



**HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE POLICY OF VIOLENCE IN THE
INTRODUCTION OF THE SOVIET MODEL TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION
SYSTEM OF UZBEKISTAN (PART 2)**

Imamov Ulug'bek Ismailovich

Master's student of the Historiography and
Source Studies of Samarkand State University

imomovulugbek59@gmail.com

ANNOTATION

During the totalitarian regime in Uzbekistan SSR, it was impossible to create a true history of Uzbekistan, the scope of studying problems and their sources was strictly limited, it was impossible to give a true assessment of historical events, and a dogmatic approach prevailed. After the establishment of the Soviet government in Turkestan, the colonial government took full control over the education system of the local people. It is stated in this article that studying the historiography of the Soviet policy of violence carried out in the field of education in this period, its consequences affecting the educational system, comparative analysis, drawing objective conclusions from them is one of the urgent tasks of the history of Uzbekistan.

Keywords: Soviet totalitarianism, knowledge spillovers, cultural revolution, educational system, pedagogical analysis, theoretical methods, violent politics, party management, dogmatism, historiography and source analysis.

Аннотация

В период тоталитарного режима в Узбекской ССР невозможно было создать подлинную историю Узбекистана, строго ограничивался круг изучения проблем и их источников, невозможно было дать верную оценку историческим событиям, господствовал догматический подход. После установления советской власти в Туркестане колониальное правительство взяло под полный контроль систему образования местного населения. В данной статье указывается, что изучение историографии советской политики насилия, проводившейся в сфере образования в этот период, ее последствий, затронувших систему образования, сравнительный анализ, получение из них объективных выводов является одной из актуальных задач история Узбекистана.



КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: советский тоталитаризм, распространение знаний, культурная революция, система образования, педагогический анализ, теоретические методы, насильственная политика, партийное управление, догматизм, историография и анализ источников.

ANNOTATSIIYA

O'zbekiston SSRda totalitar tuzum davrida O'zbekistonning haqiqiy tarixini yaratishning imkoni bo'lmadi, muammolar va ularning manbalarini o'rganish doirasi qat'iy cheklangan, tarixiy voqealarga to'g'ri baho berishning imkoni bo'lmadi, dogmatik yondashuv hukm surdi. Turkistonda sovet hokimiyati o'rnatilgach, mustamlakachi hukumat mahalliy xalqning ta'lim tizimini to'liq o'z nazoratiga oldi. Mazkur maqolada ta'kidlanganidek, bu davrda ta'lim sohasida amalga oshirilgan sovet zo'rvonlik siyosati tarixnavisligini, uning ta'lim tizimiga ta'sir etayotgan oqibatlarini o'rganish, qiyosiy tahlil qilish, ulardan xolis xulosalar chiqarish dolzarb vazifalardan biri hisoblanadi. O'zbekiston tarixi.

KALIT SO'ZLAR: Sovet totalitarizmi, bilimlar tarqalishi, madaniy inqilob, ta'lim tizimi, pedagogik tahlil, nazariy usullar, zo'rvonlik siyosati, partiya boshqaruvi, dogmatizm, tarixshunoslik va manbashunoslik mohiyati.

INTRODUCTION

The 20s and 30s of the 20th century were the most complex and controversial period in the development of the higher education system, which was directly reflected in its historiography and research. Here, it should be noted that in the historiography of the first years after the October coup, specific ideas serving the development of culture appeared. The literature of this period is distinguished by the diversity of unique views and opinions, controversy, criticism, and at the same time, the state program in the field of cultural construction should serve the development of all aspects of national culture. In general, the conflicting situations of the 20s and 30s did not affect the historiography of the problem.



