

Eckert.Beiträge 2010/8

Sergey Abashin

**Reviews of Uzbek History Textbooks  
The View from Russia**

Abashin, Sergey. „Reviews of Uzbek History Textbooks: The View from Russia.“  
*Eckert.Beiträge* 2010/8. <http://www.edumeres.net/urn/urn:nbn:de:0220-2010-00455>.

**edumeres.net**



*Diese Publikation wurde veröffentlicht unter der creative-commons-Lizenz:  
Namensnennung-Keine kommerzielle Nutzung-Keine Bearbeitung 3.0 Unported;  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/deed.de>*

Sergey Abashin

Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology,  
Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow

### Reviews of Uzbek History Textbooks: The View from Russia.<sup>1</sup>

In 2002, D. Rurikov, the ambassador of the Russian Federation in Uzbekistan, sent a letter of protest to the Russian Federation Ministry of Publishing and Information against the publication in the Republic of Uzbekistan of a textbook (in the Russian language) for 9<sup>th</sup> grade general education school. In the opinion of the ambassador, the textbook authored by Zh. Rakhimov, in which the Turkestan territory within the Russian Empire was discussed (the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century) had an “anti-Russian tendency,” was “extremely biased,” and “negatively” covered the events of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, “obscuring” the real historical picture of that time. D. Rurikov surmises that the “History Book of Zh. Rakhimov,” is one of the reasons why, in recent years, 300,000 Russians left Uzbekistan and moved to new areas. In the ambassador’s opinion, what was preferable was a “more correct” textbook by G.A. Khidoyatov and V.A. Kostetsky, although it “provoked many questions.”

The purpose of this evaluation is to elucidate the following questions:

1. Whose position does the textbook reflect?
2. Does the textbook express the facts accurately?
3. Is there an “anti-Russian tendency” in the indicated textbooks?

#### **Zh. Rakhimov. History of Uzbekistan (Second Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries). Textbook for 9<sup>th</sup> grade. Tashkent, 2001, 334 pages.**

1. As can be seen from the title page, the textbook was published first in 1999 in the Uzbek language. In 2001, a reprint appeared, translated into the Russian language. The print run of the reprint was 30,000. The textbook was “approved” by the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan as a textbook for 9<sup>th</sup> grade students of a general education school. The author -- Zhumaboy Rakhimov -- is a Ph.D. candidate in historical sciences, specializing in the popularization of historical knowledge and little known in scientific circles.

Rakhimov is a Ph.D. candidate in historical sciences, specializing in the popularization of historical publications and little known in research circles. He is not involved in professional study of Turkestan at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The book was edited by Prof. K. Usmanov, Ph.D. in historical sciences, and as reviewers were named Academician B. Akhmedov, Ph.D. in historical sciences; A. Saadullaev also Ph.D in historical sciences, and N. Zhuraev, candidate in political sciences and also several teachers. Thus, the textbook had a quite official character, a fairly massive print run, it was “blessed” by the name of respected Uzbek academics (for example, Academician B. Akhmedov).

2. The textbook from the very first pages declares that it was placing “truthfulness” and “objectivity” (p. 3) as “the main priority.” Even so, the content of the curriculum suffers from clearly one-sided evaluations and judgements.

<sup>1</sup> Zh. Rakhimov. *Istoriya Uzbekistana (vtoraya polovina XIX veka – nachalo XX veka)*, Curriculum for 9<sup>th</sup> grade. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2001; 2) G.A. Khidoyatov, V.A. Kostetsky. *Istoriya Uzbekistana (vtoraya polovina XIX-nachalo XX veka)*, Tashkent: Uzinkomtsentr, 2002.

In the book you can find quite a few mistakes. For the sake of fairness, a significant number of these mistakes are the result of carelessness and not a deliberate distortion of the facts. But these, too, can be found.

For example, Zh. Rakhimov writes that under the Russians “the taxes were increased” which the peasants had to pay (p. 148). But he “forgot” to say that the taxes consisted of only 10 percent of the harvest, whereas before the Russian conquest the peasants paid 25 percent. Zh. Rakhimov writes that “the foreigners” tried to study the Russian language and Russian culture, but in Russian society “they were not loved” and as an example the Kazakh figures Abay Kunanbayev and Chokan Valikhanov are mentioned (p. 287) which also is an untruth, since these were in fact figures who enjoyed great respect, had high ranks and occupations in Russian society and were advocates of a deeper Russian influence on the Central Asian population.

