

THE HISTORIOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE “ULAMO” ORGANIZATION IN TASHKENT

Murod Fayzullaevich Zikrullayev

*Deputy director for scientific affairs of the State Museum of Repression
Victims Memorial under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan.*

E-mail: mzf1974@rambler.ru

ABSTRACT: *The article analyzes the activities of the “Ulamo” society established in Tashkent during the intense and conflicting social and political processes of the beginning of the 20th century in the history of Uzbekistan, the Soviet system, the period when Uzbekistan gained independence, as well as the study by foreign scholars. In the conclusion of the historiographical analysis, the historical attitude to the “Ulamo” society, its positive and negative aspects are highlighted.*

KEY WORDS: *Turkestan, Uzbekistan, national organizations, “Shuroi Islamiya”, “Ulamo” society, Russian Empire, Soviet system, revolution, independence, foreign studies.*

The years 1917-1918 occupy a special place in the history of Uzbekistan. Studying the history of this period has taken a complex and important path. Although the socio-political and religious educational activities of the “Ulamo” society, which is one of the national-political organizations established in Turkestan during this period, were not the object of special research in historiography, some of its issues were reflected in research in different directions.

Literature related to the topic can be divided and classified into three periods, such as the literature of the Soviet period, the period of independence (the period after 1991), as well as studies of the works of foreign authors:

The first was the Soviet period, in which the history of Turkestan was falsified and distorted for many years. Despite the fact that many sources and factual materials were included in the scientific circulation during this period, historical

processes were not evaluated with all their contradictions and complexity, and false historical scenes were created instead of true scientific knowledge.

In certain periods of the Soviet system, in scientific works devoted to “modernism”, “History of Turkestan”, “History of February and October revolutions”, scholars are partially mentioned, and along with the movement of modernism, they are called “bourgeois nationalists”, “counter-revolutionaries”, “conservative fanatics”, were considered as “rich-clerical elements”.

It is no exaggeration to say that the analysis of issues related to national-political organization and societies in general began after the February Revolution of 1917. Despite the fact that most of these works were at the level of newspaper articles, the fact that their authors, including Zaki Validi, N. Lykoshin, Sh. Shoakhmadov, S. Nikiforov, B. Elchiev, were contemporaries of that period, and in some cases were also participants in the intense events of the beginning of the 20th century, makes the articles scientific increases its value even more.

Although most of the researchers of the 20s of the 20th century were not historians, their work is distinguished by the fact that they used a large source base and, moreover, relied on their personal memories to cover the events. Analyzing the political processes in Turkestan after the February Revolution of 1917, G.K. Safarov in his book “Colonial Revolution” says “...the political development of the Muslim masses is following a unique path. For them, the main issue of the revolution was, of course, the issue of national liberation” [1: 55].

A. Silonov stated that three political-class groups were formed here (in Turkestan) during the revolution: the first is “Shuroi Islamiya”, and professional organizations included in it. It united mainly bourgeois intellectuals... The strong competitor of this party was the party of the clergy and the rich. The third group of forces are labor organizations, which were the open enemies of the first and second groups, - concludes [2: 260-261].

In the work “From Colonial Slavery to Socialism” co-authored by K. Zhitov and V. Nepomnin, it is said, among other things: The “Ulamo” society united with the Russian bourgeoisie and fought against the workers and peasants, against the further development of the revolution... [3: 41].

Apart from the above-mentioned works, the literature of this period hardly expressed an opinion about “Shuroi Islamiya” and “Ulamo” society, which are among the large and famous national-political organizations in Turkestan.

As a general conclusion to the analysis of the literature of the 1920s and 1930s, it can be said that the main views of the historiography of the Soviet era, which are related to the research topic in a certain way, were created and formed in this period. In the later periods, these views were not seriously changed, but efforts were made to enrich them with facts in order to further strengthen them.

