

C E S R



Central Eurasian Studies Review

Volume 6

Number 1/2

The **CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES REVIEW (CESR)** is the online publication of the Central Eurasian Studies Society (CESS). Its institutional host is the Center for Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia (CREECA) at the University of Wisconsin -- Madison. CESR is a scholarly review of research, resources, events, publications and developments in scholarship and teaching on Central Eurasia. CESR appears two times annually (Spring and Fall) beginning with Volume 7 (2008) and is available free of charge to dues paying members of CESS. The print version is available by subscription at a rate of \$40 per year to institutions within North America and \$55 outside North America. CESR is also available to all interested readers via the web at <http://www.cesr-cess.org>.

CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES REVIEW Editorial Staff

Chief Editor: Virginia Martin (Madison, Wisc., USA)

Section Editors:

Research Reports: Jamilya Ukudeeva (Aptos, Calif., USA)

Conferences and Lecture Series: Pınar Akçalı (Ankara, Turkey) and Daniel Schafer (Nashville, Tenn., USA)

Educational Resources and Developments: Sarah Amsler (Kingston-upon-Thames, UK)

Perspectives: Edward Lazzerini (Bloomington, Ind., USA)

Editors-at-Large: Ildikó Bellér-Hann (Halle, Germany), Ali İğmen (Long Beach, Calif., USA), Sébastien Peyrouse (Mennecey, France), Uyama Tomohiko (Sapporo, Japan)

Production & Web Editor: Michael X. Albrecht (Madison, Wisc., USA)

Copy & Style Editor: Amy Forster Rothbart (Madison, Wisc., USA)

Editorial and Production Consultant: John Schoeberlein (Cambridge, Mass., USA)

Manuscripts and other editorial correspondence (letters to the editors, formal responses to CESR articles, etc.) and inquiries about advertising in CESR should be addressed to: Dr. Virginia Martin, vmartin2@wisc.edu.

Please consult our website at <http://www.cesr-cess.org> for other information, including new contact addresses and guidelines for contributors.

CESR no longer publishes reviews, and by current arrangement, CESS relies on *Central Asian Survey* for this. Publishers should send their new books for review to: Central Asian Survey, casurvey@soas.ac.uk

Business correspondence, including membership and subscription information, back issues, changes of address and related communications should be addressed to: The Central Eurasian Studies Society.

CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES SOCIETY

c/o The Havighurst Center
Harrison Hall, Miami University
Oxford, Ohio 45056, USA

Tel.: +1/513-529-0241

Fax: +1/513-529-0242

E-mail: CESS@muohio.edu

<http://www.cess.muohio.edu>



Central Eurasian Studies Review

Publication of the Central Eurasian Studies Society

Volume 6, Number 1/2

Fall 2007

ISSN 1543-7817

CONTENTS

RESEARCH REPORTS

- Writing the Dostumname: Field Research With an Uzbek Warlord in Afghan Turkistan*, Brian Glyn Williams.....2
- The Turkmen in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Persian Chronicles*, Arash Khazeni.....8
- Foreign Direct Investment in the Caucasus and Central Asia: A Comparative Analysis of Sectoral Patterns and Source Countries*, Serkan Yalcin.....13
- The Relationship between the Kyrgyz SSR and the Center in the Middle Khrushchev Period (1957-61) Based on Materials from Four Archives in Moscow and Bishkek*, Chida Tetsuro.....15

CONFERENCES AND LECTURE SERIES

- The Eurasian World: History, Present, Prospects*, Reported by Aigerim Shilbekova21
- Eurasian Women and Self-Reliance: Religion and Education in the Contemporary World*, Reported by Ali İgmen22
- IFEAC Regional Seminar: History, Politics and Culture of Identities in Central Asia*, Reported by Olivier Ferrando.....24
- Central Asia: Sharing Experiences and Prospects. The Tenth Conference of the European Society for Central Asian Studies*, Reported by Pınar Akçalı.....26
- Central Eurasia at the 38th International Congress of Asian and North African Studies (ICANAS)*, Reported by Ayşe Çolpan Kavuncu29
- The Roads of Pilgrimage (Hajj, Ziyarat) between Central Asia and the Hejaz*, Reported by Stéphane Dudoignon31
- Central Asian Workshop for Doctoral and Post-Doctoral Students*, Reported by Madeleine Reeves and Olivier Ferrando.....34
- The Eighth Annual Conference of the Central Eurasian Studies Society*, Compiled by Daniel Schafer38

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENTS

- Central Eurasian Studies in France*, Sébastien Peyrouse.....44
- Opportunities and Obstacles for Central Eurasian Studies at the University of Toronto*, Edward Schatz46
- Enhance Your Teaching of Central Eurasia with Images from Art Museum Collections on the Internet*, Daniel C. Waugh.....48

IN MEMORIAM: TRIBUTES TO CESS HONORARY MEMBERS

- Omeljan Pritsak, 1919-2006.....55
- Boris Il'ich Marshak, 1933-200656
- Roziia Galievna Mukminova, 1922-200764

- Letter to the Editors68

Research Reports

Writing the Dostumname: Field Research With an Uzbek Warlord in Afghan Turkistan

Brian Glyn Williams, Associate Professor, Department of History, University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth, Dartmouth, Mass., USA, bwilliams@umassd.edu, www.brianglynwilliams.com.

In the summer of 2003 I did something that Central Asianists and Afghan specialists rarely do: I traveled from Kabul over the Hindu Kush Mountains, down to the plains of Afghan Turkistan. My objective was to research a book about an Uzbek war leader whose people have been largely ignored by Western academics. Once there I made my way to the shrine town of Mazar-i Sharif where I lived with the Uzbek warlord, General Abdul Rashid Dostum, “the Taliban Killer.”

On this trip and subsequent expeditions in 2005 and 2007, I came to know not only Dostum, but his people, the Afghan Uzbeks. I found that they do not fully fit into Afghanistan or traditionally-defined Central Asia (the five post-Soviet republics). Rather they live somewhere in between.

It was this marginality that first drew me to this region and its people. I have long been fascinated by the Afghan Uzbeks for the simple reason that the location of their homeland means they have not undergone Sovietization. Far from being an example of *Sovetskii chelovek* [Soviet man], the Uzbeks of Afghan Turkistan appeared to have preserved many facets of their original Islamic Central Asian heritage that were lost to their kin in the Soviet Union.

While traversing the plains and foothills of Afghan Turkistan, I found Uzbeks living in the Hindu Kush Mountains in *yurts*, playing horse-mounted games such as *buzkashi*, fighting their enemies on horseback (now with rocket propelled grenades and AK-47s instead of compound bows), veiling their women in *chadors* or *burqas*, living in armed communal fortresses called *qalas*, visiting *mullahs* to receive protection from the evil eye and *almastis* [female spirits], and creating politico-military alliances that resembled those of Abdul Khayr Shaybani, and other heroes of the Uzbek *dastans* [legends].

Needless to say, the Uzbeks of Afghan Turkistan provided me with a unique insight into Uzbek culture as it was before the coming Russians in the 19th century. But most unexpectedly, my

experience also provided me with considerable insight into the ways that the Afghan Uzbeks were defined as “barbarians” and “outsiders” by their own 19th century conquerors, the Pashtuns (the ethnic group that created Afghanistan as a unified state in the mid-1800s). Living in the north with the Uzbeks, and to a lesser degree Turkmen, gave me an ethnoprovincial perspective on the central government and the dominant Pashtuns that is missing in mainstream Afghan histories. In many ways this counter-perspective helped me understand the actions that have made the “*Pasha*” [General] Abdul Rashid Dostum one of the most feared and least understood leaders in modern Afghan history.

Background: General Abdul Rashid Dostum

For those Central Asianists whose research focus does not extend beyond the Amu Darya River to Afghan Turkistan, a bit of a background will be useful. Dostum is the Uzbek *jang salar* [warlord] who led a 50,000 man pro-Communist government army against the *Mujahidin* prior to 1992. From 1992 to 1998 he controlled a secular Afghan mini-state in northern Afghanistan based in his capital, Mazar-i Sharif. Armed with Scud missiles, MiGs, hundreds of Soviet-built tanks, and thousands of cavalrymen, Dostum was described at the time as “one of the best equipped and armed warlords ever” (Cooper 2003).

Not surprisingly, General Dostum is despised by many (but not all) of his former Mujahidin opponents, and loathed as a whiskey-drinking “infidel” by the Arab *Jihadis* and the Taliban who died in large numbers fighting his fierce *gilamjam* [carpet thief] troops. The Taliban’s enmity increased when Dostum’s horse-mounted *cheriks* [raiders] joined with US Green Berets to destroy the Taliban army of the north during Operation Enduring Freedom. Dostum gained world attention when his horsemen, who rode into battle with close air support rendered by US bombers, subsequently captured Johnny Walker Lindh (the American

Taliban fighter) and hundreds of Al Qaeda 055 Brigade *Ansars* [“Supporter” shock troops].

Since then, Dostum has had the unique experience of surviving a retaliatory Al Qaeda suicide bombing attack even as he has deflected attempts by Western defenders of human rights groups trying to prosecute him for killing too many Taliban and Al Qaeda fighters.¹

Little of this anger is grounded in fact. Few outsiders have taken the time to ask what motivates Dostum. Fewer still have traveled to his inaccessible realm to assess the ways he is perceived among people of his region. All too often Dostum has been simplistically defined as an abstract warlord belonging to a race of Central Asian “barbarians,” not as a community leader who has genuine support among his own ethnic constituency.

My book project aims to bring Dostum to life as a three-dimensional human and shed light on his ethnic community. It also seeks to explain what drove him and his people to fight for almost 25 years against a variety of foes ranging from Massoud, “the Lion of Panjsher”, to Bin Laden. To understand Dostum I interviewed those who opposed him, including Massoud’s commanders in the Panjsher Valley and Kabul, Mujahidin opponents in the north (Pashtuns, Uzbeks and Turkmen), Taliban leaders and prisoners of war, and members of the Karzai administration who have sought to curtail his power. My most extensive interviews were with Dostum himself.

While it was initially difficult getting Dostum to open to me, he eventually did come to trust me and share tales of past betrayals, the loss of his wife to a gunshot wound when he was off campaigning and his role in fighting against such widely revered figures as Massoud. In these filmed interviews, which were usually carried out in the company of family members, sub-commanders, *aqsaqal* [white beard] tribal elders, and women’s rights activists, Dostum would bring to life stories from his past. My greatest difficulty was getting Dostum, who is a gregarious host and wonderful storyteller, to provide me with a linear, fact-filled history. I found that Dostum was first and foremost a fighting man. As such he was more concentrated on the exigencies of

battle and tribal politics than on his role in the greater flow of history.

For all of their flaws, the stories I collected from Dostum, his friends, and his foes form a unique record of one of the most turbulent chapters in Central Asian history and help bring to life this major player in modern Afghan history.

General Dostum. Demystifying a Warlord.

Before I began this project I realized I was up against an image of Dostum that defined him as a modern-day Chinggis Khan. In his bestseller *The Taliban: Militant Islam, Oil and Fundamentalism in Central Asia*, for example, Ahmed Rashid (2001) captured the Western perception of Dostum and his people using racist language that would make any Central Asianist cringe. In the description of his visit to Dostum’s headquarters in the Qala-i Jangi fortress — an account which has since been mainstreamed by the world media — Rashid writes:

He wielded power ruthlessly. The first time I arrived at the fort to meet Dostum there were bloodstains and pieces of flesh in the muddy courtyard. I innocently asked the guards if a goat had been slaughtered. They told me that a man had been tied to the tracks of a Russian-made tank, which then drove around the courtyard crushing his body to mincemeat, as the garrison and Dostum watched. The Uzbeks, the roughest and toughest of all Central Asian nationalities, are noted for their love of marauding and pillaging — a hangover from their origins as a part of Genghis Khan’s hordes and Dostum was an apt leader. Over six feet tall with bulging biceps, Dostum is a bear of a man with a gruff laugh, which, some Uzbeks swear, has on occasion frightened people to death (56).

One does not need to have an awareness of Turcophobia to sense a mixture of Orientalism, journalistic sensationalism, and a more latent pro-Pashtun sentiment in this description of the ogre-like Dostum and his “pillaging” people. Needless to say, when I visited Dostum I saw no one “laughed to death.” Nor did I find his people raping and pillaging in medieval Mongol fashion. (More on the tank episode later.)

What I did find was a communal leader who held court every evening with hundreds of *aqsaqals*, women’s activists, *komandans* [regional commanders], local government officials and

¹ *Newsweek* and an Irish producer named Jamie Doran have both insinuated that Dostum engaged in a Srebrenica-style massacre of “thousands” of captured Taliban prisoners; no proof of these claims has ever been offered (Ingram 2001).

average Afghans of all ethnic backgrounds who came to him with petitions.²

As each meeting commenced with a prayer by a mullah and often a poem read in Dostum's honor, the turbaned elders turned to him (he was seated at the head of the *shura* [consultative gathering] in a large chair flanked by bodyguards) to solve their problems. One angry petitioner from the town of Qizil Ayak claimed that his school had no chairs for its students. Where were the chairs Dostum had promised as part of his new emphasis on education? Dostum solemnly heard his case then had his accountant write a check for \$1000 dollars for the school. Another petitioner claimed that his sister had been raped by a local komandan and Dostum growled for him to be brought to him to face a trial. Night after night these open air gatherings took place in Dostum's massive walled compound in Sheberghan (his home base west of Mazar) and I had the feeling I was witnessing a ritual that was as old as the Uzbeks themselves.

Later, while walking through the bazaars, I found many locals with pictures and calendars featuring Dostum. I also found that videos featuring images of Dostum waging war on horseback against the Taliban — or being greeted by tens of thousands of cheering northerners when he liberated Mazar-i Sharif — were readily available.

When I discussed the respect with which many Turkmen and Uzbeks of the north seemed to treat their local jang salar, responses varied. Some agreed that he was a warlord, but that he was *their* warlord (i.e., he was a Turkic Uzbek).³ For all his faults, Dostum was tough and had saved them from the horrors of the Pashtun Taliban. Others who were more politically aware hotly disputed the term “jang salar” for their leader. They defined Dostum as the bona fide representative of his people in the struggle for resources and power in Afghanistan. One elderly Turkmen aqsaqal explained to me in Dostum's base at Sheberghan:

Whenever the Pashtuns send someone to murder us and steal from us he is called a king

² For pictures of Dostum's shuras and his northern realm see my website at <http://www.brianglynwilliams.com>, under “Field Research.”

³ Dostum ran for president in the Afghan elections and garnered 10 percent of the vote, which is roughly equal to the Turkmen-Uzbek population in Afghanistan. He does have rivals for power in the north, but no one with his clout and “nam” (a Persian word meaning a “name” which is required to gain followers).

or a president or a Talib *amir*. But when one of our own protects us, they call him a “warlord.” We call him our *Baba* [father]. He defends the interests of the Turkmen and Uzbeks of Turkistan against the *kalchai* (a slang term for Pashtuns who are stereotyped as having long hair and not washing for their prayers). Turkistan is our land not theirs, and he is our leader.

“We Live in Turkistan, We Are Not Afghans.” Assessing Uzbek Counter-Memory

In my travels from the Tajik foothills east of Kunduz to the deserts bordering Turkmenistan, I found that few of those I interviewed referred to their homeland as Afghanistan. The term Turkistan was invariably used to describe the plains of northern Afghanistan. I was once corrected when I called it Afghan Turkistan by an Uzbek politician who told me: “In Britain they don't call it English Scotland, so why should we include the word Afghan when naming our province?” Even Pashtun elders living in Balkh and Taliban prisoners of war whom I interviewed in Dostum's prison-fortress in Sheberghan referred to the north as Turkistan.

Not surprisingly, Uzbeks also have a counter-memory of the loss of Turkistan's independence to the 19th century Afghan-Pashtuns. This version flies in the face of the official Afghan history, which has been uncritically accepted by the (Pashtun-dominated) Karzai government's Western supporters. Far from stressing the mythical harmonious “unification” of Afghanistan, the Uzbeks, Turkmen and Tajiks of Afghan Turkistan have trans-generational stories that speak of mass slaughter, ethnic cleansing, and other horrors inflicted on their ancestors by the conquering Afghan-Pashtuns (southern Turkistan was conquered by the Afghans from 1854 to 1884). While few if any of my interviewees were dedicated nationalists of the sort I found in the Balkans, almost everyone knew the famous story of Pashtun ruler Abdur Rahman's cannons. According to local lore, in the 1880s Abdur Rahman (the “Iron Amir” who is often defined as an “Afghan Bismarck” in histories of Afghanistan), had the Uzbeks' *ishans*, mullahs, khans, and aqsaqals chained to cannons and blown to pieces to cow them into submission.

While I assumed this was merely a legend, I met an Uzbek politician named Zaki Faizullah, currently a member of the Afghan parliament, who directed me to the *Taj ul Tawreeq* [The Crown of

History] (Abdul Rahman Khan 1905). I was stunned to find that this 1905 account of Abdul Rahman Khan's reign is full of accounts of the very sort of atrocity I had thought was myth. Afghan history primers and official histories, however, make no mention of this bloody episode. They invariably define those tribal leaders who fought to defend their own people (including an Uzbek khan from the Loqay tribe who led a final, doomed rebellion in the 1930s) as *ashraran* [rebels] or *jang salaran* [warlords].

The Afghans are not the only ones who have whitewashed this bloody chapter in history, which saw tens of thousands of Uzbeks slaughtered and displaced by the victorious Pashtuns (who were incidentally armed with modern weapons by their British sponsors). To my knowledge there is only one book in the English language that sheds light on this hidden chapter in 19th century Afghan history, and that is John Lee's remarkable work *The Ancient Supremacy: Bukhara, Afghanistan and the Battle for Balkh, 1731-1901* (1995, Chapters 10 and 11). This account demonstrates that thousands of Uzbeks, Turkmen, Tajiks and Hazaras were led from their newly subjugated land to the Afghan-Pashtun capital, Kabul. Many of these were subsequently cut to pieces, strangled, poisoned, hanged, dismembered, boiled, crucified, disemboweled, sawed in half or killed by having their mouths slit open and being left to bleed to death.

Clearly the collective memory of this conquest helps explain the centrifugal forces operating in the northern provinces. It also helps explain why an Uzbek commander like Dostum might want to fight for autonomy from the Pashtun-dominated central government that discriminated against his people. But it still does not answer the most vexing question: What made Dostum fight for the Communists when all of Afghanistan's other ethnic groups supported the heroic Mujahidin?

Dostum, the "Red Khan"

Dostum's enemies have long declared him both a "pro-government Communist infidel" and a "traitor" for his role in overthrowing the very Afghan government with which he is accused of collaborating. There is some basis for both these claims, as I discovered in my research. It seems that Dostum rose to power in the early days of the anti-Soviet jihad as the head of a local government defense militia. In the 1980s this militia defended the oil wells and gas refineries of the north from the Mujahidin raiders.

Dostum was originally an impoverished gas worker and when the Mujahidin began to attack the wells he had helped build, he and the local men agreed to work for the government to defend them. Their counter-insurgency efforts were so effective that, I was told, Dostum's home base of Sheberghan became known as "Little Moscow."⁴ As his Turkmen and Uzbek Mujahidin opponents were denied weapons by Pashtun and Tajik Mujahidin parties in Pakistan (I was told that these parties did not want to empower the "flat noses" — i.e., the "Mongol" Hazaras, Turkmen, and Uzbeks), they increasingly gravitated to Dostum and the north was pacified.

As word of Dostum's effectiveness spread to Kabul, he was allowed to arm more of his people and eventually formed the 53rd Brigade. This pro-government rapid reaction force was subsequently deployed beyond Turkistan in subduing Pashtun Mujahidin in the Pashtun provinces of Kandahar and Khost, a mission they appear to have relished. It was Dostum's militia that propped up the Pashtun Communist President Najibullah for three long years after the retreat of the Soviet Army.

But in 1992 Dostum went over to the mujahideen and joined the legendary Tajik commander, Massoud, in bringing down his former ally, President Najibullah. When I asked Dostum why he had fought against the Mujahidin for "Najib" and then betrayed him, he was typically straightforward and unapologetic. His answer also sheds considerable light on the ethnic motives that drove his Uzbeks to partake in a complex war that was simplistically defined in the Americans' mind as a Manichean struggle between Communism and "freedom fighters":

The Parchami [moderate] Communists offered us our rights. For the first time they gave us (the Uzbeks) our own newspaper, they built schools and clinics. When the outside Mujahidin came with their talk of enforcing shariah and endless jihad they burnt everything so we fought back. We wanted modern things like in Uzbekistan. [...]

But I stayed friends with the local Mujahidin the whole time. They [the Pakistani-based Mujahidin parties] never really let the Turks have their own party and this also helped me.

⁴ There are many parallels here to the US military's increasing reliance on Sunni sheikhs in Iraq's Anbar province to fight Al Qaeda in Iraq.

Everyone eventually saw that the jihad was about ethnic groups fighting for power. Hekmatyar and Massoud used Uzbek Mujahidin to gain power for their ethnic groups (the Pashtuns and Tajiks) and everyone saw this. We Turks were the last to become involved. I trusted people from all groups prior to this. I admired and trusted the Pashtuns, but I learned my lesson. [...]

When Najibullah saw that my brigade had gained real power he remembered his Pashtun roots and tried to have me destroyed. His advisors told him that his *ghulam* [slave]⁵ was becoming too strong. Better to kill him and make peace with the Pashtun Mujahidin parties so the Turks don't gain power, they said. [...]

So I moved to defend myself and my people, that's why I joined Massoud. We northerners sometimes stick together. All the Turkmen and Uzbek Mujahidin came over to me. Many Hazaras, Aimaqs, Tajiks, and Pashtuns also came to live under my protection in Mazar-i Sharif when the Mujahidin and Taliban began enforcing their shariah laws. Many people from many groups liked me. Women could go to school here when the Mujahidin stopped them in other places.

While I was initially skeptical of many of Dostum's claims, I subsequently found that there had indeed been a *korenizatsiia* program implemented by the moderate Parchami faction of the Afghan Communist Party when it came to power in 1978.⁶ I was shown old copies of the *Yulduz* [Star] newspaper, which was published for the first time in the Uzbek language after 1978. It was at this time that the Communist government allowed non-Pashtuns like Dostum to rise above the level of lieutenant in the army.

Dostum's claim that people from other groups came to Mazar-i Sharif to live under his secular-moderate rule during the civil wars (which did not impact his protected capital) were also confirmed by numerous interviewees of all backgrounds in Mazar.⁷ One of Dostum's Mujahidin rivals even

admitted to me: "Dostum was opportunist, yes, but he was no Communist. He couldn't even tell you what Communism was about. That was why we ended up accepting him and supporting him in the 1990s."

As for the notorious tank incident which has become the single defining moment of Dostum's career, Dostum laughed when I asked him about it. Of course he denied that it was true. One of his aides later showed me a letter from Ahmed Rashid (which also appeared in a book on Dostum in Turkish) that apologized for the second-hand claim (Selim 2004: 312).

Still, the image of Dostum as neo-Chinggis Khan tearing his enemies apart with tanks lives on and was even used by a British parliament member to table a motion that he be tried for war crimes. While Dostum is certainly a warlord who has blood on his hands (most notably from his role in destroying Kabul in the Afghan Civil War), it would appear that much of what has been written about him is unsubstantiated or based on lack of awareness of Afghanistan's complex ethnic divides. In the text below, I trace the dissemination of the account of Dostum's running over one of his own troops to demonstrate the demonization by an uncritical Western press of the Afghan Uzbeks's most popular leader. Observe how Dostum's alleged execution of *one* of his soldiers for a war crime has led to accusations that he runs over the following groups with tanks: enemy captives, criminals, opponents from other groups, political opponents, and his own soldiers.

Dostum the "Tank Crusher." The Creation of a Central Asian Myth

Step 1: Dostum is accused by a *secondary source* of having run over a *looter* with a tank.

"Dostum, whose troops are often accused by his critics of plundering, is accused of having executed *one of his own soldiers for stealing in war time.*" (Rashid 2001: 56).

Step 2: This *single* incident becomes the defining act of Dostum's career.

"General Dostum has a particularly wretched record. Dostum is *remembered* for once punishing a soldier in Mazar-i Sharif for stealing by crushing his body under a tank" (Swain 2001). (Victim: "punished soldier").

⁵ The term *ghulam* is politically loaded and refers to the Turkic slaves who were long used by Persian and Arab rulers as warriors.

⁶ *Korenizatsiia* was the Soviet program of "positive discrimination" for ethnic minorities. For more on *korenizatsiia* see my book (Williams 2001, Chapter 11).

⁷ For a fascinating online BBC video journey to Dostum's

realm in 1996 see: "Dostum the Kingmaker" found at: <http://www.journeyman.tv/?lid=9054>.

Step 3: The *lone* victim becomes many victims.

“The strongmen don’t come any stronger than General Abdul Rashid Dostum. A former communist general is *known* to have ordered enemy captives crushed under a Russian tank” (McGirk 2004). (Victim: “enemy captives,” *plural*).

Step 4: The *lone* incident becomes “*frequent*” occurrence vis-à-vis criminals.

“He is *reported* to have frequently ordered public executions of criminals, who were usually crushed to death under tanks” (GlobalSecurity.org n.d., italics added). (Victim: “criminals,” *plural*).

Step 5: Remove conditional clauses (“reported,” etc.) to make this frequent occurrence a known *fact*, and extend to ethnic groups.

“He frequently ordered public executions of criminals and opponents from other ethnic groups, many of whom were crushed to death under his Russian tanks” (Phillips 2004). (Victim: “criminals/opponents from other ethnic groups”).

Step 6: Gruesome descriptions are added to embellish killings.

“Described by the *Chicago Sun Times* (10/21/01) as a ‘cruel and cunning warlord,’ he is *reported* to use tanks to rip apart political opponents or crush them to death” (Phillips 2006; italics added). (Victim: “political opponents,” *plural*).

Step 7: Add further creative details for effect.

“Dostum is known for tying opponents to tank tracks and running them over. He crammed prisoners into metal containers in the searing sun, causing scores to die of heat and thirst” (Murray 2007). (Victim: “opponents,” *plural*).

Step 8: Be creative and add your own Chinggis Khanesque details.

“General Rashid Dostum is in the habit of punishing his soldiers by tying them to tank tracks and then driving the tanks around his barracks’ square to turn them into mincemeat. Not only is Gen. Dostum a massive man who can eat twelve chickens and drink more than two quarts of vodka at one sitting, he is perhaps the greatest challenge to Hamid Karzai’s power. This contrasts with screams from his compound that can be heard more than 300 yards away. One of Gen. Dostum’s soldiers explains: ‘Mohammed was caught doing something he shouldn’t have, and now they are skinning him alive’” (Bushell 2002). (Victim: “his own soldiers,” *plural*).

What is most alarming about the uncritical acceptance of such myths is that it shapes US policy on the ground in Afghanistan. US troops based in Afghanistan, for example, have been advised to read Ahmed Rashid’s book, *The Taliban*, featuring the Dostum-tank incident, as a backgrounder to their theater of deployment. Not surprisingly, American soldiers whom I interviewed at Bagram Air Field north of Kabul uncritically accepted the notion that Dostum was a blood-soaked warlord who murdered his followers and enemies with tanks. His role in leading the decisive cavalry charge that destroyed the Taliban army of the north, at a time when the US was desperate for some victory in the war on Al Qaeda, has been largely forgotten.

For his part, Dostum continues to hold the US in high regard. At the entrance to his home base of Sheberghan he has erected a most unusual billboard, featuring him and two US soldiers, which proclaims: “Thanks to the American military which helped the Afghan people in the fight against international terrorism.” Among Dostum’s most treasured possessions is a plaque given to him by a US Special Force A-Team thanking him for his assistance in Operation Enduring Freedom and acknowledging him as an honorary member of their team.

On my final day with Dostum, he asked me to send greetings to Commander Mark Nutsch the “Jasur” [the Brave], who fought alongside him in November 2001. As a parting gift he also gave me a beautiful red Turkmen carpet that now rests on the floor in my study. When I see it I remember a man who seemed to be happy with the peace that had finally come to his land and optimistic about his people’s future in the American protectorate of Afghanistan. While I continue to read articles in the press about Dostum, the Chinggis Khanesque warlord, I have only to look at that carpet to recall him as a three-dimensional man who, for better or worse, is the living history of his land and his people.

References

- Abdul Rahman Khan, Ameer
1905 *Taj ul Tawreeq, Vol. II*. Bombay: Digital Library of India, <http://dli.iit.ac.in>.
- Bushell, Andrew
2002 “Dostum, challenger to Karzai is cunning, barbaric: Uzbek warlord remains enigma,” *The Washington Times* (Washington, DC), February 23, 2002.

- Cooper, Tom
2003 "Afghanistan without the Soviets," Part 3. *Air Combat Information Journal*. October 29, 2003.
- Globalsecurity.org
n.d. "Abdul Rashid Dostum," *Global Security*. *Globalsecurity.org* Alexandria, Virginia.
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/afghanistan/dostum.htm>.
- Ingram, Mike
2001 "Why Britain should be charged for war crimes: The SAS role in the Qala-i-Janghi massacre," *World Socialist Website*. December 10, 2001. International Committee of the Fourth International.
<http://www.wsws.org/articles/2001/dec2001/sas-d10.shtml>.
- Lee, John
1995 *The Ancient Supremacy. Bukhara, Afghanistan and the Battle for Balkh, 1731-1901*. Leiden: Brill.
- McGirk, Tim
2004 "Inside Karzai's campaign," *Time Magazine* (New York). October 11, 2004.
<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,995337-2,00.html>.
- Murray, Craig
2007 "Britain is protecting the biggest heroin crop of all time," *Daily Mail*. July 21, 2007.
- UK.
http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/news.html?in_article_id=469983&in_page_id=1770.
- Phillips, Catherine
2004 "From brutal warlord to 'Our Hero of Peace' — now he wants to be Afghanistan's president," *The Times* (London). September 29, 2004.
- Phillips, Peter
2006 "Corporate media ignores US hypocrisy on war crimes," *Project Censored*.
<http://www.projectcensored.org/newsflash/corporatemedias.html>.
- Rashid, Ahmed
2001 *The Taliban. Militant Islam, Oil and Fundamentalism in Central Asia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Selim, Yavuz
2004 *Dostum ve Afganistan*. Ankara: Grafika.
- Swain, John
2001 "The Northern Alliance's cruel history: Mujaheddin write their name in blood," *The Sunday Times* (London), November 11, 2001.
- Williams, Brian
2001 *The Crimean Tatars: The Diaspora Experience and the Forging of a Nation*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

The Turkmen in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Persian Chronicles

Arash Khazeni, Assistant Professor, Department of History, Claremont McKenna College, Claremont, Calif., USA, arash.khazeni@claremontmckenna.edu

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Iranian periphery was home to various independent ethnic groups and pastoral nomadic tribes [*tawayif; ilyat*]. Among these autonomous tribes on the empire's edge were the Turkmen nomads on Iran's eastern frontier with Central Asia. The Turkmen and their history are depicted in Persian chronicles, gazetteers, and travel books (*safarnama*) that surveyed the land and peoples between the eastern shores of the Caspian Sea and the Amu Darya River. While these texts are state-centric in their outlook, depicting the Turkmen as primitive and violent tribes of the borderlands, they may be read alternately to reveal the ethnic and cultural

differences, nomadic freedom, and autonomy that flourished on the margins of early modern Iran. In the past, Persian histories, geographical chronicles, and travelogues have been used to reconstruct Iran's political history, but their importance as sources for the study of social and cultural history has only recently begun to be appreciated (Alam and Subrahmanyam 2006). This project rereads Persian chronicles for the study of culture and ethnicity on the eastern frontiers of Iran. In these texts, the Turkmen gallop off the pages in raids (*chapu, alaman, takht wa taz*), plundering and carrying off slaves from the eastern Persian province of Khorasan. Below the surface, however, these

histories reveal an awareness of ethnic and cultural difference in the land the Iranians called the Turkmen Sahra, or “Desert of the Turkmen.” The following pages will briefly explore representations of the Turkmen tribes in a number of 18th and 19th century Persian imperial histories.

