



29/1183

73

TMPH
050" 95452
MUS

THE MUSLIM REPUBLICS OF THE U.S.S.R.

The following is the third of a series of articles describing recent works published in the Soviet Union on the six Muslim Soviet Socialist Republics of the U.S.S.R. and their neighbours, Persia, Afghanistan, Sinkiang and Tibet. The present article deals with books and longer articles received between January and June, 1959.

I. THE MUSLIM REPUBLICS OF THE U.S.S.R.

How independent are the Muslim republics?

EACH of the six Muslim republics of the Soviet Union is a Soviet Socialist Republic, which is the highest form of state independence within the Soviet Union, and each ranks as an equal among the fifteen S.S.R. that compose the U.S.S.R. Theoretically the Uzbek republic thus ranks equal with the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, or Azerbaydzhan with the Ukraine. The fifteen Union republics have their own governments which are subject to the central all-Union government according to the terms of the U.S.S.R. Constitution. The question of republican independence under the Constitution is one of the points dealt with by Yu. G. Sudnitsyn in a recent pamphlet entitled *National Sovereignty in the U.S.S.R.* (Natsional'nyy suverenitet v S.S.S.R. State Publishing House of Juridical Literature, Moscow, 1958. 104 pp.). A product of an official publishing house—as indeed are all publications in the U.S.S.R.—the pamphlet is remarkable for its distortions and inaccuracies. As with much Soviet literature, half-truths are interlarded with sentiment and words are used for their emotional effect rather than for their logical meaning. Sudnitsyn assumes that *ipso facto* the victory of the working classes has enabled the peoples of the U.S.S.R. to achieve national sovereignty since by definition the working classes are incapable of national oppression. The Communist Party as spokesman for the workers ensures brotherhood among the peoples, and again by definition its national policies must be infallible. It follows that any separatist movement must be inspired by “bourgeois-nationalists.” A curious example of Sudnitsyn’s “double-think” is that he gives as a proof of the brotherly care lavished by the Party on minority peoples the *return* to their original homes of the Balkars, Chechens, Ingush, Kalmyks, and Karachays who were forcibly deported to Central Asia and Kazakhstan during 1943 and 1944. It is evidently not permissible to surmise by whose authority they were removed.

In the course of the second chapter of his pamphlet Sudnitsyn discusses the sovereign rights of the Union republics as granted under the U.S.S.R. Constitution. He writes: “The expression of the sovereign will of socialist nations was the basis of the sovereignty both of the U.S.S.R. and of the Union republics. The Union republics voluntarily renounced part of their

200



Library

IAS, Shimla

TMP 050.954 52 MUS



00016276

PRESENTED TO THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED STUDY, SIMLA
BY

rights for the sake of the Union, that is, voluntarily limited their state sovereignty. This limitation is secured in Article 14 of the U.S.S.R. Constitution. Outside the terms of this Article, the Union republics exercise state authority independently and fully retain their sovereign rights . . . Each Union republic has the right of free and unilateral secession from the U.S.S.R. . . . This right is the highest expression of the sovereignty of the Union republics." Sudnitsyn does not quote Article 14 which reserves to the all-Union government not only supremacy in questions of war and peace, state security and state defence, but also the right to determine all-Union national economic plans, to approve the Union budget, to determine the taxes and revenues which go to make up the Union, republican and local budgets; to administer banks, industrial, agricultural and trading organizations of all-Union subordination and to exert a general control of industry and construction of Union-republic subordination; to administer transport and communications of all-Union importance; to direct the monetary and credit system, to organize state insurance, to contract and grant loans; to control legislation concerning the judicial system and judicial procedure and the criminal and civil codes. In addition, under Article 20 (also not quoted by Sudnitsyn), in the event of a divergence between a Union law and that of a Union republic, the Union law prevails. In fact a republic is so bound economically to the central government that secession can hardly be imagined.

