

PROBLEMS OF ETHNOGENESIS AND ETHNIC HISTORY OF UZBEK PEOPLE AT THE CURRENT STAGE

Alisher Khudayberdiyevich Doniyorov

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies,
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Alisher Khudayberdiyevich Doniyorov, Problems Of Ethnogenesis And Ethnic History Of Uzbek People At The Current Stage– Palarch’s Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 17(6) (2020). ISSN 1567-214X.

Keywords: ethnogenesis, SART, Amudarya, Syrdarya, Fergana Valley, Kipchaks, sartiens.

ABSTRACT:

This article is dedicated to the problems of ethnogenesis and ethnic history of Uzbek people at the current stage. While conducting the present paper we will provide source based on the archival documents and research of scholars in this field. The ethnic development is inevitably interrelated to the human culture, language, religion and its neighboring states. So, this paper will illustrate information regarding with small ethnic groups.

INTRODUCTION

In the newly independent states, the science of history, in general, is a fundamental problem today - the notorious "center" in order to unify their national characteristics, historical riches and traditions in order to keep entire peoples in control of the territories under their administrative subordination is engaged in revisiting and re-evaluating the “historical structures” and “patterns” that have been ingrained for many years.

The problem of the ethnic history of any nation is not only a theoretical and methodological, but most importantly - a problem of great practical importance. The history of the Uzbek people has long been inextricably linked with the Central Asian region, especially with the Amudarya and Syrdarya rivers of Central Asia, the Fergana Valley, Tashkent and Khorezm oases.

THE MAIN FINDINGS AND RESULTS

It is only natural that many works on the ethnogenesis and ethnic history of the Uzbek people, including articles in scientific journals, collections of works and monographs, some collective research [1].

In addition, the problem of ethnic history of the Uzbek people remains in the focus of modern foreign researchers [1], and the historiography of our country cannot ignore it. It is true that some of the works that have recently been published abroad are often directly indebted and, in some cases, derogatory.

In particular, an article by American researcher John Shoberlein [2] is devoted to understanding the process of national recovery in Central Asia. The main idea of the scientist is that the rather fragmented and complex ethnic structure of Central Asian society was replaced by an artificially simplified national division by the Bolsheviks in the twentieth century. According to him, the Soviet government sought to "ensure the uniformity of Uzbek self-consciousness" and "forcibly adopt an official culture" [3].

In turn, the Uzbek researcher A.I. Shevyakov, in response to Shoberlain, said that there was no forced adoption, especially in the conditions of independence of Uzbekistan. Self-awareness has been around for a long time, and while the process of assimilation of some groups has taken place, it has taken place on a voluntary basis [3].

S. Abashin, a Russian researcher who analyzed Shoberlain's article and A. Shevyakov's answers to it, said that the discussion on the ethnogenesis of the Uzbek people does not end with the groups or categories of population mentioned by Shoberlain and Shevyakov. the Qarluqs, the Karahitays, the Loqays, the Galchs, the Kalmyks, the Arabs, the Uyghurs, the "peoples of the Pamirs," and so on. Each of these groups, - writes S. Abashin, - deserves special attention. However, the groups or categories of the Central Asian population mentioned by American and Uzbek researchers represent the most characteristic types of self-awareness in Central Asian society [2].

In particular, about the Kipchaks, Shoberlain writes: "to this day they are a separate ethnic group and constitute a considerable part of the population of the region". However, the American researcher notes that in the twentieth century, the Kipchaks were artificially incorporated into the Uzbek nation. Allegedly, "Soviet ethnographers helped to compile instructions that falsified the results of the census, so that the figures obtained did not accurately reflect the reality".

In this case, Shoberlain adds [3] to the work of Y. Vinnikov. In particular, the play states: "In the socialist system, there are many examples of the ethnic convergence and integration of many small nations and ethnographic groups on the basis of full equality of all groups of the population, naturally and voluntarily, without any external pressure" (1920 and 1926) censuses are provided) [3]. It is true that what Vinnikov said is, in essence, an ideological expression of a certain period. However, it is not clear where Shoberlain obtained the "evidence" that Soviet ethnographers had compiled any instructions.