In the 1940s and 1980s, a large number of studies related to the subject in one way or another were published. For example, M. Vakhobov’s “Tashkent during the period of three revolutions” (Tashkent, 1957), “Uzbek socialist nation” (Tashkent, 1960), K. Zhitov’s “Victory of the great October Socialist Revolution in Uzbekistan” (Tashkent, 1957), I. Muminov’s “From the history of the development of social and philosophical thought in Uzbekistan at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries” (Tashkent, 1957), M. Dodonov’s “Victory of the October Revolution in Turkestan” (Tashkent, 1958), Kh. Inoyatov’s “October Revolution in Uzbekistan” (Tashkent, 1957) can be cited.

In the scientific works of Soviet historians of this period, the conclusion that the Bolsheviks played a decisive role in the development of the national liberation movement in Turkestan was given priority.

Nevertheless, these studies have a unique contribution to the historiography of the subject. In particular, in the works of A. Niallo (Stanishevsky), one can find brief information about the participants of the congresses of Turkestan Muslims [4: 125-133].

K.Sh. Inoyatov's "October Revolution in Turkestan" (Moscow, 1957), K.E. Zhitov's "October armed uprising in Tashkent" (Tashkent, 1957), I.K. Dodonov's "Victory of the revolution in Turkestan" (Moscow, 1958) contains some thoughts on the researched topic.

In the 1960s-1980s, the historiography of the national liberation movement, in particular, the activities of the societies and organizations that participated in it, was enriched with new views.

G. Rashidov's work "Socialist Tashkent history" also mentions in short lines the establishment of "Shuroi Islamiya" and "Shuroi Ulamo" organizations in March 1917, and the main emphasis is placed on the struggle of the Bolsheviks against these "Menshevik" and "bourgeois-nation" forces. [6: 47].

It should be acknowledged that in some scientific studies created in the first half of the 80s, the national-political organizations that operated in the country at the beginning of the 20th century (such as "Ulamo", "Shuroi Islamiya", "Turk Adami Markaziyati"), "nationalist organizations of the local bourgeoisie", "Turkistan Autonomy" was negatively evaluated as the government of a certain category of people.

In the 1980s and 1990s, attention to the sources of the struggle for freedom and independence of the Uzbek people increased sharply. We can mention the works of Salih Kasimov and Begali Kasimov related to the topic. For the first time, in post-independence studies, attention was paid to the understudied aspects of the problems of the organizational unity of the Muslim population.

The important features of the studies written in the 1980s and 1990s are that, in contrast to the one-sided politicized views of the history of Turkestan, modernism and the national-independence movement, it is emphasized that the societies that actively participated in these processes occupied a positive place in the history of the peoples of Central Asia.

In particular, S. Holboev and a group of historians wrote "Turkistan modernism - the history of national renaissance (late 19th century - early 20th century)" in the

book “Shuroi Islamiya” and “Ulamo” society, as well as some issues about the mutual relations between the moderns and ulamo fought for the organization of national-democratic state administration, it was rightly emphasized [8: 154].

It was only at this time that the process of breaking away from the rigid ways of thinking began, albeit with great difficulty and slowly. For the first time in historical literature, the activities, goals, and objectives of Turkestan’s “Shoroi Islamiya”, “Ulamo” society, “Turk Adami Markaziyati Party”, “Socialist Erk Party”, “Jadidlar Party”, “Turkistan National Unity” and other national-political organizations and societies Valuable information about the tasks, program and regulations appeared.

In this place, it is appropriate to cite articles and pamphlets of R.Abdullaev, S.Azamkhozhaev, D.Alimova, H.Uzokov, S.Kholboev, R.Shamsuddinov and others. R.Abdullaev in his research on “National political organizations in Turkestan in 1917-1918” analyzed the socio-political processes of 1917-1918, the activities of local societies and organizations, and the changes in the minds of the population. being determined, they began to demand that they be treated with respect and their rights, he admits [9:12]. Commenting on the activities of the “Ulamo” society in his work “Autonomy of Turkistan”, S.Azamkhozhaev writes the following: “Turkistan ulamo, like Shuroi Islamists, also relied on Islamic traditions and tried to use it in the fight against Russian colonialism” [10: 74].