Sudnitsyn lists other rights which the republics enjoy. Each republic has its own constitution which "is adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the Union republic and needs no further ratification (Article 60 (a) of the U.S.S.R. Constitution). It is precisely in this and not simply in the existence of a constitution that the sovereignty of a Union republic is apparent." He does not quote the text of Article 60 (a) which says that the Supreme Soviet of a Union republic adopts the constitution of the republic and amends it in conformity with Article 16 of the U.S.S.R. Constitution. Article 16 says that each Union republic has its own constitution which is drawn up in full conformity with the U.S.S.R. Constitution. In fact it would seem that a republican constitution takes away more than it grants.

Each republic, continues Sudnitsyn, has its own "higher organs of state authority and state administration, which have wide powers. A Union republic is independent in administering the most important branches of the economy." This statement is, of course, hardly compatible with Article 14 which Sudnitsyn does not quote.

Each republic has the right to enter into direct relations with foreign states, to conclude agreements with them, and to exchange diplomatic and consular representatives (Article 18a). Sudnitsyn adds: "The U.S.S.R. retains only the right to establish the general form of relations between the Union republics and foreign states." This is Article 14 (a). Under Article 14 (b) and (h) the all-Union government controls also questions of peace and war and all foreign trade. In fact today none of the Muslim republics has representation abroad.

Each republic has the right to maintain their own republican military formations (Article 18b). Sudnitsyn does not add that under Article 14

(g) the all-Union government has the right to organize the defence of the U.S.S.R., to direct all the armed forces of the U.S.S.R., and to determine the guiding principles governing the organization of the military formations of the Union republics. Articles 18a and 18b were enacted in February, 1944, and it is possible that there may have been republican troops for the last months of the war, but there is no evidence to show that any exist at the present. The territory of the Muslim republics, like the rest of the Soviet Union, is divided into military areas controlled from the centre.

Each republic has its own citizenship and cannot have its territory altered without its consent. Each republic has its own coat of arms, flag, national anthem, and capital, all of which, Sudnitsyn comments, are symbols of its sovereignty. Under Article 15 the U.S.S.R. is bound to protect the sovereign rights of the Union republics.

Sudnitsyn writes that the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet and its Presidium "have the right and are bound to annul any judicial act that violates the constitutional rights of the Union republics (Article 14 (d))." Article 14 (d) in fact says that the all-Union government has the right of control over the observance of the U.S.S.R. Constitution and of ensuring conformity of the constitutions of the Union republics with the U.S.S.R. Constitution; which is not same as Sudnitsyn's interpretation.

Sudnitsyn affirms that "the acts of a Union republic have special constitutional guarantees. For example, an act of the Council of Ministers of a Union republic, if it does not conform to the law, can be annulled only by the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet (Articles 49 (e) and 69)." The texts of these Articles, which Sudnitsyn does not quote, read as follows: Article 49 (f)—Sudnitsyn's (e) is a misprint—states that the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet annuls decisions and orders of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers and of the Councils of Ministers of the Union republics, if they do not conform to the law. In spite of Sudnitsyn's attempts to extol the sovereignty of the Union republics it cannot be denied that even on paper their independence is very limited. In practice it is, of course, even more limited by reason of the centralizing and authoritarian role of the Communist Party.

In a later section Sudnitsyn considers the economic independence of the Union republics. There is no doubt that in the last four or five years serious attempts have been made to alleviate chronic over-centralization by granting wider powers to local authorities. The result of the system of three types of ministry (all-Union, union-republican, and republican) was that all the most important economic enterprises in a republic were directly controlled from Moscow by an all-Union or union-republican ministry, neither of which was responsible to the republican government. Over-centralization, Sudnitsyn admits, "has begun to hinder the initiative of socialist nations and artificially to limit their sovereign rights in the economic field" (sic), and he claims that by 1957 55 per cent of all industry was controlled by the republics compared with 31 per cent in 1953. Apart from the abolition of many all-Union ministries, further decentralization has been achieved by the establishment in 1957 of regional Economic Councils (sovnarkhoz). Each of the Muslim republics has one such

council, apart from Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan which have respectively nine and four. The Economic Councils are subject to the republican Council of Ministers and are aimed at superseding some of the authority of the all-Union and union-republican ministries, many of which have been abolished, and at co-ordinating the republican ministries. There is little indication in Sudnitsyn's work of how far these measures have been successful, but there can be no doubt that even if administrative decentralization is achieved, Party control will certainly not be slackened.