A. Shevyakov contradicts Shoberlain's idea that the Kipchaks are a "separate ethnic group" that is "artificially included in the ranks of Uzbeks." He questioned the statistics provided by the American author, saying "there is no appendix to such a source of information" [9]. In turn, S. Abashin exclaims: "This is a very strange conclusion. In fact, J. Shoberlain -Engel cites appendices to L.F. Kostenko [5] and to the census data of 1897, 1917, 1926. A.I. Shevyakov is the main source on this issue - 386 essays "Naselenie Aziatskoy Rossii" [6] by N.V. Turchaninov. Abashin then looked at the digital data used by Shoberlain, noting that, like any other group, "the question of what information is available about the number of Kipchaks, which of them is reliable, is a separate topic of conversation. These are applications to L. Kostenko and K. Kaufman [6]. It should be noted that there are, of course, very few other sources in Shoberlain that require serious analytical-critical development [6].

In any case, S. Abashin's position on A. Shevyakov's "strange conclusion" that there are no "applications to data sources" in Shoberlain is not to be acknowledged. The American researcher used incomplete sources to conclude that the Kipchaks were "a separate ethnic group."

Using a wide range of sources, Abashin pointed out that in 1913-1917 the number of Kipchaks in the Fergana Valley decreased from 68,193 to 42,449, and in 1917-1926 to 32,228, "that is, in general, 50% less than in 1914." "It is true," the author writes, "that the entire population of Fergana as a whole fell by 20% in those years as a result of the civil war, that is, the decline of the Kipchaks may be partly the result of demographic processes" [9].

However, S. Abashin concludes, "this does not mean that there was no assimilation ... The question is whether this assimilation is natural or artificial. If we analyze the lists of migrants, it becomes clear that the change of name did not affect the densely populated areas of large areas in the north-east of Fergana region, that is, where the term "Kipchak" is very strong. This means that in other regions where the Kipchaks lived under a different tribe, their purely natural mixing took place [9].

Undoubtedly, it is possible to acknowledge the views of Shoberlain, Shevyakov and Abashin on the number of Kipchaks and their problems of "assimilation". At the same time, in order to have a clear idea of these views, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive ethno-sociological and comparative research based on a whole set of available statistical data and historical sources.

However, the essence of the debate between American, Uzbek and Russian researchers lies not only in statistics, but also in methodological approaches to identifying and understanding the ethnogenetic and ethno-historical issues of the Uzbek people. In particular, according to A. Shevyakov, the existence of the concept of "Kipchak self-awareness" does not contradict the fact that the Kipchaks have long been part of the Uzbeks. This is evidenced by the research conducted by researchers of the second half of the XIX century - A. Grebenkin, A. Khoroshkhin, V. Radlov [4].

At the same time, S. Abashin emphasizes the interpretation of the fact that the Kipchaks were part of the Uzbeks [4]. The combinations proposed by Abashin, although somewhat explained: "There was no pressure in such a policy (we are talking about the national policy of the Soviet government. - A.D.). The self-awareness of the Kipchaks, who retained their tribal identity, was reconciled with the self-awareness of the Uzbeks, who had ethnic status" [3] he said.

Speaking of the Khojas, Shoberlain writes: "They have retained their identity as an ethnic group like the Kipchaks" [3]. He goes on to say, "Despite the fact that during the Soviet era this division of the population into ethnic groups was a negative phenomenon, the group managed not only to maintain its identity, but also to prosper to some extent" [3].

Without knowing the true history and carefully researching the sources, Shoberlain: the masters seem to be officially of different nationalities and, even, they speak different languages, coming from prominent religious figures and uniting the role they have played and continue to play in the socio-political life of Central Asia Works [1].

A. Shevyakov rightly objected to Shoberlain and rightly called the masters "a class-religious group" [4]. Supporting his opinion, S. Abashin [6] noted that with the establishment of the colonial regime of Tsarist Russia in Central Asia, the masters were deprived of their class privileges [6].