If Zh. Rakhimov can be reproached, it is rather not in actual mistakes but in the very prejudicial interpretation of the facts, the exaggeration of negative aspects and silence about positive. I will cite several examples.

Speaking of the administrative reforms of 1870-1880, Zh. Rakhimov describes in detail the system of rule of Turkestan territory, in particular the structure of the central administration, the regional and district governance. After this, the conclusion is made that the system of government is a “form of Russian rule” and “contradicts the special features of historical development of the peoples of Central Asia” (p. 147). Yet it is “forgotten” here that the Russian government introduced the concept of “local self-governance” at the level of the volost [district] and rural community, transferring all the rights to select the local officials to the “people” itself, organizing a very democratic procedure for these elections and providing the local bodies of government (the “assembly” and the “administrators” with great powers. Essentially, this was the first experiment in establishing democracy in the region after 100 years of arbitrariness and despotism.

Speaking of economic reforms and changes in Turkestan territory, Zh. Rakhimov writes exclusively of the impoverishment of the peasants and of the growth in the number of landless (pp. 157-158, 203), on the ruination of the craftsmen (p. 159-160), the construction of the railroads in the region he describes as only a means of “extracting raw materials” (p. 153), the cotton monopoly as “the plundering of Turkestan” (p. 201) and so on. Yet nothing is said about the fact that the railroad (built on state funds) connected Central Asia to the rest of the world, opening up a route to the West and East for the inhabitants of the region, filling the region with cheap and good-quality goods, enabling cultural and economic development. Phrases such as “extracting raw materials” is a crude distortion, since this raw material was bought, and in fact for decent amounts of money. The cotton monopoly (and the high prices on cotton), with all its negative consequences, dramatically raised (!) the living standards of the local population. Moreover, even the landless workers, forced to work for hire, began to receive more than the farm-holder had once earned on average. The population of Turkestan grew 2-2.5 times in size in 50 years (from 3-3.5 million people at the time of conquest to 7.5 million by 1916) and reached those numbers which Central Asia before this had never known. This means that mortality (especially child mortality!) among the inhabitants of Turkestan was sharply reduced, and the life expectancy rose, which could not have happened with a total impoverishment and a worsening of the quality of life. As for exploitation, it took place not only from Russian industrialists and merchants but from the local riches (bay) and dealers, about whom the author of the textbook only very reluctantly speaks.

And the final example. The author writes, “The Russian colonizers were constantly in a ‘state of war’ with the Turkestani people. They stopped at nothing and wanted to virtually destroy the local customs of the Muslims” (p. 174). After this, numerous instances of uprisings and disorders are listed, demonstrating the “national liberation movement”. A careful reading, however, shows that among the “national-liberation” incidents is included the uprising against the Kokand khan (even before the Russian conquest of this state), and numerous disorders that took place before the elections (!) of village and volost officials from the native population. A certain Namaz is turned into a “popular avenger,” who, judging from the description of his “triumphs” for an entire four pages (pp. 215-218) was a common criminal. The author speaks in detail about the famous uprising of 1898 in Andijan under the leadership of Dukchi-ishan, ascribing primary significance to this event in the “national-liberation struggle,” but for some reason forgets to say that the majority of the local (that is, native) intelligentsia condemned the actions of Dukchi-ishan and even the Bukhara scientist Abduazim Sami (whom Zh. Rakhimov figures among the most significant figures of local culture (p. 295) and whom is hard to suspect of sympathies to the Russians), having spoken negatively with regard to the leaders of the Andijan revolt.

At the end of the textbook, Zh. Rakhimov cites a list point by point of the sins of the Russian Empire “in the area of policy”, “in the area of economics” and “in the area of public education and school education (pp. 325-326). An analogous list of achievements did not find a place in the book.