Naturally, one of the conditions for the cultural development of the republic is the proper organization of scientific institutions and scientific tasks. In the period under study, these issues have been widely discussed in the literature. One of the first scientific institutions was the Turkish department (section), which was established in 1918 by Munavvar Qori Abdurashidkhanov under the People's Commissar of Education of TASSR. In the 1920s, a scientific department was established on its basis, and it took on a wide range of tasks, such as creating educational, scientific and scientific-popular literature in local languages based on the study of the culture of Turkestan peoples. The report submitted by Iomudsky to the Council of People's Commissars is a program of the activities of the Scientific Department, which provides for the management of theoretical issues in the museum, library, and archive activities, as well as in the field of art, pedagogy, and science.

In addition, the Scientific Department was responsible for the development of programs and plans for public education among the local population. After N.N. Iomudsky's report was heard and approved at the extended meeting of the People's Commissariat of Education, in 1921, by his decision, the State Scientific Council, a network uniting the work of the Scientific Department and the former Turkish Section, was established. National commissioners (Uzbek, Kyrgyz, Turkmen, and later Tajik commissions) within the Scientific Council were assigned particularly important tasks. In addition to these, there were seven separate commissions for scientific-pedagogical, scientific-political, scientific-technical, artistic, museum, archive and library work. Their main task is to develop the terminology and orthography of Turkic languages, to unite all scientific forces to create educational, pedagogical and scientific-popular literature, to help develop all types of art, including theater and music, to promote the music of Turkestan peoples. had undertaken the task of studying his work. The Elscientific Commission also had a lot of research work to do.

MAIN PART

At the same time as the State Council under the People's Commissariat of Education was established, a Scientific Commission was established under the Council of the People's Commissariat of the TASSR, tasked with studying



the life of the local population of Turkestan. A.E. Schmidt is one of the prominent scientists in his work. Schmidt, S. Andreev, V.N. Day, P.A. Falev, as well as A.A. Divayev, G. Mallisky, N.N. The Iomudskys participated. By 1922, the commission had several documents on the results of scientific expeditions. The Russian Academy of Sciences, taking into account the extremely valuable nature of the scientific research carried out by this commission, V.V. Bartold addressed the RSFSR Committee of the Russian Federation with a report and asked to allocate material funds for its work. In 1922, the Turkestan Commission for the Study of the Lives of Local Population, which worked in close cooperation with the Ethnography Commission of the State Scientific Council, came under his control. At the same time, the State Scientific Council, the first scientific-organizational institution that managed all the scientific centers in the country, was overloaded with absolutely unnecessary facilities, and organizational efforts in its work increased to the extent that it harmed scientific work.

However, according to the information devoted to the analysis of the reports of national and ethnographic commissions published in the magazine "Nauka i prosveshcheyeniye", the activity of the State Scientific Council was extremely useful and effective in some areas. The author of the article is Ye. According to Chernyavsky, Fitrat, Elbek, Cholpon, and Botular greatly helped in the work of the Uzbek commission. A meeting of Uzbek cultural and educational workers was held under the direct leadership of the State Scientific Council. The Turkestan Book Chamber established the magazines "Knowledge Center" and "Nauka i prosveshcheyeniye". However, after the first two issues of these magazines were published, their publication was stopped, which certainly had a negative impact on the development of the historiography of cultural problems. In 1931, instead of the State Scientific Council, which operated until the beginning of the 1930s, a special scientific institution specializing in the study of the cultural development of Uzbekistan - the Scientific Research Institute of Cultural Construction of Uzbekistan was established under the People's Commissariat of Education of the UzSSR.

It includes: pre-school education, pedagogy, general methodology, scientific pedagogy, methodological and program department: literature, language, art, ethnography and folklore departments.



This is not an organizational and management center, but an institute with 27 scientific employees, whose task was to train scientific personnel in the cultural field from representatives of the local population. However, the class approach to personnel selection affected the scientific activity of the institute. If in the early years, 4 professors, 8 docents, 15 assistants of social origin served in the institute, then under the influence of the "proletkult" and the ideas of proletarianization of personnel, the institute was only "cleaned" passed, and only class-wise "pure" people were admitted to post-graduate studies. In M. Ramzi's article dedicated to the opening of the institute, "the task of taking a serious approach, paying special attention to issues of ideological stability and social background when accepting post-graduate students" is firmly set.