Analyzing the section "The Tajik-speaking population of Samarkand" [6] in the article by S. Abashin Shoberlain, he said that the issue of nationality of the population of Samarkand has long been a heated political debate between Uzbek and Tajik public figures [6]. Based on the opinion of some Tajik researchers that the number of Tajiks [6] has sharply decreased as a result of chauvinistic pressure from Uzbek party officials, Abashin claims that Bukhara and Samarkand are Russian cities and political scientists who claim to be "completely accidental" Tajik cities [1] emphasizes the prevalence. Such a view is evident in the apparent existence of S. Abashin himself [3].

Shoberlain writes: “the residents of Samarkand understand that their culture and language differ from other Uzbek cultures and languages. The fact that they forced them to consider themselves Uzbeks is true. However, the concept of "Uzbek" is widely covered, and the fact that these people, as a rule, perceive the Uzbek national self-consciousness by them, does not belittle their culture at all” [1]. At the same time, the American scientist puts forward a "developer scheme", according to which Tajikistan should abandon its call to Bukhara and Samarkand, and Uzbekistan should not interfere with the development of Tajik elements in the culture and language of the Samarkand people.

We admit the idea of A. Shevyakov “The issues raised in the article by Dr. Shoberlain–Engel are not politically controversial” [4]. Tajikistan does not claim to Bukhara and Samarkand, this is confirmed by the relevant documents signed by Tajik and Uzbek sides on a bilateral basis, while Uzbekistan is far from the idea of pursuing Tajik culture or hindering its development; this can be confirmed by the population of Samarkand itself, as well as international experts who have studied this issue in Uzbekistan.

About the features of the so-called "issue" of Bukhara and Samarkand are reported to J. Shoberlayn, it is worth noting that the ethno demographic situation of these regions is such that in Samarkand and Bukhara the Uzbek population lives for a long time in urban areas, while the Tajiks live mainly in rural areas. As for Tajikistan itself, there are many such regions where Uzbeks live on as a group, but Uzbekistan does not claim these regions.

It is worth saying that according to the agreement between Uzbekistan and Tajikistan; the territories of both countries will remain within the current borders and will continue to remain unchanged. This is a political solution adopted on a two-state scale, which corresponds to the spirit and requirements of international law.

While Shoberlain thinks about the SARTS, he believes that they are ostracized and to a certain extent are opposed to the nomadic population because they are the same “ethnic group” [6]. A. Shevyakov, in particular, correctly criticizes the American colleague for the fact that the “SARTS” are included in a separate people. A. Shevyakov believes that since the sarti do not have a single language and a single territory of holistic residence, a single economic space, they cannot be considered an ethnic group. At present, as our compatriot researcher correctly pointed out, the sarti are a more “noble population, a craftsman, a merchant” social group, which means [33].

In turn, S. Abashin objected to A. Shevyakov: “If A.I. Shevyakov had not immediately included all the conditions in the list of Uzbeks, such a criticism could have been admitted. Moreover, A. Shevyakov thinks that the identity of the Sarts has been decided in Russian and Soviet science. But that's not really the case” [34].

The question arises: Since A. Shevyakov speaks on behalf of the community of historians and ethnographers of Uzbekistan, what is there in Soviet historiography? It remains to be said that many influential contemporary researchers have long believed that the SARTS are part of the Uzbek people. A. Abashin himself admits [35]. Nevertheless, it immediately becomes clear that the inclusion of all the SARTS of some authors in the XIX century in Tajikistan should be considered either [35], or an independent ethnic group, referring to the extremely biased conclusions of the [36] tribe.

In the early twentieth century, M. Behbudi's articles published in the magazine “Mirror” (Oyna) were devoted to the study of the “problem of conditions”. In particular, according to D. Alimova and D. Rashidova, her article "The word SART is unknown" is not well known to modern historians and ethnographers [36]. According to M. Behbudi, he was against the definitive definition of the term “SART”. Because he was well aware of the need to study this issue with

serious, in-depth consideration, because any conclusions drawn without such research would, of course, be superficial and unfounded.

