ И ПРОБЛЕМЫ ИНТЕГРАЦИИ В ЕВРОПЕ (50-60-Е ГОДЫ. XX ВЕК)

Аннотация.

Современная Франция является республикой смешанного парламентско-президентского типа. Политическая система Пятой французской республики обладает рядом преимуществ и недостатков, но она доказала свою жизнеспособность в Новейшее время. Франция является одной из ведущих стран Евросоюза, оспаривая лидерство с соседней Германией. Интересно, что смешанная форма правления сочеталась в истории Франции с яркими лидерами, а родоначальником Пятой республики является Шарль де Голль. Историческое развитие предопределило во Франции сильную президентскую власть – президент обладает значительными конституционными правами, именно он формирует правительство, которое, впрочем, не может нормально функционировать без поддержки Национального собрания. В целом, несмотря на смешанный тип республики, преимущество президента страны очевидно. Обращение к истории Франции, таким образом, является важным моментом в понимании трансформации партийно-политической системы в контексте европейской интеграции. В статье рассматривается партийно-политическая система Пятой Республики и проблемы интеграции в Европе (50-60-е годы XX века) в контексте европейской интеграции, цивилизационные особенности Западной Европы. В нем также представлена партийно-политическая система Франции в контексте новой системы международных отношений, как одного из основных участников процесса европейской интеграции. В то же время развитие и расширение европейского строительства влияют на динамику системных преобразований во Франции и меняют ее политическую систему.

Ключевые слова: Новая Республика, партийно-политическая система, конституционная программа, парламент, новая Конституция, историческая память, общество.

REFERENCES

- 1 Gogel Fr. La politique en France. Paris: Armand Colin. 1980. 300 p. [in English]
- 2 On S. Political life in France under the V Republic. Paris: Montchestien. 1982. 185 p. [in English]
- 3 Copin N. French political life: the president, the government, the parliament and the parties. Paris. 1978. 195 p. [in English]
- 4 Duverger M. Les constitution de la France. Paris: PUF. 1964. 124 p. [in English]
- 5 April P. Political evolution and constitutiones of the V Republic. Paris: Pichon and Durand-Auzias, 1964. 344 p. [in English]
- 6 Debré M. The Republic and his neighbor. Bets: Nagel. 1950. P. 182-185. [in English]
- 7 Debré M. These princes who govern us. Paris: Plon, 1957. 22 p. [in English]
- 8 Gaulle Ch.de. Discours et messages. Paris: Plon. 1970. Vol.1. 678 p.; Vol.2. 664 p.; Vol.3. 443 p. [in English]
- 9 Gonidec P.F., Charvin R. International Relations. Paris. 1984. 435 p. [in English]

- 10 La France du XX s. Documents d'histoire présentes par O. Wiewiorka et Ch. Prichasson. Paris. 1994. 734 p. [in English]
11 Tournoux J.-R. La Tragedie du general. Paris. 1967. 494 p. [in English]
12 Debré M. The French constitutional problem. Politique notebooks. 1944. №8. P. 13-17 [in English]

Information about authors:

Pyotr Koltsov – **corresponding author**, doctor of historical sciences, professor, B.B. Gorodovikov Kalmyk State University, Elista, Republic of Kalmykia

E-mail: petrkoltsov52@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9776-3650>

Kermen Koltsova – candidate of historical sciences, Researcher, B.B. Gorodovikov Kalmyk State University, Elista, Republic of Kalmykia

E-mail: carmenring@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4326-4026>

Информация об авторах:

Петр Кольцов – **основной автор**, доктор исторических наук, профессор, Калмыцкий государственный университет имени Б.Б. Городовикова, г. Элиста, Республика Калмыкия

E-mail: petrkoltsov52@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9776-3650>

Кермен Кольцова – кандидат исторических наук, научный сотрудник, Калмыцкий государственный университет имени Б.Б. Городовикова, г. Элиста, Республика Калмыкия

E-mail: carmenring@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4326-4026>

Авторлар туралы ақпарат:

Петр Кольцов – **негізгі автор**, тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Б.Б.Городовиков атындағы Қалмақ мемлекеттік университеті, Элиста қ., Қалмақ Республикасы

E-mail: petrkoltsov52@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9776-3650>

Кермен Кольцова – тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, ғылыми қызметкер, Б.Б.Городовиков атындағы Қалмақ мемлекеттік университеті, Элиста қ., Қалмақ Республикасы

E-mail: carmenring@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4326-4026>