Health services for the Kirgiz

An impressive account of the progress of Soviet health services in Kirgizia is given by A. A. Aydaraliyev, a leading Kirgiz doctor, in *Chief Stages in the Development of Health Services in Kirgizia* (Osnovnyye etapy razvitiya zdravookhraneniya Kirgizii. Kirgiz State Publishing House, Frunze, 1958. 99 pp.). Although the traditional life of a Kirgiz nomad in the summer months was healthy, in winter, life in a yurt was damp, cold, and overcrowded, and the lack of any knowledge of hygiene made disease rampant. The traditional Kirgiz medicine man, the *tabib*, was frequently a charlatan, although the best of them had a store of traditional knowledge about the use of herbs and other natural cures. One *tabib* even carried out a successful Cæsarean section in the days before the Revolution. In the early years after the Revolution the Kirgiz were ravaged by appalling epidemics of typhus, typhoid, cholera, and other diseases which were not brought under control until 1923-4. Apart from epidemics the general health condition of the Kirgiz was such that in 1925 a leading Russian doctor could describe syphilis as endemic; malaria, trachoma, mange, goitre, and other skin and venereal diseases had an extremely high incidence. Such was the situation with which the Soviet authorities were faced. Aydaraliyev gives a full account of the development of health services in Kirgizia until 1955. He concentrates on describing the growth of establishments and personnel rather than on describing treatments or giving figures for incidence of diseases. But he claims that since 1936 there have been no cases of small-pox, that today malaria, plague, cholera, typhus have been eliminated, and that the incidence of social diseases (venereal and skin), trachoma, and tuberculosis has decreased remarkably. By 1955 the death rate had declined 3.8 times compared with 1926, and in 1956 the birth rate was 34.3 per 1,000 inhabitants and the death rate 6.2. Aydaraliyev makes no attempt to conceal the fact that the successes of the health services in Kirgizia are largely due to the presence of Russian and Ukrainian doctors. The Kharkov Medical Institute was evacuated to Kirgizia during the war and united with the Kirgiz Medical Institute which had been formed in 1939. As a result the standard of medicine and the output of doctors increased sharply. In the years 1933-40 only nine Kirgiz, one of whom was the author, successfully completed their training as doctors, and they were trained in Moscow, Leningrad, or Tashkent. After 1942, however, thanks to the presence of the Kharkov Medical Institute, doctors began to be trained in Kirgizia itself. By 1955, writes Aydaraliyev, 2,511 doctors had graduated from the

Institute, of whom 187 were Kirgiz. In 1956 the student body numbered 1,724, half of whom were Kirgiz, 347 being Kirgiz girls.

Aydaraliyev admits that the ratio of hospital beds to population is still lower in Kirgizia than the all-Union ratio, but under the present Plan the situation will be remedied. The achievements of Soviet health services are indeed impressive, and Aydaraliyev drives home his point by concluding his book with a telling comparison between health services in Kirgizia with those of Persia, and other countries.

Law and philosophy in Kazakhstan

Volume 3 of the Kazakh Academy's *Works of the Institute of Philosophy and Law* (Trudy Instituta Filosofii i Prava. Alma-Ata, 1958. 156 pp.) contains an interesting selection of articles. Four of the eight contributors are Kazakhs but all the contributions are in Russian. The content's list is as follows: "On the question of Kazakhstan's transition to socialism, avoiding capitalism"—a short theoretical article; "The influence of Russian democratic culture on the formation of Chokan Valikhanov's philosophy"—Valikhanov (1835-56) was one of the first Kazakhs to receive a Russian education. He is renowned as a liberal and progressive thinker; "Some characteristics of the development of Soviet criminal law in Kazakhstan before the publication of the criminal code of the R.S.F.S.R."—a short consideration of criminal law in Kazakhstan between 1918 and 1922; "The first decrees of the Soviet state on family law in Kazakhstan"—an account of measures to abolish *kalyim* (bride-purchase), polygamy and other traditional Kazakh customs which violated the rights of women to equality; "Some questions of judicial practice in cases of petty theft"—a brief practical consideration of how cases of petty theft from state and communal property should be punished in view of the absence in the criminal code of a definition of petty theft; "Some questions of paying workers of M.T.S. tractor brigades"—this article was written before the M.T.S. (Machine and Tractor Stations) were abolished; "Direct talks as the most important means of resolving international disputes"; "Feuerbach's criticism of idealistic philosophy"; and finally "Kant's teaching on the gnoseological role of understanding."