Persian Histories, Ethnographies, and Travel Books

With the Afghan invasion of Isfahan and the fall of the Safavid Dynasty in 1722, Iran entered a period of dynastic instability and resurgent tribalism. This was perhaps nowhere more evident than on Iran’s fluid eastern frontier, which saw at this time persistent nomadic migrations (Astarabadi 1989: 2-3; Amanat 1997: 15). Nadir Shah Afshar (1736-1747) briefly restored an ephemeral order on this frontier, defeating the Afghans, establishing nominal authority over the Turkmen and moving the capital from Isfahan to Mashhad in the eastern province of Khorasan. But following Nadir Shah’s death in 1747, the empire again belonged to the “kings of the tribes” (*muluk-i tawayif*). In the mid-eighteenth century, with the Persian Zand capital in distant Shiraz, Turkmen nomads, including the Tekke, the Saruk, the Salor and the Ersari, poured into the eastern borderlands of Iran, settling in Marv, in Sarakhs and along the banks of the Amu Darya and the Murghab (O’Donovan 1882: 170-171). Through most of the nineteenth century, the Turkmen remained independent of the Qajar dynasty and enjoyed great autonomy on the eastern frontier. In 1861, the Tekke Turkmen defeated thousands of Persian troops who had marched in a campaign on Marv, capturing their guns and chasing the surviving troops across the desert (Blocqueville 1866: *passim*). The disastrous defeat signaled Iran’s diminishing frontiers to the east, which was also evidenced by the loss of Herat to Afghanistan in 1857 (Amanat 1997: 225-232). The pacification and settlement of the Turkmen would become the project of the more intrusive Russian Empire, which was fast advancing across the steppes with the Trans-Caspian Railway and annexing the oases of Central Asia.

Eighteenth and nineteenth century histories by necessity took account of the Turkmen and the tribalism that prevailed on Iran’s Central Asian frontier, providing a rich record of tribal and nomadic cultures on the edges of Iran. The dynastic instability and the pervasive tribalism of the eighteenth century are described in chronicles written during the reign of Nadir Shah. Among these is the Afshar chronicle of the mid-eighteenth century *Alamara-yi Nadiri* by Muhammad Kazim Marvi, the

Vazir of Marv. It is an ornate history that presents the restless and free nomads on Iran’s eastern frontier. Another important official chronicle from the Afshar period is *Jahangusha-yi Nadiri*, written by Mirza Mahdi Khan Astarabadi, Nadir Shah’s secretary of the provinces (*munshi al-mamalik*). The Afshar chronicles describe the uprisings, rebellions and raids of the Turkmen and Nadir Shah’s repeated attempts to pacify them.

Histories from the Qajar period (1785-1925) that shed light on the society and culture of the Turkmen include the mid-nineteenth century chronicles *Nasikh al-Tawarikh* by Mirza Muhammad Taqi Lisan al-Mulk Sipihri (1998) and *Rawzat al-Safa-yi Nasiri*, Riza Quli Khan Hidayat’s edition and supplement to Mirkhwand’s chronicle, *Rawzat al-Safa* (2001). Among the other Qajar sources that deal with the Turkmen are Muhammad Hasan Khan I’timad al-Saltana’s geographical dictionary *Mir’at al-Buldan* (1988) and official history *Tarikh-i Muntazam-i Nasiri* (1963), Iran’s first newspaper *Ruznama-yi Waqayi’-i Ittifaqiya* (1997), and Mirza Abu al-Hasan Sani al-Mulk Ghaffari’s illustrated gazetteer *Ruznama-yi Dawlat-i ‘Alliya-yi Iran* (1991). Also of note is the early nineteenth century Persian chronicle *Histoire de l’Asie Centrale* (1876) by Mir ‘Abd al-Karim Bukhari. To these sources may be added nineteenth-century travel literature on the Turkmen frontier. *Safarnama* depicting the Turkmen and their environment include Riza Quli Khan Hidayat’s *Safarnama-yi Khwarazm* (1876), ‘Abdallah Qaragazlu Hamadani’s *Diyar-i Turkmen* (1992), and Sarhang Isma’il Mirpanja, *Khatirat-i Asarat: Ruznama-yi Safar-i Khwarazm wa Khiva* (1991). Despite their shortcomings, eighteenth and nineteenth century Persian chronicles, histories and travel narratives reveal an awareness of the ethnic and cultural heterogeneity of the peoples of Iran and its peripheries.

The Turkmen Frontier

Persian chronicles and histories represent the Turkmen tribes as vicious nomads on the edge of civilization. A recurrent theme covered in these texts is Turkmen raiding and violence on the frontier. In the eighteenth-century Afsharid chronicle *‘Alamara-yi Nadiri*, Muhammad Kazim Marvi described the Turkmen as wicked tribes (*tawayif-i ashrrar*) settled on the banks of the Jayhun (Oxus) who were always raiding, carrying off sheep, and taking Muslims as slaves (Marvi 1985: vol. 1, 11, 435). In *Nasikh al-*

Tawarikh, Sipihir described the Turkmen raids on the villages of eastern Iran in 1852 (1268 AH):

A thousand Turkmen *sawar* [horsemen] set upon the village of Shahrud until they were driven off and defeated by the troops of the governor of Astarabad, Muhammad Vali Khan. But in this year on the day of *Aid*, horsemen from the Turkmen tribes of Akhal and Tekke from Tejjend entered the mosque of light [*masjid-i nur*] and took thirty women [*niswan*] as slaves (Sipihir 1998: vol. 3, 1193-1194).

Authors of chronicles were prone to characterize the pastoral nomads on Iran's frontiers as primitive and uncouth. By reading these texts "against the grain," however, Turkmen raiding and slaving can be seen as resistance on the part of the Sunni Turkmen against the authority of the Shia dynasts of Iran. Some accounts also offer perceptive discussions of the culture and performance of the Turkmen raid (Hamadani 1992: 86-94).

The popular religious practices and movements of the Turkmen are also described in Persian sources. In *'Alamara-yi Nadiri*, Marvi provides a narrative of a Sufi named "Darwish Rasul" who gained wide converts among the Turkmen tribes of the eastern Iranian province of Khorasan in the 1740s. Becoming skilled in the craft of alchemy and joined by a number of other wanderers and mendicants (*qalandar*), Darwish Rasul gained fame for healing the sick and performing miracles (*karamat*) among tribes and pastoral nomads (*sahra nishin*), who called him "Hazrat Ishan" and gave him their vows and blessings. According to Marvi, "in every land where there were many tribes and flocks, and where there were dwellers in the steppes, he was seen as a saint and a messenger" (1985: vol. 3, 988-996). When the charismatic mendicant became the center of an uprising among the Turkic tribes in the vicinity of Balkh, he was captured by the Afshar authorities and martyred. Similarly, in *Nasikh al-Tawarikh*, Sipihir writes that in 1839 "the Tekke and Yomut Turkmen became attached to a saint whom, according to tribal custom, they called 'Hazrat Ishan'" and followed the way of rebellion" (1998: vol. 2, 767-768).

Eighteenth and nineteenth century Persian texts reveal other aspects of Turkmen identity, history, and culture. Their authors delved into questions of tribal genealogy and ethnic belonging. A Qajar agent (*mamur*) posted in Sarakhs between 1876 and 1878 (1294-1296 AH) provided an

explanation of the Turkmen's origins in his travel memoirs:

It is the opinion of the elders and the headmen that this tribe descends from the clan [*ulad*] known by the name Salor Ghazan Baba. They say that Salor Ghazan Baba was a brave and glorious Turk. He was killed by some of his rivals from among the tribes of Turkistan [*'ashayir-i Turkistan*] and left behind four sons. These sons were named Ersari, Salor, Yomut, and Tekke (Hamadani 1992: 32-33).

The same text describes the wedding ceremonies of the Turkmen, including the custom of bride stealing:

The men mount their horses and the women of the groom's tribe walk to the edge of the encampment. Then the girls and women from the bride's tribe rush out of the felt haired tents, followed by the white beards. After this the bride is wrapped in a kilim with two bridesmaids and carried on the shoulders of the men out of the camp. The bridesmaids, according to custom, are allowed to return home. Then two horsemen lift the bride and take flight with full rapture and joy, galloping and firing rifles while the women sing and holler, until they reach their tribe (Hamadani 1992: 97-98).

The authors of chronicles also wrote on the land, nature, and the environment. In *Alamara-yi Nadiri*, we find Nadir Shah Afshar planning to revive Marv and transform the Central Asian steppes by rebuilding the Sultan's Dam (*Band-i Sultani*). Marvi praised Nadir Shah's ill-fated scheme to build the dam, tame nature, and prevent the city from being absorbed into the desert of the Turkmen:

Iran, Turan, and Hindustan have never seen the like of it. The people from this province know that if the dam breaks, all the city will dry up and its shrines, buildings, and gardens will be destroyed (Marvi 1985: vol. 1, 435).

These texts contain references to aspects of the Turkmen economy. In the geographical chronicle *Mir'at al-Buldan*, I'timad al-Saltana described the Turkmen horse trade in bountiful Khorasan:

The air of Shahrud is pure and gentle and the water is famous for its coolness and goodness. The horses of the Turkmen, which are from the Turkmen tribes of Tekke and Marv and are taken to Mazandaran, Tehran, and other lands

These histories, geographical dictionaries, gazetteers and travel books have been previously used mostly as sources for the high politics of the shah, his court and other elites. Yet they remain untapped written sources for the study of such topics as pastoral nomadic culture, native religion, ethnicity and relations between the state and the tribes on the frontiers of Iran. The research presented here began in 2003, while I was completing my graduate studies in history at Yale University and became interested in nineteenth-century Persian chronicles as sources for the study of peoples and places on the periphery of Iran. These sources became the basis of a new project on the eastern borderlands of Iran and with the generous support of the Yale Council on Middle East Studies, I was able to conduct archival research on the Turkmen in the United Kingdom at the Public Record Office. In the spring and summer of 2006, I continued research on this project at the Iranian National Archives [*Sazman-i Asnad-i Milli*] and Iranian National Library [*Kitabhkhana-yi Milli*] in Tehran, exploring chronicles, travel books, gazetteers, letters and other sources from the Qajar period dealing with Iran's eastern frontier. In the near future, I hope to return to northeastern Iran in order to carry out fieldwork in the Turkmen Sahra, where over two million Turkmen remain on the Islamic Republic's margins, following a semi-nomadic life and native religious practices.

References

- Alam, Muzaffar, and Sanjay Subrahmanyam
2007 *Indo-Persian Travels in the Age of Discoveries, 1400-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Amanat, Abbas
1997 *Pivot of the Universe: Nasir al-Din Shah and the Iranian Monarchy, 1851- 1896*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Astarabadi, Mirza Mahdi Khan
1989 *Jahangusha-yi Nadiri* [History of the World Conquering Nadir Shah]. Tehran: Dunya-yi Kitab.
- Blocqueville, H. de Couliboeuf de
1866 *Quatorze mois de captivite, chez les Turcomans aux frontieres du Turkestan et de la Perse (1860-1861)* [Fourteen months captivity in the country of the Turkmen on the frontiers of Turkestan and Persia], Paris: Hachette.
- Bukhari, Mir 'Abd al-Karim
1876 *Histoire de l'Asie Centrale, Texte Persan*. [History of Central Asia. Persian Text] Charles Schefer, ed. Paris: Leroux.
- Hamadani, 'Abdallah Qaragazlu
1992 *Diyar-i Turkmen* [The Region of the Turkmen]. Husayn Samadi, ed. Qa'imshahr: Ahmadi.
- Hidayat, Riza Quli Khan
1876 *Safaratnama-yi Khwarazm* [Ambassadorial Memoir of Khwarazm]. Charles Schefer, ed. Paris: Leroux.
2001 *Rawzat al-Safa-yi Nasiri* [Garden of the Pure], vols. 8-10. Jamshid Kianfar, ed. Tehran: Asatir.
- Iran, Government of
1997 *Ruznama-yi Waqayi'-i Ittifaqiya* [Gazetteer of Events That Happened], 4 vols. Tehran: National Library of the Islamic Republic of Iran.
- I'timad al-Saltana, Muhammad Hasan Khan
1963 *Tarikh-i Muntazam-i Nasiri* [The Arranged History of Nasir al-Din Shah], 3 vols. Muhammad Isma'il Rizvani, ed. Tehran: Dunya-yi Kitab.
1988 *Mir'at al-Buldan* [Mirror of the Lands], 3 vols. 'Abdul Husayn Navai, ed. Tehran: University of Tehran Press.
- Kashani-Sabet, Firoozeh
1999 *Frontier Fictions: Shaping the Iranian Nation, 1804-1946*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Marvi, Muhammad Kazim
1985 *Alamara-yi Nadiri* [History of the World Embellishing Nadir Shah], 3 vols. Muhammad Amin Riahi, ed. Tehran: Zawwar.
- Mirpanja, Sarhang Isma'il
1991 *Khatirat-i Asarat: Ruznama-yi Safar-i Khwarazm wa Khiva* [Memoirs of Travels in Khwarazm and Khiva]. Safa' al-Din Tabarrayan, ed. Tehran: Mu'asisa'i Pajhuhishi Mutala'ati Farhangi.
- O'Donovan, Edmund
1882 *The Merv Oasis: Travels and Adventures East of the Caspian During the Years 1879-80-81, Including Five Months among the Tekkes of Merv*, 2 vols. First Edition. London: Smith, Elder, and Co.

Siphr, Lisan al-Mulk, Muhammad Taqi
1998 *Nasikh al-Tawarikh* [Abolisher of
Histories], 3 vols. Jamshid Kianfar, ed.
Tehran: Asatir.

Sani al-Mulk Ghaffari, Mirza Abu al-Hasan
1991 *Ruznama-yi Dawlat-i 'Alliya-yi Iran*
[Gazetteer of the Sublime State of Iran].
Tehran: National Library of the Islamic
Republic of Iran.

Foreign Direct Investment in the Caucasus and Central Asia: A Comparative Analysis of Sectoral Patterns and Source Countries

Serkan Yalcin, PhD student, John Cook School of Business, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., USA,
syalcin@slu.edu

Foreign investments can play a crucial role in stimulating economic growth throughout Eurasia. The World Investment Report (WIR) 2006 by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) indicates that foreign direct investment (FDI) in Southeastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) accounts only for 2.5% of the world's total FDI. This means that the vast region has a limited ability to attract foreign investors. To address this issue, my research poses the following questions. In which sectors do Eurasian countries receive FDI? Which countries invest in the Eurasian market? What motivates the investments? By searching for answers to these questions, we can improve our understanding of FDI in the Eurasian region and address the region's failure to attract greater FDI.

The study is based on my dissertation comparing international entrepreneurship in three countries with three different economic development levels, the USA, Turkey, and Kazakhstan. The study examines sectoral patterns and source countries of FDI in the Caucasian and Central Asian countries. Multinational companies from the Triad (the US, Europe and Japan) have been the major sources of worldwide FDI. However, the WIR 2006 indicates that companies emerging from developing countries have also begun to operate in the global business arena (UNCTAD 2006). This fact may be a good sign for the poor countries in Eurasia since the giant multinationals from the Triad are not investing in the poor Eurasian countries due to their small markets. Firms from developing countries may fill the niche markets in the poor Eurasian countries, and transfer certain know-how and technology. In this context, Russia and Turkey are the two closest (geographically and culturally) developing countries to offer FDI to the Caucasian and Central Asian countries.

In the study I use cumulative (1990-2005) "FDI stock" data covering all foreign companies.

My report covers only the most significant foreign companies in their corresponding host countries. Using panel data obtained from major sources such as UNCTAD, IMF, World Bank, and national government agencies, the study examines FDI in eight Eurasian countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. The analysis follows the FDI motives typology formulated by Dunning (1993), who states that companies undertake investments across national borders to seek resources, markets, strategic assets, and efficiency. My research focuses on the market- and resource-seeking motives since the panel data is not sufficient to identify the strategic asset and efficiency seeking characteristics of the foreign investments.¹ When foreign investments focus on extracting natural resources (e.g., natural gas and gold) in foreign markets and exporting them from foreign markets to domestic markets, the investment characteristic is categorized as a resource-seeking one. On the other hand, the market-seeking behavior is associated with foreign investments into local production and marketing.

The findings show that, in general, the US and the United Kingdom (UK) have the highest volume of foreign investments in the eight Eurasian countries. Their FDI behavior is characterized as resource-seeking, as evidenced by heavy investments in the oil and mining sectors, especially in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. The other two important investors, Turkey and Russia, invest in non-energy related sectors (though Russia has investments in the energy sector as well). Turkey and Russia's market-seeking investments focus on trade, industry, construction, communication and

¹ To identify the strategic asset and efficiency seeking characteristics of the foreign investments I plan to obtain managerial data by conducting surveys in Kazakhstan, the US and Turkey at a later stage of my research.

services. Besides these four investor countries, no other country consistently invests in the eight Eurasian countries. Greece holds some investments in Armenia, Canada in Kyrgyzstan, South Korea and Italy in Tajikistan, and Switzerland in Uzbekistan.

The Caucasus

The country by country analysis shows the following results: In the Caucasus, Armenia, having \$1.2 billion FDI stock² as of 2005, attracts FDI to energy, transport, telecom, light industry, machine-building, trade and mining sectors. Russia and Greece (27% of market share each) are the leading investors in Armenia. Canada (11%) and the US (10%) are other important investors. FDI behavior in Armenia can be classified as the resource- and market-seeking type.

Azerbaijan, the second most important FDI location in the analysis after Kazakhstan, has \$13.9 billion FDI stock as of 2005. More than half of FDI in Azerbaijan goes to the oil sector, an indication of a resource-seeking FDI motive. American and British petroleum companies are the main investors. The US has 28% of FDI share in Azerbaijan followed by the UK and Turkey with 16% and 12% of FDI shares, respectively. Russian investments are preceded by those of Norway, the fifth largest investor in Azerbaijan. Whereas western investors focus on the oil sector, Turkish investments cover trade, light industry, machinery engineering, communication and service sectors. Turkey is the leading investor in the non-oil sectors. Turkey's cultural ties and common border with Azerbaijan encourage Turkish investors to increase their commitment towards the Azeri market.

The third Caucasian country, Georgia, has \$2.3 billion FDI stock as of 2005. The UK and the US are the leading investors with 17% and 16% of FDI shares, respectively. The analysis of sectoral distribution of FDI stock in Georgia indicates that the transport and communication sectors (55%) are the leading FDI target followed by electricity, gas and water supply (29%), and manufacturing (6%). Russia and Turkey follow the US and UK in terms of FDI volume. Russia provides electricity to Georgia while Turkish investments concentrate on telecommunication, glass production, construction and textiles. The market-seeking FDI motive is prevalent in Georgia as evidenced by the majority of investments in transportation and communication.

² FDI stock in this study refers to accumulation of FDI from the early 1990s to 2005.

In sum, I characterize FDI behavior in the Caucasus as market-seeking in Armenia and Georgia, and as resource-seeking in Azerbaijan.

Central Asia

Among the eight Eurasian countries, Kazakhstan is the leading FDI recipient with \$25.1 billion FDI stock as of 2005. The US (32%), UK (17%), South Korea (13%), Turkey (6%), and France (5%) are the main investors. Foreign investments concentrate mainly on the oil and mining sectors. Therefore, FDI in Kazakhstan is of the resource-seeking type.

Kyrgyzstan is a poor and resource-void³ country that has just \$522 million FDI stock as of 2005. Gold mining attracts most FDI, with Canada having 38% of the share. Kyrgyzstan is the tenth largest gold producer in the world. The US (14%), Turkey (12%) and UK (9%) are other important investors.⁴ I characterize FDI motive in Kyrgyzstan as resource-seeking as well.

Tajikistan is similar to Kyrgyzstan with its low level of FDI stock — \$522 million. Major investors are UK (45%), South Korea (24%) and Italy (21%). Foreign investments go to textiles (45%), gold mining (42%) and the construction industry (6%). Thus, FDI motives are of both the resource- and market-seeking types in the Tajik market.

Turkmenistan has \$1.4 billion FDI stock as of 2005. It has rich oil and natural gas reserves that attract foreign investors mainly from the US and UK. Turkey is another important investor focusing on the construction and textile sectors. FDI in this country is of a resource-seeking type, as most FDI is in the oil and gas sector.

Finally, Uzbekistan is relatively weak in attracting FDI, despite its potential. It has \$964 million FDI stock as of 2005. Uzbekistan has rich resources in gold, gas and cotton, offering attractive opportunities for investors. Uzbekistan is the world's fifth largest cotton producer and second largest cotton exporter after the United States. Major investors are the UK (36%), the US (10%), Russia (8%) and Switzerland (6%). Uzbekistan has the potential to be a regional economic powerhouse, but the government of Uzbekistan has yet to create the

³ "Resource" here means technological capabilities, capital accumulation, skilled labor and modern industries, i.e., necessary factors of production. Resource here is used in its accounting meaning (anything a company/country has), not only natural resources.

⁴ Sectoral data were not available.

necessary conditions to attract needed foreign investment (US Department of State 2006). Therefore, investments in gas, gold and cotton characterize FDI motives in the country as resource- and market-seeking type.

In sum, the FDI motives in Central Asia are resource-seeking in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan, and both resource- and market-seeking in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

In conclusion, the problem is that only four major investors (USA, UK, Russia and Turkey) are investing in the region. The US and UK generally invest in energy-related sectors, such as oil and gas, as well as in mining (mainly gold). That is, FDI motives in the region are resource-seeking. Nevertheless, the investments do not contribute much to the economic development of the Eurasian countries since these investments do not do much to stimulate manufacturing and service sector activities in the local markets of the Eurasian countries. Big multinationals from the US and UK do not invest heavily in other sectors since the market sizes of the Eurasian countries are not large enough to generate the level of profit demanded by big companies. This leaves the non-energy related sectors to Turkey and Russia. Since Turkey and Russia are developing countries, they are not able to bring highly sophisticated technology and know-how to the region. This limits the benefits of foreign investment. The remedy for this problematic situation is to encourage foreign investments towards sectors other than the energy sector to stimulate and develop local manufacturing and

service sectors. This points to the importance of encouraging both market- and resource-seeking FDI.

In addition to Russia and Turkey, other countries can be encouraged to invest in the Eurasian countries. This would increase the competition level as more and different firms invest. The increased competition would then accelerate economic activities in terms of both quantity and quality. To encourage foreign companies to invest in the region's production and market, the Eurasian countries have to liberalize tight, intensive inspections and bureaucratic burdens. Bilateral and multilateral economic integration in the region may provide enlarged markets, a foreign investment stimulant. Economic integration will facilitate regional trade that may stimulate foreign investors as well.

References

- Dunning, J.
1993 *Multinational Enterprises and the Global Economy*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- UNCTAD
2006 *World Investment Report: FDI from Developing and Transition Economies: Implications for Development*. United Nations: New York and Geneva.
- US Department of State
2006 *Uzbekistan. 2006 Investment Climate Statement*. US Department of State.
<http://www.state.gov/e/eeb/ifd/2006/62049.htm>

The Relationship between the Kyrgyz SSR and the Center in the Middle Khrushchev Period (1957-61) Based on Materials from Four Archives in Moscow and Bishkek

Chida Tetsuro, Doctoral Student, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan, tetsuroch@dream.com

Beginning in December 2005 I conducted one year of research in Moscow under a fellowship from the Japan Russia Youth Exchange Center (JREX). I continued my research in Moscow until May 2007, and visited Bishkek for three weeks in June 2007. During this time I pored over official archival documents at RGANI (Russian State Archive of Contemporary History), RGASPI (Russian State Archive of Social-Political History), GARF (State Archive of the Russian Federation), and TsGA PD KR (Central State Archive of Political Documents of

the Kyrgyz Republic). First of all, I would like to express my appreciation for the warm support of JREX.

In this report, I present a draft of my current study titled "Iskhak Razzakov's Policy and the Moscow-Kyrgyzstan Relationship in the Middle of the Khrushchev Period," which will be part of my dissertation about center-republic relations in the USSR during the post-World War II period. My approach is mainly "sovietological," which is often criticized for its excessive focus on "elites" and

disregard for “ordinary people.” However, in my study I treat national “elites” as intermediate actors searching for connection and middle ground between the interests of the “above” (central government leaders and bureaucrats) and “below” (local government leaders and citizens). This was the case, especially, after Stalin’s death. The preliminary findings of my report suggest that the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) gave impetus to the national republics, including Kyrgyzstan, to move towards more autonomous decision-making. Shortly afterwards, seeing national republics move further than anticipated, Moscow began to curtail their autonomy. From 1959 this policy reversal led to political “recentralization” of national republics towards Moscow, which, in Kyrgyzstan, eventuated the dismissal of Iskhak Razzakov from the position of the First Secretary of the Central Committee (CC) of the Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan (CPK).

I view the political history and republican politics of Central Asia in the post World War II period as a blank spot in world historiography. The goal of my project is to fill in some of the blanks in this part of the historiography. Some pioneer studies on center-republic relations in the post WWII period have been done, but they are often oriented excessively towards Moscow and towards finding certain patterns in the relationship, largely disregarding specificities of each republic’s political process (Hough 1969; Gill and Pitty 1997). Despite having limited primary sources, Rakowska-Harmstone (1969) and Olcott (1995) did an excellent job depicting republican policy. One of my objectives is to connect Moscow and local views of political processes, revealing their relationship and republican specificities by investigating archival materials in Moscow and Central Asian states, as well as previously published sources.

The findings of my research point to three factors that shaped the Moscow-Kyrgyzstan relationship from June 1957 (the “Anti-Party Group” incidents) to May 1961 (the dismissal of Razzakov). The three factors are: 1) Khrushchev’s agricultural policy of “catching up with America in stock farm production per capita;” 2) nationality and educational policy before and after Khrushchev’s educational reform in 1958; and 3) Dmitrii Trofimovich Shepilov in Kyrgyzstan as an exile, who “sided with” (*primknuvshii k*) the Anti-Party Group. In this article, due to the limited space, I discuss only the first two factors.

Khrushchev’s Agricultural Policy “Dognat’ Ameriku” and Kyrgyzstan

In May 1957, at a meeting in Leningrad Nikita S. Khrushchev chanted a new slogan that per capita production of meat, milk and butter should catch up with and surpass America in three to four years. The speech aimed to create a sense of improvement in the living standards of the Soviet citizens, the prime issue in Khrushchev’s public policy after the Twentieth CPSU Congress. The so-called “anti-party group” members, V. M. Molotov, G. M. Malenkov, and L. M. Kaganovich, opposed it as unrealistic and incompatible with industrialization. At the June meeting of the CC of the CPSU, central party bureaucrats and regional leaders secured Khrushchev from an attack by the “anti-party group.” Iskhak Razzakov also climbed the podium and condemned the “anti-party group” by saying “they had dirty hopes of embroiling workers with farmers” (Iakovlev 1998: 388). Khrushchev’s new agrarian campaign certainly reflected the interests of Kyrgyzstan, which was one of the key republics for livestock breeding in the USSR, lacking almost any heavy industry base.

Initially, the republican leaders sought a solution to the problem on their own, but the condition of stock farming in Kyrgyzstan remained poor. In September 1958, Kyrgyzstan’s CC and government adopted a resolution setting numerical targets for livestock production through 1962 (TsGA PD KR 56/4/1136/37-47). The resolution lacked any directions on “how many times” Kyrgyzstan had to multiply stock farm production. Kyrgyzstan’s goal setting practice soon was propelled even higher by the so-called “Riazan initiative.” In January 1959, Aleksei Larionov (the first secretary of the Riazan *Obkom*) promised that kolkhozes and sovkhoses in his province would expand their meat production by 3.8 times in just one year (Pikhoia 2000: 174). Khrushchev extolled this pledge demanding other party organizations accept this initiative at the Twenty-First CPSU Congress. Razzakov assented to it, though more modestly, by pledging an increase in meat production of 1.5 times in the year 1959 (RGASPI 17/89/455/47).

In 1958 and 1959 only Tian-Shan Province seemed to have made great progress in meat production. In accordance with the Riazan initiative Mukhambet Isaev (First Secretary of Tian-Shan *Obkom*) promised a grandiose production rise in 1960: a production increase of 1.9 times and two years’ worth of meat supply to the state (Sovetskaia Kirgiziia 1960). The promise was never

accomplished. In addition, various cases of “upward distortions” (*pripiski*) of plan indices, and other unkept promises in Tian-Shan and other provinces of Kyrgyzstan had been exposed and leaked since the end of 1959. The CC Bureau was aware that Isaev had personally known of one of these instances (TsGA PD KR 56/4/1223/41). What is extraordinary was Isaev’s promotion to the position of Minister of Internal Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic in August 1960. This fact and other newly unveiled information about Isaev’s personal involvement and instructions in covering up fraudulent acts, such as *pripiski* in his province, ferociously angered Khrushchev. In January 1961 at the CC plenum of the CPSU, Khrushchev reproachfully asked Razzakov about Isaev’s past conduct. Razzakov answered: “I knew, but the punishment for him was too mild” (Sovetskaia Kirgiziia 1961). Isaev and other provincial leaders were fired. Isaev was expelled from the CPSU in February 1961 (RGASPI 17/91/481/18), while Larionov, the Riazan Party Secretary, committed suicide. Many other *raikom* secretaries lost their posts for the same reason as Isaev did, undercutting the authority of Razzakov’s leadership. Khrushchev’s agricultural policy “dogmat’ Ameriku” [to catch up with America] never came to fruition, and only created chaos throughout the USSR, including Kyrgyzstan.

Nationality Policy and Educational Reform

Khrushchev’s intention to improve the living standards of Soviet citizens was also exemplified in his social policies. A government resolution issued in October 1956 proposed “improvement of after-school care and school lunches.” Along this policy line, in September 1957 Kyrgyzstan’s leaders instituted free lunches in urban primary schools, up to the seventh grade (TsGA PD KR 56/4/1101/69-70). At the CC Bureau meeting Razzakov explained the newly introduced free school lunches as an effort “to prevent children’s tuberculosis by supplying nourishments to school children,” which at once gained Moscow’s sanction, including that of Petr Pospelov, Secretary of the CC of the CPSU. (TsGA PD KR 56/4/1098/210, 1101/188). However, Kyrgyzstan’s initiative came to an end within a year because of its lack of preparation and a policy change that set budgetary priority on constructing new schools. Moscow’s intervention played a major role in bringing the free school lunches program to an end. According to Kadyrkul Kachkeev, the permanent representative of the Council of Ministers of Kyrgyzstan at the time, Arsenii Zverev (Minister of Finance of the USSR) first opposed the program

as a squander mania. The criticism was backed at the meeting of the Presidium of the USSR government (*Velikaia lichnost’* 1996: 31). Afterwards, Moscow labeled the benevolent-looking policy “illegal” and an act of “localism” (*mestnichestvo*). Razzakov accepted Moscow’s criticism in his letter to the CC of the CPSU in June 1959 (RGANI 5/31/118/73).

In April 1957 Kyrgyzstan’s leadership restored compulsory education in the Kyrgyz language in Russian primary and secondary schools, which had been abolished in October 1954 due to the excessive burden of language learning for pupils (TsGA PD KR 56/4/1134/62). At the time, compulsory learning of the language of the titular nation in Russian schools was prevalent throughout the USSR. In his writing in the CPSU journal *Kommunist*, Razzakov (1958: 48) held that it was necessary for all pupils to speak Kyrgyz, since the majority of graduates started their careers in rural areas, where Kyrgyz constitute the majority of the population. Khrushchev first expressed the need for educational reforms in April 1958. He stated that the goal of the education reforms should be directed to provide overall “politechnism” from primary schools to *VUzy* (Higher Educational Institutions). Khrushchev did not mention language learning in his speech. In June, Khrushchev demanded that republican CCs present a draft of the educational reform in an official letter. Republican CCs sent back their original plans of educational reforms to Moscow in September. Apparently, not only Kyrgyzstan, but also Moldova, Estonia, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan clearly indicated their intentions to continue the teaching of titular nations’ languages in Russian schools (RGANI 5/35/91-92). The plan to teach titular nations’ languages was suddenly overturned by Moscow’s thesis on educational reforms published in November 1958. The thesis stated that parents should have the right to decide what languages their children would study at school (Pravda 1958). As Bilinsky (1963: 142-144) wrote, delegates of Georgia, Azerbaijan, and the Baltic republics severely opposed the thesis at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in December 1958. The contention was settled in the republican law on educational reforms, which acknowledged parents’ rights to choose and encourage the study of the Russian language in Kyrgyz schools (The Government of the Kirgiz SSR 1960: 11). The above-mentioned Kyrgyzstan resolution dated April 1957 was finally repealed in July 1959 (TsGA PD KR 56/4/1178/5). Moscow did not make any “concession” to the Kyrgyz language, but reserved

Kyrgyz language education only for “a certain part” of the Kyrgyz people.