An analysis of the textbook, prepared by the Uzbek historian Zh. Rakhimov, cites in conclusion that the book reviewed, undoubtedly contains **numerous cases of distortion of facts, contradictions and one-sided interpretations**. Moreover, all of these shortcomings are not a chance selection but have the obvious purpose **to place the policy of the Russian Empire in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries exclusively in a negative light**.

3. Zh. Rakhimov clearly misuses negative and emotionally-colored terminology in the description of the events at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> centuries. In the conquest of Central Asia by the Russia, in his opinion, “the brutality was unparalleled” (p. 83) (“unparalleled” means the Russian conquerors were more harsh than all the other conquerors?) This characteristic was accompanied by descriptions of military actions in which Russian soldiers are portrayed in the role of sadists, killing old men, women and children indiscriminately. This picture is supplemented with photographs and drawings with corpses (without reference to the source) which even further increases the emotional affect on the reader (15-16 year olds!) As Zh. Rakhimov maintains, the Russian authorities (“Russian chauvinists”) had “distrust” in the local population and “disrespect” and “other forms of chauvinist relations” (p. 133). In the opinion of the author, the Russian rulers were “cunning” and “implacable enemies of the peoples of Central Asia (p. 133).

Anyone who cooperated with the Russian authority is labeled “traitors” (which was “doglike... faithful” (p. 250) in serving the colonial administration, all those who stood up against it were “patriots”.

The author contrasts other empires of that time -- France and Great Britain -- believing that they were “mild” regarding their colonial subjects. He writes that Russia is a “theft of property on a world scale” (p. 133) citing some “expression” famous in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In another place, the author cites some anonymous author of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century: “history itself has provided the Russian people with the capabilities of the colonizer” (p. 195).

Some expressions of Zh. Rakhimov regarding Russian culture in the past could be if desired interpreted as its attitude toward modern Russian culture in Uzbekistan. Zh. Rakhimov speaks with clear dislike of the settlement of the “Russians” and the “Slavs” in Central Asia on at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> centuries (p. 149), supposing that “representatives of the Russian nationality should be a bulwark of Russian tsarism, performing the role of informants.” (p. 149), and the migration itself of the Russian population negatively reflections on the “moral and material aspects of life of the local population” (p. 152). In these expressions can be found a veiled setting off of the local and Russian population. Just as negatively the author evaluates the incorporation of Russian-native schools in Turkmenistan, seeing in this a policy of Russification (pp. 285-286). Here, for example, one can guess a hint to the negative attitude toward the teaching of the Russian language in modern Uzbek schools.

Obvious striving to minimize the significance of Russian culture can be found in the section of the textbook which is devoted to the “cultural life of Turkestan” at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Zh. Rakhimov writes about the “honest” and “leading” and “selfless” Russian scientists who “deserve the gratitude” “of our nation” (pp. 288-298). Yet the caveat is made that Russian scientists were employed in the colonial policy. In the account of concrete figures of culture, Russian scientists are relegated to the background, and some of them (N.I. Veselovsky, A.L. Kun, N.A. Severtsev, P.P. Semyonov-Tyanshansky, A.P. Fedchenko and others) are only briefly mentioned, but about the majority (V. Nalivkin, H. Lykoshin, A. Semyonov, N. Ostroumov and many others) almost nothing is said. Nothing is said about the great Orientalist V.V. Bartold. From Zh. Rakhimov’s perspective, judging from the textbook in the “cultural life” of Central Asia there was no Russian architecture, music, theater, and so on. The natural question arises: does Russian culture exist as a part of the cultural life of modern Uzbekistan?

Some of Zh. Rakhimov’s statements could be called provocative. For example the author mentions other colonies where a “ruthless empire” ruled. Thus on one level he cites “from the coast of the Baltic Sea” to “the Ukrainian steppes” the “Kazakh heights” and “the Far East”. Here, among those seized into captivity is “Bashkirtostan”, Siberia and Kalmykia (p. 133). Aside from the mistake (the Kalmyks settled in the 18<sup>th</sup> century on the Lower Volga with permission from the Russian authorities, and there was no conquering of Kalmykia), these phrases can be interpreted as a dislike of modern Russian status of the territories enumerated, which would be strange for a publication officially “approved” by a government agency of Uzbekistan. For the sake of fairness it must be said that the author is not calling for the “liberation” of Kalmykia or “Bashkirtostan” and the mentioning of these regions is rather accidental in nature.