Kazakhstan in the Second World War

Kazakhstan in the Great Patriotic War (Kazakhstan v velikoy otechestvennoy voyne, 1941-45. Kazakh State Publishing House, Alma-Ata, 1958. 362 pp.) is a long propagandist account by G. Abishev of the Kazakh war effort. Chapter I describes the reorganization of the economy to the demands of war, the man-power position, and the reception in Kazakhstan of evacuees and evacuated industries. Chapter II describes the war efforts of the republic's workers, peasants, intellectuals, women, and youth. Chapter III describes the moral and material help given by the people of Kazakhstan to the soldiers at the front and later to liberated areas. Chapter IV describes the work of the Party during the war. Chapter V gives accounts of the part played by Kazakh soldiers in the defence of Moscow, at Stalingrad, and in the defence of Leningrad. There is a con-

clusion, a chronology of the most important dates in the war, and a long bibliography.

The general picture of the causes and development of the war is unrecognizable to a western reader. The U.S.A., Britain and France are said to have helped in unleashing the war against the Soviet Union. "With the direct connivance and complicity of the imperialists of the U.S.A., Britain and France, the Hitlerites enslaved most of the states of Europe. . . ." There is no mention anywhere in the book of the fact that Britain had been at war with Germany since September, 1939, nor is there any mention at all of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of August, 1939. "The Soviet Union was the inspirer and creator of a single anti-fascist front of freedom-loving peoples and the organizer of the coalition of the three great powers. . . ." Thanks only to the Soviet army, Britain and the U.S.A. were able "in the course of 2-5 years" to put their economy on a war footing. In the chronology at the end of the book, there are given only dates which refer to the Soviet Union with the exception of the Normandy landings and the capitulation of Italy and there is no indication at all of what events led up to Italy's surrender.

It can be assumed that the account of the war effort in Kazakhstan is highly tendentious. In the section on evacuees there is no mention of the north Caucasian peoples deported there in 1943-4. In describing the vastly increased industrial output of the war years the book nowhere contains any reference to forced labour camps of which many are known to have existed in Kazakhstan. The Karaganda coal-mines in particular were largely manned by deportees. In the chapter on the moral and material help given to the front-line soldiers, there are descriptions lasting several pages of letters sent from factories and villages urging the soldiers to spare no effort, and of the food and warm clothing sent to the front; at the end of the chapter there is only the briefest mention of the fact that in 1943-4 the kolkhozes of Kazakhstan "gave" nearly half a million head of cattle to the newly liberated western areas of the Soviet Union.

One of the most interesting sections of the book is that devoted to the exploits of soldiers from Kazakhstan at the front. The Eighth Panfilov Guards Rifle Division, which was formed in Kazakhstan, distinguished itself in the defence of Moscow. The 73rd Stalingrad Guards Rifle Division was formed from the Alma-Ata district and fought at Stalingrad. The 310th Rifle Division from Akmolinsk showed great valour in the siege of Leningrad. There is no indication of what proportion of Kazakhs to other nationalities were contained in these divisions, but many Kazakhs showed exceptional valour and received high military honours. In February, 1944, the Soviet Constitution was amended to give each republic the right to its own troops; this fact is mentioned in the chronology but not in the text of the book. There is no indication whether in fact Kazakh republican troops were formed at the end of the war and if so for how long they lasted.