The shortage of “specialists” among the titular nation was still severe in Kyrgyzstan. As Kiuliupa Konduchalova (Vice-Chair of the republican Council of Ministers) mentioned in her memoir, the system of special enrollment quotas to the central and regional VUZy (known as “*bronia*”) for the titular nationalities, which Kyrgyzstan’s leadership had tried to utilize, was brought back in 1953 (*Velikaia lichnost’* 1996: 78). In 1958 Kyrgyzstan received forty guaranteed admissions to VUZy, primarily in Moscow and Leningrad. By 1960, the number went up to sixty admissions, although Razzakov demanded 100 admissions each year (GARF R-9396/1/878/180-181; RGANI 5/35/150/24, 27). In October 1958, seeing the lack of national cadres in Kyrgyzstan as a problem, the Presidium of the CC in Moscow passed a resolution “About work with cadres of party organizations in Kyrgyzstan” calling for the strengthening of Kyrgyz specialists in the VUZy inside the republic (*KPSS v rezolutsiakh* 1986: 269). Before this resolution, Razzakov and his colleagues adopted a CC Bureau resolution dated August 1958, granting preferential treatment to Kyrgyz youth in gaining admissions into the republican VUZy (60-70% of the enrollment limit was reserved for Kyrgyz youth) (TsGA PD KR 56/4/1134/16). It seemed that Moscow officially confirmed Kyrgyzstan’s internal policy line, but in fact, it was just the contrary. The August 1958 resolution was once again retracted by Moscow’s intervention in July 1959. The October 1958 resolution remained in force, creating problems for Razzakov and his colleagues throughout 1960 and 1961.

It is noteworthy to mention that Kyrgyzstan’s CC Bureau passed a number of resolutions in 1958, which were retracted a year later. The retracted resolutions included rehabilitation of the well-known Kyrgyz intellectuals Moldo Kylych and Kasym Tynystanov, who had been purged by Stalin.

Razzakov, criticizing himself at the Eighth Plenum of the CC of the CPK in January 1960, mentioned the following: “The CC of the CPSU quite properly directed our attention to serious political mistakes in the implementation of the party’s nationality policy” (RGASPI 17/90/483/24). He also pinned the blame for the policy “mistakes” upon other party-state officials. He clearly went out of his way to settle the disagreement congenially. Yet the effort to avoid any complications in the

relationship between the Kyrgyz SSR and the center proved to be futile.

Razzakov’s Fall from Power and Its Aftermath

Moscow began to plan the replacement of Razzakov around the January plenum of the CC of the CPSU in 1961, as Turdakun Usubaliev (First Secretary of the CC of the CPK after Razzakov; First Secretary of Frunze *gorkom* at the time) wrote in his memoir. Vitalii Titov (Chief of the Department of the Party Organs of the Union Republics) notified the leaders of the CPK about the replacement in Kyrgyzstan’s leadership on the evening of May 7. It is still unclear whether Razzakov himself knew about his expulsion prior to that date. There is no question that Usubaliev knew about the upcoming replacement, since he presented his extensive report critical of the republic’s leadership at the plenum. The above-mentioned Isaev case and other cases of routine falsifications, the practice of “localism,” violations of state discipline by Kazy Dikambaev (Chairman of the republican Soviet of Ministers), Razzakov’s mistakes in nationality policy and many other failings were dredged up at the plenum by Usubaliev and other delegates (RGASPI 17/91/482/5-28). Interestingly, Usubaliev never suggested that Razzakov himself organized the various deceptions in the republic. Instead, Usubaliev limited himself to blaming Razzakov for being too lenient towards the culprits and having “weak organizational management and low expectations for the cadres” (RGASPI 17/91/482/27). Razzakov and Dikambaev were dismissed from their posts. Turdakun Usubaliev succeeded Iskhak Razzakov as First Secretary and remained as such until 1985.

Razzakov and his family left Kyrgyzstan for Moscow, where he worked as an *apparatchik* in the State Economic Soviet of the USSR. In Moscow he frequently suffered from severe illness, which accelerated his retirement in 1967. In his lifetime he returned to Kyrgyzstan only once, in 1972, as a result of his negotiation with Usubaliev. He knew that he was in political exile. Razzakov passed away in 1979 and was buried first in Kuntsevo cemetery, Moscow. His remains were reburied at Ala-Archa cemetery in Bishkek only in 2000, nine years after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Conclusion

In the course of my study I derived several preliminary findings. First, the dismissal of Razzakov cannot be ascribed only to “nationalism.”

The “Riazan initiative” as the base of Khrushchev’s approach brought Kyrgyzstan’s leaders and livestock breeders into a state of disarray, weakening their sense of “discipline” and encouraging them to practice deception. The chaos and collapse of animal husbandry in Kyrgyzstan was the primary reason for Razzakov’s dismissal. In addition, accusations of engaging in the practice of “nationalistic tendencies,” “national limitedness” and “idealization of the past” (Simon 1991: 253) instigated the downfall of Razzakov’s leadership. The third, but not less important, factor was the antagonism between Razzakov and certain political elites and intellectuals in Kyrgyzstan, spurred by the Shepilov affair. Due to limited space, I cannot further discuss this third factor.

To conclude, my findings suggest that the failure of Moscow’s key policies coupled with internal conflict among national elites resulted in the dismissal of the republican leadership. I suggest that this tendency can be applied with some modifications to other Central Asian republics, except for Kazakhstan. The CC First Secretary of Tajikistan’s party, Tursun Ul’dzhabaev, was ousted from his post in 1961 for his “participation” in organizing *pripiski* in cotton production. Estrangement of the republic elite from Ul’dzhabaev also accompanied his downfall. Unlike Razzakov’s case, Ul’dzhabaev’s name was banished from the central “nomenclature,” and he himself was demoted to the level of a sovkhoz director. The three factors can also explain the ouster of S. K. Kamalov (Uzbekistan) and S. Babaev (Turkmenistan). I see the same tendency in the first days of *Perestroika*, in the Central Asian republics, including Kazakhstan, which is partially revealed in my previous article in Japanese (2004). I would like to continue my research about Moscow-Kyrgyzstan relations through the entire Brezhnev (that is, Usubaliev) period, when, I suggest, Kyrgyzstan gained some authority over personnel issues and the right of control over the republican cadres.

References

- Bilinsky, Yaroslav
1963 “The Soviet Education Laws of 1958-9 and Soviet Nationality Policy,” *Soviet Studies*, 14 (3) 138-157. Oxford.
- Chida Tetsuro
2004 “The Central-Republican Relationship and Party Elites in the Soviet Union: Kazakhstan (1980-1991).” *Surabu kenkyu* [in Japanese] 2004 (51) 29-62. Sapporo.
- GARF (Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii)
f. R-9396, op.1 *Ministerstvo vysshego obrazovaniia SSSR. Kantseliariia* [The Ministry of Higher Education of the USSR. Chancellery]. Moscow.
- The Government of the Kirgiz SSR
1960 *Zakon ob ukreplenii svyazi shkoly s zhizn’iu i o dal’neishem razvitii sistemy narodnogo obrazovaniia v Kirgizskoi SSR* [The law on strengthening the relationship of schools with life and on further development of the system of public education in the Kyrgyz SSR]. Frunze.
- Gill, Graeme, and Roderic Pitty
1997 *Power in the Party: The Organization of Power and Central-Republican Relations in the CPSU*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Hough, Jerry F.
1969 *The Soviet Prefects: The Local Party Organs in Industrial Decision-making*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Iakovlev, Aleksandr N., ed.
1998 *Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich. 1957. Stenogramma iun’skogo plenuma TsK KPSS i drugie dokumenty* [Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich. 1957. Stenograph of the June Plenum of the CC of the CPSU and other documents]. Moskva: MFD.
- KPSS v rezoliutsiiakh
1986 *KPSS v rezoliutsiiakh i resheniiakh s[”]ezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK. T.9. (1956-1960)*. [The CPSU in resolutions and decisions of the congresses, conferences and plenums of the CC. Vol. 9. (1956-1960)]. Moskva: Politizdat.
- Olcott, Martha Brill
1995 *The Kazakhs* (2nd ed.). Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.
- Pikhoia, Rudol’f Germanovich
2000 *Sovetskii Soiuz: istoriia vlasti. 1945-1991. Izdanie vtoroe, ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe* [Soviet Union: The history of authority. 1945-1991. 2nd ed.]. Novosibirsk: Sibirskii khronograf.
- Pravda
1958 *Ob ukreplenii svyazi shkoly s zhizn’iu i o dal’neishem razvitii sistemy narodnogo obrazovaniia v strane. Tezisy TsK KPSS i Soveta Ministrov SSSR* [On the strengthening of the relationship of schools with life and on further development of the system of public

education in the country. Theses of the CC of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR]. 16 November. p. 2.

Rakowska-Harmstone, Teresa

1969 *Russia and Nationalism in Central Asia: The Case of Tadzhikistan*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Razzakov, Iskhak Razzakovich

1958 "Leninskaia natsional'naia politika i druzhba narodov" [The nationality policy of Lenin and friendship of the peoples]. *Kommunist* 1958 (13) 37-48.

1996 *Velikaia lichnost': vospominaniia* [Great personality: Memoir]. Bishkek: Uchkun.

RGANI (Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv noveishei istorii) (Moscow)

f. 5 *Tsentrāl'nyi komitet KPSS* [The Central Committee of the CPSU].

op. 31 *Otdel partiinykh organov soiuznykh respublik* [Department of the party organs of the Union Republics].

op. 35 *Otdel nauki, vysshykh uchebnykh zavedenii i shkol* [Department of sciences, institutions of higher education and schools].

RGASPI (Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv sotsial'no-politicheskoi istorii) (Moscow)

f. 17, op. 89-91 *Tsentrāl'nyi komitet KPSS: Sektora organizatsionno-ustavnykh voprosov i informatsii otdela partiinykh organov soiuznykh respublik* [The Central committee of the CPSU. Section on organizational-regulation questions

and information, department of party organs of the union republics].

Simon, Gerhard

1991 *Nationalism and Policy toward the Nationalities in the Soviet Union: From Totalitarian Dictatorship to Post-Stalinist Society*. K. and O. Forsters, trans. (from German). Boulder: Westview Press.

Sovetskaia Kirgiziia

1960 "Vse sily — na uspeshnoe vypolnenie reshenii dekabr'skogo Plenuma TsK KPSS: Sobranie respublikanskogo partiinogo aktiva [All powers to successful achievement of the decisions of the December Plenum of the CC of the CPSU. Meeting of party activists]." January 14, 1960. p. 2.

1961 *Plenum Tsentrāl'nogo Komiteta KPSS. Doklad tovarishcha I. R. Razzakova* [Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Report of comrade I. R. Razzakov]. January 15, 1960. p. 2.

TsGA PD KR (Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv politicheskoi dokumentatsii Kyrgyzskoi Respubliki) (Bishkek)

f. 56, op. 4 *Tsentrāl'nyi komitet Kompartii Kirgizii. Protokol'naia chast'*. [Central committee of the Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan. Protocol division].

Usabaliev, Turdakun Usabalievich

1995 *Epokha, sozidanie, sud'by: Kniga I* [Epoch, Creation, Fate: Book I]. Bishkek: Izdatel'stvo Sham.

Conferences and Lecture Series

The Eurasian World: History, Present, Prospects

Astana, Kazakhstan, October 12-13, 2006

Reported by: **Aigerim Shilibekova**, PhD student, Faculty of International Relations, L. N. Gumilev Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan, aigerimsh@ok.kz

The Fifth International Eurasian Scientific Forum, which was held at the L. N. Gumilev Eurasian National University (EMU), was devoted to Eurasia in general and nomadism in particular. The Forum's theme was "The Eurasian World: History, Present, Prospects" [*Mir Evrazii: istoriia, sovremennost', perspectiva*]. It carried on the tradition of previous forums, dealing with current issues in Eurasian studies and touching on a wide range of issues facing the Eurasian region. For two days, EMU students and faculty members had a great opportunity to attend presentations and listen to prominent international scholars. Guests from Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, the United States, the Russian Federation, France and Japan enjoyed both a tour of the new capital of Kazakhstan and enthusiastic scholarly exchanges.

The Forum was opened by the Rector of the Eurasian National University, Professor S. Abdīmanapov, an academician of the International Academy of Sciences. Abdīmanapov greeted guests, students and faculty members and delivered a report on EMU's role as a center of science and education in the Central Asian region. The report focused on the university's vision of innovative education and teaching at international standards and the university's major initiatives in this direction.

The Forum covered the following topics: The Eurasian Idea: History and the Present; The Place and Role of Nomadism in Eurasia: Nomadism as a Factor of Eurasianism; Cultural Interactions of the People of Eurasia; The History of Kazakhstan in the Context of Eurasia's History; Language of the Eurasian People: Heritage and the Present; and Folklore and Literature of the Countries of Eurasia.

Jacque Legrand, Director of INALCO (National Institute of Oriental Languages and Civilizations, Paris) raised the matter of migration and nomadic pastoralism as historic models for mobility. The speech attracted great attention and interest from students and faculty members of the History Department, as it challenged their previous

approaches and helped them to view nomadism in new ways. Legrand's reconceptualization of the "mobile phone" as a "nomadic phone" was much appreciated.

Anatoly Khazanov, Professor of Anthropology and Central Asian Studies at the University of Wisconsin (USA), emphasized the role of nomadism in the historical development of Eurasia. Khazanov classified the achievements of nomadic people in cultural, political, religious and linguistic terms.

Dilorom Alimova, Director of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Tashkent), presented the results of her research on the history of Uzbekistan in the early twentieth century in the context of Eurasian processes of integration.

The next speech was delivered by Aleksandr Dugin (Moscow), who is famous for promoting the ideas of Eurasianism [*Evraziistsvo*]. As the leader of the International Eurasian Movement, Dugin spoke on the Eurasian educational canon as a means of crisis management in the sphere of education. After assessing the developments and challenges in the field of education in the era of globalization, Dugin suggested that the challenges of globalization can be met through "isolationism" — reverting to one's roots — or through multipolar globalization.

Catherine Poujol, Professor of Central Asian Studies at INALCO, talked at length on the theoretical bases of Eurasian studies. Her report was entitled "Some Western Geopolitical Theories about 'the Heartland' and Their Significance Today."

Meruert Abuseitova, Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies under the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Almaty), offered an interesting report on the research projects carried out in the framework of the "*Mādeni Mura*" [Cultural Heritage] state program that was initiated by the President of Kazakhstan in 2003 to preserve and study Kazakh historical and cultural heritage. Her report was entitled "Historical-

Cultural Ties of People of Eurasia in the 17th-18th Centuries: New Research.”

Sergei Kliashorny, from the Institute of Oriental Studies (St. Petersburg), delivered a speech on “The Main Stages of Politogenesis among the Ancient Nomads of Eurasia.” Famous for his substantial research on the history and interpretation of nomadic society, Kliashorny was warmly greeted by the conference guests and drew a number of questions from researchers of the younger generation.

In addition to the briefly reviewed speeches and reports delivered by the participants of the

Forum at the plenary meeting, an assessment of this exciting event was kindly provided by a member of the organizing committee, Zhuldiz Tulibaeva (History), head of the Department of Regional Studies at the Eurasian National University. Tulibaeva noted that the fifth forum had attracted more than 150 international scholars, nourishing the hopes of the Kazakh people and their President that Astana was to become a heart of Eurasia, and that the center of this heart was the L. N. Gumilev Eurasian National University. The web address of the university is as follows: <http://www.emu.kz>.

Eurasian Women and Self-Reliance: Religion and Education in the Contemporary World

Long Beach, California, USA, March 22, 2007

Reported by: **Ali F. İğmen**, Department of History, California State University, Long Beach, Calif., USA, aigmen@csulb.edu

On March 22, 2007, the Department of History at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) held a mini conference on “Eurasian women.” The objective of the conference was to assess women’s and gender issues in regions from Bulgaria to China. This interdisciplinary conference included anthropologists, geographers, historians and scholars from the fields of early childhood education, religion and women’s studies.

The first panel was entitled “Women Challenge Reform and Revolution in the Former USSR and Bulgaria.” Kate Brown (History, University of Maryland, Baltimore) presented “The Hidden Terrain: Sectarian Radicalism in Tsarist and Soviet Ukraine,” exploring the history of religious dissent and radical sectarianism in the frontier regions of Ukraine in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. She showed that this background supplied a context for what contemporaries understood as a sudden and surprising emergence of women leaders armed with a language of resistance and the political means to contest the will of authorities. Brown further explored the tradition of religious sectarian dissent, suggesting a substantial ideological foundation that inspired village communities, and women in particular, to attempt to overturn the social order in both the Tsarist and Soviet period.

Mary Neuburger (History, University of Texas, Austin) presented a paper on “Women on the Edge of Time: Muslim Women and the Negotiation of Nation and Modernity in Communist Bulgaria.” She pointed out that Bulgarian national projects in the Communist period looked for the future, among other places, behind the so-called veil of Muslim minority (Turkish and Pomak) women. She argued that in the wake of World War II, unveiling strategies merged with the imperatives of socialist development and the Soviet model of modernity. Both before and during the Communist period, Muslim women were gradually redefined as “Bulgarian” women who had been abducted, raped, veiled and oppressed by (Ottoman) Muslim men. The “Bulgarian” woman was presumably concealed and hybridized by her veil; only through de-veiling could the Bulgarian woman, and by extension the nation, look to the future. Muslim women, through sustained refusal to de-veil or through deliberate re-veiling, transformed the veil into a weapon of protest against state “feminism” and imposed modernity.

The paper by Douglas Northrop (History, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor) was entitled “A Visual Voice? Muslim Women and the Choice to Un/Veil.” He proposed listening for the “voices” of Muslim women in Uzbekistan during the first years of Soviet power. He chronicled their experience of the *Hujum*, a long struggle over female seclusion

and dress that began in 1927 when party activists launched an assault on the horsehair and cotton veils worn by many Central Asian women and girls. He showed that Uzbek women responded to this campaign in a wide variety of ways: a few openly welcomed it, most ignored it, and others spoke out vehemently against the very idea of “unveiling.” He argued that Uzbek women refused to accept fully either the Soviet vision of liberation or a countervailing Muslim/national alternative based on supposedly “authentic” notions of cultural seclusion and piety. Instead, they showed sophistication and subtlety as they negotiated these conflicting sets of social demands. Their non-textual responses give insight into this creativity.

Lastly, Ali İğmen (History, CSULB) presented on “Heroines, Actresses, and the Soviet State: Kyrgyz Women Assert Themselves,” which explored the images of Kyrgyz and Uzbek women living in Kyrgyzstan in the 1930s. He suggested that the Soviet regime saw women both as objects of and participants in the cultural development of Kyrgyz society. The delegation of such significant responsibility to women reflected the Soviet state’s desire to exhibit Kyrgyz women as symbols of so-called cultural development. He indicated that the documents of the Houses of Culture from the late 1920s and 1930s and his interview materials provided evidence that women were faced with competing and unstable claims to their identity and social roles. These sources show that Soviet authorities and intellectuals saw the women of Kyrgyzstan as a symbol of cultural revolution, while their societies continued to view them as keepers of their ethnic traditions. İğmen argued that a significant number of women used these claims to fashion a new Soviet Kyrgyz community by participating in cultural programs such as theater.

The second panel, entitled “Women Face Educational Reform and Writing of History in Muslim China, South Asia and Secular Turkey,” focused on the interaction of educational reform and modernity. Linda Benson (History, Oakland University) presented a paper on “Daughters of Ipar Han: Writing Women’s History in Muslim China.” She suggested that while research on the role of women in Central Asian societies is currently expanding, the history and present status of Turkic-speaking Muslim women in northwestern China remains little studied. Her presentation focused on both the difficulties that have impeded such research and the possibilities for the reconstruction of women’s places in the modern history of Muslim

China. In addition to surveying some of the resources currently available, her paper provided a brief overview of the Xinjiang region’s Uighur and Kazakh women during the Republican era (1912-1949) based on a variety of materials, including interviews, archival documents, missionary records, travelers’ accounts and recent anthropological fieldwork. Benson argued that these varied sources provide evidence of Muslim women’s self-reliance during a tumultuous era marked by the emergence of modern Uighur nationalism and by widespread political and military upheaval.

The presentation by Jyotsna Pattnaik (Early Childhood Education, CSULB) was entitled “Education and Empowerment of the Girl Child in South Asia: Intersections of Culture, Religion, Economics, Policies, and Politics.” Her work shows that among the eight South Asian countries (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka) gender disparities in education and all other spheres of life and society pose a serious challenge to advancing almost all measures of the Human Development Index. She argued that although educational policies vary across the region they take a gendered dimension: parents are willing to spend their scarce resources on education of their sons rather than their daughters, so that in a choice between sons and daughters, girls usually lose out. The result, Pattnaik argued, is that poverty, natural disaster, armed conflict and other emergencies hurt girls more than boys. Pattnaik recommended that gender-sensitive targeting be implemented in all aspects of schooling, including in negotiating school budgets, empowering and recruiting teachers (especially women teachers), involving parents (especially mothers) in decision-making, ongoing monitoring, and making schools more responsive to girls’ needs.

Kathryn Libal (Anthropology, University of Connecticut) spoke on “Popular Education and Women as (Mother-) Citizens in the Early Turkish Republic.” Her work contributes to the literature on the politicization of reproduction and motherhood in the interwar years in the Middle East, outlining how Turkish republican leaders and reformists labored to fuse notions of motherhood and nationalism to promote rapid population growth in the first decade of the Republic. She traced this process by examining public discourses, legislation, and social policies introduced by the state to reduce infant and child mortality rates and encourage women and men to have large families. Drawing upon a variety of Turkish newspapers, memoirs, and archival sources, she underscored the increasing politicization of

women as “reproducers” of the nation, and illustrated some of the latent contradictions in nationalist campaigns to foster population growth and “modernize” mothering practices. Libal’s research revealed the extent to which women were seen as pivotal actors in the creation of a modern nation-state through their reproductive and mothering capacities, and underscored the lengths to which republican reformers sought to legislate and coerce women (and sometimes men) into having large families.

The final panel focused on the theme: “Women and Men Negotiate Modernity, Space, Identity and Feminism in Yemen and India.” The paper by Sophia Pandya (Religious Studies, CSULB) on “Religious Change among Yemeni Women: The New Popularity of ‘Amr Khalid,” explored the implications of modernity, globalization, and education for religion. As she interviewed educated Yemeni women during the summer of 2006 regarding their changing religious practices, many conveyed that their favorite preacher was the charismatic Egyptian televangelist ‘Amr Khalid, whose show was broadcast in Sana’a on a weekly basis. Why would Yemeni women watch this preacher, who is known for his non-political, touchy-feely approach to Islam, and what does this say about religious change in Yemen? She argued that the Islamic resurgence is commonly understood as representing not only a return to a religiously based society, but also a political movement. Given that Yemen is a conservative Muslim country with many men and women participating in the Islamic resurgence, it is surprising to find this support for a preacher who does not discuss politics.

Bipasha Baruah (Geography, CSULB) argued in “A Hand Up, Not a Handout: Vocational Training for Low-Income Women in India” that formal

education by itself does not translate into better employment opportunities for poor women. This is especially true in countries like India with their teeming millions of highly educated unemployed middle-class youth. While her research in the slums in Ahmedabad generally pointed to a lack of enthusiasm for formal education among slum-dwelling women, it also revealed high demand for non-formal education in entrepreneurship, establishment of cooperatives, and vocational training in lucrative skills like television repair, radio mechanics, masonry and carpentry. Her findings indicated that women frequently need to “prove” themselves to be as capable as men in trades like carpentry and masonry. Thus, while enthusiastically endorsing efforts of organizations like the Self-Employed Women’s Association to train more women in skills like carpentry and masonry, she emphasized the need to demand affirmative action legislation at the state and national levels to ensure that women are able to translate their vocational training into equal employment opportunities with men.

Finally, the conference concluded with a stimulating keynote speech entitled “Women’s Lives and Critical Theories: The Spaces in Between,” by historian Choi Chatterjee of California State University, Los Angeles. More than three hundred students, faculty, staff and community members attended the conference. The Center for European and Eurasian Studies, UCLA, and the following CSULB sponsors made this conference possible: Yadunandan Center for India Studies; Odyssey Theme-Year Project; College of Liberal Arts; Middle Eastern Studies Program; Center for International Education; Departments of Geography, History, Religious Studies, and Women’s Studies; and the South Asia Committee.

IFEAC Regional Seminar “History, Politics and Culture of Identities in Central Asia”

Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, May 2-3, 2007

Reported by: **Olivier Ferrando**, PhD Candidate, Institute of Political Sciences, Paris, France, olivier.ferrando@sciences-po.org

The French Institute for Central Asian Studies (IFEAC) held a regional seminar in Bishkek on the “History, Politics and Culture of Identities in Central Asia,” which offered a possibility for scholars from Central Asia, Russia and Europe to gather around the issue of identity in the transitional period from

the colonial to the Soviet and post-Soviet eras. The objective of the seminar was to address various aspects of the mutation of construction and deconstruction of identities and to analyze identity in its relation with systemic constraints such as assertion and stigmatization processes. Presenters

endeavored to understand the consequences of the dissolution of the USSR on the identity building process, from both collective and individual perspectives. The seminar took place at Arabaev Kyrgyz State University in Bishkek with the support of the French Embassy in Kyrgyzstan. Participants originated mostly from Kyrgyzstan (Arabaev University, Manas University, Academy of Sciences) and all bordering Central Asian countries, as well as from Russia, France, Switzerland and Italy. The languages of the seminar were Russian and French, with simultaneous translations.

One panel focused on the issue of minorities. The French scholar Yves-Marie Davenel (School of Advanced Studies in Social Sciences [EHESS], Paris) presented a paper entitled “From Soviet Citizen to Kazakhstani: The History of Multiple Developments of a Tatar Identity,” which used the case of the Tatars in Kazakhstan to illustrate the evolving link between ethnic minorities and new independent states. He pointed out a reversal of the traditional relationship: in Soviet times, the Tatars were largely Russified and assimilated to the Russian-speaking community, while in present-day Kazakhstan Tatar activists try to promote a linguistic and cultural identity closer to the Kazakhs, the new host nation with which they are living. However this strategy is confronted by the heterogeneity of the Tatar community in Kazakhstan, as it is composed of several groups who moved there at different periods and from different areas (Volga-Ural region, Siberia, and Chinese Xinjiang). Alessandro Monsutti (Graduate Institute of Development Studies, Geneva) offered an insightful analysis of subnational identity in Afghanistan entitled “Beyond Ethnicity and Kinship in Afghanistan: An Ethnographic Approach of Transversal Relations of Cooperation.” According to Monsutti, ethnicity is one identity criterion among many others and is often irrelevant to understanding how networks are set up between communities. Taking the example of the Hazaras, he showed that individuals develop two distinct strategies of social relations: some Hazaras keep reinforcing the cohesion of the family by marriages among the lineage (*qawm*); on the flip side, others do not hesitate to cooperate and even become united by marriage with members of other lineages. The most outstanding point here is that these opposite strategies within a family do not impede the maintenance of strong solidarity ties. Even more, this so-called “political diversification” is viewed by community members as a social guarantee in case of deterioration of security conditions, as has often been the case in Afghanistan. Other presentations on

this panel included “The Kazakhs of Uzbekistan as an Ethnic Minority” (Kamil Kolonov, Islamic University, Tashkent); “Forced Population Transfers and the Construction of Identity: A Comparative Analysis of the Transfer of Mountain Tajiks in the 50s and the Exile of Refugees from Tajikistan in the '90s” (Olivier Ferrando, Institute of Political Sciences, Paris); “Russians of Contemporary Uzbekistan: The Construction of a New Identity?” (Evgenii Abdullayev, independent scholar, Tashkent); and “Identities and Resources: An Ethnographic Approach to the Construction of Solidarity in the Naryn Valley” (Boris Petric, National Center of Scientific Research, Paris).

A second panel, on the issue of identity from a historical perspective, proved to be successful in terms of the debates between presenters and the audience. The presentation by Italian researcher Paolo Sartori (La Sapienza University, Rome), entitled “Progressive or Regressive? A *Qadimi* Periodical of the Tashkent Ulama *al-Islah* (1915-1918),” provided a revised analysis of Jadidism. On the basis of his research in local archives and newspapers of the Jadid period, he deconstructed the typical, collective understanding of Jadidism, where progressive Jadids stand in opposition to regressive Qadims, and tried to rehabilitate the contribution of Qadims to the progress and achievements of this key period on the eve of the Russian revolution. A group of scholars proposed a new reading of the construction of the Kyrgyz identity: Sergei Abashin (Academy of Sciences, Moscow) considered “How to Write the History of Central Asia? Some Thoughts on Identities,” developing the link between the history of Central Asia and local ethnic identities. The paper by Sinaru Alunkulova (Arabaev University), “The Interest towards One’s Own History as a Factor of Reinforcement of Identity Consciousness among the Kyrgyz,” examined Kyrgyz consciousness in the light of a politicized national history. Amantur Japarov (Academy of Sciences of Kyrgyzstan) proposed a cultural understanding of the identity of today’s nomadic Kyrgyz in a paper on “Identity of Mobile Shepherds in the Region of Naryn.” A fourth paper at this panel was presented by Numonjon Gafarov (University of Khujand, Tajikistan): “The Concept of ‘Nation’ from the Periodical ‘Ayna.’”

A third panel at the conference examined the categorization and construction of national identity, while a fourth addressed identity practices and relations through the lens of kinship, collective work and musical culture. The seminar gave rise to lively discussions. Participants drew upon historical,

sociological, economic and political sources to oppose the archetypal representations of Central Asian identities. They all came to the same conclusion that identity could not be addressed from a single perspective. In this respect, it is interesting to note that the Arabaev University, which hosted the seminar, made a first step in developing multidisciplinary approaches. Indeed a chair of social anthropology was created in 2005 with the support of several French institutions: the MSH Foundation, the National Center for Scientific Research and EHESS and the financial support of

the French government. This broadening and mutual enrichment of the Soviet conception of anthropology with history, sociology and economy appears to be a major step for Kyrgyz academia and for the training of a new generation of Kyrgyz scholars. A selection of papers presented at the seminar will be published in the next issue of the IFEAC journal "Cahiers d'Asie centrale" in the French language in 2008. Further information on this and other conferences sponsored by IFEAC may be found at the organization's website: <http://www.ifeac.org/fr/>.

Central Asia: Sharing Experiences and Prospects. The Tenth Conference of the European Society for Central Asian Studies

Ankara, Turkey, September 12-15, 2007

Reported by: **Pınar Akçalı**, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey, akcali@metu.edu.tr

On September 12-13, 2007, the Tenth Conference of the European Society for Central Asian Studies (ESCAS) was held at the Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara, Turkey. ESCAS is a European-based scholarly organization, the roots of which go back to 1985, when a group of European scholars from the Netherlands, Germany, France, Great Britain and Denmark working on Central Asia came together in the first and founding meeting of ESCAS at the Utrecht University Department of Oriental Languages and Cultures. Since then, similar meetings have been organized in London (1987), Paris (1989), Bamberg (1991), Copenhagen (1995), Venice (1998), Vienna (2000), Bordeaux (2002) and Krakow (2005).

The conference was organized by the Center for Black Sea and Central Asia (KORA), a research center of METU, which has become one of the leading research institutes conducting projects on a variety of different issues in the Caucasian, Central Asian, East and Central European countries. The conference brought together many scholars from Europe, Turkey, Eurasia and the United States and provided them the opportunity to attend several sessions on a variety of different topics and issues.

The conference was opened by the keynote speech of the ninth President of the Turkish Republic, Mr. Süleyman Demirel. Demirel's speech highlighted both the difficulties and challenges of the post-Soviet transition and the opportunities lying

ahead. Demirel also focused on Turkey's role in the past, present and future to facilitate this transition.

The conference was interdisciplinary, with many papers focusing on identity formation, history, international relations, political issues, economic development and environmental problems. Among these topics, however, papers focusing on historical issues, identity formation, political developments and geopolitics of the region deserve special attention, as they formed the bulk of the sessions.

One of the most noticeable characteristics of the papers focusing on historical issues was the new approaches and information that they introduced, shedding new light on several historical phenomena, and potentially contributing to the process of post-Soviet history re-writing. One such paper, entitled "Between Loss of Power and Market Integration," was presented by Wolfgang Holzwarth (Institute of Oriental Studies, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg), who focused on the changes brought by the colonial transformation of rural and nomadic pastoralists in Central Asia. According to Holzwarth, pastoralists were not "losers" in all cases, although livestock-breeding underwent substantial changes. As such, "a new type of cattle owner appeared on the scene, the rich city dweller who engaged in profitable sheep business." In another paper, entitled "The Role of Alash Orda in the Formation of the Kazakh SSR," Yunus Emre Gürbüz (Department of History, METU) argued that in the turmoil of transformation in Russia between

1917-1920, the leaders of the Kazakh Alash Orda movement changed their political allies depending on the changing conditions. According to Gürbüz, the relationship between the Bolsheviks and the Alash Orda leaders should not be viewed from an “aggressor-victim dichotomy,” as these leaders worked as “active modernizers” alongside the Bolsheviks until their liquidation two decades later. Kirill Nourzhanov (Senior Lecturer, Center for Arab and Islamic Studies, Australian National University) focused in his paper, “Reassessing the Basmachi: Warlords without Ideology,” on the “highly heterogeneous phenomenon” of the Basmachis and argued that the Basmachis represented “very different strains of activity rather than a continuous and concise social movement.” So they could be regarded as a “manifestation of warlordism” or as “an attempt by traditional communities to protect their authorities vis-à-vis any kind of centralized state.” Marianne Ruth Kamp (Associate Professor of History, University of Wyoming) presented a paper entitled “Remembering Collectivization: Destruction, Development and Personal Fortune in Uzbekistan.” In her paper Kamp focused on the interviews of 120 *dehqons*, elderly collective farmers, from different regions of Uzbekistan, and argued that these people remembered the collectivization experience in their country differently, depending on their political position. As such, those *dehqons* who stood at the top of the kolhoz or worked in those kolkhozes that prospered had a more positive view of the collectivization experience than did others. Finally, Cynthia Ann Werner (Associate Professor of Anthropology, Texas A&M University) presented a paper entitled “Unraveling the Secrets of the Past: Contesting Versions of Nuclear Testing in the Soviet Republic of Kazakhstan,” which focused on the legacy of nuclear testing in Kazakhstan, and analyzed the emergence of different versions of the “truth” among nuclear scientists, medical researchers and Kazakh and Russian villagers who lived near the Semipalatinsk test site. Today, different versions of the nuclear past coexist “in a highly politicized present where the victims are struggling to receive greater compensation for their suffering and nuclear scientists are striving to redefine their jobs in a post-testing context.”