Zh. Rakhimov is not an apologist for the East. In the textbook, he very cautiously speaks of Islam, whose significance is even minimized. The author supports progress, sympathetically writes of the struggle with vestiges of the past, the backwardness and ignorance, and condemns the “ignorant and fanatic forces of Turkestan” which “negatively perceived all of advanced European science and culture” (p. 288).

Twice, before the introduction and conclusion -- the author reiterates that the textbook does not have an anti-Russian tendency. The first time he writes: “when in the book such terms are encountered such as “Russian occupiers”, “Russian chauvinists” it would be incorrect to apply them to the entire Russian people. The chief blame for this lies on the Russian leadership.” (p. 6) And here the following is said: “It must be taken into account that both tsarist Russia and the Soviets raised the Russian people in the spirit of chauvinism” (p. 6). In conclusion, Zh. Rakhimov once

again makes the caveat: “unquestionably, the policy of tsarist Russia was essentially alien to the Russian people” (p. 315) and “no one is interested in disruption of the friendship between the Russian and Uzbek peoples” (p. 316). It has to be admitted that this sort of insert appears forced and artificial.

Thus, the textbook **contains within it an anti-Russian sub-text, emphasizing the alien and even hostile nature of Russian culture to the Central Asian population, opposing Russia and Russians to Central Asian society.** This anti-Russian tendency, however, has an **implied, hidden nature.** The author of the textbook provides the caveat, at least formally, that his complaints about the Russian Empire do not extend to the Russian people.

**G.A. Khidoyatov, V.A. Kostetsky. The History of Uzbekistan (Second Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and Beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries). Textbook for 9<sup>th</sup> Grade. Tashkent, 2002, 159 pp.**

1. This guide was published in 2002 in the Russian language. The print run of the reprint was 10,000. The book was “recommended” by the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan (MNO RU) as a textbook for 9<sup>th</sup> grade students in a general education school. As indicated, the textbook is the winner of a tender organized in 2002 by the MNO RU. The authors are a professor of the University of World Economy and Diplomacy, a Foreign Ministry consult Goga Abramovich Khidoyatov and the chief methodologist of the Republican Center for Education, a teacher of history and law, Vasily Anufriyevich Kostesky. The first of them, the former deacon of the Historical Faculty of the Tashkent State University (now the National University) is known for his numerous publications and speeches at international conferences. The second is the designer of tests in history for those entering institutions of higher education, the author of numerous textbooks and methodological guides. Participation in the writing of the book by these two authors should symbolize objectivity and moderation in its contents. Both authors are nevertheless not specialists in Turkestan at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The reviewers named are Prof. D. Alimov, Ph.D. in historical sciences (director of the Institute of History of the Academy of Science of the Republic of Uzbekistan), K. Radzhabov, Ph.D. candidate in historical sciences, officials from a number of state agencies responsible for education, and several teachers. Thus, **the textbook has a more official nature than the book by Zh. Rakhimov, but has a smaller print run.**

2. The textbook is twice as small in size as Zh. Rakhimov’s book. The material in it is fairly dry and brief. Nevertheless, this book is not free of shortcomings.

This textbook also is marred by distortion of the facts. For example, speaking of the system of local self-government, the authors write: “If in precolonial times the appointment to office was a result of careful (!) selection of candidates, recognition of trust in him on the part of the population and his competency, then the electoral system weakened these requirements” (p. 56). It thus turns out that arbitrariness in the khanates, where people were appointed only by kinship, for bribes or as a result of conquests and uprisings, is better than a democratic system of elections (by the whole population, by the majority of votes!).

The authors write that “the lands of the Turkestan territory” as a result of the agrarian reforms of 1870-1880 became “the property of Russia” and “the local population was deprived of historical rights to its own land” (p. 51). In fact, the native population obtained from Russia its lands for inherited, inalienable use with the right to buy or sell it, that is virtually as private property. Furthermore, lamenting regarding the introduction by the Russian government of some restrictions (and not prohibitions) on endowment property of Muslim institutions, the authors mention in

passing that the land, according to the Edict of 1886 was transferred without compensation from rich workers. This was a reform that was of an order more progressive than the analogous reform of 1861 in the domestic regions of Russia (under which the Russian peasants received land for redemption and so on). The topic of the lowering of taxes by the Russian authorities is not addressed at all by the authors.