According to M. Ramzi's information, requirements such as having a higher education and scientific work in a specialty were not taken into account during admission to postgraduate studies, and such requirements were canceled for individuals with special abilities. Some studies published by the institute show that it is completely far from the direct mission of the institution, that is, research of culture. Although it could not replace the State Scientific Council, the activity of this institute, which was the first specialized scientific center for researching cultural problems, was not affected by the political environment of the 1930s. Unfortunately, this institute could not work objectively and fully in at least 7 out of ten fields and did not have such an opportunity. Because in these years, "the method of dialectical materialism, which is gaining momentum in the conditions of established proletarian class rule, was recognized as a real scientific method." For example, academician N. Marr's article is devoted to the tasks of science in the Soviet East and was prepared on the basis of a lecture delivered at the annual meeting of the Institute of National and Ethnic Culture of the Peoples of the East.

The author draws attention to the training of national personnel for social sciences and thinks about the necessity of establishing local scientific institutions for this purpose. N. Marr believes that teaching in Uzbek language lowers the level of knowledge, V.P. Unlike Volgin, he opposes the nonsense that "due to their cultural backwardness, local youth should be taught in Russian if they want to devote themselves to science."



In his opinion, the people who have given up their mother tongue and have their own language and way of life and study their culture in another language cannot ensure the public's participation in economic and cultural affairs. Although he is not against moving cultural workers from one place to another, N. Marr looked at it with irony, as if moving factories to places without collecting the necessary funds. He supported the idea that nations should be equal and competent employees in the development of science. The article is written in a theoretical tone, and although it does not make specific proposals, it is noteworthy for its objective approach to the issue.

A.L. Bulinsky and V.P. Volgin raised the issue of professional associations under the Union of Educational Workers of the USSR, branches of scientific workers in Uzbekistan and Central Asia. In particular, V.P. Volgin notes that he does not have equal rights with professors and teachers and scientific staff of higher educational institutions of Uzbekistan. M. Ramzi, while confirming these opinions of B. Volgin, at the same time criticizes such a confrontation of the issue, instead of discussing it in official organizations, V. Volgin's opinions are old-fashioned thinking and giving in to "reactionary mood". Most of the articles of this period describe the state of cultural and educational affairs. Their authors think about the specific forms of this industry (for example: women's, workers' clubs, red teahouses, peasant houses, etc.), taking into account the lifestyle characteristics of the local population. Special attention was paid to the role of cinemas in the promotion of culture, ways of developing the national theater were considered. When discussing the Uzbek folk theater that emerged from the circles in old Tashkent, some authors emphasized that it should not be similar to the Russian theater, while others believed that the Russian theater should serve as a model.

The issue of library work, in particular, the work of the Turkestan National Library, was thoroughly reviewed. The development of library work in Uzbekistan made a great contribution to its history, the well-known librarian Ye.K. Betger writes in his articles about the shortcomings of the library, about the loss of books when they are transported from one place to another. His detailed reports on the work of the Turkestan National Library, his articles on the creation of the library and the collection of valuable manuscripts related to the history of Central Asia aroused great interest.



Regarding these issues, A.A. Harrisky's works are also worthy of attention. It is worth noting two of the articles related to the works of the museum in the 20s. One of them was written by A. Nikitin, and the ideas about how the Turkestan museum should be in it have not lost their value even now. He truthfully states that "the museum is a visual proof that shows the level of development of the country and the level of knowledge of its authorities".

It should be noted that the article written by A. Nikitin with excitement was the only article of the program in those years. Anatoly Mironov's article is noteworthy for its valuable information about the reorganization of the art museum in Tashkent, museum funds, and the work of the museum team. In the 1920s and 1930s, there were heated discussions about the development ways and forms of Uzbek literature in the pages of the magazines "Knowledge Center" and "Maarif va Okhita". The staff of the Institute of Literature named after A. Navoi of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan carried out a great deal of research on this literature, and its results were reflected in monographs and articles. For this reason, we will dwell on the fact that representatives of Uzbek literature, who did not want to adapt to the official doctrine, and Uzbek literature in general, began to be ideologically suppressed in the late 1920s and 1930s.