One theme of the papers focusing on identity issues was how traditions and traditional identities such as religion, ethnicity, tribal attachments and gender re-emerged and reshaped the political landscape and patterns of social interaction in these countries in the post-Soviet era. Gabriele Rasuly-

Paleczek (Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Vienna) analyzed gender roles and family and kinship relations among the Uzbeks of Afghanistan in her presentation, “Dislocating Gender, Family and Kinship: The Uzbeks of Afghanistan and Beyond.” According to her, kin and family relations were important in overcoming social and political uncertainties. However, gendered perceptions of male and female role models and virtues either enhance or diminish the reputation of individuals, families and kin groups. For females, reputation is closely tied to “chastity and modesty,” whereas for males it is closely tied to “bravery, public role and religiosity.” In a similar presentation, Professor Maxsuda Abdusalyamova (Tajik State National University) focused on the traditional stereotypes about female and male roles and powerful barriers to achieving equal opportunities for Tajik women in labor markets, especially in technical professions. According to Abdusalyamova, although women constitute 42% of the workers in industry, they are hired basically for “difficult, low-paying jobs.” This factor helps us to “understand the reasons for poverty and migration in Tajikistan.” Helene Thibault (Université libre de Bruxelles) argued in her presentation entitled “Islam as a Political Strategy” that several legitimate and illegitimate political actors use Islam as a way of “promoting their different political interests.” Therefore, Islam continues to have a “great impact on the political strategies of various actors” and it contributes to the emergence of new actors such as Hizb-ut Tahrir.

Another major theme of the papers focusing on identity was how the above-mentioned traditions and traditional identities have been used either by the state or by the Central Asian people themselves in coping with post-Soviet challenges. For example, Rano Turaeva’s presentation, entitled “Integration through Practical Kinship and Ethnicity,” discusses how kinship and ethnicity are used by migrants in Tashkent as means of integration into the “host” society. According to Turaeva (PhD student, Max-Planck-Institute for Social Anthropology), the term “practical kinship” sheds light on one aspect within the process of the instrumentalization of kinship ties that takes place as the migrants’ integration process is shaped by the organization of ethnic and kinship networks in the capital city. In another paper entitled “Informal Networks and Politics: A Case Study of the Clan Logic in Candidate Selection and Campaigning in Kyrgyzstan,” Fredrik M. Sjöberg (Department of Government, London School of Economics) analyzed the role of informal networks

in Kyrgyz political life, especially in nominating candidates to parliamentary elections. Sjoberg argued that the use of clan power in the country “prevents the emergence of strong national political parties and structures of democratic accountability.” Aksana Ismailbekova (PhD candidate, Max-Planck-Institute for Social Anthropology), in her paper entitled “Patron-Client Relations: Inter-Class Relationships within the Context of a Kyrgyz Community,” argued that in the post-Soviet era, patron-client relations have been modified in Kyrgyzstan as a “coping strategy for survival in response to the specificities of the market economy.” As such, new and larger social networks form in order to “provide economic security” and “to give status, prestige, recognition and reputation” to the people. Svetlana Jacquesson’s presentation, “Kins and Animals as Bases of Cooperation and Integration among Nowadays Northern Kyrgyzstan,” focused on re-emerging social ties after the socialist period, as well as on “kinship and genealogy” as sources of group formation and identification. According to Jacquesson (Senior Research Fellow, Max-Planck-Institute for Social Anthropology), both kinship and heredity are seen as “sources of cooperation” as well as ways of integrating into the economic and political setting in today’s Kyrgyzstan.

Another interesting focus of the papers on identity issues is the redefinition of traditional identities in the post-Soviet era. Irene Hilgers (Research Fellow, Max-Planck-Institute for Social Anthropology) focused in her paper, “Contested Spaces in the Religious Landscape of Post-Soviet Uzbekistan,” on the changing religious landscape in Uzbekistan by using the example of the city of Kokand in the Ferghana Valley. According to Hilgers, in the post-Soviet era “a redefinition within the religious space” is taking place. As such, the contest over spaces and religious practices is not between Islam and Christianity; rather, it takes place on the intra-confessional level (in the case of Christianity) and along the dichotomies of “traditional/modern,” “local/global” and “national/transnational” (in the case of Islam). In another paper, “Understanding Social and Religious Change in Kyrgyzstan,” David Radford, a research fellow at the American University of Central Asia in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, analyzed the *mashayakchi*, Kyrgyz who converted to Christianity in the post-Soviet era. According to these converts, the Kyrgyz people were Christians even before Islam. Some *mashayakchi* argued that the famous Kyrgyz legend, *Manas*, took its name from “Manasa,” a Jewish tribe,

and that the *tiindik*, the top part of the Kyrgyz yurt, in fact symbolized the Trinity. Radford emphasized that these converts believe that they did not adopt a new faith, rather that “their old faith came back to them.”

Migration was another interesting issue in several conference papers. For example, in François Rollan’s paper, “International Migration in Post-Soviet Central Asia,” the major focus was on political and economic migrations in Central Asia, which he characterized as “mass migrations” because they included several million people. Rollan (National Center for Scientific Research, Bordeaux University) analyzed the unique conditions of Russian, German, Tajik, Kyrgyz and Uzbek migrants who left their countries for different reasons. According to him, half of the migrants from Central Asia go to Russia, as this country is “their Eldorado.” Nazgul Tajibaeva (International School of Sociology, University of Bielefeld) discussed in her paper, entitled “Sending State and Transnational Migration: The Case of Kyrgyzstan,” how sending states evolve and develop over time as strategic actors in international migration and how state activities affect the transnationalization of migration. Tajibaeva argued that the relationship between the state on the one hand and the migrants/diaspora on the other is “a matter of considerable importance” especially for young states. In this context policies about migrants in Kyrgyzstan need to be analyzed within the context of nation- and state-building processes.

There were several papers focusing on the issue of educational reform. Nikolai V. Muraviev (Department of Public Administration, Kazakhstan Institute of Management, Economics and Strategic Research, Almaty) in a presentation entitled “The Globalization Challenge: Transformation of Higher Education in Central Asia,” analyzed the ways in which higher education in several Central Asian countries was reformed due to “the aspirations for globalization through joining the world educational community.” Although there is a quest to improve higher education along Western standards, there has been little actual change because the universities “tend to downgrade the importance of this transformation and concentrate just on the façade.” Zifa-Alua M. Auezova (Executive Director, Educational Center “Bilim-Central Asia,” Almaty) focused in her presentation, “Intellectual History of Central Asia: Building a ‘Curriculum,’” on the emergence of a “global perspective” in higher education as universities make the necessary

changes to adopt the credit system of Western universities.

There were several papers focusing on issues of geopolitics and relations among regional actors. Kyle T. Evered's paper, entitled "Eurasianist Geopolitics Today: A Comparative Survey of Kazakh and Turkish Examples," discussed the concept of Eurasianism, which "has come to constitute sets of ideals and geographies quite distinct from those associated with its origins." Kazakhstan and Turkey are two regional countries promoting Eurasianism; however, "Russian/Slavic and Aryan/Scythian/Iranic contributions to a Eurasian identity and history are conspicuously absent." Evered (Assistant Professor of Geography, Michigan State University) also suggested that in addition to these contributions, state and Islamist groups are "integral to the construction of Turkish views of Eurasia." Aziza Umarova's paper, entitled "From Security Convergence to Energy Competition," focused on the changing characteristics of Sino-Russian relations in Central Asia. According to Umarova (Junior Analyst, Center for Political Studies, Tashkent), Sino-Soviet cooperation gives both countries "an opportunity to counter Western pressure in their anti-American alliance and press for a multipolar world." Despite that, Umarova also discussed the possibility of an energy competition between Russia and China over Central Asia in the long run. Stephan Aris (PhD candidate, Russian and East European Studies, University of Birmingham) in his presentation entitled "Tackling the Three Evils: Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO)" discussed the SCO "as a regional response to the main internal security concerns of prevailing elites," rather than "a

vehicle for non-democratic states to express an anti-US position," a popular claim in mainstream Western liberal academic circles. According to Aris, the driving force behind SCO was not external but domestic, as the member states "have recognized the need to build a regionally cooperative approach" to the common threats that they face.

Last, but definitely not least, we should mention the keynote speech by John Schoeberlein (Program on Central Asia and the Caucasus, Harvard University), entitled "The Ubiquitous State: Scholarship of Central Eurasia and the Sovietological Legacy." Schoeberlein suggested that approaches to understanding Central Asia were, and to a large extent still are, shaped by Sovietology, which was a product of the Cold War past. As such, as researchers, we are living in a "prison of our own scholarly legacy." Schoeberlein also focused on the main characteristics of Sovietology, which basically aimed to discredit the Soviet Union and the Soviet regime. In that sense Islam and nationalization were intensively analyzed as potential opposing forces against Soviet ideology. According to Schoeberlein, post-Soviet scholarly work should look specifically at what is non-state, problematize the state/society boundary, closely question the concept of continuity, and be aware of the state's heterogeneity and the locations and practices of interaction of the people with the state.

As a final note, it needs to be mentioned that the next ESCAS Conference will take place in 2009 in the city of Leiden, The Netherlands. Detailed information about ESCAS and KORA can be found on their websites, <http://www.escas.pz.nl/> and <http://www.kora.metu.edu.tr>, respectively.

Central Eurasia at the 38th International Congress of Asian and North African Studies (ICANAS)

Ankara, Turkey, September 10-15, 2007

Reported by: **Ayşe Çolpan Kavuncu**, PhD student, Program in Urban Policy Planning and Local Government, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey, akavuncu@metu.edu.tr

On September 10-15, 2007, the 38th International Congress of Asian and North African Studies (ICANAS) was held in Ankara. ICANAS is a prominent congress with a history of 134 years. The first ICANAS congress was held in Paris in 1873 under the name of "International Orientalists Congress," but in 1973 the Congress was re-named ICANAS. The Congress is considered to be one of

the most outstanding meetings in the field of social sciences and humanities, as it brings together many scholars of North Africa and Asia from different countries in fields such as language, history, literature, religion, philosophy, anthropology, culture, ecology, economics, international relations and music.

ICANAS 38 was organized by the Atatürk Supreme Council for Culture, Language and History. Over the course of six days, the conference focused on many different themes discussed in roughly 250 panels by participants from the former Soviet republics, Turkey, Africa, the Middle East, the United States and Europe. Papers about Eurasia were presented in sessions about language policies, history and international relations. This report provides a brief sampling of the scholarship on Central Eurasia presented at the conference.

Ayşe Dietrich's paper can be given as a good example of those that focused on the development of language policy and the role of Russian in the five Central Asian states from the time of the Russian Revolution to the present day. Likewise, Filiz Kılıç claimed in her presentation that although the Kyrgyz people increasingly emphasized their native language in the post-Soviet era, Russian has maintained its position in Kyrgyz society. In another paper, Oidov Adica analyzed the impact of globalization on the political language of Mongolia. According to Adica, the concept of globalization affected not only the economic, social or political situation in the country, but also the political language. Although Russian was the dominant second language in Mongolia for decades during communist rule, it was replaced by English after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

There were several presentations about the history of Central Eurasia. Dilorom Agzamovna Alimova's presentation, for example, analyzed the process of Jadidism in Turkistan by focusing on the "Turkistan Mukhtoriyati," which was a "national-democratic state based on eastern traditions" during the Russian civil war. According to Alimova, Jadidism and the history of Turkistan need to be understood with new approaches and international academic cooperation among historians. A few papers specifically focused on the Uighur Autonomous Republic of China. For example, Sergey V. Dmitriev's paper analyzed the impact of the Uighur experience in administration and culture in the Mongol Empire and China between 1206 and 1368. Dmitriev outlined how the Mongolian khans utilized the experience of the Uighurs in government and state administrative structures as well as in cultural areas such as alphabet formation.

The bulk of the presentations about Central Eurasia focused on various issues related to the field of international relations, ranging from regional

security and integration in Central Asia and inter-state relations among countries in the region to certain problematic areas such as the Karabagh region, Daghestan and Chechnya. Mirzokhid Rakhimov discussed the challenges and future prospects of regional cooperation in Central Asia by looking at organizations such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and the Economic Cooperation Organization. According to Rakhimov, these organizations as well as the interests of major powers have determined the basic dynamics of geopolitical transformation and inter-state cooperation in the region in the post-Soviet era.

Richard Dietrich's presentation was on the failures of American policy in Central Asia since the September 11th attacks. After briefly examining the formation and direction of US policy in the five republics of Central Asia, Dietrich looked at the changes in US policy in the region, as well as new American expectations, cooperation with Russia and some counter-measures to America's presence in Central Asia.

Alexei D. Voskressenskii's presentation analyzed the regional division of the oriental world and its influence on international relations. He argued that in the age of globalization a new international system has emerged, wherein one must understand both the universal/general rules and regionalization and regional fragmentation along lines of common geographical, cultural, and civilizational identities. According to Voskressenskii, this division would have consequences in disciplines like international relations and political science as well as in different regions of the world, including Central Asia.

Gao Shuqin's paper looked at the "alternative relations" of great powers in Central Eurasia. Gao analyzed the cases of the US, Russia and China, examining their redefinition of Eurasian security challenges in the post-Soviet era and their shift "from special interests to strategic cooperation." In another similar paper, Heithor Romana focused on Chinese concerns in the region, revolving mainly around the goal of "becoming a major economic and military actor in the Asia-Pacific Rim." As such, Romana argued that for Chinese leaders, Central Asia is basically a "geopolitical issue" and an important region that helps them become the strategic leader in the region.

In general, ICANAS 38 was a productive gathering at which international networking and exchange among scholars advanced considerably.

More information on the conference can be gathered at the following link: [http://www.icanas38.org.tr/..](http://www.icanas38.org.tr/)

The Roads of Pilgrimage (Hajj, Ziyarat) between Central Asia and the Hejaz

Tashkent, Uzbekistan, October 3-4, 2007

Reported by: **Stéphane A. Dodoignon**, Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS) and the Central Eurasian Reader, Paris, France, dudoignon@aol.com, and cereader@aol.com

Interest in Islamic (or Islamized) pilgrimage practice in Central Asia has been and remains a key feature of the human and social sciences of this wide region of the world. This is due notably to the significance that has been given to *ziyarat* as a substitution ritual not only for the hajj, but also for the expression of Islamic piety in general during almost all of the Soviet era. In connection with this logic, a key aspect of the conference “The Roads of Pilgrimage (Hajj, *Ziyarat*) between Central Asia and Hejaz” was the study of mutual relations between a wide range of *ziyarat*s and the hajj, the former often perceived as a substitute of the latter. Among other aspects upon which the organizers intended to cast light are the following: the geography of pilgrimages (inside Central Asia as well as on the major trunk roads to the Hejaz, and at these highways’ main stopping places), the collective and individual experience of the hajj (through religious practice and the transmission of knowledge in pilgrim hostels, or in Mecca and Medina themselves), and contemporary perspectives (through attention to the impact of new means of transportation, and to the role played by émigré figures and groups). According to the conference’s postulates, a combination of approaches from history and the social sciences was to investigate activities parallel to the pilgrimage *strict sensu*: travelling, crossing points, emigration, sociability, intellectual encounters, supererogatory pious deeds and mystical progression. Lastly, the study of pilgrimage roads and their use aimed at avoiding two pitfalls: 1) an enclosed and static appraisal of Central Asia, limited to its contemporary identities; 2) an imaginary or anachronistic vision haunted by the memory of ancient pathways. Beyond these simplifications, the organizers intended to consider “a history made of movements and otherness.”

Although during the conference the papers were not distributed according to their respective content (which allowed the organizers to modify the program several times, keeping the audience on their toes), for clarity it is possible to divide them into three categories, regardless of their place in the program. The first group concentrated on the definition of specific holy places or categories of holy places, as well as on the study of the role of significant stopping places of the hajj through the ages. The second group focused on the evolution of pilgrimage practice and symbolic instrumentation in specific periods of history, with a particular interest in the Soviet era. Finally, a third and substantial group of studies looked at a variety of categories of pilgrimage accounts as sources for historians and social scientists, entailing a systematic reflection of the very nature of these narrative sources and on the possible methodology of their utilization.

On the first day, two presentations were based on the principles and techniques of *micro storia*. Hamid Algar (University of California, Berkeley) spoke on “Central Asian Naqshbandis in the Twin Holy Cities” while Thierry Zarcone (CNRS, Paris) presented a paper on “The Uzbek Zawiyah of Jerusalem: A Welcoming Centre for the Pilgrims on the Way to Mecca.” Both shed light on the role played by the presence of a network of “Bukhari” or “Uzbek” *tekkes* of notably Naqshbandi obedience in Istanbul, Jerusalem and Cairo in the choice by Central Asian pilgrims of the western road to the hajj at different periods of time, especially between the advent of the Safavid dynasty in Iran in the early sixteenth century and the strengthening of Soviet power in the mid-1920s. These perspectives on the *longue durée* were qualified by Thomas Welsford (Oxford University), whose paper on “Piety, Refuge and Dynastic Change: The Reopening of Iran for the Circulation of Pilgrims from Central Asia (1600-

1650)” explored political decentralization in Central Asia and the influx of refugees from this region when Iran was opened to the circulation of pilgrims in the first half of the seventeenth century. Such diachronic studies of on the hajj and its itineraries were complemented by historical approaches to Central Asian holy places of regional significance, notably through their mutual symbolic relationship and link with the Hejaz as both are established by the hagiography of Central Asian saints. For instance, the paper by Hamada Masami (University of Kyoto) on “An Invitation to the Imagination of the Hajj” focused on the connections between Kashghar and Samarqand, Bukhara and Constantinople through legendary master/disciple links, while Sawada Minoru (University of Toyama) explored the close association of numerous *mazars* of the Khotan province (southern Xinjiang) with the imams of the ‘Alid lineage in his presentation “Pilgrimages on the Holy Places of the Taklamakan Desert: Mausoleums of the Imams in the Khotan Region.” A particular aspect of the veneration of holy places in the context of normative religious practice, namely the objects related to some holy figure — from the Prophet Muhammad’s beard (*mu-yi mubarak*) to elements of clothing of recent saints — was presented by Nadirbek Abdulhatov (Ferghana Regional Museum, Marghilan) in his talk on “‘Sacred’ Objects in Ferghana Mazars: Between Islam and Fetishism.”

A specific category of historical analyses dealt with the practice and role of pilgrimage in particular periods of time. The paper by Lola Dodkhudoeva (Institute of History, Dushanbe) on “Hajj in the Political Legitimization of the Kurt and Timurid Rulers of Imperial Herat” analyzed the place of the hajj in the system of legitimization of Herat’s rulers, notably through the elaboration of normative *hajj-namas* (hajj accounts) and through the veneration of holy graves, with special reference to the place of the development of Mashhad in Shahrukh and Gawharshad’s policy of providing attention to both Sunnis and Shiites. The Tsarist period was represented by a reflection by Naima Nefliasheva (Center for the Study of Civilizations and Regions, Moscow), whose paper “The Hajj from the Russian Empire and the Notion of Boundary,” explored how the hajj reinforced local and ethnic identities, rather than the sense of belonging to the *umma*, as inferred from a report by a Muslim officer of the Russian Army, A. Davletshin, after a secret mission to the Hejaz in 1898. The Soviet period was illustrated by two contributions dealing with the normative literature *par excellence* constituted by fatwa

collections. Bakhtiyar Babadjanov (Biruni Institute of Oriental Studies, Tashkent) reported in his “Mazar Pilgrimage as a Form of Practice of Islam during the Soviet Period” on local pilgrimages as a form of religious practice in the “short” twentieth century through the promotion of the theological notion of *fard al-kifaya*, according to which the non-fulfilment of obligation is excusable in determined circumstances. In a presentation on “The Role of Hajj and Ziyarat in the Formation of Soviet and Post-Soviet Islam (a Comparative Study of Dagestan and Uzbekistan),” Vladimir Bobrovnikov (Institute of Oriental Studies, Moscow) commented on the rapid evolution of the respective roles of hajj and ziyarat in the reshaping of Islam in the former Soviet space, through a comparative study of Daghestan and Uzbekistan that was based on yet unstudied collections of *fatwas* issued since the 1980s on this topic in both republics. Both insist on the role of Soviet policy and the closure of mosques and *madrasas* from the mid-1920s onwards in the durable reinforcement of the relative significance of holy places and in the preservation and evolution of religious practice in the Caucasus and Central Asia. Insight into the current period was offered by Abd al-Hakim Juzjani (Islamic University of Tashkent) in his report on “The Issue of the Taliban and the Ziyarat in Afghanistan,” which eloquently evoked the essentially negative impact of Taliban power and influence on the rich tradition of pilgrimage practice in Afghanistan — with special reference to Eastern Khorasan as implicitly opposed to the regions south of the Hindu Kush.

The third category was about monographic studies of specific narratives as possible sources for the history and anthropology of Islamic pilgrimage in Central Eurasia. After Hamid Algar’s analysis of the place of *adab* in the very notion of pilgrimage in Islam, Necdet Tosun (State University of Osh and Marmara University of Istanbul), commented on “Hajj from a Sufi Viewpoint” through classical — mainly Turkic — texts of Islamic gnostic poetry, which stressed the importance of intentionality in the practice of the hajj, in a mood quite characteristic of the Hanafi *madhhab*. In an overview of the theological literature over the ages entitled “Isnad, Silsila, An‘ana in Central Asia: New Elements on Hajj and Ziyarat,” Ashirbek Muminov (Institute of Oriental Studies, Almaty) stressed the gradual substitution of genealogy (*silsila*) for tradition (*an‘ana*), and the growing role of Sufi *shaykhs* in the debates over the lawfulness of ziyarat in Central Eurasian lands. Other presentations stressed the importance of hajj accounts in the history of Central

Eurasian thought and social practice in general. In his analysis entitled “Pilgrimage Routes and Mystical Paths: The Journey of a Qalandar Sufi, Muhammad Zalili, from Yarkand to Mecca (17th-18th centuries),” Alexandre Papas (CNRS, Paris) shed some light on the role of gnostic hajj-namas for the metaphoric expression of the successive states (*hals*) of the mystical experience. Two parallel contributions by scholars from the Biruni Institute of Tashkent stressed the role played in the late nineteenth century by this classical genre as a vehicle for ideas of religious, social and political reform in Central Asia: Sharifa Toshova through the polemic accounts by Bukharan scholars and travellers like Wazih (in her paper “Central Asian Hajj: Itineraries and Impressions”), and Omonullo Buriev through his presentation on “The Description of the Hajj in the ‘Muntakhab al-Tawarikh’ by Muhammad Hakim Khan Tura.” More panoramic overviews were offered on early twentieth-century lithographed hajj accounts. Shovosil Ziyodov, also of the Biruni Institute, spoke on “Hajj Narratives: The Lithographs Preserved in Tashkent,” focusing on two extremely normative early twentieth-century hajj-namas lithographed several times and preserved in public libraries in Tashkent. In a paper entitled “Narratives of Tatar Hajj,” Alfina Sibgatullina (Institute of Oriental Studies, Moscow) explored personal narratives printed during the same period in the Volga-Ural region of Russia. Interestingly enough, several of the latter accounts insist on physical and other tests (*imtihon*) endured by the pilgrims on the road to Mecca. They also suggest the rebuilding of collective identity through the reinforcement, among Tatar-language pilgrims, of the sentiment of their belonging to the Russian Empire (already suggested by Captain Davletshin in his 1898 confidential report). This role of modern hajj in the reinforcement (and of the hajj-nama in the apology) of existing kinships and of local, regional, national or imperial identities was enhanced in the study by Stéphane A. Dudoignon (CNRS, Paris) entitled “Globalized Pilgrimage? Individual Narratives and Collective Practice of the Hajj in Post-Soviet Central Asia,” which looked at a hajj-nama published in northern Tajikistan in 1994. Underlying the contrast between the individualist, existentialist stance of the author and the essentially

collective, kinship-based practice depicted in this modernist account, the author notably shed light on the discovery of a Tajik identity during the crossing of Iranian territory by the little group of travellers guided by a local spiritual authority from the city of Khujand.

The liveliness of the debates following each set of papers (in English, Russian, Uzbek and even in the Persian language), despite the impressive size of the assembly, testified to the organizers’ success in gathering an orchestra of scholars of diverse ages, origins and disciplines around a common problematic. In spite of the weak presence of social sciences and the overrepresentation of Oriental studies, the historical approaches and the constant effort developed by participants to resituate in their respective context the sources they were using and the practices they were depicting, the conference managed to avoid the pitfall of an essentialist, romantic vision that continues to be commonly developed in studies on religious thought and practice in Central Eurasian societies. On the contrary, the conference was marked by the interest shown by many contributors in the impact of rapidly evolving political and juridical frameworks upon the practice and very representation of pilgrimage in this part of the worlds of Islam. It remains perhaps to be deplored that the consensual character of such a theme, and the central place that hajj and ziyarat have occupied in nation- and state-building in Central Asia since the late 1980s were not really questioned by the participants, apart from occasional remarks in the very last moments of the conference.

The day after the conference, a small group of participants still present in Tashkent was privileged to attend a presentation of the show on “Mashrab” written in 2005 on a commission by the Vienna Festival by Marc Weil, the Director of the Ilhom Theatre. After Marc Weil’s assassination on September 7, his programming for the ongoing year has been maintained by the current directors of the theatre and this “ziyarat” at the Ilhom Theatre has offered the attendees an opportunity to express their sadness and their ongoing interest in Marc Weil’s exceptionally innovative work in the service of a permanent mutual interaction between Central Asian and international cultures.

Central Asian Workshop for Doctoral and Post-Doctoral Students

Paris, France, October 26-27, 2007

Reported by: **Madeleine Reeves**, Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change, University of Manchester, UK, madeleine.reeves@manchester.ac.uk and **Olivier Ferrando**, Institut d'études politiques [Institute of Political Science], Paris, France, olivier.ferrando@sciences-po.org

The National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS) in Paris was host to an intensive Workshop on Central Asia [Journées d'études centre-asiatiques] on October 26-27, 2007. Organized in collaboration with the Institut français d'études sur l'Asie centrale [French Institute for Central Asian Studies] (IFEAC) and with the support of the Réseau Asie [Asia Network] at CNRS, the workshop brought together over forty young researchers working on Central Asia at the doctoral and post-doctoral level in diverse fields, including archaeology, history, anthropology, sociology, geography, politics and architecture. Also participating were a number of established scholars, representatives of research agencies and many master's level students. The majority of participants were affiliated with French universities and research institutes, including several scholars from Central Asia. There was also a small, but significant minority of participants from other countries, including Canada, Germany, Italy, Kazakhstan, Switzerland, the UK and the US.

As the opening speeches emphasized, the workshop had both an exploratory and a programmatic function: to bring together young researchers working on Central Asia so as to introduce one another to research-in-progress; and to make the voice of Central Asian studies heard more cogently and forcefully within the French academy. As Svetlana Gorshenina argued in her opening presentation, a meeting of this kind was a "grande première" and as such represented an important milestone in the institutionalization of a field whose students, in France as elsewhere, are dispersed across diverse disciplinary and regional programs. In order to foster interdisciplinary linkages, the days were structured with a single panel running at any one time so that the archaeologists stayed around to listen to the political scientists and vice versa. While this necessarily constrained the available time for discussion, the short presentations, designed to give the audience an overview of research in progress, enabled those attending to develop a sense for the shape of the field as a whole.

With over forty individual presentations of research in this two-day marathon, and disciplinary overviews that introduced the audience to a further

twenty research projects in progress, the conference attested to the vibrant state of Francophone research on Central Asia, particularly in fields such as archaeology and pre-Islamic history that tend to be comparatively underrepresented at interdisciplinary conferences on the region. Indeed, of seven separate sections during the two days, four were devoted to archaeological and historical themes (on archaeology and prehistory, antiquity and pre-Islamic history, Turkistan under Russian rule and in Xinjiang and Soviet history), while the remaining three covered more contemporary issues (from geopolitics to anthropology to architecture).

The quality and scope of archaeological research is particularly noteworthy, drawing on a tradition of large ongoing collaborative excavations that has a long history in France. The French Archaeological Delegation to Afghanistan dates from the 1920s and revived its activities in 2002 after a 20-year hiatus; Franco-Uzbek collaboration in archaeological excavations considerably predates the collapse of the Soviet Union, and there are currently digs underway involving multicountry teams of archaeologists in Khakassia, Altai, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan. Among the ten presentations in the sphere of archaeology, Claire Dupin (University of Paris-I) described her recent findings in Gonur Depe (Merv oasis, Turkmenistan) in her presentation "The Gonur Depe Necropolis (Turkmenistan)," which shed new light on Bronze Age funerary rights. Rouhollah Sharazi (University of Paris-I) illustrated the fascinating similarities between bronze age carved figures found in eastern Iran and Turkmenistan in his presentation "A Study of Figurines of Central Asia and Eastern Iran from the Chalcolithic to the Middle Bronze Age" and described his attempts to develop a typology of figurines and to understand their role within fertility cults. Drawing on findings from pioneering archaeological excavations, a paper on "Petroglyphs of the Western Himalayas" by Laurianne Bruneau (University of Paris-I) presented her research on prehistoric petroglyphs in Ladakh, which share "a common artistic language" with those of the Inner Asian steppe. Jean-Baptiste Houal (University of Lyon-I) and Johanna Lhuiller (University of Paris-I)

described how ceramics are being used to determine ritual practice. Houal focused on the ancient fourth-century BCE citadel of Termez (“Ceramics of Termez, Uzbekistan, from the 4th century BCE to the 16th century AD”), while Lhuiller looked at an important transitional period in “The Period of Transition Between the Bronze Age and the Iron Age in Central Asia: The Phenomenon of the ‘Modeled Painted Ceramic Cultures.’”

As the discussion moved from archaeology to ancient and medieval history, the debate shifted to themes no doubt familiar in many national academies concerning the relative dearth of positions on Central Asia in contexts where the geographical logics of research institutions and donor agencies tend to leave Central Asian studies on the margins of other “world regions.” In the comments following the second panel on ancient and medieval history, Frantz Grenet (CNRS), who presided over the session, noted the imbalance between the quality of current doctoral work on Central Asian history in France and its tendency to be deprivileged in the major research academies. As the panel attested, there is much fascinating and innovative research underway. Orkhan Mir-Kasimov of the *École pratique des hautes études* [Practical School for Advanced Studies] (EPHE) in Paris described his research on “The Study of Ancient *Hurufi* Texts,” specifically texts of the 14th and 15th centuries, and the role of textual authority in the groups subsequently identifying as Hurufi. Daniel Allgoewer (University of Lausanne) in his presentation “Bilingual Iconography in Central Asia from Alexander the Great to Islam” suggested a semiotic approach to the interpretation of what he calls “bicultural objects” — that is, objects of art which that are accessible to interpretation via two cultural schemas — using this to explore the reception of Hellenistic iconography within the Sassanid empire following the conquest by Alexander the Great. Other research presented during the panel on pre-Islamic history included a paper by Charlotte Baratin (University of Lyon-II) examining the extent of Saka settlement in early Persia (“Eastern Provinces of the Parthian and Sassanid Empires: Saka Settlements in the Helmand Basin [Afghanistan and Eastern Iran] from the 4th Century BCE to the 3rd Century AD”) and a discussion by Katia Juhel (EPHE) of techniques for determining the spread of early Buddhist iconography from the Mahavastu (“Analysis of Narrative Materials of the Mahavastu and their Representation in Gandharan Art”).