The effects of Soviet rule on the Uygur community

Nearly 100,000 Uygurs live in Soviet Central Asia. Over half of them

live in the Alma-Ata and Taldy-Kurgan oblasts of the Kazakh S.S.R. while smaller communities are to be found in Uzbekistan and Kirgizia. The Uygurs migrated to Russian territory from the Ili district of Sinkiang after the Treaty of St. Petersburg of 1881, which ended Russian occupation of that part of the Manchu empire. The social changes that the community have experienced since that time are the subject of a long and detailed article by P. D. Khodzhayeva entitled "The social position and family life of the Uygur woman of Kazakhstan" (*Trudy Instituta Arkheologii i Etnografii*, 3, Kazakh Academy of Sciences, Alma-Ata, 1958. pp. 231-284). In the first section Khodzhayeva gives a brief history of the Uygurs before their migration, discusses their social and economic position after their settlement in Russian territory, and then proceeds to a full account of their social life and the position of women in the family and community in the period up to the Revolution. Although less strictly secluded than among other Islamic peoples, an Uygur woman was in total subjection to her parents, and after marriage to her husband and husband's family. Marriage took place before the age of 14 and preferably to a kinsman. Khodzhayeva gives a detailed and careful account of the customs and ceremonials surrounding marriage and childbirth. She considers divorce procedure and emphasizes the hard lot of women who were without any rights or freedoms and had little or no education or medical assistance.

Khodzhayeva devotes the second section to describing the social position of Uygur women in Soviet society. She describes the measures and propaganda to realize the equality of women and the bitter struggle to break down the old traditions. She gives numerous personal stories of Uygur women who now occupy prominent positions either in their own community or in other parts of the Soviet Union. She gives examples of Uygur women in industry, agriculture, teaching, and Party work. One Uygur widow in Alma-Ata has seven children all with higher education who work in responsible positions in many parts of the Soviet Union. Another Uygur woman played an important part in devising the new Uygur Cyrillic alphabet. Others are prominent in political and artistic life. In the third and final section of her article, Khodzhayeva describes the family life of the Uygur woman today. The modern Uygur woman, having equal rights with men and playing an important part in the productive life of her community, is very different from her mother or grandmother. Today marriages are usually arranged by the young couple themselves rather than as before by the parents. Some of the traditional marriage customs and ceremony are retained, usually to please the older generation, but in a greatly simplified form. Among intellectuals they are usually dispensed with entirely. Girls mostly marry between 18 and 20, and those with higher education later still. There are still instances of parents or grandparents denying their children freedom of choice or secluding their daughters, but these are growing rarer. Khodzhayeva mentions instances of mixed marriages: a leading Uygur woman actress married to a Ukrainian, an Uygur married to a Russian girl, and an Uygur girl married to a Kazakh, but as these instances are named personally it may be assumed that they are exceptional. Within the family the sub-

servience of women to men and to the older generation no longer obtains, and the work of the house and garden is shared among the sexes. Thanks to the establishment of day nurseries, women can work in the fields alongside the men. Education and medical care has raised their status. New customs have arisen such as the celebration of birthdays, and naming girls with Russian first names. Education has taught Uygur women modern methods of child-care: infants are now weaned at 7 or 8 months instead of at 2 or 3 years as before. Fathers no longer regard the upbringing of the children as purely woman's duty. In general, Khodzhayeva concludes, the removal of the old patriarchal and feudal order has opened new fields of opportunity before Uygur women with the result that life in an Uygur community increasingly resembles that of other peoples of the Soviet Union.

Art and literature

In 1958 a Russian translation of Rudaki's poems was published in Tadzhikistan (Abu-Abdullo Rudaki. Tadzhik State Publishing House, Stalinabad, 1958. 198 pp.). The translations are by two Russians and the book includes fifty verses, mostly couplets, described as "unknown until our times." Unfortunately there is no introduction or comment to indicate where these verses were found, and the few brief notes at the end of the book describe only Rudaki's verse forms. Rudaki was a ninth century Persian poet, but in the Soviet Union he is always described as a Tadzhik. The title page of the present volume describes the verses as a translation "from the Tadzhik-Farsi."