It should be noted that the topic of conditions has long been controversial in Turkestan, and in his articles M. Behbudi [38] called on scholars and intellectuals to actively study and discuss this topic. By the way, according to the research conducted by M. Behbudi, the indigenous people of Turkestan considered the term *sart* a nickname and considered it an insult to themselves [39]. In our opinion, it is necessary to take into account the research and conclusions of M. Behbudi, who later differed from some Russian researchers (for example, N. Ostroumov) in studying the process of formation of the Uzbek people.

According to Shoberlayn, the acceptance of “Uzbek self-consciousness” by the peoples of Central Asia in the 20-ies, the fact “they are not always determined by the national self-determination, which aspired to the soul” sucking [38]. The author wants to base this on the fact that “Uzbeks are not the only nation so far” [39]. Obviously, such conclusions can be taken sharply negative and must; strictly speaking A. Shevyakov did the same.

In turn, he was “criticized” by S. Abashin: “A. I. Shevyakov replaces the issue of self-consciousness with the issue of the name, trying to prove that the term “Uzbek “was known in Central Asia long ago, even before the Mongol invasion... A.I. Shevyakov behaves as if he does not feel the contradictions of the arguments he presents, which are completely incompatible with the current state of “ethnic division” of the peoples of Central Asia. In particular, according to him, AN Khoroshkhin included Karakalpaks, Kyrgyz and Kazakhs among the Uzbeks. AD Grebenkin believed that “for us, Uzbeks and Kyrgyz (Kazakhs) are the same”, and also called Karakalpaks Uzbeks. We can also mention V.P. Nalivkin, who considered Kazakhs, Kyrgyz and Karakalpaks to be a part of the Uzbek people...” and others.

We want to address S. Abashin with such a question: “who can prove that the rules and conclusions in the works of Khoroshkin, Grebenkin, Nalivkin and other scientists are absolutely flawless and correct?” The same thing is that the confluence of nations that are different in their historical origins is scientifically wrong, morally unethical.

Well, it is worth noting that the debate on the problem of ethno genesis of the Uzbek people is intense and, apparently, it will continue further.

It is important that researchers engaged in the study of this extremely complex and controversial issue are comprehensively inclined to this issue, taking advantage of the masses of Statistics, sociological, ethnographic, historiography and other information necessary for the work. As for the work of Shoberlayn, it should be said that he considers the issue of ethno genesis of the Uzbek people, as well as its historiography as extremely biased and self-aware. Therefore, it clearly reveals the history of the Uzbek people, the knowledge of its peculiarities, comparative-analytical work, and the kenticity of the theoretical-methodical research base as a treatise.

CONCLUSION

Having concluded with a brief description of the problematic (controversial) issues of the ethno genesis of the Uzbek people and the historiography of ethnic history, it should be noted that the research carried out at the present time should not be deliberately presented as an ideos-chemical structure, which is not based on experience and evidence.

In our opinion, targeted research work in the field of ethnogenesis and study of ethnic history of Uzbekistan:

-first of all, the Uzbek people expressed their satisfaction with the further development and deepening of the national revival process, as well as the

development of the optimal model of the sustainable regional development and strengthening of the Central Asia in the realities of the 21st century, expressing the necessary needs of Uzbekistan and the entire regional community;

- secondly, it is necessary to focus on the analytical review and critical understanding of the printed products of foreign authors, who often seek to distort the history and reality of the Uzbek people for various purposes, including political ones.