The session that followed, on Russian Turkistan and Xinjiang, introduced the audience to several ongoing and recently completed doctoral projects innovative both theoretically and methodologically. Alexander Morrison (University of Liverpool) argued in his presentation entitled “Russian Rule in Samarqand, 1868-1910: A Comparison with British India” for the need for a sustained comparison between Russian colonial rule in Turkistan and British colonial rule in India, drawing on detailed empirical study of administrative practice (and failure) in Samarqand Province to make the case against Russian imperial exceptionalism. Francois Lantz (University of Paris-IV) described in his presentation on “The Colonial Writing of Russian Turkistan” the beginnings of a vast research project to document the European imagination of Central Asia in the 19th century, and his empirical study of the relationship between this imaginative place and the practice of spatial conquest through the development of railways and other technologies. Colonial imaginary was also explored in the lavishly illustrated presentations of Heather Sonntag (University of Wisconsin - Madison) and Svetlana Gorshenina (University of Lausanne). Sonntag provided a fascinating account of the story behind the *Turkestan Album*, the availability of which online is in no small part thanks to her efforts (http://www.loc.gov/r/r/print/coll/287_turkestan.html), in her presentation “Photography and Mapping Russian Conquest in Central Asia: Early Albums, Encounters and Exhibitions, 1866-1876,” which developed an important argument about the insights that this “album mania” affords into the imperial project in Turkistan. Gorshenina, meanwhile, provided a conceptual history of the shifting bounds of “Central Asia” from Tartary onwards in her paper entitled “Inventing Russian Turkistan.” She developed a theme implicit in many of this panel’s presentations, on the relationship between conceptual conquest and physical incorporation of Turkistan within the Russian empire. Remi Castets of the Institute of Political Sciences, Paris, extended the discussion to Eastern Turkistan in the paper “Between Socioeconomic Claims and Terrorism: Identity, Colonization and Nationalism among the Uighurs of Xinjiang (Chinese Turkistan),” which looked at Uighur activism in the 20th century and Chinese nationalities policy.

If this panel was characterized by a concern to interrogate the meanings of Turkistan to the imperial cartographer, photographer, administrator and reader, the panel which followed, on Soviet Central

Asia, was striking for the extent to which it questioned univocal historical narratives. In a paper entitled “From Silent to Talking Movies: Cinema and Societies in Uzbekistan (1924-1937),” Cloé Drieu of the Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales [National Institute of Oriental Languages and Civilizations] (INALCO) in Paris explored the evolution of a “national” cinema in Uzbekistan, using this as a lens into evolving relations between Moscow and Tashkent. Xavier Hallez of the École des hautes études en sciences sociales [School of Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences] (EHESS) in Paris introduced a research project entitled “Comparative Biographies of Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev (1892-1940), Turar Ryskulov (1894-1938) and Elbegdorž Rinčino (1885-1937): Between Revolutions and Decolonization,” that seeks to use microhistory to question accounts of early Soviet state-formation, drawing upon biographies of revolutionary leaders in the Middle-Volga, Kazakhstan and Buriatia to explore the ambivalent place of “national” Bolsheviks “between revolution and decolonization.” Xavier Le Torrivellec (INALCO) used an analysis of the “long history” of Bashkir identity discourse in the Volga-Ural region to question standard periodizations of Soviet nationalities policy in his paper “History of Identities in Muslim Russia: The Autonomous Republic of Bashkortostan (1969-2004).” Bakhyt Sadykova (Abai University, Almaty) and Beatrice Penati (EHESS) both focused on exiled members of the pre-revolutionary Muslim intelligentsia. While Sadykova’s paper, “The Political Biography of Mustafa Chokay” focused on the legacy and contested historiography of a Central Asian leader, Penati’s paper on “Muslim Emigration from Russia to Western Europe (1919-1939),” provided a compelling introduction to her kindred project in the history of ideas, examining the way in which Chokay and others engaged with Western European political tropes and discourses of nation in the interwar years.

The three remaining panels dealt in different ways with the post-Soviet period, engaging respectively with social and political change; urban, spatial and environmental transformations, and the cultural and experiential dimensions of dramatic social change. The first of these, which closed the first day of the workshop, demonstrated both the possibility for genuine interdisciplinary collaboration (on issues, for instance, of identity politics, the appropriations of international languages of “minority” and “diaspora” and the gendered dimensions of post-Soviet labor

migrations), but also the relative dearth of such collaborations among young researchers, who work largely in isolation from one another. This is despite the fact, as Catherine Pujol (INALCO) noted in her insightful presiding comments to the panel, that the French Institute in Tashkent had acted as a “nursery of talent” for many of the projects presented — and that in certain fields there is a “French school” with a clearly articulated sense of its own institutional history. Among the innovative research projects presented in this large (nine-paper) panel, Louisa Piart (University of Leipzig) presented an ethnographically rich account of female Uzbek shuttle traders to Turkey and their complex negotiation of gender norms and administrative regimes in her presentation “Bazaars and Uzbek ‘Suitcase Traders’: New Commercial Roads in Central Asia.” Antoine Buisson (EHESS) provided a theoretically sophisticated model of state transformation in Tajikistan in his paper “State-Building Strategies in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan Since 1991: Legitimacy and Political Forms of State Power in Sovietized Muslim Lands.” Several papers critically explored the intersection of normative global discourses around rights, mobility, gender and terrorism with local practice, using this to critique linear accounts of “transition.”

Particularly heartening here, as in the following panel on urban, architectural and spatial transformations, was a willingness to engage substantive theoretical questions through detailed empirical research. Julien Thorez (CNRS) summarized his doctoral study of spatial transformation in Central Asia in his paper “Territories and Societies in Central Asia: From Desovietization to Globalization,” which used analysis of spatial recomposition (through the securitization of borders, the nationalization of transport networks and the administrative regulation of human movement) to elaborate processes of post-Soviet “enclavement” and nation-building. In her paper on “‘Metropolization’ in the Former Soviet Union,” Uljana Agibetova (University of Grenoble-II) introduced an innovative way of calibrating post-Soviet “metropolization” based on the quantification of hypertext links to given cities, while Guillemette Pincent (University of Paris-IV) looked at the ways in which “heritage” is located and contested in contemporary Uzbekistan through a comparative study on “The Rehabilitation of Pre-Colonial Urban Quarters in Central Asian Cities: Case Studies of Tashkent and Bukhara, Uzbekistan.” The panel included two explorations of the architectonics of power in Central Asia: Cecile Gintrac (University of

Paris-VII) looked at the rebuilding of Central Asian capital cities in a paper on “Presidents’ Power and the Mutation of Capital Cities in Central Asia: A Comparative Analysis of Ashgabat, Tashkent and Astana,” while Adrien Fauve of the Institute of Political Sciences in Paris looked at “New Capitals of Kazakhstan,” specifically the “three capitals” of Atyrau, Astana and Almaty. There was also one paper focused more explicitly on the place of irrigation and its management in the transformation of rural space: “The Wrecked Garden: Ancient Oases and New Farming in Uzbekistan,” by Alain Cariou (University of Paris-IV).

The final, anthropological, panel took us from grand spatial transformations to the everyday practices through which these changes are navigated and acquire meaning. Among many rich presentations, the paper by Olaf Guenther of Humboldt University in Berlin (“The *Dorboz* of the Ferghana Valley: Research in the History and the Everyday Culture of Acrobats”) provided an insight into the lives of Ferghana’s acrobats, the *dorboz*, whose professional activity and ambiguous position within the religious and cosmological order makes them at once “marginal” and central to Ferghana sociality. In her paper “‘Hama Mugat!’ A Model of Identity Reproduction among the Mugat, Central Asian Gypsies,” Karine Gatelier (Modus Operandi Research Institute) explored the “paradox” of Mugat identity and social relations in Uzbekistan, where the Mugat become a kind of “corporate other,” defined both through their shared history and the everyday social articulation of alterity. Carole Ferret (Collège de France, Paris) and Emilie Maj (University of Cambridge) drew on their respective research into horsemanship in Yakutia. In her paper on “Central Asian and Siberian Turkic Societies: A Project of Comparative Ethnomusicology,” Ferret developed arguments about the meanings of action, while Maj’s presentation on “The Horse Among Yakut Hunters and Shepherds: From Mount to Cultural Emblem” focused on the cosmological significance and contemporary political appropriations of the horse-as-symbol. In a beautifully illustrated presentation entitled “Techniques of the Yakuts at the Furthest BOUNDS of the Altai Horse Civilization: Contribution to an Anthropology of Action,” Franco-Canadian ethnomusicologist Frédéric Leotar (University of Alberta) drew on comparative research into herding songs in Tuva and Uzbekistan, which share several musical features, to develop a thesis about their common origin in shamanic practice.

Perhaps inevitably in a workshop of this kind, in which the emphasis was on broad overviews and the presentation of projects-in-progress, the value of the meeting lay in the chance to become acquainted with one another’s research: it was a meeting of openings, intellectual and social, rather than of conclusions. It did, however, enable young doctoral and post-doctoral students to present their research in the presence of renowned senior scholars, fostering intergenerational exchanges and mutual contributions to a field of research in constant renewal. The marathon nature of the event meant that most of the substantive discussion of ideas occurred in the coffee breaks, and the final plenary session did not allow much opportunity to synthesize the days’ work, beyond the acknowledgement that Central Asian studies in France deserves more recognition and institutional support. As an exploratory encounter, however, it was enormously valuable, and the lingering lunch after the final plenary session attested to the volume of discussion that it helped generate.

To an outside observer (and particularly one more used to Anglophone conferences on Central Asia) it also reminded of the extent to which national scholarships still shape the study of Central Asia in significant ways. French scholarship on Central Asia has no doubt benefited from the valuable institutional support and intellectual stimulus provided by IFEAC in Tashkent; and in certain fields, such as archaeology, the model of long-term collaboration with Central Asian Academies of Science is one that deserves close study by academies and research councils elsewhere. The Paris workshop provided a wealth of evidence, if any were needed, of the extent and vitality of current Francophone scholarship on Central Asia at the doctoral and postdoctoral level. Yet perhaps the very vitality of this largely national conversation also means that French scholarship tends to be comparatively underrepresented in international gatherings such as CESS (and thus, we daresay, less known beyond the borders of the hexagon than it deserves). The website for this year’s CESS conference in Seattle, for instance, listed amongst the panel presenters just two scholars affiliated with French institutes; the 2006 program notes just one. The organizers of the Paris workshop have made an important move in making this scholarship more widely known by providing extensive research summaries and biographies of the participants on the web. The challenge now is to sustain the momentum of this exploratory meeting through deeper discussion of each others’ work — and perhaps also

to extend this meeting of young researchers into more of a pan-European conversation.

The conference program, information about each of the seven panels, detailed introductions to the research presented and the participating

researchers are all available on the web in French at: http://www.reseau-asie.com/cgi-bin/prog/pform.cgi?langue=fr&ID_document=225&TypeListe=showdoc&Mcenter=article_standard&my_id_societe=1&email=&password=&PRINTMcenter.

The Eighth Annual Conference of the Central Eurasian Studies Society

Seattle, Washington, USA, October 18-21, 2007

Reported by: **Pınar Akçalı, Adrienne Edgar, Agnès Nulifer Kefeli, Daniel Schafer**

Compiled by: **Daniel Schafer**, Belmont University, Nashville, Tenn., USA, schaferd@mail.belmont.edu

The Eighth Annual Conference of the Central Eurasian Studies Society (CESS) brought together over three hundred scholars from more than thirty countries in a variety of different disciplines. Forty percent of the participants hailed from outside North America, with particularly strong representation from EU and Transcaucasian states, Kyrgyzstan, Turkey and Japan. The healthy exchange of views and sharing of research within this international community of scholars is perhaps the most important and attractive feature of CESS conferences. The vast scope of such an interdisciplinary conference (over 200 presentations on sixty panels) does not permit anything approaching a complete accounting here; we have reported on an admittedly idiosyncratic selection of panels that we attended and found interesting, with apologies to the dozens of paper presenters we were unable to include.

One of the best attended panels at the conference was “Challenging Interpretations of Islam in Central Asia” (SO-03). In a paper entitled “The Religious, the Secular and the Esoteric in Bishkek,” postdoctoral scholar Maria Elisabeth Louw from Aarhus University (Denmark) used anthropological approaches to challenge stereotypes and essentializing discourses of Islam in Kyrgyzstan. In spite of widely held views in Bishkek, such as that the Kyrgyz have never been very religious, as Islam arrived late to them, or that people who express their religiosity are fanatics, Louw found that everyday, ambiguous esoteric experiences that localize the divine are common. Her work advocates understanding how these esoteric experiences “enchant and disenchant the surrounding world” for the supposedly “not-so-religious” Kyrgyz people. In a similar vein, the presentation by Vernon Schubel of Kenyon College, “Studies in Texts and Contexts: Anthropological Approaches to Islam in Central Asia,” challenged the tendency to evaluate Islam

through classic Arabic texts, stressing that Islam is pluralistic and not unchanging according to a fixed Islamic law (*Sharia*). Schubel argued that popular religion (“religion of the people”) can be very powerful, and scholars should study actual religious practices to get an idea of how people understand Islam. Historian Adeeb Khalid (Carleton College) sought in his presentation, “In Search of Soviet Islam,” to integrate archival and institutional sources with awareness of lived experience in order to understand the massive transformation that took place in Central Asia during Soviet times. According to Khalid, although Islam survived in the Soviet years and did not “vanish” as some expected, its institutional infrastructure (mosques, *madrasas*) was compromised, Islamic education disappeared, and religious practices were marginalized. There was serious shrinkage of religious knowledge and displacement of Islam as moral authority. Lastly, John Schoeberlein (Davis Center, Harvard University) in his presentation “Dawah in Central Asia: Radical Islam?” questioned whether *dawah* — the practice of teaching about Islam by people (the *dawachi*) who move from one community to the other — presents a danger as a form of political Islamic radicalization, as is commonly supposed. This is a relatively new phenomenon for the region, a “missionary” effort that tries to convince ordinary Muslims of the value of Islamic practices and targets those whose practice of the religion is deemed insufficient. Schoeberlein sees *dawah* as one of many practices in Central Asia today that have fostered debate on the nature of Islam; this may in some senses be a healthy phenomenon, as long as it is not accompanied by extreme social polarization.

Related issues concerning the place of Islam in Central Asia were raised at a roundtable on “Teaching in and about Eurasia: Methods and Resources of a New Generation of Teachers” (SO-

10). The chair of the roundtable, Anthony Koliha (Social Science Research Council), described two important SSRC projects: “Teaching Islam in Eurasia,” held in three summer sessions in 2005-2007 in Kazan, Bishkek, and Simferopol, and “Histories of Central Asia,” a website (scheduled to be launched in 2008) designed to present information that can be integrated into university-level courses. The bulk of the panel’s discussion revolved around the participants’ experiences teaching Islam. Shoshana Keller (Hamilton College) described how she introduced Eurasian scholars in Bishkek to the sorts of methods used at an American liberal arts college to teach about religion and Islam in particular, with a focus on critical analysis of texts, exploration of the cultural context and counterfactual writing to explore assumptions about historical change. Adeb Khalid commented that Central Asians’ assumptions about religion continue to be shaped by prevailing Soviet interpretations of Islam as an objective entity with self-evident features. Many of Khalid’s points were echoed in the first person by Abdullo Hakim (Tajik National State University), who commented on the frequently unprofessional and uninformed teaching about Islam in secular schools and universities, the lingering Marxist and Soviet interpretations, and the absence of both anthropological views and awareness of the international context of Central Asian Islam. Ashirbek Muminov (R. B. Suleimenov Institute of Oriental Studies, Almaty) focused on the ways that the Soviet and post-Soviet states established a hegemonic view of Islam through education and the obstruction of outside religious influence.

A panel on “Higher Education and Academia” (SO-11) also suggested some of the new opportunities and challenges for education in Central Asia in a globalizing academic environment. In a paper entitled “‘Feed from the Service’: Corruption and Coercion in State-University Relations,” Ararat Osipian (Vanderbilt University) examined the varieties of corruption in the Central Asian academic world: violations on entry exams, student cheating, bribes in return for grades, diploma fraud, administrative embezzlement, abuse of public property, and others. Osipian presented statistics on the extent of corruption at specific institutions; for example, over 60% of students at four universities in Kyrgyzstan report having experienced some form of corruption. His modeling of the economics of corruption suggests that Central Asian regimes keep the loyalty of academic leaders in a context of low salaries by deliberately minimizing the risks of corruption and maximizing its benefits. Hence

corruption is an integral part of Central Asian academia under current conditions. Alan DeYoung (University of Kentucky) presented results of his survey probing why Kyrgyz pursue higher education at such a high rate when the demand for university graduates is stagnant or declining, in his paper “Conceptualizing Post-Secondary Education Paradoxes in the Kyrgyz Republic.” He surveyed forty students at the International University of Kyrgyzstan and found multiple reasons to study — e.g., to escape the village and move to the city, to allow young women to escape traditional roles — and generalized faith that hard work would overcome poor preparation and permit students to get a vaguely-defined “good job.” More research is warranted given the small sample size, but these results suggest that Western understandings of private sector demand as driving higher education enrollments do not clearly apply in Central Asia. In a report on “Academia and Development: Building Social- Science Research Capacity in the Region,” Hans Gutbrod (Caucasus Research Resource Center, Tbilisi) reported on the efforts of his organization to develop social scientific research skills in the Caucasus, so that research on social and economic issues does not need to be conducted at high cost by imported Western researchers.

As at previous conferences, a large number of panels investigated Central Eurasia from a historical perspective, whether focusing on one region or exploring the networks of connections among them. Among notable historical papers was that by Beate Eschment (Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg) entitled “Neither Barbarians, Nor Noble Savages: The Russian View on the Kazakhs of the Empire,” which is part of a larger collaborative project of the universities of Halle and Leipzig focusing on the image of nomads around the world. She examined the great variety of images of the steppe and of nomads in over two hundred Russian novels and short stories stretching from the eighteenth to early twentieth centuries. Among her conclusions was that authors often described nomadic groups as a whole in negative and condescending terms (sly, dirty, pillaging, hostile, rebellious) while incorporating positive and romanticized assessments of individual nomads (honest, free, heroic). Also interesting was the paper “The Revolt of 1916: Tsarist Policy and Nomadic Lebenswelten” by Joem Happel (Universität Basel), who focused on the interrogation of a captured Kazakh rebel in 1916 by a Russian Okhrana official who knew the Kazakhs well and was personally acquainted with his captive. The paper presented the

discourses deployed by both individuals as symptomatic of larger gaps in perspective between colonizer and colonized, which are nevertheless mitigated by personal relationships, inner conflicts and occasional sympathies with those on the other side of the political and colonial divide.

In an enlightening exchange on the panel “Russia’s Muslims and Eurasian Networks” (HC-05), the discussant focused commentary on one presentation. Mustafa Tuna (Princeton University), in a paper entitled “From Ulama to a Muslim Intelligentsia in Imperial Russia,” addressed the actual impact of jadidism in the Volga countryside and argued that Russian government schools for Muslims and reformed *madrasas* trained a new generation of Muslim intellectuals who became alienated from the larger Muslim population and therefore lost their ability to transform their coreligionists. The discussant, Agnes Kefeli (Arizona State University), encouraged the panelist to look at the educational experiments in Russia within the context of other colonial empires. She raised questions about the difficulty of assessing Jadid influence in rural and urban communities without knowing what was actually taught in the schools. Student strikes at the beginning of the twentieth century and the *defters* or students’ notebooks in the archives could open new doors of investigation in determining the place of Islam or its absence in the intellectual debates of pre-revolutionary Tatar society.

Particularly interesting for historians was a panel presenting “New Research on Central Asia in the 18th and 19th Centuries” (HC-08). Nurten Kilic-Schubel (Kenyon College) discussed “Women, Gender and the Literary Milieu in the Khoqand Khanate,” which explored the flourishing in Kokand and the Ferghana Valley in the early 19th century of women’s poetry and literary life. Her research suggests that gender status questions before the Russian conquest were much more complex than frequently assumed. Elite women achieved status through their own genealogical lineage, their literary talent, and their religious leadership among other women in gendered networks and hierarchies that sometimes coexisted and paralleled similar male structures. Women played critical roles in the alliance system among tribes and in integrating nomadic groups into the Kokand Khanate. Scott Levi (University of Louisville) explored “The Altun Beshik Legend and Political Legitimacy in the Khanate of Khoqand.” The story of Altun Beshik, the “Golden Cradle,” is a legend that legitimizes the Shahrukhid dynasty in Kokand by tracing it back to

a baby son left behind in a golden cradle by Babur before he embarked on his conquests in India. Levi set this story in its political context as the deliberate creation of Alim Khan (r. 1785-1811). He showed how the story evolved through its various versions to fit the evolving tribal complexion of the khanate, and suggested that this story marks an important shift away from Chinggisid political legitimization. Lastly, in a presentation on “The Ferghana Valley in the 18th-19th centuries: A View from the Tadhkira-i Majdhub Namangani,” Ron Sela (Indiana University) surveyed the contents of a major manuscript anthology of works by eighteenth-century Sufi shaykhs that dates perhaps from the early 1800s. The roughly one hundred anecdotes feature Sufi shaykhs in a range of experiences: on the road, often on pilgrimage (Kokand, Namangan, Yarkand, Kashgar, and India are all mentioned), experiencing mystic dreams, performing miracles, mediating between khans and rebels, removing unjust khans. The existence of hundreds of similar such manuscripts suggests the need for extensive historical study and reconceptualization of our understanding of Islam in Central Asia before the Russian conquest.

A panel entitled “Doing Oral History of Central Asian Transformations” (HC-19) provoked a lively discussion of the benefits and challenges of using oral sources in research on Central Asian history. In a presentation entitled “Stereotypes, Nostalgia, and Other Challenges of Oral Histories of Soviet-era Ethnic Relations,” Jeff Sahadeo (Carleton University) focused on the ways in which ethnic stereotypes and nostalgia affect the oral testimony of non-Russian migrants to Moscow and Saint Petersburg. These migrants, Sahadeo noted, express nostalgia for the harmonious ethnic relations of the Soviet era and deny the existence of ethnic discrimination or racism, even as they maintain negative stereotypes about Russians. Although nostalgia and stereotypes can make it difficult to evaluate the accuracy of oral testimony, Sahadeo argued that historians can learn a great deal from the ways in which these biases are presented in interviews. In a presentation entitled “The Blind Men and the Elephant: Looking at Uzbek Rural Class Relations from Below,” Marianne Kamp (University of Wyoming) argued that oral history can provide a corrective to the biases implicit in written sources, despite sharp differences in the way individuals recollect the same events. Interviews with Uzbeks who experienced collectivization, for example, can help researchers understand how class resentments and state-sponsored benefits led some

individuals to support Soviet policies in the countryside. Research based exclusively on archival sources, by contrast, may give the erroneous impression that Uzbeks universally opposed collectivization. Comments by the discussant, Ali İğmen (California State University, Long Beach), and audience members raised questions about the reliability of oral testimony relative to documentary sources and about the effect of decades of Soviet socialization in shaping the recollections of Soviet citizens.

As in previous CESS conferences, a large number of panels focused on the ongoing political, economic and geopolitical transformation of the region over the last two decades. For example, a panel on “Economic ‘Transition’ in Central Asia” (PO-14) featured papers on the contradictory and unanticipated economic outcomes of the post-Soviet experience. When the Soviet Union collapsed it was predicted that over a course of five-to-ten years bazaars would become a thing of the past. Yet according to Regine Spector (University of California, Berkeley) in her paper “Who Owns the Marketplace? Conflict over Property in Kazakhstan,” instead of vanishing, bazaars have actually become “enduring fixtures,” employing tens of thousands of people and serving important social and economic purposes. Although bazaars can be dirty, chaotic and inconvenient, prices are cheaper and consumers can bargain for further price reductions. Before 2005, authorities tried to modernize the bazaars and understand their landscape by regulations such as passportization (creating passports for each bazaar). But beginning in 2005, local authorities have closed those bazaars that are on leased-out lands (for 7-11 years) citing sanitary and other regulations. However, bazaars that are privately owned are flourishing. Here informal networks and politics play a major role. George E. Wright (University of Washington, Seattle), in his paper “On the Economic Analysis of Central Asia: Transition or Economic Development?” focused on economic progress in Central Asia and suggested that this progress is largely assessed within the framework of a Eurocentric model of economic transition. Central Asia is fundamentally different and more typical of developing countries, and we should view it through a combination of transition and development perspectives. A transition perspective refers to reduced state role, privatization, macro stability, market supporting institutions and competitive firms, whereas a development perspective refers to industrialization, a shift from colonial trade, declining of the dualistic society in

which the periphery was less developed, and human capital creation.

The panel “Whither Turkmenistan?” (PO-17) focused on some of the recent political and economic developments in this country, looking ahead to the future after the death of President Niyazov in December 2006. Jason Strakes (Claremont Graduate University) presented a paper on “Autocratic Evolution: Turkmenistan’s Public Policies and Political Institutions in the Central Asian Context.” He focused on the incumbent elites who disseminate public goods to a select group of political power holders, as well as other Soviet-type public organizations such as those for women, youth and veterans. In today’s Turkmenistan, elite agencies actively engage in the state-building process, using the distribution of externally generated revenues, revision of formal institutions and incorporation of informal institutions. Kenyon Weaver (Georgetown University) in his presentation “The Legal Regime of Turkmenistan and Its Effect on Trade and Investment” addressed a variety of questions about the options that the new president of Turkmenistan has to shape Niyazov-era laws and create a market economy. According to Weaver, a bifurcated economy characterized the Niyazov years. Formally, there was an oil, gas and agricultural economy (plagued by legal troubles, corruption, and bribery) and informally there was the black market. Today, the Constitution largely permits a liberal economy in Turkmenistan and the Civil Code is also promising, as are parliamentary laws such as the 1996 Foreign Investor Law. But Weaver suggests that in practice, investors must partner with a Turkmen, Turkish or Russian businessman or with official ministries in order to do business, and this has the effect of pushing Western investors out. The paper by Christopher Boucek (Princeton University) on “Turkmenistan after Niyazov and the Impact on Western Energy Security: An Initial Assessment,” provided an overview of the oil and gas sector in the country and its export options (such as the huge Chinese alternative pipeline project, the Iranian pipeline, the trans-Afghan pipeline, and the trans-Caspian pipeline supported by the US and the EU). Boucek also analyzed the importance of Turkmenistan in meeting Russia’s energy needs, which has given Turkmenistan useful leverage in Russia.

The panel “One Step Forward, Two Steps Back: Democracy Building in the Caucasus and Central Asia” (PO-09) looked at recent developments in terms of democratic processes. Antoine Buisson (École des hautes études en

sciences sociales), in his paper “Political Legitimacy, Statehood Building and Democracy in Post-conflict Tajikistan,” offered a typology with legitimacy as a critical factor for institution building. The paper analyzed “democratic, charismatic, bureaucratic and patrimonial types of legitimacy,” which generate four state ideal types (“populist, democratic, collusive and reactionary”). For Tajikistan, the main problem was restoring central authority, and since 1997 the state monopoly of legitimate power has been partially successful in liquidating warlordism. But as of 2007, the state remains somewhere between charismatic and patrimonial legitimacies as a reactionary state, according to Buisson’s typology. Niklas Swanstrom (Institute for Security and Developmental Policy, Sweden) in his paper “Democratic Development and Organized Crime: The Yin and Yang of Greater Central Asia” focused on the strength of organized crime, which has increased at the expense of political development. According to Swanstrom, weak state institutions and organized crime have a symbiotic relation and no political change can be introduced without strong institutions. But institutional reform may not be a solution due to the corruption of government officials. Beyond the local Central Asian scene, Swanstrom also implicated members of the international community (especially European countries and China) which ask a great deal from the Central Asian states but will not admit their own role as “consumer markets” that make organized crime lucrative. Lastly, in his paper entitled “Democratic Institution Building and Security Sector Reform in Central Asia,” Taleh Ziyadov (Azerbaijan Diplomatic Academy) provided information on the various security agencies in Azerbaijan and reflected on the state role in economic and political change. The chief obstacles and challenges for Azerbaijan include the Karabakh conflict, the lack of professional staff, corruption and the immaturity of new institutions.

The opportunities and contradictions of political transition and state building were also of concern at a panel on “Civil Society and Social Movements in Central Asia” (PO-18). In a presentation on “Social Capital and Organized Resistance in Central Asia,” Scott Radnitz (Kennan Institute) focused on the development of the social capital that allows people to act collectively. Based on a survey of 1,000 people in Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, Radnitz explored factors that contribute to resistance behaviors such as complaining, organizing and protest. The paper concluded that Central Asians assert their rights to a certain extent;

we do not see only “passive obedience” to state demands. Amy Forster Rothbart (University of Wisconsin, - Madison) in her paper, “The Effects of Multilateral Environmental Cooperation on Environmental Politics in Kazakhstan,” used the Aarhus Convention on access to information, public participation, and access to justice in environmental matters as a case study of the consequences of joining environmental agreements. She asserted that while Kazakhstan has mostly signed such agreements to affirm its sovereignty, domestic actors are nonetheless able to use agreement commitments to pressure the government. Even without full implementation, multilateral agreements affect environmental protection and state-society relations. Gert Jan Veldwisch (Reinische Friedrich-Wilhelm Universität Bonn) presented “Uzbek Water Users Associations (WUAs) in Action: The Continuation of State Control and the Emergence of Collective Action in Khorezm, Uzbekistan.” Veldwisch argued that Uzbek WUAs came to the country from outside as part of a push for greater democratization; however as of 2005-2006, they were still state-managed organizations controlling production by private farmers. The Uzbek government successfully reinterpreted the concept of WUA to fulfill its objective of maintaining control over agricultural production. Kimairis Toogood (George Mason University) in “Tajikistan’s Potential for a ‘Bottom-Up’ Revolution” used a multi-track diplomacy approach to ask whether peace may be in jeopardy given the restrictions on political participation. According to Toogood, bottom-up revolution seems unlikely in the short run in Tajikistan. Official state leaders, NGO leaders and community leaders are the most important political tracks in Tajikistan. However, the opposition is being shut out of political competition; they boycotted the 2006 elections, and the political space collapsed for them, opening renewed possibilities for warlords and Islamic politics.

The study of Armenia has not been regularly represented at the CESS conference, except for a rare smattering of papers about Armenia on panels addressing the Caucasus or other topical issues (notably at the 2003 conference). This year saw what may be the first panel focused on Armenia at a CESS conference, “Religion and Identity: The Armenian Case” (HC-17). Hrag Varjabedian (University of Wisconsin - Madison) presented on “The Tree of Vardan Mamikonean: The Vicissitude Branches of Armenian Identity.” This ancient sacred tree, which was knocked down by a storm in 1976, is said to have been planted by the Armenian hero

Vardan in 450 CE. Varjabedian explored the uniqueness of this tree (the only one in Armenia to retain its sacred status after death) and its intersection with the development of the legend of Vardan Mamikonean, particularly in the 19th and 20th centuries. In a paper entitled “Religion in Post-Soviet Armenia: Pluralism and Identity Formation in Transition,” Ani Sarkissian (Michigan State University) explored the ways in which Armenia’s “religious nationalism” with its focus on the privileges due to the Armenian Church, particularly in the face of a flood of foreign religious missionaries after 1991, has led to the constriction of freedom of conscience, inhibiting the acceptance of diversity that she argues is essential to the consolidation of democracy. Lastly, Sevan Yousefian (UCLA) explored “The Armenian Church and the Soviet Homeland: Church Involvement in the Soviet Armenian Repatriation Campaign, 1946-1948.” His research uncovered the role played by the Armenian Catholicos in mobilizing Armenians abroad during WWII and initiating a post-war movement among the Armenian diaspora to return to Soviet Armenia. Besides challenging traditional views of late Stalinist institutions as entirely centralized or state driven, his work raises interesting questions about identity and religion.

The keynote speaker for this year’s conference was Rogers Brubaker (UCLA), whose talk on “The Nationalizing State Revisited” built upon his well-received work, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe* (Cambridge, 1996). Brubaker described the features of the nationalizing state in some detail and then explored the ways in which the concept might appropriately be applied to Soviet and post-Soviet Central Asia, with special reference to Kazakhstan. Important elements to observe in this context include counting and categorizing citizens by their nationality (a famous Soviet priority) and the power

issues and nationalizing impetus behind language policy.

One of the most noteworthy aspects of this year’s conference was the presentation of several films produced in the region. They included “*Ty ne sirota*” [You Are Not an Orphan] (Shukhrat Abbasov, Uzbekistan, 1962), “*Aksuat*” (Serik Aprymov, Kazakhstan, 1997), and “*Nevestka*” [Daughter-in-Law] (Hodzhakuli Narliev, Turkmenistan, 1972). Among others, the documentary film entitled “The Kyrgyz People in the 20th Century (1916-1991)” deserves special mention. The film is one end product of the Oral History Project on the “Formation of the Kyrgyz Identity in the 20th Century.” It was carried out by the Maltepe University (Turkey) and Manas University (Kyrgyzstan) with the sponsorship of the Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency. The Kyrgyz National University and the State National Broadcast Company of the Kyrgyz Republic and the Republic of Turkey also supported the project. The aim of the project was to study major developments in Kyrgyz history in the 20th century and their impacts on Kyrgyz national identity, based on in-depth oral interviews with people aged seventy years or older. Intensive fieldwork for the project was conducted March-July 2007. Interviews focused mainly on memories of everyday life. The first screening of the documentary took place at the Eighth Annual CESS conference, but the film will soon be broadcast on national television stations in Turkey and Kyrgyzstan, after which it will become available on DVD.