An example of this is a large article written by A. Fitrat published in "Za partyyu" magazine, which sharply criticized the work "Samples from Uzbek literature". The article was directed not only against "Chigatoy Gurungi", but also against Fitrat and A. Hoshimov. Unfortunately, later he withdrew from this path and became a supporter of the official idea. His articles such as "The issue of the state and development of Uzbek Soviet literature" and "The new Uzbek literary language and its orthography" published in the early 1930s testify to this. In these articles, A. Hoshimov develops the theory of class, proletarian Uzbek literature, evaluates "enjoyment of nature", "looking at women with admiration and excitement" as foreign vices, and like many other critics, Uzbek Soviet literature has an iron hand. However, they believes that it is necessary to reflect the life of workers who breathe oil and gasoline.

The works of H. Olimjon, Oybek, Ghairatiy, Khasan Polat, and Uygun were not left out of the fire of this criticism.



The Arabic script was assessed as "an old, clumsy script of the Qur'an" and "most of the peoples of the East do not know the Arabic alphabet, because the literary heritage of these peoples is mainly old and religious" the opinion that the majority of the population will be beneficial" began to prevail. The Chairman of the All-Union Central Committee of the new Turkish alphabet, established in 1927, said that "Mongolian, Tibetan, Manchurian, Korean, Chinese, Burmese and Japanese cultures that began to develop in the recent past are as old as Muslim culture and have stopped developing" and his announcement did not meet any criteria.

Another author, M. Papava, assessed the Arabic writing as a "legacy that has become a heavy burden from the past" and is an obstacle to cultural development in the Eastern republics. In his article written in 1930, M. Papava claims that the new Turkish alphabet has completely won. But in reality, the situation was completely different. Changing the alphabet required a lot of money. For example, in Uzbekistan, 15,000 soums were needed for the retraining of teachers and 18,000 soums for the publishing house, excluding the money spent on the preparation of the typeface in 1927. The new Turkish alphabet was 4 million soums in the account book (estimate) of the All-Union Central Committee for 1928. Amirov remembers the introduction of the new alphabet like this: "...only 15 percent of the publishing plan was fulfilled in the new alphabet. There was a lack of new textbooks, printing press and publishing staff who knew the new alphabet, fonts. Because of this, most of the Uzbek language newspapers and magazines were still published in the old alphabet, and a small part of them was published in the new alphabet. And work in Soviet and public organizations was carried out in this Arabic alphabet, from the center to remote villages."

According to L. Kantor's information, even in the early 20s and early 30s, business and official correspondence continued in the Arabic script. On August 7, 1929, a decision was made on the new Latinized alphabet of the peoples of the MIK and the USSR in the Arabic script. Council member Abdurauf Fitrat, in his speech, pointed out the difficulties in printing and using Arabic graphics, thoroughly analyzed the proposals and ideas for its simplification, and suggested reducing the Arabic alphabet to 31 letters. However, after the speeches of Eshonbek, Abdulla Avloni, and Elbek, it was decided to reduce the letters to 23.



The council emphasized the important role of "Chigatoy Gurungi" in the reform of writing and thanked its members for their activities in this direction. However, by the end of 1922, the issue of changing the alphabet caused a lot of controversy in the assembly of Uzbek education and culture workers. The main speaker is the expert of Central Asian languages, famous linguist, professor Ye.D. Polivanov, like Professor Pavlovich, did not even dream of reforming Russian spelling or replacing it with Latin spelling, because he rightly believed that young Russian generations should be able to read books written in the past.