The state is the only patron of the arts in the Soviet Union. State patronage has resulted in the preservation of certain traditional arts of Central Asia and all too frequently in their vulgarization. The applied arts of Soviet Uzbekistan are described in a finely produced book—*The Popular Decorative Art of Soviet Uzbekistan* (Narodnoye dekorativnoye iskusstvo sovetskogo Uzbekistana. State Publishing House of Art, Moscow, 1955. 156 pp.). The work, which consists of photographs, including ten colour plates, and brief commentaries, was compiled by Uzbek Institute of Art Studies. The editor and eight of the ten contributors are Russians. Uzbek decorative arts today are a combination of traditional methods and subjects with new realistic elements. "An important feature of modern Uzbek decorative art," says the introduction, "is the appearance of motifs usually connected with the aims of popular craftsmen to express the reality surrounding them, to embody favourite popular themes." Such themes are "the Moscow Kremlin, the hammer and sickle, peace emblems, and views of the transformed towns and villages of Soviet Uzbekistan." Even the traditional ornamental motifs have changed. "Elements taken from surrounding reality have been introduced into the traditional geometrical and plant forms." Such elements are "an open cotton boll" and themes from "Soviet heraldry."

The first section of the book considers alabaster and wood carving, and painting on alabaster and wood. The finest modern examples of alabaster and wood carving are to be found in the Alisher Navoy Theatre at Tash-

kent. Although the building was designed by a Russian architect, the very fine internal decorations were entirely carried out by Uzbek craftsmen, mostly working under Russian supervision. Carving has not yet succumbed to the portraying of realistic subjects and the methods and styles are still traditional. Not so with painting: in this art the traditional colour wash and tempera are increasingly giving way to factory-made oil and enamel paints, though some wood painters still make their own colours; subjects are frequently portrayals of "Soviet reality." Ceramics are considered in another section. The traditional art of architectural ceramics—mosaics and majolica used to decorate the exterior of buildings—had almost completely died out at the time of the Revolution, but has been revived in Soviet times primarily to restore historical monuments. More widespread is the production of ceramic dishes, the chief centres today being Tashkent and the village of Rishtan near Kokand; the motifs used are both traditional and Soviet. The third section considers textiles. The traditional cotton and silk cloths woven for clothes are rarely produced nowadays since, with the exception of Khorezm, native dress is rarely worn. However, silk bed-covers are still produced by traditional methods and with traditional designs, though the thread used is now factory produced. Hand-printed cloths are, however, frequently produced and widely used as wall and bed coverings. Embroidery and embroidery with gold thread are both flourishing arts, but the art of carpet-weaving is recovering but slowly from its decline. A final section deals with metal-working and jewellery. State encouragement has obviously been successful in preserving and developing the traditional applied arts of Uzbekistan. From the pictures in the book it seems that many, though by no means all, of the leading craftsmen are old, and it appears that efforts are made to train the younger generation in the traditional skills of their forefathers. Although many of the more publicized examples of Uzbek art are tasteless portraits of Party leaders or views of hydroelectric dams, it appears that a solid foundation of traditional works are still produced.

Archæology and ethnography

The thirtieth issue of the Institute of Ethnography's Bulletin (*Kratkiye soobshcheniya Instituta Etnografii*. XXX, Moscow, 1958. 167 pp.) is dedicated to Professor S. P. Tolstov, the renowned archæologist, on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday in 1957. The twenty-two contributors are his colleagues, friends, and pupils. The following are some of the subjects treated: "Natural factors determining the distribution of ancient man in the deserts of Central Asia"; "The early Kel'teminar settlement of Kunyak-I" (the Kel'teminar stone-age culture was first discovered by Professor Tolstov in the Khorezm area. It relates to the end of the fourth and first half of the third millennia B.C.); "A female statuette of the early Bronze Age from Khorezm"; "Lion's head handles on vessels from Khorezm"; "On Khorezmian statue ossuaries"; "The question of the Kidarites" (an obscure fourth-century A.D. people who ruled in Central Asia); "Some ritual objects from the excavations at Balalyk-Tepe" (near Termez); "From the history of political life of Khorezm in the fourteenth

century" (a study of contemporary coinage); "The Goklen madrase" (a description of the eighteenth-century madrase in northern Turkmenistan which is unique in style and architecture); "The Kara-kalpak epic *KYRK KYZ* as a historical and ethnographical source"; "Traditional rivalry between districts of towns in Uzbekistan (end of nineteenth to beginning of twentieth centuries)"; "On the characteristics of Shamanism among the Kirgiz" (a discussion by S. M. Abramzon, a leading specialist on Kirgiz ethnography, of information given him by two living Kirgiz shamans or wizards); and "An ancient Turkic stone figure from the region of Mungu-Khayr Khan-Ula" (a description of a recently discovered seventh- or eighth-century statue in the Altay district).