For the complete program of panels and presentations at the Eighth Annual CESS conference, as well as information on past and future conferences, please access the CESS website at <http://www.cess.muohio.edu/>. Also, look for summary versions of selected, quality papers presented at the 2007 conference in Volume 7 (2008) of CESR.

Educational Resources and Developments

Central Eurasian Studies in France

Sébastien Peyrouse, Visiting Fellow, Central Asia-Caucasus Institute, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, Washington, DC, USA, and Associated Scholar, Institute for International and Strategic Relations, Paris, France, sebpeyrouse@yahoo.com

In France, the study of Central Eurasia is concentrated in Paris: although there are professors also working on this area outside of Paris, they are isolated and most of them do not have any specialized teaching structures at their disposal. In Paris, two main institutions share the teaching of Central Eurasian studies, the Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales [National Institute for Oriental Languages and Civilizations] (INALCO) and the École des hautes études en sciences sociales [School of Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences] (EHESS). Neither of them are universities in the strict sense but so-called “grandes écoles,” which offer courses of greater originality than those offered at the universities. The birth of a French school of Central Eurasian studies, rooted in an old French Orientalist tradition, has greatly benefited from the opening up of the region and the establishing, in Tashkent in 1993, of the Institut français d'études sur l'Asie centrale [French Institute of Central Asian Studies] (IFEAC), which hosts and trains the majority of researchers and students in their fieldwork.

INALCO

The first institution, INALCO, remains in keeping with French Orientalist tradition: it stresses the need for knowledge of local languages in the learning of other civilizations. INALCO is in fact descended from the former École des jeunes de langues [Language School for Youth], which was created under Louis XIV (shortly thereafter renamed École des langues orientales vivantes) for the study of Persian and Ottoman, and then reorganized under the Convention in 1795. Long divided into several departments (Russia, the Middle East and Asia), the teaching of Caucasian and Central Asian languages — as well as Turkish, Kurdish, Pashto, Persian, Mongolian and Korean — was regrouped into a single “Eurasia” department in 1997-98. However, the research teams are often dissociated; for

example, the research center on post-Soviet societies (Observatoire des états post-soviétiques), associated with the Russian Department, hosts within it an autonomous structure devoted to Central Asia (the CRAC, Collectif de recherche sur l'Asie centrale, under the leadership of Catherine Poujol).

Of the languages of Central Asia, Mongolian was the first, in 1967, to which regular courses were devoted (although it had also been taught for some years in the last third of the 19th century). Today, a complete French *licence* (three years; equivalent to a bachelor of arts degree) is available in Mongolian; it is taught by Professor Jacques Legrand along with readers from Mongolia. Other *licence* programs exist in Armenian and in Georgian. The latter are supplemented by an introduction to one of the various other Caucasian languages: Chechen, Ingush, Circassian, Abkhaz, Ubykh, Megrelian, Laz, Svan or the languages of Daghestan. There are three tenured language teachers — Anaid Donabédian, who teaches Armenian, and Dominique Gauthier-Eligoulachvili and Madame Metreveli, who teach Georgian. They each receive assistance from several external teachers. Students receive this language instruction alongside civilization classes on the history of the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union, as well as special classes on the history of the Transcaucasus and Mongolia.

Apart from the three languages for which a complete program of study is available, several other languages are taught as optional classes. Since the start of the 1980s, the Institute has offered an introduction to Kyrgyz taught by Rémy Dor, who was head of IFEAC from 2002 to 2006; and, since the beginning of the 2000s, it has offered courses in Azeri taught by Gilles Authier, and in Kazakh taught by Cholpan Dor-Khoussainova. These courses (a few hours per week) are open to students of all levels. A course in Kazan Tatar is also occasionally offered depending on the availability of an invited professor from Tatarstan. For several years INALCO

has sought to create a course in Uzbek, currently a major gap in the Institute's program, but it has not been granted a permanent position enabling it to recruit a specialist.

While there have been many difficulties in institutionalizing the teaching of languages of Central Asia, the courses on civilization were much more developed and structured already at the start of the 1980s. Apart from the courses on each of the major languages and on the history of civilization within the Eurasia department, INALCO also offers six special courses on the civilizations of Central Asia. These are organized by Catherine Poujol, who is the first tenured professor of Central Asian Civilization at the Institute since it was occupied by diplomat Ujfalvy de Mezo Kovezd, for whom it was created in 1902. Poujol teaches four courses open to students of all levels: "History of Central Asia from its origins to the threshold of the modern world," "History of Central Asia from Russian colonization to the fall of the Soviet Union," "Islam and cultures in Central Asia" and "Central Asia in transition." She also teaches a masters seminar on intercultural exchanges in Central Eurasia from the 16th to the 21st centuries. This curriculum is rounded off by an introductory course on medical anthropology entitled "Health and society in Central Asia," taught by Sophie Hohmann, a specialist in public health in Uzbekistan, and by a course on the history of the steppes offered by Isabelle Ohayon, a specialist on Kazakhstan. In 2000, a special third year (bachelor-equivalent) diploma — *Diplôme supérieur d'études centrasiatiques* — was established that is devoted to Central Eurasia; it gives official recognition to competency in one of the region's languages, introduction to other languages, as well as courses in Central Eurasian civilization.

The courses on civilization, which Catherine Poujol has taught since 1982, follow in the footsteps of the French Orientalist tradition of the study of Turkistan, and endeavour to uphold the intellectual heritage of Alexandre Bennigsen, who taught in France for a long time at the side of Chantal Lemerrier-Quellejey. In this tradition, priority is given to a long term approach to understanding Central Asia, centering on notions of "rupture" and "continuity" between different historical periods, as well as on that of the region's "interculturality." This instruction is actually aimed at students from Russian, Turkish and Iranian studies who have already acquired linguistic competency, but come from diverse disciplinary backgrounds, including from the *Hautes études internationales* section of INALCO, which trains students for professions

relating to field research. However, the majority of PhD students in Central Asian studies from INALCO are trained in Slavic studies and specialize in the tsarist colonial, Soviet, or post-Soviet periods in accordance with Catherine Poujol's own work.

EHESS

The second institution offering instruction on Central Eurasia is the EHESS, a special institution born in 1975 when, on the initiative of Fernand Braudel, it split from the *École pratique des hautes études* [Practical School of Advanced Studies] (EPHE). Braudel's main objective in so doing was to bring history and the social sciences closer together. Until recently, the EHESS was a pure research institution that students could enter at the doctoral level after having completed the equivalent of bachelor's and master's degrees at other institutions. Today, the EHESS also offers master level studies, which are centered on the social sciences and which do not offer any language courses. The first full-time position in Central Asian History was established in 1995; Vincent Fourniau held it from 1995-98 and then from 2002 onwards. Today, EHESS offers five research seminars, four of which are held at the *Centre des études turques et ottomans*, which is one of the EHESS research centers.

The topics of Vincent Fourniau's seminar change regularly. Students receive just one credit for it, and many return several years running, since each time the subject matter is new. After first focusing on the post-Timurid period of Central Asia, it then provides analyses of the post-Soviet period over the long term in two courses entitled "Ethnosocial history of Central Asia" and "The notion of Central Asia — between local and global elements." In 2007 the seminar is dedicated to a transversal notion, that of "the traveller and the peasant," which enables Central Asia to be approached through the question of trade in medieval, modern, and contemporary periods; this is done, on the one hand, by looking at travel itineraries, and, on the other hand, through exploring the elements of agrarian history.

A second seminar, taught by Olivier Roy, a political scientist specializing in Islamism and its relation to globalization, is devoted to the "deculturation of the religious fact" in the contemporary Muslim world. It analyzes the effects of globalization on religion, and in particular the growing importance of proselytizing movements that promote religious models unlinked to any cultural reference points and models of community grounded in individualization. He thereby follows in the

French tradition of the sociology of religion (Danielle Hervieu-Léger, Patrick Michel, Marcel Gauchet, Jean-Paul Willaime, and Gilles Keppel), the aim of which is to link religion to the contemporary evolution of societies outside of the Christianity/Islam division. Vincent Fourniau instructs graduate and PhD students specializing in historical questions, while Olivier Roy caters to those who work on Islam.

The three other seminars are taught by researchers working at the Centre national de la recherche scientifique [National Center for Scientific Research] (CNRS). One of them, offered by Stéphane Dudoignon, a specialist on Islam in Central Eurasia, bears on Islamic authority figures in Central Eurasia both during the Soviet period and since the dissolution of the USSR in 1991. Through comparative biographies and life stories, it aims to analyze how the legitimacy of major figures of Islam is constituted. The second seminar, taught by Alexandre Papas and Thierry Zarcone, is dedicated to Sufism and to brotherhoods in the Turko-Persian world (Turkey, Iran, Central Asia, Xinjiang, Afghanistan and northern India) from the 16th century to today, and studies the practical and doctrinal aspects of several Sufi brotherhoods (Naqshbandiyya, Qadiriyya, Mevleviyye, etc.). The third of these seminars, taught by Boris Petric, is in the field of political anthropology. It examines the themes of the global and the local, along with the articulation of spaces, powers, and the appropriation of resources through examples taken from Siberia, Central Asia, Southeastern Europe and Sub-Saharan Africa. In the seminars at the Centre d'études des mondes russe, caucasien et centre-européen, some sessions are occasionally devoted to Central Asia, but irregularly.

Other Institutions

Apart from these two main institutions, students can specialize in Central Eurasia at other institutions. One is the EPHE, which is also a public research

institution catering to PhD students; since 2002 it has hosted the Centre d'études mongoles et sibériennes (CEMS), founded in 1969 as part of the Laboratoire d'ethnologie et de sociologie comparative at Université Paris-X under the leadership of Roberte Hamayon. The EPHE offers several seminars taught by Yves Dorémieux and Charles Stepanoff, which are devoted to the religions of northern Asia, and especially to Mongolian, Altaic and Siberian Shamanism. There is also a seminar on the history of pre-Mongolian Central Asia dedicated to the study of Sogdian texts and ancient Khorezm taught by Etienne de la Vaissière.

In the domain of archaeology, several specialized teams on Central Asia conduct seminars mainly at the École normale supérieure (the "grande école" for training teachers): Claude Rapin teaches the archaeology of Central Asia and Afghanistan and heads an excavation team with Frantz Grenet on the Afrasiab site (Samarqand); Pierre Leriche teaches archaeology and the history of the Roman and Hellenistic Orients and leads an excavation team at Termez. Lastly, we should note that the École d'architecture de Paris-Belleville, one of the most famous architecture schools in France, has created a "Central Asia collective," bringing together undergraduates, PhD students, and teachers specializing in Uzbek, particularly Bukharan, architecture.

Though there are various possibilities to study languages and cultures of Central Asia, there are currently very few positions for academic employment in Central Asian studies in France. Only a few graduates of INALCO and EHESS have found positions at the CNRS, and almost none, for the time being, have found university employment. Some of them are working for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, some are working in French institutes abroad (IFEAC, but also IFEA in Istanbul with a branch in Baku), and some have post-doctoral fellowships in the US or in Germany.

Opportunities and Obstacles for Central Eurasian Studies at the University of Toronto

Edward Schatz, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto at Mississauga, Mississauga, Ont., Canada, eschatz@utm.utoronto.ca

The University of Toronto (U of T) in Ontario, Canada, is in the midst of institutionalizing its

curricular and intellectual offerings that concern Central Eurasia. The intellectual and institutional opportunities and obstacles that it has faced as it

deepens the study of the region parallel some of the opportunities and obstacles faced by Central Eurasianists in general.

Unlike universities whose mandate is clearly regional and even local, U of T is an outward-looking university in a generally outward-looking country. Home to approximately 70,000 students (about 6,000 foreign students), U of T has 75 PhD programs. Toronto itself is a vibrant, cosmopolitan city; approximately forty percent of residents are immigrants to Canada, and Canadian multiculturalism helps to preserve strong links between diaspora communities (including Central Eurasian diasporas) and their historic homelands.

This outward-looking orientation presents intellectual opportunities for the study of Central Eurasia. Even before the Soviet collapse, Professor Michael Gervers took an interest in the region, and since 1994 has hosted the Central and Inner Asia Seminar — a regular scholarly conference that covers the study of Afghanistan, Inner Mongolia, Iran, Kalmykia, Kazakhstan, Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Tibet, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and East Turkistan (Xinjiang) [CIAS, <http://www.utoronto.ca/cias/>]. The architect of CIAS, Gervers is now working actively and assiduously to bring instruction in Turkic languages to U of T.

As outward-looking as U of T is, the study of Central Eurasia naturally encounters intellectual obstacles. Central Eurasianists can sometimes be greeted with “Where is that?” or “Are they *really* Muslim?” or “Don’t they have oil?” or “Isn’t that where *Borat* is supposed to be from?” — questions that are reasonable for the non-specialist to ask but that betray an ignorance that Central Eurasianists are only beginning to remedy. This ignorance creates a conundrum for those of us working in the field: as we draw attention to the region, should we emphasize the things that average Canadians can easily relate to — things like Islamism and extractable resources? Or should we rather emphasize the region’s rich and diverse cultural traditions and histories — things that may not easily capture the attention or the imagination of the average non-specialist Canadian? What is our burden as public intellectuals (if that is indeed how we imagine ourselves) as we seek to show how Central Eurasia “matters”?

Some intellectual obstacles are also institutionalized. For example, the Canadian government under normal circumstances has no capacity to issue travel visas on site in ex-Soviet

Central Asia. Scholars, students, and other travelers from the region who wish to come to Canada typically fly to Moscow — at a considerable expenditure of time and money. In the meantime, well intentioned Canadian government programs target the region for student exchanges, development and institution building, but these programs simply cannot become active without major help from the consular offices. In this way, Central Eurasia’s marginalization is in fact institutionally reproduced.

In university environments, this marginalization is a familiar story. To simplify matters greatly: Central Eurasia is neither Russia nor China, though funding for the study of each of these two great powers may spill over into the study of Central Eurasia. At U of T, the Munk Centre for International Studies has two major institutions that partially cover the study of Central Eurasia. The Asian Institute has programming and coverage of most parts of Asia, and the CIAS (above) is part of AI (AI, <http://webapp.mcis.utoronto.ca/ai/>). In the meantime, the Centre for European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies has also created a Central Asia Program that runs a Central Asia lecture series dedicated to making public the freshest research about the region and a visiting scholars program that brings exceptionally talented Central Asian scholars to U of T to conduct research and give public lectures (<http://www.utoronto.ca/ceres/centralasia.html>).

If the division between the study of Asia (through AI) and Eurasia (CERES) were ossified, then Central Eurasia’s marginalization would be more or less permanent. Luckily, it is also a part of the institutional culture at U of T to be pragmatic and flexible. Thus, AI and CERES have begun to realize that great value is added when they pool their resources to study a region that is increasingly capturing the imagination of the university community and the general public.

Graduate and undergraduate students interested in Central Eurasia have a broad range of courses at their disposal — courses that are currently offered through various departments and programs, both disciplinary and area-related. In the future, U of T plans to offer language training and consolidated programs that focus on the region. For now, one option for graduate study is the CERES Master’s program (<http://www.utoronto.ca/ceres/marees.html>). Student interest in the region is strong and growing. In 2007, for example, more than half of eligible CERES MA students took a course on “State and Society in Central Asia.” Will U of T take advantage of this student interest? Will it do everything

possible to build even more student interest? Given that Canadian universities do not enjoy an equivalent to Title VI funding that US universities seek from their federal government, U of T has to be programmatically creative, institutionally flexible and outward-looking in orientation to ensure a vibrant study of the region for years to come. So far, it is all of the above.

CESS's annual conference will be held at U of T in October 2009. Bringing the conference to Canada is a useful reminder that, as a community of scholars, CESS deeply benefits from the energetic exchange of ideas, information and perspectives across borders.

Enhance Your Teaching of Central Eurasia with Images from Art Museum Collections on the Internet

Daniel C. Waugh, Professor Emeritus, University of Washington, Seattle, USA, dwaugh@u.washington.edu

How might we encourage more people to become informed about Central Eurasia and even develop a serious interest in its study? The question is relevant for any level of education either within an institutional framework or beyond it. We might assume that specialists on Central Eurasia have appropriate answers, but a perusal of books that are published as texts or purport to be for general audiences often disappoints us in this regard. The academy, after all, generally does not promote people for their success in teaching or their ability to communicate with the broad public. Moreover, many of the opportunities for introducing the subject of Central Eurasia come the way of non-specialists, who, though trained as educators, may think they lack ready access to materials for use in the classroom. While it is only one resource that can assist in the teaching and learning about Central Eurasia, the Internet has immense potential to help address the challenges of creating the audience for our expertise.

The focus of this essay will be on what some of the major art museums are doing for education and the resources they offer. After reviewing selected examples, I shall comment only briefly on pedagogical considerations — how best to incorporate those resources in the classroom. That important subject merits separate treatment. My premise is that for many of us, even if this does not always carry over into our teaching, the experience of seeing Central Eurasia and viewing objects produced or consumed by the people who have lived there are a key part of why we are so interested in our field. If this is true, then the corollary is that we should do whatever possible to provide for learners those same visual experiences. This should mean transcending the artificial barriers that separate

disciplines: what is food for the anthropologist may also belong in the political science or history course; art is not just to be studied for its aesthetics but for what it tells us about daily lives and rituals, and so on. Students should be exposed to written primary sources (be they medieval chronicles or the latest speech by a political leader), and they should equally be exposed to artifacts such as fish traps or saddles, be given an appreciation of the importance of calligraphy in an early manuscript of the Quran or be asked to analyze modern emblems of national identity. Film can be part of our repertoire, where an imaginative instructor can teach from resources as varied as *The Story of the Weeping Camel* or (in limited doses) one of the worst Hollywood films ever made, *The Conqueror*, in which John Wayne portrays Temüjin, the future Chinggis Khan. Fortunately we are increasingly well served by the availability of “art objects” on the Internet, a fact that means the instructor may be spared the need to digitize images either to incorporate into Powerpoint slides or place in a “course pack.”

Informing my review of museum websites are several key questions:

- Does the collection contain material of substantial importance for our subject?
- How much of that collection can be accessed online and how good are the images? Are there alternatives to a museum's own website for accessing its collections?
- How easy is it to access the material? Is material grouped thematically in ways that make sense? Is there a good search mechanism?

- What auxiliary material beyond mere images is available — descriptive captions, analytical essays, links to comparative material, etc.?
- Apart from displaying objects, does the museum provide other kinds of educational material?

While the picture changes as I write, the likelihood is that the landscape of museum websites will remain quite unevenly populated in the near future. The attitudes of museum directors and curators about how freely they should “give away” their collections on the Internet seem to vary substantially, although one has the distinct impression that there is growing consensus about the desirability of making as much as possible available electronically. This is consistent with museums’ educational mission and should serve as an incentive for people to visit their collections. There is, after all, no real substitute for the excitement of actually seeing an object that one previously has known only from photographs and written text. Some collections of acknowledged importance may be represented electronically at best poorly simply because the museum has not yet prioritized creating a good website. The explanation may not always lie in general inaccessibility and remoteness or national impoverishment: to date the outstanding Berlin museums have done no better than, say, the museums in Ulaanbaatar or Samarqand. In the Berlin case, the explanation may be that resources in the first instance have understandably been devoted to renovation and remounting of displays. The National Museum of Mongolian History in Ulaanbaatar has made rapid progress in improving its exhibits and has at least a start on the Internet, but the nearby Museum of Fine Arts, which includes some outstanding Buddhist devotional art, still has no website. Even “rich” museums have relied on significant private donations to support the development of websites. The basic technology for having them may be cheap enough nowadays, but developing and maintaining a good website requires a considerable investment of staff time. Museums that have a significant Internet presence—for example, the Louvre and the British Museum—may be quite different in the quality of what they offer electronically. In saying this, I should note that even in the physical space of a single museum, the quality of the presentation of different parts of a collection may vary substantially: lighting may be good or bad, descriptive and analytical material substantial or absent, and so on.

A critical question in accessibility, whether in the museum itself or on the Internet, is language: is the website (or captioning on a card in a display case) in English or French or Chinese, for those who do not know, say, Russian, Mongolian or Japanese? Understandably, often the most substantial auxiliary information is in the national language but is not equally presented in other languages. One way museums address this issue is to make available audio players with various language options, keyed to certain objects in the exhibits. More of this kind of multilingual capacity could easily be added to Internet presentations simply by connecting those same audio tapes to the display of the objects on the website.

Here is a sampling of museum collections and their Internet presence, where I provide links to English-language pages if there is a choice. My selection will include no surprises, but despite the prominence of these museums, their Internet presence illustrates a wide range of strengths and weaknesses. My comments in the first instance reflect my personal interests in the pre-modern history of Central Eurasia. I would hope that colleagues with other disciplinary and chronological interests would take up the challenge of writing about a different mix of resources on other websites. All of the websites here are analyzed (and links provided to some of their most interesting subsections) in the Museum Collections pages of “Silk Road Seattle”, to which readers may refer for additional detail and for a considerable array of additional images of the art (<http://depts.washington.edu/silkroad>). That site also contains an informative virtual exhibition on the “Art of the Silk Road.”

The Louvre (Paris)

The visitor to the Louvre (<http://www.louvre.fr/llv/commun/home.jsp?bmLocale=en>), who is likely to have read *The Da Vinci Code*, may immediately head for the “Mona Lisa.” The museum itself is capitalizing on this interest and even has a self-guided tour outlined on its website for those who come clutching in their fists Dan Brown’s cleverly marketed but otherwise undistinguished moneymaker. Of course the student of Central Eurasia, while envious of his royalty checks, is above such frivolity and will head instead to the outstanding Islamic collection or the extensive galleries of Near Eastern Antiquities. The Islamic collection includes some of the best known examples of ceramics, metalwork and objects with

carved relief from the Iranian and Turkic world. Among them are works produced under the Seljiks, Ilkhanids and Timurids. What one misses here are manuscript illuminations, presumably because the major collections are in the Bibliothèque nationale (see, e.g., the online exhibit there on “The Art of the Arabic Book,” <http://expositions.bnf.fr/livrarab/anglais/index.htm>). Although I have not yet examined the possibilities, presumably those interested in “orientalism” will find in the Louvre’s vast collection of French painting excellent examples to illustrate the ways in which some Europeans viewed the Islamic world through a distorted lens.

The museum has a commitment to making its entire collection available online, although the realization of that staggering goal is still in the future. As with most museums, there are “selected works,” on the website, the ones for Islamic art including a generous 125 objects, with high quality images (often multiple perspectives showing details) and short, intellectually stimulating essays that are among the best on any museum website. In theory, one can access electronically all the material in each gallery in its order of presentation, although the descriptive captioning for those separate web pages is only in French, and, for many objects, photographs are still lacking. Although it is a work in progress and is difficult to search, there is also a national database of objects in French museums.

As is the case with many museum sites, one can collect in a folder one’s personal favorites from the Louvre. That simple kind of web device has potential for classroom assignments where students might be asked to assemble and explain a selection of objects that illustrate certain themes of a course. While it is clear that the museum is very active in educational programs, so far there is little on the website designed specifically for younger viewers. This surely will change though. Even though the subject matter so far available is not directly relevant for Central Eurasia, the museum is using “Virtools” software as a way of presenting three-dimensional virtual tours, which have immense potential for offering detailed views of art, accessing accompanying descriptive text or comparative material and the like. This technology goes well beyond early digital experiments of providing “gallery tours,” where the camera simply pans a room with everything in it too small for proper examination on the screen.

Musée Guimet (Paris)

France’s national museum of Asian art is the Musée Guimet (<http://www.guimet.fr/-English->), which recently reopened after a major renovation of its galleries. While the museum can be faulted for its limited captioning and explanations, the visual presentation of the art is outstanding; its collections are among the best in the world for Chinese, Indian, Nepalese, and Tibetan material. It displays generous selections of the acquisitions by the Paul Pelliot expedition to Chinese Inner Asia (including, for example, some of the outstanding Buddhist banners from the Mogao Caves at Dunhuang) and the French Archaeological Mission in Afghanistan. It is no accident that the recent special exhibition of archaeological treasures from the Kabul Museum was held at the Guimet.

Although nicely designed, the Guimet’s website is as yet less than generous in what it offers from the collection. Other websites help to fill in the gaps though; work is already underway to make available through the International Dunhuang Project at the British Library the Pelliot Collections from Dunhuang. In using the Guimet website, do not ignore the treasures from the library, where one finds, for example, a Uighur “Life” of the famous Buddhist pilgrim Xuanzang, and the collections of old photographs, currently heavy on China but with the promise of the major collections from the Pelliot and French Afghan expeditions. For featured objects, the Guimet uses a technology that allows one to walk around them in order to view all sides. The Guimet already has some cleverly designed exercises to introduce art to schoolchildren, although text is still only in French for these. While other material on the website is available in several languages, some of the valuable text descriptions are as yet only in French.

State Hermitage Museum (St. Petersburg)

In the depth and range of its collections pertinent to Central Eurasia, the State Hermitage Museum (http://www.hermitagemuseum.org/html_En/index.html) has no equal. Of course the casual tourist will never get past the throne rooms, the couple of Leonardos and the French Impressionists up on the third floor, even though to walk beyond the latter brings one into wonderful material from Inner Asia and the Islamic world. The Inner Asian collection includes artifacts from the Xiongnu royal tombs at Noyon Ula in Mongolia and the striking Buddhist thangkas brought back from Khara-Khoto by the Kozlov expedition. One notes that the latter have

finally been properly catalogued in the impressive new volume by their curator, Kira Samosiuk. Although the museum is gradually upgrading the physical presentation of the exhibits, many of those of greatest interest for us are still far from meeting current museum standards, and budgetary constraints mean that some key exhibits are not open every day. A year ago the museum was preparing to consolidate and remount its major collection of early nomadic materials, which include the Pazyryk burials in the Altai. Of course Russia is a major part of Eurasian history and culture and tends to be generously represented in various ways on the website, but the Hermitage's take on the Russian Empire is Eurocentric, too much focused on the likes of snuffboxes in the time of Catherine II or the portraits of the officers who participated in the Napoleonic wars.

The website, available in Russian and in English, has a lot of promise, thanks to a founding grant from IBM. In particular, visit the section on "Oriental Art" under "Collection Highlights" in order to access material by region or culture. While for some objects it is possible to zoom in to see details, descriptive captioning is often disappointing. In general one is impressed not by how much of the collection can be accessed digitally but rather by how little, although different kinds of searches can ferret out images of objects that should come up more readily. There is as yet no hint that the Hermitage may in the short term substantially expand the digitization of its collections. Images, although of high quality, generally are too small for effective display if copied for a Powerpoint presentation.

As one can sense in visiting the Hermitage, Russians still take seriously the idea that schoolchildren should be exposed to art. The museum offers a range of educational resources, among them a few virtual exhibitions available both in Russian and in English. However, so far the selection has little that is relevant for the study of Central Eurasia.

British Museum (London)

The British Museum (<http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/default.aspx>) can rival the Hermitage in many ways when it comes to collections relevant to the study of Central Eurasia. As one might expect, to a fair degree the strengths of the collection reflect the extent of British imperial ambitions; that means collections of, for example, Middle Eastern and South Asian

material are very good. The arts of China are also among the museum's strengths, where the material collected by Aurel Stein on his several expeditions to what he termed "Serindia" occupies pride of place, even if too little of the Stein material (for my liking) is actually on display. That said, the goal of the International Dunhuang Project (IDP) at the British Library (<http://idp.bl.uk>) to make available online all of the East Asian Silk Road material means that the British Museum does not have to worry about doing the same on its own website. As it is, already one can view superb, large images of most of the Stein Collection Dunhuang Buddhist banner paintings through the IDP site. Moreover, if one is interested in the art of the book and sacred texts, the British Library is now at the forefront of using new technologies to provide electronic access (visit the online galleries, <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/ttp/ttpbooks.html>, which include a splendid, informative Quran exhibit as well as the famous printed Diamond Sutra from Dunhuang).

Unfortunately, the British Museum does not seem to have figured out as well as has the Louvre how to design a good website. At one point the best search access for what in fact is a very generous selection of several thousand objects was via what the museum called "Compass." But Compass has been scrapped and with it went all the URL links that teachers may have been using to connect their course materials directly to the excellent images and generally very informative descriptions. One can now find the objects through "Explore" (the underlying web pages are essentially the same), but often the combinations of works one might wish to have students compare can be found only with some experimentation and as a result of serendipity. That has its virtues for opening new lines of inquiry, but is not always the most effective way to group information on any particular topic.

This criticism notwithstanding, the British Museum does offer various options for thematic or geographical access to objects that one might want to compare and work into an analytical narrative. There are always suggestions for finding analogous objects, even if sometimes what comes out of a search would seem to have little apparent relevance to what one wants. A challenge in searching museum websites is that often the terminology is inconsistent: does one look for ceramic, pottery, porcelain, stoneware, fritware? In this regard, the museum's suggestions for medium or materials under which to find objects still leave a lot to be desired. Granted, effective searching (be it in a

library or on the Internet) has a learning curve: one develops the vocabulary and techniques through experience.

Victoria and Albert Museum (London)

While those who head to London tend to think first of the British Museum, they should not ignore the wonderful collections in the Victoria and Albert Museum (<http://www.vam.ac.uk/>), which was founded as a source of inspiration for the applied arts of British industry. Its collections of Islamic, Chinese and Indian art are especially noteworthy. A lot of work and money has gone into improving the displays. Most recently, the renovated Islamic galleries reopened, where the centerpiece is the impressive carpet commissioned by Safavid Shah Tahmasp for the shrine at Ardebil (a generous selection of good images of the carpet are available on the museum website). The V and A has the laudable goal of making all of its collection available online, although so far the images vary in quality, there are significant gaps, and the search mechanism needs improvement.

On the plus side though, clearly the staff at the V and A is thinking about how to integrate the art it holds into meaningful educational presentations. Thus, for example, while the overview of the Islamic collection has few “featured objects,” there are several thematic “virtual exhibits” and exercises. The descriptive and analytical content of these so far is shallow, but they offer a promising way to encourage further exploration and they employ technology well to allow viewers to focus in on details or to highlight features of particular works.

As the lessons of the British Museum website and that of the Victoria and Albert Museum demonstrate, having a stable URL for pages containing images and description of individual objects is essential if the website is to be of longterm value for those designing courses and assembling resources for student assignments. The example of JSTOR for journal articles is a model in this regard; perhaps ArtStor, the parallel Mellon-financed project for images, will prove its value for the same reason, especially if it were to end up being one-stop shopping for art images.

Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York)

In terms of Internet presence, I have saved what are arguably two of the best museums for last. Few museums can even pretend to be comprehensive in their coverage. An exception is the Metropolitan Museum of Art (<http://metmuseum.org>); its website

is equally ambitious. The museum offers the “standard” featured objects selections under various cultural or geographical rubrics — thus one can view and enlarge a few dozen pieces of, say, Islamic art, and read decent, short descriptions of them. What makes the Met website different from others is its Timeline of Art History, which ranges around the world and across the centuries, allowing one to choose by region of the world synchronous developments in different cultural areas, and much more. There is even a rather rare category of “Central and North Asia.” For Islamic art alone, there are dozens of thematic choices, each of which will bring together combinations of objects and descriptive material about them. The logic and detail of this approach stands in contrast to the often rather confusing, open-ended and ill-defined chaos of what one finds via the British Museum’s invitation to “Explore.” Within individual essays there are links to related essays that really do connect and contain some substance, plus suggestions for reading. Increasingly in recent years, the Met’s web pages for special exhibitions are becoming richer in content than had earlier been the case. Outstanding examples are “China at the Dawn of a Golden Age, 200-750 A.D.,” “In the Footsteps of Marco Polo” and “The Legacy of Genghis Khan.”

Los Angeles County Museum of Art (Los Angeles, Calif.)

The Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA) (<http://www.lacma.org/>) was one of the first museums to commit to placing its entire collection online; already; one can access more than 70,000 objects with relatively easy searches. Its Asian and Middle Eastern collections are outstanding. For me, the highlight of all this is the very substantial introduction to Islamic art found on web pages written by the curator of that part of the collection, Linda Komaroff. Such essays should serve as a model for other museums to emulate and could readily be incorporated into assignments for something like a survey course on Islamic Eurasia. Komaroff and Stefano Carboni (of the Met in New York) were the co-curators of one of the best recent exhibitions of Islamic art, one devoted to the courtly art of the Ilkhanids. A very striking introduction to that exhibition may still be viewed on the Internet (<http://www.lacma.org/khan/index.htm>; for more detail, see the different set of pages on the Met’s site).