The authors, like Zh. Rakhimov, write about the railroads only from a negative perspective (p. 58). Even the liberation of the native population from the draft, which was unquestionably a special privilege for conquered territories (and the violation of which, in fact was a reason for the disorders of 1916) is interpreted negatively -- like a sequestering of the local inhabitants from military affairs (p. 59). Here the textbook is little distinguished from what Zh. Rakhimov writes. This is what concerns the consequences of the economic policy of Russia which G.A. Khidoyatov and V.A. Kostetsky, like Zh. Rakhimov, characterize almost exclusively in a negative vein: it led to the "ruin" and "impoverishment" of the people and so on (pp. 61-64). In the same tone is written the conclusion: "the colonization of the territory of tsarist Russia led at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to a deep political and economic crisis in Turkestan" (p. 140). No positive results from the entry into the Russian Empire are seen by the authors (the increase in revenues, the growth of the population, the appearance of the first democratic institutions, the penetration of European culture, the discovery of the world and so on). thus, the general conceptual line in the textbook of G.A. Khidoyatov and V.A. Kostetsky is the same as in Zh. Rakhimov's textbook.

3. The authors of the textbook do not counterpose the local population to the Russian. Unlike Zh. Rakhimov, who clearly abuses the word "Russian" in proximity with the words "conqueror," "colonizer," "chauvinist" and so on and is then forced to "justify himself" and emphasize his loyalty to "the Russian people," G.A. Khidoyatov and V.A. Kostetsky do neither of these things.

The authors of this textbook, unlike Zh. Rakhimov, do not use terminology and photographs, which could give the text an emotionally negative coloring. Even some of the complex episodes, for example, from the history of the conquest of Central Asia, which have an advantage in terms of demonstrating the brutality of Russian soldiers, is carefully explicated. Thus, during the uprising in Samarkand in the summer of 1868, there really were killed a number of local residents, including innocents, and the population of the city really did fiercely resist the occupiers. The Russian artist V. Vereshchagin wrote about this in his memoirs. Zh. Rakhimov actively employs in his book this testimony, whereas G.A. Khidoyatov and V.A. Kostetsky write: "the troops of the emir entered the city and together with the Samarkand rebels attacked the citadel of the city, where the garrison of tsarist troops were secured. The attack was spontaneous and for regular troops, who had gone through good combat training, it was not difficult to repel the attack by the rebels" (p. 36). And that's it! Curiously, in describing the so-called "cholera uprising" in Tashkent in 1892, the authors of the textbook especially emphasize that it was not "anti-Russian" and was directed most likely against representatives of the local government (p. 68). I will recall, that Zh. Rakhimov considered the "cholera uprising" one of the obvious facts of the "national-liberation movement". Without piety, G. A. Khidoyatov and V.A. Kostetsky write also about the uprising of Dukchi-ishan in 1898. In the book, there is no counterposing of Russia to other colonial powers of that time. The sense is absent, which is created from reading Zh. Rakhimov's book, that it was Russia that was the most harsh and the most unjust empire.

In the section on the "development of culture in Turkestan," however, some ideas are repeated that have a place in Zh. Rakhimov's book. A large part of the section is devoted to local figures of

science, art and literature. About the Russians it is said that “for a long time, almost nothing was done to conduct scientific research” (p. 127) and “scientific explorations were conducted episodically, chiefly through the efforts of enthusiasts, without the support of the government” (p. 128). And that is despite the fact that one can name hundreds if not thousands of titles of works of that time in the Russian language devoted to Central Asia! And that is despite the fact that in the territory, there were several research societies, many of which were under the patronage of the state! And that despite the fact that the government allocated from its treasury funds for repair and restoration of destroyed monuments of culture, the creation of museums and libraries, the conducting of archeological and ethnographic research! Of the Russian academics, only V.L. Vyatkin is named (p. 128) despite the fact that dozens of Russian scholars right to be preserved in the memory of the residents of Uzbekistan.