However, Ye.D. Polivanov, not taking into account that this feeling is also necessary for the Turkic peoples, noting that it is difficult for them to abandon the Arabic alphabet, he also became the initiator of the idea of replacing the script. For an expert like Polivanov, it is said that "traditional Arabic writing is valuable only from the point of view of religious Muslim traditions." After intense discussions and debates, the reformers, supported by the State Scientific Council under the Public Education Commissariat of the Republic of Turkestan, won. In the 6-point decision adopted by the Syezd, it was emphasized that the Uzbek spelling should be preserved on the basis of the Arabic script (printed letters), but it should be adapted a little in order to facilitate reading and learning the writing. In 1926, this problem caused heated discussions at the First All-Union Congress of Turkic Studies held in Baku. A brief report on the work of the parliament published in the magazine "Noviy Vostok" indicates that it went in a premeditated direction.

Those who opened the session until the decision of the Sejd and the results of the vote were determined - the chairman of the Central Committee of the New Turkish Alphabet (NTA) Agamali O'glu, the chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR Musabekov, recognized the historical importance of the sejd in the reform work. those who have passed. 131 delegates participated in the session. The following national composition of the participants of the Syezd is: 8 Uzbeks, 10 Tatars, 32 Turks, 5 Kazakhs, 2 Kyrgyz, 1 Abkhaz, 1 Chechen, 1 Ingush, 1 Nogai, 1 Uyghur, 1 Avar, 3 Karachay, 9 Bashkir nationalities were taken into consideration. 20 of the participants of the meeting were representatives of scientific organizations such as the FA of the USSR, the Scientific Association of Orientalists under the MIK of the USSR, the Ukrainian Academy, the Association of Orientalists of the Caucasus.



In the Syezd case, V.V. Barthold, S.F. It should be noted that famous scientists such as Oldenburg, professors Pavlovich, Borozdin, Zhirkov, Yakovlev, Samoylovich, Shcherba also participated. Some of them gave lectures on problems related to important issues of the history of the Turkic peoples, unrelated to the reform. However, the documents of Pavlovich, Borozdin, and Yakovlev played a decisive role in the decision of the parliament. These Orientalists, who devoted their scientific activities to researching the history and culture of the peoples of the East, were under the strong influence of their time. This can be confirmed by the following words of Professor Pavlovich: "Syezd is an obstacle to spreading culture, education, general literacy among the masses of the people of the Soviet Union with the old Arabic alphabet, awkward spelling, meaningless terms and other obstacles.

"This is the beginning of the great attack of the Turkish-Tatar peoples, who embarked on a new life against the Singapores and Giblaltars of ignorance, ignorance and ignorance." Developing his opinion, Professor Pavlovich, based on superficial comparisons, comes to the following conclusion: "We cannot maintain the method of teaching unimproved spelling, useless terms, because some peoples have an alphabet that can be mastered in 2-3 days, others and cultural equality cannot be imagined in a situation where there is an alphabet to be studied for months. Although the head of the Central Publishing House, N. Torakulov, praised the need to solve this issue taking into account the local conditions, his speech had an extremely sharp tone. Most of the speakers emphasized that those who are against Latinization are in the extreme minority. However, the information known to us does not confirm this.

The main opponents in the syez - the representatives of Tatarstan Olimjon Sharafov, Alfarov, Galimjon Ibragimov, who spoke about the increase in the level of literacy as a result of Latinization, said that the information and numbers of those who spoke about the increase in the level of literacy as a result of Latinization are not true, and the participants of the syez were solemnly informed about the experience of Azerbaijan. who tried to prove that it is not so big and should be checked. The representative of Kazakhstan, Boytursunov, absolutely denied the need for such a reform and stated that Kazakhs have a spelling that meets their requirements. Galimjon Ibragimov, taking into account the work carried out by linguists in order to lighten and simplify the Arabic graphics, did not give an urgent and sharp tone to the issue



of Latinization, but to solve it not in a revolutionary way, but in an evolutionary, i.e., gradual development way. emphasized that it is possible. Nevertheless, these opinions were ignored and came under sharp criticism, and the Seyaz decided on a new Latinized Turkish alphabet. It should be noted that 7 out of 101 people voted against the reform, 6 abstained, and these were representatives of Moscow scientific institutions. Unfortunately, academician V.V. Barthold did not express a clear opinion on this issue, and in his lecture on the tasks of studying the history of the Turkic peoples, he said that the peoples of Central Asia should acquire European culture while preserving their national wealth and achievements. limited by thought.