The list of museums with Internet resources relevant to our interests in Central Eurasia can easily be expanded — e.g., the Cleveland Museum of Art

(<http://www.clevelandart.org/>), which has one of the world's best collections of textiles, many from Central Eurasia, even if their images on the web are often too small or dim to be of more than notional value; or the Miho Museum in Japan (<http://www.miho.or.jp/english/index.htm>), which provides detailed photographs of a famous Sogdian burial couch from China. Thus the resources are extensive if uneven. But access to images alone or even with a certain amount of verbal contextualization does not by itself make for good teaching or learning.

Utilizing Museum Web Materials in the Classroom

How might those of us who are not art historians effectively use this material? Valuable guidance on pedagogy can be found in resources such as the Association for Asian Studies print journal *Education About Asia* (<http://www.aasianst.org/aaa-toc.htm>) or the innovative Internet resource produced at George Mason University, "World History Matters" [<http://worldhistorymatters.org/>]. A detailed discussion of pedagogical issues requires separate treatment, but let me offer a few thoughts.

Simply to tell students to go find a few interesting art objects on the Internet hardly does the job, any more than does throwing a few images into a lecture without really integrating them into the subject matter. Moreover, there is the danger that the pithy descriptive paragraphs most museums provide on the Internet invite only passive learning (a kind of Wikipedia approach to information, although generally informed by real expertise). We should not want to reinforce intellectual laziness. On the contrary, by asking our students to analyze primary sources (written, visual, aural) we should be stimulating them to ask questions, discover connections, develop the enthusiasm and the abilities to locate and understand additional information. While some of the thematic Internet presentations include questions, they may be more of the type asked in a school quiz or on a standardized test, rather than ones that expand the learner's horizons.

It should be possible to develop assignments including Internet art resources as an important component. There are rich opportunities, for example, if one wanted a class to learn about Ilkhanid, Timurid or Safavid courtly culture, since so many primary texts have been translated, there is so much good art material on the Internet, and a lot of that art is ideal for illustrating themes of cross-

cultural interaction. Apart from comparing, say, Chinese Blue and White ware with "Kubatchi ware" produced in northwest Iran, one can challenge the students with examples such as those puzzling depictions of nomadic life often attributed to one Mohammed "Siyah Qalem" ("of the Black Pen"), some of which can be found on Bilkent University's website for the Topkapi Saray in Istanbul (<http://www.ee.bilkent.edu.tr/~history/topkapi.html>). It would be possible to introduce students to the great poet and patron of the arts, Alisher Navoi, or include in an assignment a section from Orhan Pamuk's novel *My Name is Red*, where some of the famous Timurid painters such as Bihzad make an appearance. In addition to what art museums offer, if our subject is the Islamic world, there are many other possibilities for obtaining textual and visual material. One can read all of the Quran online and hear it recited. In ArchNet (<http://archnet.org/lobby/>) we have the most extensive database of images, and, increasingly, analytical text, for Islamic architecture. We are equally well served for Buddhist material on the Internet, where one can find any number of texts, introductions to Buddhist art and ample illustrative material.

A carefully designed assignment then can pose a series of questions that requires the students to search, identify patterns, analyze visual clues, juxtapose text with image, compare. Certain lines of questioning can relate effectively the past with the present. An instructor, even if he/she normally writes on the energy sector or clan politics in Kazakhstan, undoubtedly should be prepared to answer questions such as: "Does the Quran really proscribe images?" or "Why did the Taliban destroy the Bamiyan Buddhas?" The answers are not necessarily straightforward, nor might be the instructor's response in the form of an assignment: "Write an essay on when and how images came to be proscribed in Islam, if they were, and provide visual examples to illustrate your conclusions. Here are some suggestions about resources...."

A not inconsequential benefit of developing such assignments, as with any teaching, is to expand the horizons of the instructor who creates them. I made a commitment to offer a course on the Silk Road some ten years ago without having yet learned much about the cultural traditions of East Asia. Panicked at the prospect of facing the class, I not only began reading, but even took the drastic step of spending a month in a summer institute, studying Buddhist art in the Mogao Caves at Dunhuang in China. That has been a pivotal experience in my life, from which there has been no turning back. My

inspiration to learn more about Islamic art goes back to wonderful lectures by Oleg Grabar, which I audited as a graduate student. I went into them with something of a background in Orthodox Christian art, which on the face of it is totally antithetical to what one finds in Islam (in fact, as I later learned, the Iconoclast controversy in 8th-century Byzantium may have arisen in response to the Umayyad decisions to circumscribe the use of certain kinds of imagery). Nowadays, thanks to the Internet, inspiration for both you and your students to learn more about Islamic art may come from LACMA's "The Legacy of Genghis Khan" or another stunning web presentation which I have just discovered, on the Suleymaniye Mosque in Istanbul (<http://www.saudiaramcoworld.com/issue/200605/suleymaniye/default.htm>). The latter is available

through *Saudi Aramco World*, which is one of the most valuable resources now online for teaching and learning about the culture of the Islamic world. You will want to add Istanbul to your list of destinations for future travel. While there, don't miss the superb collection of Chinese porcelain in the Topkapi Saray, the Seljuk carpets in the Museum of Turkish and Islamic Arts, and the glorious Byzantine frescoes and mosaics in the Kariye Cami.

I invite other contributors to CESR to share their experiences with the visual aspects of the region we study and to provide examples of success (and failure) from their own experience of incorporating such material in their teaching. We are still all learners in this new world of digital resources.

In Memoriam:

Tributes to CESS Honorary Members

Omeljan Pritsak, 1919-2006

Richard N. Frye, Professor Emeritus, Harvard University, frye@fas.harvard.edu

Omeljan Pritsak was born in Luka, eastern Poland, on April 9, 1919, and died in Massachusetts on May 27, 2006. After the Soviet occupation of his town he moved to Kiev and studied with the noted Orientalist, Ahatanhel Krymsky. Enrolled in the Soviet army, he was taken prisoner by the Germans and later released.

I first met Omeljan at the home of Hans Heinrich Schaeder in Göttingen, just before he received his doctorate on the Karakhanids from Schaeder in 1948. He clarified the involved history of the first important Muslim dynasty of Central Asia, in an important article "Von den Karluken zu den Karachaniden" [From the Qarluqs to the Qarakhanids] (1951). His study of the intricate family relationships of the Qarakhanids brought new light to various other Turkic tribes in Central Asia. His article, "The Decline of the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu," published in 1952, was a significant contribution. He wrote important scholarship on the Pechenegs and other Eurasian nomadic empires. His *Khazarian Hebrew Documents* (1982) was an especially important work on interpretations of the Geniza documents. For details of his coming to Harvard, see my memoirs (Frye 2005). References to his publications may be found on the internet under his name.

He remained Professor of Turkology from 1964-1989 at Harvard, but his interest also focused on Ukrainian matters. In 1973 he created the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and in 1975 became the first Mykhailo Hrushevsky Professor of Ukrainian History.

Omeljan's scholarly interest turned to the question of the origins of the Rus' and his publication *The Origin of the Rus'* (1981) was followed by a massive second posthumous volume. He already had prepared more volumes which were a complete account of many sources on the Rus', as

well as their neighbors and their extensive trading networks. His work represents the last word not only on the Rus', but also on the early history of Ukraine. His contributions in this field are of such value that he was made the first foreigner elected to the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and moved to Kiev. He also built the department of Oriental Studies at Kiev University, but because of his health he had to return to this country.

Omeljan, together with Şinasi Tekin, published the *Journal of Turkish Studies*. He trained many students, such as Robert Dankoff, Thomas Barfield, and others. For a time Harvard was a center of classical Turkology, of which Omeljan Pritsak was a central figure.

References

- Frye, Richard N.
2005 *Greater Iran: A 20th-century Odyssey*.
Costa Mesa, Calif.: Mazda Publishers.
- Pritsak, Omeljan
1951 "Von den Karluken zu den Karachaniden."
Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morganländischen Gesellschaft, 1951 (101) 270-300.
1952 "The Decline of the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu." In *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US*. New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US.
1981 *The Origin of the Rus'*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
1982 *Khazarian Hebrew Documents*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Boris Il'ich Marshak, 1933-2006

Aleksandr Naymark, Assistant Professor, Art History, Hofstra University, Hempstead, N.Y.,
aleksandr.naymark@hofstra.edu

Opening an obituary with an emphatic statement that an archaeologist died on an expedition seems to be a typical journalist trick — a cliché similar to that of the soldier who lost his life at his post. And yet the fact that Boris Marshak died in Panjikant during the excavation season is extremely telling, because one would have no grounds to assume that he would be at this place at this time. Indeed, of all the archaeologists I have known through my fairly long professional career, Marshak was certainly one of the least physically fit to endure half a century of archaeological work in Central Asia. Notwithstanding the personal valor of Indiana Jones, it is common knowledge that actual fieldwork does require certain physical abilities, many of which Boris Marshak certainly lacked. He was neither strong nor nimble — just the opposite, he gave the impression of a very fragile and awkward man. Many times, seeing him going down into a deep archaeological trench, I had the urge to close my eyes in anticipation of a seemingly unavoidable misstep and disastrous fall. His skin could not stand the Central Asian sun and in order to protect himself he had to button up his long sleeved shirt and wear a broad-brimmed hat. At least in advanced age he had to be very cautious in diet, which is not an easy thing to do on a Central Asian expedition. And yet despite all the challenges, Marshak spent every season on the Panjikant expedition for over half a century and kept going to the field even when the absolute majority of Central Asian archaeologists belonging to his generation had long before stopped their excavation work.

What made him go from day to day and year to year? No doubt the seasonal change of scenery, like in the case of many other archaeologists, became his way of life, his mode of existence. There is also no doubt that the site of Kainar-su, the location of old Panjikant, is not a typical archaeological monument: unlike the vast majority of other Sogdian sites, it proved capable of rewarding its excavators with exceptional materials on an annual basis. And yet I believe that Marshak's exceptional devotion to his field and to "his" monument, resulted from the internal, rather than external factors — I think that Marshak was simply permanently taken by the ardor of a true scholar who could not stop improving and broadening his own

understanding of his "personal" scientific problem, that is, the derelict Sogdian town of Panjikant and the broader image of early medieval Sogdiana behind it.

During the last 15 years, there was also an additional bitter motive: in the unstable post-Soviet world, Marshak's personal merit and fame were absolutely essential to protect and preserve the results of his own life's work and the efforts invested into the common cause by several generations of researchers who worked in Panjikant. Thus he was "obliged" to keep going, in the hopes that a new generation of bright scholars would be able to receive estaphet and to carry the torch forward.

Boris Marshak himself was very lucky to enter this great scholarly enterprise during his student years. In the 1950s the Panjikant expedition was run by major scholars, who created an unbelievable intellectual climate for the time. It became a real "breeding ground" for a whole generation of genuine researchers. It is sufficient to say that the first three directors of the expedition were O. Iu. Iakubovskii, M. M. D'"iakov and A. M. Belenitskii. Among the participants of the expedition were such major figures as the numismatist, philologist and historian O. I. Smirnova, architect V. A. Voronina and conservator P. I. Kostorov. The expedition was especially lucky to host the absolutely brilliant field worker, A. I. Terenozhkin. Despite the shortness of his tenure — he took part in only the first two seasons — Terenozhkin managed to train two students, B. Ia. Staviskii and O. G. Bol'shakov and it was mainly from them that the representatives of the younger generation, who arrived in the 1950s, learned the excavation techniques. Among these "later arrivals" were E. V. Zeimal', V. A. Livshits, V. G. Lukonin and B. I. Marshak.

Needless to say, Boris Marshak, who came from a family of professional literati with a long intellectual tradition,¹ was more than compatible

¹ Boris Marshak's father Ilia, originally an engineer, made an illustrious career under the pen name M. Il'in; some of his works were written in collaboration with his wife, Elena Segal. Boris' uncle was the major Russian poet Samuil Marshak. The sister of Samuil and Il'ia, Liya Preis, wrote under the pen name Elena Il'ina. In fact, the

with this intellectual environment. Yet it was definitely not easy for him to meet the expectations of the young and cheerfully cruel Panjikant gang of neophyte archaeologists, when it came to the actual excavation process. This side of the accommodation process caused Marshak a lot of grief. He told me once how during his first seasons, he made the typical novice mistake of cutting through a *sufa* (a bench) in one of the rooms. Completely overwhelmed by this “disaster” he wrote in a letter to V. I. Raspopova that he would “never make a true archaeologist.”

Yet only several years passed before Marshak, together with the slightly senior Bol’shakov, led the local scale “revolution” in the Panjikant expedition. The work of these two young scholars broke the then-existing perception of Panjikant as a “single-stratum monument.” In particular, Marshak demonstrated that the so-called “early stratum” of Panjikant contains materials going back as far as the fifth century and that it can and should be divided into several large chronological periods. Together with brilliant work done by Bol’shakov on the chronology of Panjikant in the seventh and eighth century, these considerations formed the basis for the study of the history of this *étalon* site as a sequence of chronological cross-sections “sliced” by several contemporary events, which were known to seriously affect the town or the Sogdian society in general. It was this new, truly historical approach that ultimately turned the murals of Panjikant into the best dated Central Asian paintings, that allowed for the attribution of quite a few Sogdian coin series to particular time periods, that brought a new understanding of the social stratification and social dynamics of the early medieval Sogdian city, and altogether brought Sogdian archaeology to a new level (for example, see Belenitskii, Marshak and Raspopova 1979, 1981; Raspopova 1990, 1993.)

I believe also that it was Marshak who greatly “intellectualized” the very essence of the excavation method in Panjikant. Yet before talking about that, it is necessary to mention several particularities of

intellectual tradition in this family can be traced as far back as far as the 17th century. Marshak is not a usual surname, but an acronym formed from the Hebrew expression “Morenu (our teacher) Rabbi Shmuel Kaidanover.” All of the bearers of this surname, among whom there are many people famous for their scientific, scholarly, or literary works, are the descendants of the prominent Jewish scholar and religious leader, Aharon Shmuel ben Israel Kaidanover (Vilna, 1614 - Krakow, 1676/1679) active in Ukraine, Moravia and Poland.

Panjikant as an archaeological monument. It is definitely true that the material used by the builders of Panjikant and thus the material constituting most of the archaeological strata does not create any major problems for archaeologists — the soil of the site is sufficiently, but not overly, moist, and has its own distinct color characteristics. In other words, normally it is quite easy to separate the walls from the wreckage, the brick from the mortar. Yet Panjikant is undeniably a complex site for excavations, because the build up of its upper stratum consisted predominantly of two- or even three-story adobe brick buildings. Excavations of such structures belong to the most complex tasks in archaeology. During their relatively long life, many of these houses went through reconstructions, rebuildings and repairs. Establishing a sequence of these architectural renovations is not a trivial task in itself, but it becomes a real riddle when the collapse of vaults and upper stories creates a reverse stratigraphy, in which the strata with earlier materials are found on top of the later ones (Marshak 1964: 183-4; Raspopova 1970). In such cases an excavation spot turns into a complex three-dimensional puzzle, which an archaeologist is expected to solve before he has the entire picture at hand — otherwise a proper separation of artifacts belonging to different times becomes impossible.

The excavation method as it was taught to me during my years with the Panjikant expedition (1978-1982) could be briefly described as follows. First of all, quite in accordance with the “ideal” archaeological methodology, no “blind” digging was allowed in Panjikant — an archaeologist was supposed to know precisely the origin and significance of every cubic inch of soil he removed. That meant that broom and brush were the first to be used and that he/she always had to be ahead of a worker’s spade with a *tesha* (a small Central Asian horizontal axe) and a knife. It would be wrong to assume, however, that with the progression and expansion of the excavation spot and, consequently, with the overall better understanding of it, the process of “comprehension” became simpler. Just the opposite: in most cases with the expansion of the “excavated” space the picture would become more complex and the structural history of the edifice would present an archaeologist with real conundrums. In order to solve the latter, one would need to formulate several working hypotheses about the sequence of different structural elements of the building. This “active anticipation” of the solution required constant thinking “ahead” and in some

ways resembled methods of archaeological data interpretation suggested by Binford. Using some other minor, “sensitive” instrument (Marshak himself always preferred a long knife with a flexible point) an archaeologist eliminated one hypothesis after another until the most probable solution would be reached. Only then would he allow his workers to return to the excavation process with their spades.

One can say that Marshak taught his students to be in constant “conversation” or even in “argument” with the excavation spot. According to him, an archaeologist should never allow the excavation spot “to lead.” This was an enormously time consuming and laborious method of work, and it kept an archaeologist constantly busy and often put him/her in a great hurry. If the three-dimensional puzzle presented by the ancient dwelling was of a complex nature, it could lead to a real psychological constraint because an archaeologist would still be required to provide the workers with the volume of digging and thus he/she would constantly feel a strong psychological pressure. The result, however, was great, as this excavation method brought an unprecedented (in Central Asian archaeology) precision in dating: for the end of the seventh and the eighth centuries the dates of different alterations in Panjikant buildings could be narrowed to decades, while the materials from the earlier periods, where no numismatic material or written sources could support the dates offered, were divided into 30-50 year periods.

There was another important aspect of the excavation process in Panjikant as set up by Marshak. Working in many different expeditions, I saw how over the course of time their directors removed themselves from the actual excavation process and delegated their responsibilities to advanced assistants. This was not the case with Marshak. Besides controlling his own spot, he constantly circled around the site attending each active spot on a fairly regular schedule. The younger and less trusted archaeologists would see him almost on a daily basis, while those who already had a chance to prove their proficiency were visited once or twice a week. This was not just plain supervision: Marshak carefully discussed each significant step to be undertaken by the actual excavator and tried to offer his own solution for each significant puzzle; he always went down in the trenches and checked the spatial relations between different structural elements using his long knife. Yet this was not an example of a more experienced colleague dictating what was to be done; although Marshak often

offered his own solutions, the trench supervisor could disagree and argue. I recall how, towards the end of the 1982 season, sometime in September, I was finishing the terminal clean-up of my excavation spot along the southern side of Temple I, when Valentin Shkoda, the small owner of a very big voice, called me from his Sector 10, situated about a hundred yards to the east. Upon my arrival, I found Shkoda with Marshak, apparently in deadlock, who asked me to hit a particular spot on the wall with my tesha. My request for an explanation was firmly rejected: “Just hit.” I did. “You see!” said Marshak. “No it is not!” responded Shkoda. Marshak turned to me: “Try once more.” I did as he asked. “Aha! Here it is!” said Shkoda. “No way!” responded Marshak. They requested one more hit; I refused to do it without hearing some explanation. “Just once more!” they insisted. I struck once more. “It sings!” said Marshak. “No it thumps!” replied Shkoda. As the sound was something I could estimate, I went beyond the orders and dealt one more strike on my own. Unexpectedly, it opened a seam between the two brickworks. “Aha! Here it is!” I said, and turned. I saw two deeply disappointed faces — neither of them expected this seam to be there....

Marshak’s involvement with the fieldwork was certainly not limited to the excavation process alone. The famous paintings that Panjikant generously yielded on an annual basis required a lot of special care. The expedition was always lucky to have excellent Hermitage conservators, who, like Galina Ter-Aganian, could be completely trusted with the removal of the paintings. There was, however, a stage of work on which the knowledge of Sogdian and not only Sogdian paintings was of major importance. Prior to the removal of the paintings from the wall, the wall was covered with a polyethylene film and all contour lines of the composition were traced with a green ballpoint pen. Even the highly qualified people, who, like Tat’iana Vasilenko, mastered the tracing technique for years, were not always able to recognize the content of fragmented and poorly preserved scenes. In such a situation Marshak’s excellent visual memory and broad erudition were absolutely indispensable. Sometimes, when strained timing created a need for additional hands, Marshak would take a pen and do the tracing alongside the conservators. It is worth mentioning that he was a very good draftsman in general, although I am still unable to comprehend how he could be so good with his strange manner of

holding a pencil — the most awkward one I have ever seen.

Marshak also controlled the “wandering” brigade of architects, who passed from one excavation spot to another and recorded all structural remains. Of course these architects worked with individual trench supervisors, but Marshak devised their working schedule and controlled the receiving end, checking and endorsing each and every plan, section or axonometry. In the 1970s, close cooperation allowed Marshak and architect Leonid Gurevich to unite all the structures that were excavated in Panjikant during the first three decades in one plan, although they originally had been measured and recorded separately. This work was immense in volume, but it later brought many important benefits such as the understanding of the measurements underlining the original layout of the site.

Coming from a full day of excavations, Marshak usually took a short rest and then went through all the work that was done on the base. He taught young archeologists how to draw and describe pottery. Yet all the drawings of thousands of sherds, even those that were produced by professionals, had to pass through his control and be endorsed. One temporary member of the team, an archaeologist who worked in Panjikant in the late 1980s, said that it is very hard to work in this expedition, because Marshak controlled everything. It was indeed true, but it was this restless control that kept the Panjikant quality standards so high, and ultimately what led to the export of Panjikant methodology to other Central Asian expeditions.

I cannot imagine Boris Marshak without Panjikant exactly like I cannot imagine Panjikant without Boris Marshak. Panjikant was not just “his monument,” it was the center of his universe. This was already clear to people working by Marshak’s side in the 1960s. Towards the end of this decade, Belenitskii started feeling the weight of age and decided to “designate his heirs.” He selected two people, Boris Marshak and Evgenii Zeimal’, who complemented each other in terms of their interests and abilities. Zeimal’, although an excellent archaeologist, was by that time minimally interested in the excavation process itself and worked mostly in the field of numismatics. Marshak’s interest was in the excavation process and numismatics obviously occupied one of the last places among his extremely broad scholarly interests. Marshak was not a particularly good manager and always had troubles

providing his expedition with the necessary resources, materials and goods in the severe conditions of the declining Soviet economy. Zeimal’, by contrast, was able to establish working contacts with all kinds of people on all possible levels and was very effective on the organizational front. Yet, despite the apparently wise choice of two mutually complementing people, Belenitskii’s plan did not work — Zeimal’ refused to participate in this venture. Many years later, when I asked Zeimal’ why he declined Belenitskii’s offer, he said: “It was Boris’ site. He wanted it, he worked on it harder than anybody else, and he absolutely deserved to have it for himself.”

One thing that did not come easy to Boris Marshak was writing. On one hand, like many other members of his literati family he had ambition. For example, he took part in a contest for the best translation of some of Rudaki’s *rubais* announced by the journal “Pamir” and subsequently spent half an hour trying to explain to me why the translation done by my father, a professional translator of poetry, who also participated in this competition, did not sufficiently reflect the sense of the original. I am sorry to say that due to my young age I listened only with half an ear and in Tom Sawyer’s tradition escaped as early as possible under some pretext. There was a rare span of free time in the schedule and there was a girl in the expedition in whom I was interested.

Yet now I think that this conversation was indeed very indicative: Marshak was almost obsessed with precision in writing. He once told me that good scholarly writing is as laborious as poetry and has much in common with it, because both require a high degree of precision. His interest in precision and his great respect for the written word served him well as a means of expressing original thoughts, but this also meant the lack of interest in general phrases, statements and description of commonly known facts. It was certainly this attitude that prevented Marshak from writing popular works — he left practically no writings in this profitable genre. The same factor was responsible for the relative brevity of his publications. Being tightly packed with information and analysis, they were always concise and required a serious and slow reader who could spare time for the real digestion of such a complex text. There is no doubt that Marshak’s first book, *Sogdiiskoe serebro* [Sogdian Silver] (Marshak 1971), was revolutionary in approach and comprehensive in coverage, yet the actual text of this fundamental study comprises only

85 small format pages. Once Marshak's wife, Valentina I. Raspopova, asked me whether I understood this book. I replied that digesting it took a while, but that I thought I was quite comfortable with both the ideas and the material. "Good for you!" she remarked. "I still cannot comprehend it."

Marshak belongs to a generation of scholars who were very much aware of the methodological challenges posed by the great advancement of positivist studies in both archaeology and art history. This was the generation that by and large turned to the statistically significant quantities of regular plain materials and tried to transform these unimpressive artifacts into historical sources of the first order.

Yet Marshak stands out even among the scholars of his generation as a person who preoccupied himself with methodological issues, for he enhanced analytical techniques in the study of virtually every artistic medium and every category of material culture that happened to become a subject of his investigation. To be sure, Marshak was by no mean a theoretician, who tries to solve ontological problems of archeology as a *sciencia* or to advance archaeological terminology; rather, he was a very practical scholar who preoccupied himself with the development of standard algorithms applicable to various categories of artifacts and art objects.

Marshak wrote a magnificent PhD dissertation on the pottery from the so-called lower stratum of Panjikant (fifth to the first half of the seventh century, CE). I honestly believe that this work still remains (40 years later!) the most methodologically advanced study of Central Asian pre-Islamic ceramics ever done (1965). Unfortunately, except for the formalized code for the description of the pottery (Marshak 1970), this work remains unpublished in its final, advanced form, so that students of Sogdian ceramics are still forced to refer to several separate intermediary studies, which neither covers the entire bulk of the used materials nor exhausts the variety of methods utilized and developed within this project (1957, 1960, 1961, 1964: 227-236).

Mathematical applications that Marshak employed in his work with Panjikant pottery made him one of the most recognized specialists on "new methods" in archaeology. In fact, while the majority of his colleagues who employed statistical applications in their studies of pottery complexes applied simple correlation methods, Marshak suggested a much more sophisticated program of study: application of the Robinson and Pierson

criteria, the indicators of the degree of correlation of objects and the measures of entropy, as well as the criteria of Student and Wilcoxon.²

A side outcome of this work with pottery was Marshak's participation in a joint project with two other Soviet archaeologists of the time known for their non-traditional approach to the data, I. Kamenetskii and Ia. Sher. The three of them produced a wonderful book *Analiz arkheologicheskikh istochnikov* [Analysis of Archaeological Sources] (Kamenetskii, Marshak and Sher 1975), which was a manual to provide students and the archaeological community in general with a convenient systematic introduction to the advanced methods of description, classification and seriation, as well as (to some extent) to the formalized ways of historical interpretation of archaeological data.³ Labeled as a manual, it was in fact the first Russian language monographic work devoted to methods of mathematical analysis in archaeology (Klein 1977). Indeed, it was based first of all on rich personal experience and thus was mostly original in the selection of material. Other scholars working in this field immediately noticed that the approach to automatic seriation presented in it was "for the most part original and pioneering" (Malina 1977). Published in a ridiculously small edition, this book immediately became a bibliographic rarity even in the former Soviet Union; despite its obvious merit, it had (to the best of my knowledge) almost no impact on the literature of this sort published in Western languages, with the single exception of the *System of Analytical Archaeography*, by Iaroslav Malina (1977: 4, 20, 82, 85, 87). In Russia, however, it was well-known and widely used. I remember how the reading of this book (which was not, by the way, assigned reading in any courses) became a must for the students of the archaeological department of Moscow University who were interested in the new analytical methods (and what efforts we made to obtain a copy in the still pre-xerox era of Soviet history when I studied!).

The study of Sogdian pottery pushed Marshak's interests into another theme, which was destined to become one of his major interests: the

² On the importance of these innovations, see Kvirkvėliia 1981: 326.

³ This book became a standard reference. Since its appearance many Soviet scholars who used mathematical applications in their research would not describe their methods, but just reference *Analiz arkheologicheskikh istochnikov*.

study of Sogdian and then Oriental tureutics in general. It was way back in the 1930s that Grigor'ev recognized reflections of metalware in some Sogdian pottery shapes. As a follow-up to this idea, Marshak suggested that local pottery production imitated locally popular Sogdian silver and used metalizing features of pottery in his hypothetical reconstruction of Sogdian silver vessels. Then he found a coherent group of vessels that was characterized by these properties. Further work made it possible to expand the pool of objects on the basis of technological and stylistic analysis. Already the first works in this field brought the young scholar recognition, so that when an early medieval silver plate was found in Chilek, Marshak was asked to join Krikis, the archaeologist of the Samarqand Museum, in excavating the spot. Yet Marshak went much further and developed a new approach, which can be seen as the next step in the formalization of the methods originally employed in the works by Smirnov and Kondakov. The most important of Marshak's methodological inventions were stemmata based on the study of the lines of mechanical reproduction. The study of Sogdian tureutics made him interested in Sasanian and early Islamic metal work, and also in silverware of Eurasian nomads, as Sogdian schools of tureutics exerted a major influence on steppe art. The results of his studies are now widely known, especially since the publication of the *Silberschätze des Orients* (1986), a version of his habilitation dissertation, which brought Marshak the prize of the French Academy.

Marshak's numerous studies in Sogdian paintings and in Sogdian iconography in general look more traditional and less technical, but they also involve both a highly formalized approach and a lot of non-traditional thinking. This became absolutely obvious with Marshak's very first works in this field. Once more I would like to cite an opinion of a major scholar who closely worked with Marshak. In the spring of 1991, I visited the long retired Aleksandr Belenitskii, who served as the director of the Panjikant expedition from 1954 to 1977, when he passed the reins to Marshak. The old man was in a good mood, and shared with me some memories about "past times" with the wonderful kind smile of a dignified senior scholar. Among other things we talked about his works on Sogdian paintings, and when I mentioned his joint articles (Belenitskii and Marshak 1971, 1976) and a huge section in the book on Sogdian paintings that he wrote jointly with Marshak (Belenitskii and Marshak 1981), Belenitskii said: "These were

already more Boris' works than mine. It is perfectly clear from the absolutely different and innovative approach which is employed in them." Indeed, in these studies Marshak principally shifted the weight given to the different aspects of the problem: he made the questions of attribution his main priority, and, using the unique opportunities of archaeological dating provided by the long-term stationary excavations of Panjikant, elaborated a chronological sequence of paintings that allowed him for the first time to talk authoritatively about evolution of style, development in the range of subjects, and so forth (Belenitskii and Marshak 1979). Altogether, Marshak raised our understanding of the development of Sogdian paintings and Sogdian art in general to a higher level (Marshak 1999a, 1999b, 2000), and opened new avenues for advanced fundamental research in the field of Sogdian iconography (Marshak 1987, 1989, 1994, 2002; Marshak and Raspopova 1990, 1991, 1994, 1997/98; Marshak and Grenet 1998).

One can also say that the last decades of Marshak-led excavations in Panjikant have turned Sogdian paintings into a truly historical source — meticulous recording and advanced understanding of the archaeological contexts of the paintings opened opportunities for the cultural-sociological analysis of this rich pictorial material. Given the volume of data obtained, one can say that paintings turned into a mass material that can be studied with the help of almost statistical methods (Marshak 1987, 1996, 1999a; Marshak and Raspopova 1991).

It is very difficult, if possible at all, to list all the achievements of such a versatile scholar as Boris Marshak, and I certainly do not plan to do it here. The breadth of his interests and the extent of his knowledge supported by an amazing personal asset — a fantastic memory — often made people feel that he was a genius. Yet I recall a conversation that we had one evening on the *avivan* of the Panjikant base. We were talking about different personages of Central Asian historiography and Marshak told me that there are no geniuses in our business. I was young and did not believe him at that time. Now I think that he was probably right — the main characteristic of a genius' work is the uniqueness of his/her creative style, the internal coherency of which could not be faked. Archaeology nowadays is a social science with a set of developed analytical methods, which are expected to produce exactly the same result when applied to the same data. In other words, there seems to be less and less space for intuition and genius in our field. And yet, if any

student of pre-Islamic Central Asia can be deemed a genius it is Marshak. It does not mean that he was always right, for sometimes he made serious mistakes, especially when he relied on intuition and did not do his homework. Marshak was, however, famous for his constant awareness of methodological issues, for the solidity of his argumentation and for his formalized approach to any problem. As a result he made many fewer mistakes and produced many more solid results than most of his colleagues.

The loss of such a figure is especially painful now as Marshak was the last acting representative of a brilliant generation that laid the foundations for the study of Sogd proper. Indeed, Marshak was there almost from the very beginning and had a truly intimate knowledge of the field — he witnessed its formation and knew the internal logic of its development. We all know how important the individual factor in scholarship is in general, and in archaeology in particular, how personal acquaintance with the actual circumstances of certain discoveries and with the scholars who made these discoveries, corrects and shapes our estimates of their seemingly objective conclusions and theories. It also is very bad timing because Central Asian archaeology is undergoing a great break in tradition. Indeed, only five archaeologists remain active in Turkmenistan, the staff of the Institute of Archaeology of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences contracted manifold, and expeditions from Moscow and St. Petersburg have terminated their work in Central Asia, one after another.