Central Asia before the Arab conquest

The late Professor A. E. Shmidt, the distinguished Soviet Arabist, left a manuscript of translations from the works of ninth-, tenth-, eleventh- and thirteenth-century Arabic chroniclers which describe the history of Central Asia before the Arab conquest. To the translations Shmidt added his own full notes and interpretations. This most valuable source has now been published in full in the *Learned Notes* of the Institute of Oriental Studies (Uchenyye Zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniya, XVI, 1958. pp. 441-513) and is designed for scholars studying the early history of Central Asia and Persia.

The history of Central Asia (sixteenth to nineteenth centuries)

Another valuable posthumous work on the history of Central Asia is P. P. Ivanov's *Outline History of Central Asia* (Ocherki po istorii Sredney Azii. U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 1958. 247 pp.). P. P. Ivanov was a leading Soviet orientalist who died in the Leningrad siege in 1942. His *Outline History* was started in 1938 and finished in 1941, but publication was postponed because of the war. The present volume consists of Ivanov's text minus the three last chapters which dealt with Central Asia under Russian rule and which were, according to the present editor, A. Borovkov (who quotes Ivanov on this point), unoriginal and schematic; Borovkov has substituted his own prefatory notes in place of Ivanov's brief introduction. Ivanov's work was the first attempt to write the history of Central Asia from a Marxist angle; although not published until 1958 the manuscript was apparently well known and has been used by other orientalists. At the request of his publishers, Ivanov wrote his work in "a scientific-popular" style, but it is nonetheless a work of serious scholarship. Ivanov spent many years studying the historical documents of the period, and was the first to have done so.

The book is divided into two parts: Central Asia from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, and the Central Asian khanates in the first half of the nineteenth century. The first part contains chapters on "The Uzbeks and Kazakhs before their settlement in Central Asia," "Shey-bani-khan and his conquest. The formation of the Bukharan and Khivan khanates" and "Bukhara and Khiva in the eighteenth century. The formation of the Kokand khanate." The second part devotes a chapter

to each of the three khanates with a final chapter on cultural life in Central Asia in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. There is an annotated list of the most important sources and a very full bibliography which has been brought up to date by the editor. This is an essential work for the study of Central Asian history.

The Revolution in Turkestan

In November and December, 1905, the railway workers on the Central Asian railway called a strike. Thirty-two documents relating to this strike and the prosecutions that followed it have now been published with a commentary in the journal of the Turkmen Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography. (Trudy Instituta Istorii, Arkheologii i Etnografii. IV, 1958. Turkmen Academy of Sciences, Ashkhabad. Pp. 111-207). The documents consist of personal statements made to the police, official telegrams and orders, interrogation and legal reports, intercepted telegrams, and revolutionary manifestos. The documents are all from the Turkmen State Archives and were presumably found in the archives of the Tsarist police during the revolution. This is one of the few occasions on which archive documents have ostensibly been quoted in full, the usual course for a Soviet historian being to refer to the archives but not to quote them. B. Kurbanov, the author of the commentary, attempts to give the strike significance against the general background of the 1905 Revolution in Russia and says that the strike was "supported by the working class and the working masses of the whole country." It appears, however, to have been a purely Russian affair, very few, if any, Turkmen being involved.