CONCLUSION

In many articles, it was emphasized that the Arabic script serves religion, religious people, and scholars at the meeting of Turkic scholars. V.V. Barthold, S.F. Oldenburg, A.N. When well-known orientalists like Samoylovich approached this issue objectively and firmly, it was possible that the result would be the right solution. They had to understand that the reform would deprive them of the opportunity to study the sources that illuminate the history and culture of the peoples of the East. Perhaps they understand it well, but unfortunately they followed the official instructions about the reform. They did not help the scientists, trainers, enlightened people who were opponents of reforms in Uzbekistan, Tatarstan and other republics. In the opposition group, Ghozi Olim Yunusov, Ashurali Zahiri, pedagogue and teacher Qayum are the authors of the first 2-volume Uzbek-Russian dictionary, which is the basis of modern Uzbek lexicology.

Ramazonov, Abdurahim Yoldoshev, Polatkhan Kayumov and others were there. They assessed the reform as cultural ignorance. Especially Ashurali Zahiri, who in 1921 made valuable suggestions about the consolidation of the Arabic script and the vocabulary and vocabulary of the Uzbek language at the First All-Uzbek Congress devoted to language and spelling, gave a lot of strength to this struggle. spent. T.N., who supported the idea of Latinization of Ashurali Zahiri. He regularly discussed with Qori-Niyazi. In the official appeal, it is said in a sentence: "The new Turkish alphabet does not have a significant advantage over the Arabic alphabet used in most Turkic peoples, except for its international appearance, which does not gain serious



importance in the conditions where different languages have been preserved." In the following years, this problem became the content of the propaganda work of the party and public organizations that flourished at that time.

Evidence of this, the information that the first working day of the II plenum of the All-Union Central Committee of the New Turkic Alphabet was spent only with the broadcasting of many congratulations, was widely covered in the press. It should be mentioned that propaganda work was the first stage of the policy of Latinization, and during this period, "Arab scholars" who opposed the reform were fiercely fought. In the second stage, committees were formed everywhere, and in the third stage, the law on the Latin alphabet began to be implemented. By the beginning of the 1930s, in solving this problem, in the words of one of the authors of those years, "socialist methods that soaked us in blood and money in our work", "socialist competition", "self-criticism", "progress" words such as "orlik" began to be used, and any discussion on this issue ended, and "the struggle for a new alphabet" began to be considered as a manifestation of the class struggle on the cultural-ideological front.

REFERENCES

1. Agamoli ogli. Rubicon pereigran // Oriental culture and manuscripts. Baku, 1928.
2. Bendrikov K.E. Excerpts from the cultural history of Turkestan. Moscow, 1960.
3. Cantor L. For a new alphabet // Revolution and culture. 1928.
4. Crisis of national enlightenment in Turkestan. Flag of Turkestan. 1923.
5. Ivanov P. Teacher and students // National economy of Central Asia. 1926.
6. Khashimov A. On the issue of the current state and further development of Uzbek Soviet literature // Proceedings of the first conference on the study of the productive forces of the Uzbek SSR. Tashkent: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1932.
7. Papava M. Structure of the new Turkic alphabet // Enlightenment of nations. 1930.
8. Polivanov E.D. About the principles of construction of Turkish language grammar. Lecture abstracts at the meeting of the Pedagogical Commission of the Scientific Council // Science and education. 1922.



9. Ramzi M. The next conquest in the field of cultural construction // Scientific thought. 1930.
10. V. Barthold. About friends and readers from Turkestan. Tashkent, 1927.
11. Volgin V.P. Section of Central Asian scientists // Researcher. Moscow, 1928.