As far as I know, it was the sudden death on expedition that is solely responsible for the fact that Boris Marshak was buried in Panjikant. And yet, the prosaic causes for the selection of Boris Marshak's place of rest only underline that it is highly symbolic. Marshak was an archaeologist of one archaeological site. Except for training in the expeditions of Moscow University, first of all in Novgorod, one archaeological season spent in Turkmenistan, and one short-term excavation in Chirchik, Marshak worked only in Panjikant. Yet the qualitative criterion is even more important here than quantitative: in his life Marshak was, first of all, a scholar, and as Panjikant was the principal object of his research, one can hardly be wrong in saying that he lived in this town. Indeed he knew every house and everything that was possible to learn about its inhabitants. He walked on the streets of Panjikant for over 50 years. He devoted his life to Sogdian Panjikant and it is only right that he is buried there as its last true citizen.

References

- Belenitskii, A. M., and B. I. Marshak
 1971 "L'art de Piandjikent a lumiere des dernieres fouilles (1958-1968)." *Arts asiatiques*.
- 1976 "Cherty mirovozzreniia sogdiitsev VII-VIII vv. v iskusstve Pendzhikenta [Features of Sogdian ideology and worldview in the art of Panjikant]." *Istoriia i kul'tura narodov Srednei Azii*. Moscow: Nauka.
- 1979 "Voprosy khronologii zhivopisnerannesrednevekovogo Sogda [Problems in the chronology of early medieval Sogdian Paintings]." *USA* 4.
- 1981 "The paintings of Sogdiana." In: *Sogdian Painting. The Pictorial Epic in Oriental Art*. Guitty Azarpay, ed. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Belenitskii, A. M., B. I. Marshak and V. I. Raspopova
 1979 "Sotsial'naia struktura naseleniia drevnego Pendzhikenta [Social structure of the population of ancient Panjikant]." In: *Tovarno-denezhnye otnosheniia na blizhnem i srednem Vostoke v epokhu srednevekov'ia*. B. G. Gafurov, G. F. Girs, E. A. Davidovich, eds. Moscow: Nauka.
- 1981 "Sogdiiskii gorod v nachale srednikh vekov: itogi i metody issledovaniia drevnego Pendzhikenta [The Sogdian city in the beginning of the Middle Ages: Results and methods of research in ancient Panjikant]." *Sovetskaia Arkheologiia* 1981 (2).
- Kamenetskii, I., B. I. Marshak and Ia. Sher
 1975 *Analiz arkheologicheskikh istochnikov (vozmozhnosti formalizovannogo podkhoda)* [Analysis of archaeological sources (The possibilities of a formalized approach)]. Moscow.
- Klein, L. S.
 1977 Review of: I. Kamenetskii, B. Marshak and Ia. Sher, *Analiz arkheologicheskikh istochnikakh*. Moscow, 1975. *Sovetskaia arkheologiia* 1977 (3) 309-316. Moscow
- Kvirkvelia, O. R.
 1981 "Kratkii obzor sovetskoi literatury po voprosam primeniia statistiko-matematicheskikh metodov issledovaniia v arkheologii [A brief survey of Soviet literature devoted to the use of statistical mathematical methods of research in archaeology]."

Matematicheskie metody v sotsial'no-ekonomicheskikh i arkheologicheskikh issledovaniakh. Moscow.

Malina, Iaroslav.

1977 *System of analytical archaeography. Studie archeologickeno ustavu ceskoslovenske akademie ved v Brne*, roc. 5, sv. 2. Praha: Academia.

Marshak, B. I.

1957 "Keramika nizhnego sloia Pendzhikenta (Predvaritel'noe soobshchenie po materialam raskopok 1955 g.) [The pottery of the lower stratum of Panjikant (A preliminary report based on materials from the excavations of 1955)]." *Izvestiia otdeleniia obshchestvennykh nauk Akademii Nauk Tadzhikskoi SSR*, vyp. 14. Stalinabad.

1960 "Amfora iz nizhnego sloia Pendzhikenta [An amphora from the lower stratum of Panjikant]." *Iskusstvo tadzhikskogo naroda. Sbornik statei*, vyp. 2 *Trudy Instituta Istorii Akademii Nauk Tadzhikskoi SSSR*, vol. XXIX. Stalinabad.

1961 "Vliianie torevтики na sogdiiskuiu keramiku [Influence of toreutics on Sogdian pottery]." *Trudy Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha V. Kul'tura i iskusstvo narodov Vostoka* 6. Leningrad.

1964 "Otchet o rabotakh na ob"ekte XII za 1955-1960 gg. [Report on excavations of Sector XII [on the site of Panjikent] in 1955-1960]." In: *Materialy i issledovaniia po arkheologii SSSR* 124, pp. 227-236. Moscow-Leningrad: Nauka.

1965 *Keramika Sogda V-VII vv. kak istoriko-kul'turnyikul'turnyi pamiatnik. Avtoreferat kandidatskoi dissertatsii.* [The ceramics of V-VII c. Sogd as a historical-cultural memorial. Abstract of a dissertation]. Leningrad.

1970 "Kod dlia opisaniia keramiki Pendzhikenta V-VI vv. [The code for the description of Panjikant pottery of the 5th and 6th centuries]." In: *Statistiko-kombinatornye metody v arkheologii.* Moscow: Nauka.

1971 *Sogdiiskoe serebro* [Sogdian Silver]. Moscow: Nauka.

1986 *Silberschätze des Orients. Metallkunst des 3-13. Jahrhunderts und ihre Kontinuität* [Silver Treasures of the Orient. Metal Art of the 3rd - 13th Centuries and its Continuity]. Leipzig: Seeman.

1987 "Iskusstvo Sogda" [The Art of Sogd]. In: *Tsentral'naia Aziia. Novye pamiatniki*

pis'mennosti i iskusstva. B. B. Piotrovskii and G. M. Bongard-Levin, eds. Moscow: Nauka.

1989 "Bogi, demony, i geroi Pendzhikentskoi zhivopisi [Gods, demons and heroes of Panjikant paintings]." In: *Itogi rabot arkheologicheskikh ekspeditsii Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha.* Moscow.

1994 "Le programme iconographique des peintures de la 'Salle des ambassadeurs' à Afrasiab (Samarqand)." *Arts asiatiques* XLIX.

1996 "New discoveries in Pendjikent and the problem of comparative study of Sasanian and Sogdian art." *La Persia e L'Asia Central de Alessandro al X Secolo. Atti dei Convegni Lincei* 127. Roma: Academia Nazionale de Lincei.

1999a "Sogd V-VIII vv.: Ideologiya po pamiatnikam iskusstva [Sogd in the 5th to the 8th Centuries: Ideology as revealed by the monuments of art]." In: *Sredniaia Aziia i Dal'nii Vostok v epokhu srednevekov'ia. Sredniaia Aziia v rannem srednevekov'e.* G. A. Brykina, ed. Moskva: Nauka.

1999b "L'Art Sogdien (Ie-IXe siecle) [Sogdian Art (I-IX centuries)]." In: *Les arts de l'Asie centrale* [The arts of Central Asia]. Pierre Chuvin, ed. Paris: Citadelle et Mazenod.

1999c "Sogdian art." In: *New History of World Art 'Shogakukan,'* 1999 (15) 386-395.

2002 *Legends and Fables in the Art of Sogdiana.* New York: Biblioteka Persica.

Marshak, B. I., and Frantz Grenet.

1998 "Le mythe de Nana dans l'art de la Sogdiane." [The myth of Nana in Sogdian art]. *Arts asiatiques*, 53.

Marshak, B. I., and Valentina I. Raspopova

1990 "Wall paintings from a house with a granary. Panjikent, first quarter of the eighth century AD." *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* I.

1991 "Cultes communautaires et cultes privés en Sogdiane" [Communitarian and private cults in Soghd]. In: *Histoire et cultes de l'Asie centrale préislamique* [History and cults in pre-Islamic Central Asia]. Paris: CNRS.

1994 "Worshippers from the Northern Shrine of Temple II, Panjikent." In: *The Archaeology and Art of Central Asia. Studies from the Former Soviet Union.* B. A. Litvinskii and Carol Altman Bromberg, eds. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 1994 (8).

1997/8 "Buddha icon from Panjikent." In: *Silk Road Art and Archeology V*.

Valentina I. Raspopova.

1970 "Keramika i sloi poseleniia (na materialakh VII-VIII vv. Pendzhikenta) [Pottery and the

layer of settlement (based on the materials of Panjikent of the 7th to the 8th century)]." In: *Statistiko-kombinatornye metody v arkheologii*. Moscow: Nauka.

Roziia Galieвна Mukminova, 1922-2007

Elyor Karimov, Chair of the Ancient and Medieval History Department, History Institute, Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, ekarimov@yahoo.com. Translated from Russian by **Russell Zanca**, Associate Professor, Department of Anthropology, Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, Ill., USA, rzanca@neiu.edu

The well known historian and scholar, Roziia Galieвна Mukminova, was born into a prosperous family in the city of Kazan on December 31, 1922. Her father, Gali Mirgali oghly (Gali Mirgalievich Mukminov), who was born in 1887 and died in Tashkent in 1969, was a native of Kazan. Her mother, Khadija Shakhbaidinovna (Khadichaiu Kubro) was born in 1892 and died in 1980 also in Tashkent, but by birth she came from the village of Shirdan in what was the Sviazhsk uezd of the Kazan guberniia. This village was located some 50-60 km from Kazan. Mukminova's maternal grandfather worked as an imam at a local mosque, so she was raised in a literate family. According to Mukminova's own recollections, when she began to study the Arabic and Persian languages in her student years, her mother provided linguistic help; Khadichaiu Kubro knew the Arabic language and had some ability with Persian, remembering at least the grammar well. During her formative years her mother studied under the tutelage of her father, the imam in Shirdan. She continued her studies with an *otin* (known as an *obistai* among Tatars)¹.

Mukminova's mother told her that Abdulla Tukai² lived in the apartment of her *obistai*. Mukminova once related the story of how her



mother learned this: "The *obistai* asked me if I wanted to see Abdulla Tukai. Of course, I said. And she said, okay then come and see through this keyhole, he's in his room. Well, through that keyhole I saw Gabdulla Tukai."

Mukminova was born the fourth of five children. During the New Economic Period (NEP) her father worked in the private sector as a retail businessman, and he had a large store in Kazan, but at the end of NEP in 1929, he was declared a disenfranchised person.³ As a result of this status, Roziia Galieвна's older brother, Fulat, who was studying in the fourth grade, was not allowed to continue to fifth grade. He went on to study at a *rabfak* (a kind of introductory school for illiterate factory workers), where he attended classes with

¹ An *otin* was a woman teacher in one of the so-called "old method" schools that were the educational institutions for children before the October Revolution. The *otin* served as the disseminator of religious instruction to women, and led in the conduct of religious rituals for women, including the *mavlud* and the *muskulkushod*.

² Gabdulla Tukai (Gabdulla Mukhamedgarifovich Tukaev, 1886-1913) was the founder of classic Tatar national poetry and one of the fathers of the Tatar literary language.

³ Disenfranchised person (1918-1936): this status meant that a person was deprived of particular rights according to the Soviet Constitution. The disenfranchised were forbidden from voting, working in state institutions, and receiving a higher or technical education. Disenfranchised persons were not eligible to receive grocery card rations, and often during famine periods they ended up dying from hunger. The 1936 Constitution restored their rights.

adult workers. Moreover, the Mukminov family was forced to pay high taxes imposed upon private business owners. Finally, in 1929 Gali Mirgalevich left with a friend for Kokand, where they began studying photography, and in 1930 the rest of the family joined them in Kokand.

In the 1930s there was a great outflow of people to Central Asia from other parts of the USSR connected with dekulakization and repression. Somewhere in this great exodus were the Mukminovs.

They arrived in Kokand having suffered many trials, and their nerves were frayed. There was one amusing incident along the way. As Mukminova related it: "My mother referred to us as 'the five kids and the five bundles' during our move. We had to make three transfers on our way to Kokand. At one of the transfer stations we counted up the five bundles alright, but only four kids. We could not locate my younger sister. Oh, were we scared! Seems she had slipped between bundles, fallen asleep and taken no heed of our panicked shouting."

They were met by an uncle in Kokand. At the station he told them they were to move into a nice house with a garden. Mukminova recollected: "I remember getting to that house and searching all the time for that garden. Well, actually, the 'garden' was a small flower bed. The house indeed was pretty with separate recesses. The house owners were very nice people, and we lived almost as a single family. The home was divided into 'inside' and 'outside' areas. We lived in the inner domain, and the outer was reserved for guests. Papa made a bathhouse for us."

Life in Kokand, however, was not easy. This was a period of terrible famine. Mukminova recalled walking to school and seeing the swollen corpses of those who had died from hunger lying in a ditch next to the school. She said, "I saw these bodies on the sidewalk or lying in the street because in the early morning no one yet had been able to take them away, so then people just pushed them into the deep *arık* [feeder canal]. That's why they ended up in the *arık*." Hunger was comparatively light in the non-chernozem regions as well as in the Transcaucasus and Central Asia. But many people suffered as a result of dekulakization and actions in response to it, such as slaughtering of livestock and peasant "uprisings" in villages in Andizhan, Bukhara, Khorezm, Samarqand and Tashkent regions, which were put down by detachments of the Red Army.

Many contemporary people who live in comparatively well-to-do areas, especially in cities, know practically nothing of these past events. The Soviet press, furthermore, did not write about this, and even the movements of the suffering peasants were severely limited. But now we see that this did not make famine in Central Asia any less awful, and Mukminova provided a living testimony to it.

Roziia Galieva also recalled the opening of the *torgsiny* (trading centers with foreigners, which basically contained all one could want, but a person had to pay in hard currency). Besides hard currency, gold and other precious metals and fine jewelry were also accepted as currency in these stores. Mukminova's mother gradually brought all of her own valuables and exchanged them for the vital groceries her family needed. In creating her own family archive, Mukminova kept a wedding photo of her parents. And in this photo one notices her mother wearing a special hat embroidered with pearls. In time she was forced to remove all of the pearls from her special wedding *qalpaq* so that she could bring the pearls to the *torgsin* and exchange them for food.

In 1936, when the oldest children were finishing eighth grade and her oldest brother, Fuad, left for Tashkent to enter the Financial and Economics Institute, Mukminova's father decided to move the whole family to Tashkent to keep everyone together. He made arrangements so that all of the children would be placed in a good school, the Sverdlov School. It was situated in the center of Tashkent. Mukminova herself graduated with high honors, and this gave her the opportunity to study in higher education without taking the entrance exams. And so in 1939 she first matriculated into the history department of Central Asian State University (which later became Tashkent State University), and set out on her path toward scholarship.

During World War II, some of the greatest Soviet orientologists were evacuated from Leningrad to Tashkent; they came from the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences. These scholars began working at the Central Asian State University as well as the Tashkent Pedagogical Institute. Combining their strengths, the Leningrad and local scholars began working on the composite, academic history of Uzbekistan. Many written sources were collected in the National Public Library where a manuscript division was also housed. These later formed the basis for the creation of the Oriental Institute of the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences.

Roziiia Galieva recalled that time: “We students felt really lucky, because we had the privilege of hearing the lectures of these major scholars. During the course of our work, we were taught by those very people whose books we had read, such as B. D. Grekov, A. Iu. Iakubovskii, and I. P. Petrushevskii. We were really afraid of Petrushevskii, because he seemed to be such a strict person to us. At that time the history department was located on a certain square, and during our breaks we would go out to get some fresh air. Whenever we caught sight of Petrushevskii, however, we would all go hide. Later on we understood that he was a softy, a really decent and sympathetic man.” Mukminova also studied under other well known scholars, including S. V. Bakhrushin, V. I. Beliaev, M. V. Nechkina, B. M. Peshchereva, and A. A. Semenov.

The famous medievalist Andrei Iur'evich Iakubovskii was a person with a fine sense of humor. Owing mainly to his lectures, Mukminova strengthened her resolve to study the medieval period. At that time the faculty also organized a series of evening studies. Even though it wasn't a required part of the program, nearly everyone gladly participated, organizing seminars and debates, and presenting reports.

At that time the history department included archaeology, which was chaired by E. Masson. Among the local scholars who worked there was Ia. Gul'iamov, who also played a leading role in training Mukminova. In 1944 Mukminova graduated from the history department and went on to become one of the very first graduate students in the newly established History Institute of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan.

Mukminova worked for a long time in her graduate student years under Gul'iamov, who advised her to specialize in ethnography. She also worked closely with Mikhail Stepanovich Andreev, whose well-known scholarship included lengthy research in India during the pre-revolutionary period. Mukminova wasn't exactly sure why she needed to specialize in ethnography, and, disturbed, approached Gul'iamov, asking him, “Why specifically do I need to specialize in ethnography?” Gul'iamov answered, “Because among our scholars all of the women are ethnographers.” Mukminova later turned her attention to Il'ia Pavlovich Petrushevskii, requesting that he serve as her thesis advisor. He proposed to Mukminova that she undertake a study focusing on the rivalry to control Maverannahr between the Timurids and the Shaybanids.

How Mukminova came to study Oriental languages requires mentioning. She studied Persian with M. S. Andreev, but outside of his lectures, students such as Mukminova wanted to learn the language in greater depth. At first when a group of students approached him about this he claimed to be too busy, but in time he invited the students back to his place. Mukminova told the story of how during these Persian immersion sessions he would pick up the *dutar*, and sing out the verse of such renowned poets as Saadi. As for Arabic, Mukminova studied under Viktor Ivanovich Beliaev, who had assisted the great translator of the Quran, I. Iu. Krachkovskii.

During her graduate years, Mukminova spent time in Leningrad at the great Institute of Oriental Studies under the directorship of I. P. Petrushevskii, and in 1949 she defended her candidate thesis, entitled “The Struggle for Maverannahr between the Timurids and Shaybanids,” at the Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Assessing the quality of this dissertation, A. Iu. Iakubovskii said, “Till this point no work is as inclusive in its scope.”

Years later in 1971, she completed her full professorship thesis and handed the manuscript to Petrushevskii. After reading it, he announced, “Well done! I have to hand it to you — you managed to combine a life in scholarship with a family.” By the time she set to work on the full professorship book, she was raising three sons. As she was among the first to work with particular manuscripts, she clearly had her work cut out for her. In 1976 the book from this research was published under the title *Ocherki po istorii remesla v Samarqande i Bukhare v XVI veke* [Outlines of the History of Trades in Samarqand and Bukhara in the 16th Century].

Much of the scholarly productivity of Mukminova was devoted to asking and pursuing questions that had not been well researched in Central Asian medieval history, including Central Asian institutions (*tiul*, *suiurgal*), terminology (*tagzhoi*, *tamga*, *bozh*, *rokdar*, etc.), types of rent for real estate, and the social categories of the population (*chukhra*, etc.).

Her book, *K istorii agrarnikh otnoshenii v Uzbekistane XVI v.* [The History of Agrarian Relations in Uzbekistan in the 16th c.], was published in 1966 based on materials in the *Waqf-name*. In this work she was able to illuminate much information about the institutions of waqf [pious endowments] and the elevation of the waqf institutions during the Shaybanid and Astrakhanid dynasties. Mukminova was also able to show that

women sometimes played a prominent role in the administration of the economy tied to waqf, especially through her examination of Mikhr Sultan Khanum.

Urban life and the importance of trade and commercial relationships among the cities of Central Asia in the medieval period was another domain of Mukminova's research, including studies of Tashkent, Samarqand and Bukhara as centers of medieval Central Asia. Her long term interest in city life culminated in the 1985 publication of her book, *Sotsial'noe differentsiia naseleniia gorodov Uzbekistana konets XV-XVI vv.* [Social Differentiation among the Populations of the Cities of Uzbekistan, end of the 15th to the 16th Centuries].

Mukminova's teaching and lecturing also spanned a broad range of classes taught and talks given in Uzbekistan, including in the history department of the National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent State University's Oriental Studies department, and the Tashkent State Pedagogical University. She produced many respected students who went on to become prominent scholars in their own right, including Galiba Juraeva, M. M. Abramov, Nozim Khabibullaev and Gulchekhira Agzamova. As an international scholar, Mukminova presented her research in the US, Canada, Japan, Germany, Turkey and France. Overall, she published over 200 scholarly books and articles. She was well known and revered outside of Uzbekistan by an international community of scholars, who shared her interests and learned more about their chosen areas through consultations with her. Here we would include Catherine Poujol (France), Mansura Khaidar

(India), Komatsu Hisao (Japan), Robert McChesney (USA) and Ingeborg Baldauf (Germany).

During the very trying and difficult times that were Soviet scholarship in the 20th century, Mukminova was able to maintain her objectivity and avoid succumbing to the ideological nonsense to which many of her colleagues fell prey. Never neglecting her historical roots, she devoted her entire scholarly life to the study and description of Central Asia and the Uzbeks. Her research was deep and sincere, and did not favor Uzbeks or Tatars (despite her Tatar origins). She was a worthy and valued member of the international scientific community.

Roziiia Galievna's family was wonderful. She went through life with her husband, the energetic Alim Akhundjanovich Inogamov, part of whose family had been repressed during the 1930s. Together they raised three boys, Niaz, Nail' and Said. She passed away as she approached 85, which was, unfortunately, before we were able to have a huge birthday party for her to celebrate her life in science and in our common humanity. Nevertheless, Roziiia Galievna's life, work and memory will remain with us forever.

References

- Mukminova, Roziiia Galievna
 1966 *K istorii agrarnikh otnoshenii v Uzbekistane XVI v.* Tashkent: Nauka.
 1976 *Ocherki po istorii remesla v Samarqande i Bukhारे v XVI veke.* Tashkent: Fan.
 1985 *Sotsial'noe differentsiia naseleniia gorodov Uzbekistana konets XV-XVI vv.* Tashkent: Fan.

Letter to the Editors

M. Parvizi Amineh, Director, Energy Program Asia, Senior Research Fellow, International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS), and Adjunct Professor of International Relations, Webster University, Leiden, The Netherlands, m.p.amineh@uva.nl; and **Henk Houweling**, Professor of International Relations, Department of Political Sciences, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, hwhouweling@gmail.com

The review of our book, *Central Eurasia in Global Politics: Conflict, Security, and Development* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004) written for CESR by Dr. Agnieszka Paczynska (www.cesr-cess.org/pdf/CESR_05_2.pdf, p. 66) fails to properly inform the reader about the content of the work. Below, we argue why we think this to be the case.

Dr. Paczynska properly refers to our approach as “critical geopolitics.” However, she fails to inform the reader what the term means, except that in her opinion the concept is “undertheoretized.” Critical geopolitics as an approach to international relations is extensively explained in Chapter I of our book. The main argument is that state-society complexes of industrialized and newly industrializing countries compete in international relations in geographical settings where stocks of fossil fuel and other natural resources are located. Leaders of these countries aim for uninterrupted access to affordable supplies of fossil energy sources and for control of supply routes. In this, scarcity is a major concern, and in Chapter II we refer to three types of scarcity: demand-induced scarcity, supply-induced scarcity and structural scarcity (pp. 77-82).

Demand-induced scarcity is caused by population growth, increments in per capita income, size of GDP and change in technology. In supply-induced scarcity, energy producers confront depletion of the pool of resources, in this case, reserves of oil and gas. A good measure of supply-induced scarcity in energy production is the net energy return of one barrel of oil invested in exploration, drilling, transport, processing and retail. An alternative measure is exploration and development cost. Between 1999 and 2006, discovery and development cost tripled to almost \$15 a barrel. Supply insecurity is especially pronounced due to the political volatility in regions that are oil rich, which is the case for Central Eurasia (CEA). This region is not incorporated into the territorial sphere of the security institutions of any major power or its allies. In other words, this part of

the world has not been divided into stable, agreed upon zones of influence.

State-society complexes are under international pressure to adapt domestic institutions to those of the stronger, faster growing ones. The result is the spread of capitalist industrialization and a growing proportion of the world population that produces and consumes manufactured products. It grows much faster than world population. We argue that fossil energy is a non-renewable resource and thus inevitably declines as time goes on. When local stocks are exhausted, countries become import-dependent, which in turn translates into competition in order to secure energy supplies.

The third type of scarcity, structural scarcity, is the result of powers that control energy stocks and transport routes. Stockowners that have the power to decide on quantity have control over price. Powers that control transport routes to competitors have the additional power to interrupt flows, and thus the ability to create dependence. Sensitivity to price changes is a universal phenomenon. Unilateral vulnerability comes from deliberate actions that interfere with the flow of energy to competitors. The ability to obstruct supplies is not limited to state-imposed boycotts. The bombing of a refinery has the same effect. Major power competition in CEA sets off geopolitical rivalry among a variety of intrastate and transnational actors, which prevents the emergence of strong states and threatens regime legitimacy. Critical geopolitics, as we define it in the work on page 11f, is in our view better equipped to explain the direction of post-Cold War foreign policies than either structural realism or liberalism. Concepts introduced in the critical geopolitics literature are essential for setting up effective energy security politics, which coincides with securing state and society. Scarcity creates a field of social forces that crosses state borders involving both state and a variety of non-state actors.

We refer to the activity of getting control over the resources that domestic society and the state depend on as “power projection” (Ch. I: 11-12; 35-

36). Power projection by major powers thus is a competitive activity. The American-led invasion of Iraq continues the struggle in the region between maritime and land-based powers that began in the run-up to World War I. As argued in chapter one of the book, the Anglo-Saxon war against Iraq opens doors for the United States to create a long-term military presence in Western Asia and Central Eurasia. Victory for America and Britain would create either a client regime in Iraq or a basis for permanent military presence in the country. However, it seems right now that the most likely development is both. Invading Iraq has at the same time opened doors for so-called private energy companies headquartered in the United States and Britain. This creates the capacity for the United States, if American pre-war aims in Iraq were realized, to shape host societies as well as to impose conditions on outsiders for gaining access to the energy resources of the region. It would give America the ability to impose structural scarcity on its rising industrial competitors such as China, India and the unifying (the process is not complete) European Union.

We speculate in the book that the military predominance of the United States in the energy resource-rich Persian Gulf and CEA would prevent China from what Vice President Cheney called “locking-up” energy stocks by buying from governments in the region instead of on commodity markets. We fail to understand, therefore, the reviewer’s remark that the insertion of US military power into Central Eurasia ‘is an odd choice for this volume [...]’ as it ‘adds little to our understanding of contemporary political dynamics’ in the region under study. On page 45 ff., we study the US post-war power projection in Western and Central Asia in the post-Cold War context of the expansion of industrial capitalism beyond the “Grand Area” of the cold war bipolar era. We argue that the current setting of world politics is very different from that

which existed during the Cold War. First, we have demand and supply induced scarcity of fossil energy (see Ch. II: 79-82). Secondly, we argue that America’s maritime hegemony over energy supplies to a fully recovered Europe, Japan and industrializing China, is being undermined by pipeline transport over land and by Chinese naval expansion. Accordingly, the US is losing its ability to impose scarcity by the control of sea routes only. The US itself is competing with the European Union, Japan, and industrializing China and India for shares in the fossil fuel stock of the Persian Gulf and Central Eurasia. We further argue that in the post-Cold War era, the emergence of an integrated Eurasian energy-industrial system linked by rail, road and pipelines is a distinct possibility. Industrializing China, India, Korea and Japan are interested in connecting to the European Union, whose largest manufacturing economy, Germany, is expanding eastwards.

This process of the restructuring of transport routes from sea-based carriers to pipelines, rail and road transport on the Eurasian landmass, would, if it continues, deprive maritime powers of the ability to trap energy supplies in choke points such as the Strait of Malacca and the Strait of Hormuz.

We argue that with the Soviet Union gone, the US believed it could afford to wage a victorious war of choice in Iraq. What we did not know at that time was the full extent of the lies justifying the attack, the early planning for such a war and the US refusal to contribute to the rebuilding of Afghanistan, relegating the war against terrorism to a sideshow. In conclusion, we *speculate* that Mahan, an icon of US maritime supremacy, has stepped on land in the world’s most oil-rich region to prevent Mackinder (who feared at the eve of World War I that rail and the combustion engine would unify Eurasia either by war or alliance) from becoming true.

About the

Central Eurasian Studies Society



The CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES SOCIETY (CESS) is a private, non-political, non-profit, North America-based organization of scholars who are interested in the study of Central Eurasia and its history, languages, cultures, and modern states and societies. We define the Central Eurasian region broadly to include Turkic, Mongolian, Iranian, Caucasian, Tibetan and other peoples. Geographically, Central Eurasia extends from the Black Sea region, the Crimea, and the Caucasus in the west, through the Middle Volga region, Central Asia and Afghanistan, and on to Siberia, Mongolia and Tibet in the east.

The CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES SOCIETY's purpose is to promote high standards of research and teaching and to foster communication among scholars through meetings and publications. The Society works to facilitate interaction among senior, established scholars, junior scholars, graduate students, and independent scholars in North America and throughout the world. We hold an Annual Conference and coordinate panels at various conferences relevant to Central Eurasian studies. The Society also works to promote the publication of peer-reviewed scholarship and other information essential to the building of the field.

The CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES SOCIETY is a not-for-profit organization incorporated in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, USA.

We invite anyone who shares these interests to become a member and participate in our activities.

To become a member of CESS or join the mailing list for occasional announcements concerning CESS activities, visit the website or contact the address below. Annual dues range from gratis to \$50, depending on income. CESS publications, the Membership Directory, conference paper abstracts and other information are available online at: <http://www.cess.muohio.edu>.

All inquiries may be directed to:

CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES SOCIETY
c/o The Havighurst Center
Harrison Hall, Miami University
Oxford, OH 45056, USA
Tel.: +1/513-529-0241
Fax: +1/513-529-0242
E-mail: CESS@muohio.edu
<http://www.cess.muohio.edu>

Members of the Executive Board of the Central Eurasian Studies Society

Laura Adams, President, (Boston, Mass., USA)
Gulnara Aitpaeva (Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan)
Philippe Forêt (Zurich, Switzerland)
Deniz Kandiyoti (London, UK)
Alexander Knysh, Past-President, (Ann Arbor, Mich., USA)
Edward J. Lazzarini, President-Elect, (Bloomington, Ind., USA)
Scott Levi (Louisville, Kent., USA)
Douglas Northrop (Ann Arbor, Mich., USA)
Anara Tabyshalieva (Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan)

Officers (non-voting Board members) of the Central Eurasian Studies Society

Dan Prior, Director of the CESS Secretariat (Oxford, Ohio, USA)
Kimairis Toogood, Secretary (Fairfax, Vir., USA)
John Schoeberlein, Acting Treasurer (Cambridge, Mass., USA)

Central Eurasian Studies Review

CALL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

CESR offers scholars, researchers and educators engaged in the study of Central Eurasia a review of current research, recent publications, scholarly meetings and new educational resources. We encourage contributions that reflect the regional and disciplinary breadth of the field.

Brief descriptions of each section follow. For more complete descriptions and submission instructions, please read the Information for Contributors on the CESR webpage: http://www.cesr-cess.org/CESR_contribution.html. **Contributors are urged to read CESR's format guidelines and transliteration tables carefully before submitting articles.**

Perspectives: Essays of up to 4,000 words that (1) afford scholars an occasion to reflect on their fields, (2) endeavor to set Central Eurasia within the larger Eurasian context, or (3) apply close analysis to essentially non-verbal texts — —paintings, advertisements, maps, cartoons — selected for their utility as windows on important moments of social, political, economic or cultural transition. Contact: Edward Lazzerini, elazzeri@indiana.edu.

Research Reports: 1) reports on findings and methods of on-going or recently completed research; or 2) reports on conditions of conducting research in Central Eurasian studies. Length: 1,500-3,000 words. Contact: Jamilya Ukudeeva, jaukudee@cabrillo.edu.

Conferences and Lecture Series: Summary reports of conferences and lecture series devoted to the field of Central Eurasian studies as well as reports about selected panels on Central Eurasian studies at conferences held by professional societies in the humanities or social sciences. Contacts: Pınar Akçalı, akcali@metu.edu.tr and Dan Schafer, schaferd@mail.belmont.edu.

Educational Resources and Developments: Materials that will help develop an informed public awareness of the Central Eurasian region, such as ideas on curriculum development, discussions of teaching methodology, descriptions of specific courses programs or materials (with links to syllabi), discussion of public education undertakings. Contact: Sarah Amsler, S.Amsler@kingston.ac.uk.

Deadlines for submissions: Spring issue — March 1; Fall issue — October 1.

Copyright. Unless otherwise indicated, the materials appearing in CESR are not copyrighted and readers are encouraged to copy and distribute such materials as widely as possible for the use of scholars, students, organizations, and others interested in Central Eurasia. In the event that you wish to republish any part of CESR not otherwise copyrighted, you require no permission from the Central Eurasian Studies Society as long as the republication clearly acknowledges CESR as the source, you do not claim copyright and you insure that prompt notice of such republication is sent to the Chief Editor of CESR, Dr. Virginia Martin, vmartin2@wisc.edu.