The following are the most relevant, poorly studied or controversial issues of the problem via thematic complex “ethno genesis and ethnic history of the Uzbek people”:

- Periodization of ethnic history;
- Time of completion of folk formation;
- The peculiarity of the formation of the Uzbek people;
- The Uzbek language, as well as the process of formation of the ethnics "Uzbek" after finding the people's content;
- The so-called “issue of the SART”, although it has been studied both in the past historiography periods and today, but this topic has not yet come to an end and has not lost its relevance.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Asgarov A.A. Some questions of the history of the formation of Uzbek statehood. // OIF. -1997. Pp. 3-4; Shevyakov A. I. About the article by J. Schoberline – Engel “Prospects for the formation of the national identity of Uzbeks” // East. -1998.- №6.
- [2]. Schoberlyn - Engel John. Prospects for the formation of Uzbek national identity. // East. –M., 1997. No. 3. – pp.-52-63.
- [3]. Shoberlain is the director of the Central Asian Studies Forum at Harvard University. The forum was established in 1993 on his initiative. In 1998-1999, he temporarily left Harvard and worked as the chief technical adviser of the so-called Fergana Valley Development Program under the UNDP (based in Osh). He holds a doctorate in social anthropology from Harvard University. Shoberlain’s current projects focus on how the emergence of nation-states in Central Asia has affected regional uniformity. He is also involved in the study of national communities that may influence the development of disparities between peoples in the region.
- [4]. Abashin S.N. On the self-awareness of the peoples of Central Asia (As Alexander Igorevich argued with S. John) // East. -1999. -№4. –p. 208.
- [5]. Vinnikov Y.R. Changes in the ethnic geography of Central Asia. 1913-1959 Yillar. – Moscow. 1964.
- [6]. S.Abashin and Schoberline using A.F. Kostenkoning “Turkestan Territory: The experience of military-statistical formation of the Turkestan Military District” (St. Petersburg, 1980).
- [7]. Kaufman K.P. Draft of the most comprehensive report of Gen. – Adjutant K.P. von Kaufman on civil administration and organization in the areas of Turkestan governor general. 1867. November 7 - March 25, 1881 –SPb., 1881.
- [8]. Kostenko L.F. First General Census of the Russian Empire. 89-w. Fergana region. St. Petersburg., 1904
- [9]. Statistical review of the Ferghana region for 1904. -2-silt. –Population in 1904. –Yangi Margilon, 1905
- [10]. Grebenkin A.D. Uzbeks // Russian Turkestan: Collection. 2-Juz. – Moscow. 1872; Khoroshkhin A.P. Collection of articles relating to the Turkestan region. –SPb., 1876; Radlov V.V. Middle Zarafshan Valley // Notes of the Russian Geographical Society. –SPb., 1889.
- [11]. Masov R. History of ax division. Dushanbe, 1991; Rakhimov R. On the issue of modern Tajik-Uzbek interethnic relations. // EO. -1991. -№1.

- [12]. Karmysheva B.Kh. Essays on the ethnic history of the southern regions of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan...; Askarov A.A. Some questions of the history of the formation of Uzbek statehood.
- [13]. Bronnikova O.M. Sarts in the ethnic history of Central Asia (Towards a statement of the problem) // Ethnicities and Ethnic Processes: in memory of RF. Its. –M., 1993.
- [14]. Bushkov V.I. Formation of the modern ethnic situation in Northern Tajikistan // SE. -1990. -№ 2.
- [15]. Alimova D., Rashidova D. Mahmudhodzha Behbudiy and his historical views. –T.: Manaviyat, 1998. – p. 12.
- [16]. Behbudiy M. The word SART is ambiguous. // Play. -1914. №22.-22 March; The word SART is unknown // Ibid. -№39. July 19.
- [17]. Khudoyberdiyevich, D. A., & Rakhmonqulovich, K. N. (2019). The historical significance of "dastur ul-muluk" ("guide to the kings") by khoja samandar termizi. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(6), 2020.
- [18]. Khudoyberdiyevich, D. A., & Rakhmonkulovich, N. K. (2018). The contribution of sarah sviri to the study of the scientific heritage of hakim tirmidhi. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 8(11), 60-67.
- [19]. Karimov N.R. SOME RESEARCHES ON HAKIM TIRMIDHI IN THE USA AND CANADA. 9-10 American Journal of Research P. 4-10 (2018).