Yet another work has appeared on the 1917 Revolution in Turkestan (for others, see the two previous articles in this series). *The Victory of the October Revolution in Turkestan* (Pobeda oktyabr'skoy revolyutsii v Turkestane. Uzbek State Publishing House, Tashkent, 1958. 104 pp.) is a chapter from a forthcoming book by Academician Dodonov and was written with the assistance of the Uzbek Institute of Party History. It deals only with 1917 and the first few months of 1918. It differs from other works on the subject in that it attempts a thorough study of the distribution of Bolshevik groups in Turkestan at the time of the Revolution and of the spread of Soviet authority in the different localities of Turkestan after the seizure of power in Tashkent. The common practice until now has been to deal with these subjects in general terms. Unfortunately the sources that Dodonov quotes are almost entirely later Soviet works; if he has used archive materials—and this seems likely as he was working under the auspices of the Institute of Party History—they are not mentioned. As it stands the work is entirely one-sided; once Dodonov has described how the Tashkent Soviet won power on November 1, 1917—after four days of street fighting which are well described in detail—he gives no consideration to any opposition. The account of the spread of Soviet organizations into Fergana in the early months of 1918, for instance, is given without any mention of the Kokand autonomous government or the many years of fighting that were to ensue before the Bolsheviks finally gained control of this area. Such omissions may, however,

be because the work is only one chapter from a longer book. More serious are the omissions directly concerned with the period described: Dodonov gives an account of the III Regional Congress of Soviets held at Tashkent in November, 1917, which established the Tashkent Soviet Government; he even mentions that the Declaration of the Congress "mistakenly" excluded all Muslims from participation in the revolutionary government. He does not, however, describe other measures taken by the new government against the native population such as unequal food distribution and measures against Islamic institutions. Following the usual line, Dodonov throughout emphasizes native support for the Soviets and even comments directly after he has described the Declaration of the Congress of Soviets that the Declaration "was an assurance to the Uzbeks, Kirgiz, Tadzhiks, Turkmen and Karakalpaks that from now on they would have their own native Soviet authority" (*svoya rodnaya i blizkaya im Sovetskaya vlast.*)

II. THE BORDERLANDS

In the period under review, few new works have been received on the borderlands. There is nothing on Persia, and only one article on Sinkiang; but the one volume on Afghanistan is of exceptional interest and importance. D. Tikhonov published an article entitled "Some questions of the internal policy of Yakub-Bek" (*Uchenyye Zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniya*, XVI, Moscow, 1958. pp. 109-137), which is the first recent Soviet attempt at an evaluation of Yakub-Bek's rule in Sinkiang, and remarkable for its consistent attempt to denigrate his regime. Yakub-Bek was a Muslim ruler of exceptional powers who welded together a kingdom in the space of very few years. He was renowned for his statesmanship and enlightenment. Tikhonov, however, is concerned to show only the sufferings of the peasantry and the corruption of the officials, many of his assertions being based on the slenderest evidence.

Of far greater actual significance is the symposium *Independent Afghanistan* (*Nezavisimyy Afganistan*. Publishing House of Eastern Literature, Moscow, 1958. 269 pp.) prepared by the Afghanistan Sector of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences. As a summary of the current Soviet attitude to Afghanistan in all fields of national life, the book is essential reading. There are thirteen contributions. Six articles are devoted to Afghan history: "The Herat rising of 1716-1732"; "The independent Afghan state of Ahmad Shah Durrani and his successors (1747-1819)"; three articles—one devoted to each of the three Afghan wars of Britain; and one on the internal and external policies of Muhammad Nadir Shah. There are two articles on modern Afghan writers, one on Abdurrauf Benava and one on Gul Pacha Ulfat. One article is devoted to descriptions of the Afghan people in Soviet literature. There are two articles on Afghan foreign policy—one on Soviet-Afghan relations since 1917, and one praising the Afghan policy of non-alignment. There is a substantial article on the current Afghan Five-Year Plan which started in 1956. Two themes run through these works: one is that Soviet Russia is and always has been Afghanistan's best friend,

and that Tsarist Russia, for all its faults, never had serious designs on Afghanistan; the other is that Britain is Afghanistan's traditional enemy, Britain's role today being carried on by Anglo-American imperialism. The Soviet Union is today the one country where serious studies are being made of all features of Afghan life and history. In spite of its tendentiousness, the symposium contains a wealth of most valuable research material; because of its tendentiousness, it is probably hardly less valuable as an exposition of current Soviet thinking on Afghanistan.



Library

IAS, Simla

TMP 050.954 52 MUS



00016276