Again, as with Zh. Rakhimov, not a word is said about V.V. Bartold. Thus, the textbook written by G.A. Khidoyatov and V.A. Kostesky undoubtedly is **far more polite and neutral** in describing the events of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. But in the majority of cases this politeness and neutrality has a superficial nature. **Meanwhile, as for the content or the conceptual side, the textbook of G.A. Khidoyatov and V.A. Kostesky is little distinguished from that of Zh. Rakhimov.**

Conclusions:

1. The textbooks referenced are offensive to read. In some of their parts, what is written in them is inaccurate and unfair. One cannot demand scientific accuracy and complete objectivity from a textbook, since presupposes simplified theses and formulations. With rare exceptions, nothing essentially “criminal” regarding modern Russia, nothing candidly and openly anti-Russian is contained in these books. They are not aimed at confrontation with today’s Russia. The object of their enmity is the former Russia. The condemnation of the colonial period has become in modern Uzbekistan part of the national ideology (national mythology!), that is, an element of primarily internal, not external policy. Similar expressions on the role of Russia in Central Asia at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, varying in degrees of emotionality and proof, **can be heard from all the Uzbek scientists and politicians**, including President Islam Karimov. This common ideological method, to which all the recently emerged national states resort for legitimization of the new regime, is consolidation of the new nation out of diverse ethnic, confessional and clan remnants. Something similar can be seen in Russia itself -- both on the level of the national republics as well as on the level of the Russian nationalist self-consciousness (for example, we write more in textbooks about the negative consequences of the Tatar-Mongolian conquest or the negative goals of Napoleon in 1812, although in the first case there were obvious positive results -- an end to internecine strife, and in the second, a promise to liberate the Russian peasant from the humiliating dependency on serfdom.

2. It must be admitted that the ideologizing of the Uzbek textbooks is in some degree the result of the ideologizing of the Soviet era. The current distortion of history is a result of the “effect of negation” when everything that was said and claimed in the past is refuted, and the “effect of negation” when suddenly the society is presented with some unknown and hidden facts and also opinions and evaluations are allowed that were until now considered forbidden. Of course under such conditions, exaggerations are inevitably, but this stage has to be suffered and then survived. Furthermore, Russian scholarship cannot yet oppose the “nationalist” and “anticolonialist” perspective on the history of Central Asia with some other alternative version, which could avoid

bout the pitfalls of the ‘empire’ and “Soviet” vision as well as the modern mistakes.

Unfortunately, the current politicians and scholars of Russia are themselves at times not prepared to acknowledge obvious things -- more victims among the local population during the conquest of Central Asia, the presence of an entire layer of culture in the works of the jadids, economic and political mistakes of the Turkestan authority and so on. **Our scholarship cannot unambiguously answer the questions of what was “good” and what was “bad” in the history of the Russian Empire.** Are we right to criticize our colleagues? Furthermore, we must take into consideration that in Uzbekistan there is no unambiguous assessment of the role of Russia, which is demonstrated by the book by G.A. Khidoyatov and V.A. Kostetsky, published and proposed to schools instead of the book by Zh. Rakhimov.

3. The Russian side, at the level of the ambassador in the Republic of Uzbekistan and so on is right to raise the issue that official publications, above all textbooks for general education schools, should be written properly, without attacks against “the Russian people,” without unreliable facts, negatively covering the history of Russia, without offensive labels, and so on. Nevertheless, **protests** on the side of the Russian government agencies regarding the content of these curriculum guides devoted to the history of Turkestan within the Russian Empire, that is, to **history of 100 years antiquity**, in my view, **are not needed.** These protests could only increase the interest of the Uzbek public in the book by Zh. Rakhimov, and make the author a popular figure, and provoke sympathy toward him due to these attacks of the “new colonizers”. A different strategy would be more intelligent: grounded scholarly criticism of these views outlined above, support of our own (Russian) scholars studying the history and culture of Central Asia; conduct of joint scholarly research with Uzbeks (and not only Uzbeks but Tajiks, Kazakhs, etc.), conferences, seminars (including the invitation of Uzbek scholars to conferences in Russia); the offering of opportunities for Uzbek specialists to apply for graduate study and intern in the major institutions of higher learning and institutes of Russia and so on.