One of the latest researches is Sirojiddin Ahmad’s scientific and historical publication “Troubleshooting Two Empires”, in which some opinions are expressed about the historical conditions of the establishment of the “Ulamo” society. Religious scholars - ulama, who understood the perspective of the work carried out by the youth at that time, joined them. But the secret service of the tsarist government and those sold to them created a conflict between the young and the old. As a result, writes mudarris and mullabachchas formed the society “Ulamo” and “Khaloiq” [11: 89].

Issues related to the “Ulamo” society have not escaped the attention of foreign historians. At the beginning of the 20th century, they had a unique direction in covering the socio-political processes that took place in Turkestan.

In particular, the German researcher Kh. Braker “Religionsdiscussion und Islam in der Sowjet Union. Communismus und Weltreligionen Asiens” thinking about Islam in the Soviet Union, none of the organizations in Turkestan at that time, even the “Shuroi Islamiya” and “Ulamo” societies, which had a great position among them, did not raise the issue of secession from Russia after the February Revolution, but organized autonomy within Russia. puts forward the idea that he strives to do.

Italian scientist Marco Buttino in his “Revolution is the opposite. Central Asia between the fall of the Tsarist Empire and the formation of the USSR”, analyzing the participation of Muslim intellectuals in the socio-political processes of Central Asia, especially in Turkestan, at the beginning of the 20th century, writes “the traditional scholars decided to respond to the political superiority of the moderns and used the co-optation system for elections in order to use the support of the population and they found the transition to be the right time”[12: 165].

According to the American researcher A. Khalid, the main task for the ulama was to protect the boundaries of their society in the conditions of the new order that was emerging with the revolution [13: 56]. From the above analysis, it can be concluded that in today’s historiography, it is necessary to study the activities of the “Ulamo Society”, which took an active part in the processes of the national liberation movement in 1917-1918 and had a great position among the Muslim population of Turkestan, and the issues of the society’s publication – “Al-Izah” magazine. A separate study devoted to detailed analysis has not been carried out.

First of all, the official name of the society is wrongly stated in most of the reviewed literature and it is called “Shuroi Ulamo”. Secondly, the activities of the society and the ulama of that time were mainly evaluated negatively. In the literature of the Soviet period, studying the activities of clerics was even considered dangerous, and this topic was avoided in scientific research.

In the post-independence historiography, approaches to the “Ulamo” were expressed from the perspective of the “modern-ancient” aspect. Although the activities of the “Ulamo” society were covered with some impartiality, they were viewed as a more conservative force.

REFERENCES:

1. Сафаров Г. Колониальная революция (опыт Туркестана). –М.: Госиздат, 1921.
2. Силонов А. Февральская революция в Средней Азии // Коммунистическая мысль. -1927. –Кн. 3.
3. Jitov K., Nepomnin V. Kolonial qullikdan sosializmga. –Toshkent: OzK(b) PMK partnashri, 1939.
4. Ниалло (Станишевский) А. Очерки истории революции и гражданской войны в Киргизии и Средней Азии. –Фрунзе: Изд-во комитета наук при СНК. 1941.
5. Ф.Рашидов. Социалистик Тошкент тарихи. 1-том. –Тошкент: Фан, 1965.
7. История Узбекской ССР. – Тошкент: Фан, 1974.
8. С.Холбоев (хаммуаллифликда). “Туркистон жадидчилиги – миллий уйғониш даври тарихи. (XIX аср охири – XX аср бошлари)”. –Наманган. 2012 й.
9. Абдуллаев Р. Национальные политические организации Туркестана в 1917-1918 года. Дисс.. д-ра ист. Наук.
10. С.Агзамходжаев. Туркистон мухторияти. –Тошкент: Маънавият, 2000.
11. Сирожиддин Аҳмад. Икки империя асоратида / илмий тарихий нашр. I жилд. –Т.: Info Capital Group, 2018.
12. Марко Буттино. Революция наоборот. Средняя Азия между падением царской империи и образованием СССР. -М.: Звенья. 2007.