

“The Great Game” Policy in the Uzbek Historiography

Radjabov Ozodbek Aminboevich

Past master of the Faculty of History, the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
E-mail address: article_01@mail.ru

Abstract: *There are such issues in world history that over the years will not lose their relevance and importance. One of these issues is the English-Russian rivalry, which began in Asia in the middle of the XIX century, which means the policy of “the Great Game”. This issue is reflected in the monographs of all the world’s largest historians, many books, magazines and newspapers on international relations and diplomacy.*

Keywords: “The Great Game”, policy, Uzbek history, historiography, geopolitical issue, English scientific school, Russian historical school, “Russian risk”, foreign literature, Central Asia, the New History of Uzbekistan.

1. INTRODUCTION

This geopolitical issue has been studied and evaluated by foreign researchers, historians and politicians for more than a century and a half. There are two main scientific schools for evaluating “the Great Game” policy: 1) English scientific school; 2) Russian historical school. This trend, which initially arose as a result of political battles and struggles, soon broke out of scientific schools and centers. In this article we will try to highlight the Uzbek historiography about the politics of the “the Great Game”.

2. DISCUSSION

The first Uzbek scientist, who studied foreign scientific literature on the politics of “the Great Game” is Goga Abramovich Khidoyatov. A remarkable point of scientific research is that it was not created by a written or desk scholar, but as a result of studying original documents of the British Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defense. The scientist said that the concept of “Russian risk” is multifaceted in nature, is a general concept invented by the British military and political circles. Contributing to this idea is the spread of colonial ideas in Britain and increased chauvinism among the British, which does not allow Indians to act against the British.

G. A. Khidoyatov studied books on “the Great Game” policy, researching from the very beginning to the latest editions, analyzed the genesis of these publications. The strongest part of his research is that he understands the sources in the English archive and it was proved that the concept of “Russian risk” from beginning to end was lie [1].

Unfortunately, scientific researches on this issue was not continued after G.A.Khidoyatov, but the scientific literature on this theme was constantly updated with new works. The new generation of historians and researchers acquaints older British politicians’ scientific works which reflected “Russian risk”. They expand their sources and also resort to foreign sources to light British colonial politics.

On this subject, G. Khidoyatov addressed this issue in his book “History and ideological struggle” and analyzed the work of foreign scientists [2]. The author is critically accustomed to foreign literature based on the spirit of his era.

Historian G. Akhmadzhanov wrote that “According to G.A. Khidoyatov, writing a case in this direction is justified, because it reflects the wrong methods of modern bourgeois historiography, its scientific foundations, its political goals and objectives, ideals and principles in the disclosure and interpretation of these problems” [3].

G. Khidoyatov described the “explicit description of the brutality of the Russian invasion” as an example of the “Islamic threat to the Soviet state” created by A. Benningson and his daughter Mary Brocken, “It is clear that in the history of Russians, the policy of Central Asia must be cruel. It is described, that the lack of evidence and facts has been replaced by sharpness.”

The author also pointed out that there are also works describing the “positive results of Central Asia’s accession to Russia and the progressive consequences of its development for the economy and culture of the country”. He gives an example of the monograph by G. Stephenson “Russia until 1812-1845”[4].

G. Khidoyatov notes that “there are several ways to distort the historical process of Central Asia’s accession to Russia and its various consequences”:

First of all, he wrote, “to deny any positive consequences of this historical event” as a basis for E. Bacon’s ideas “the arrival of Russians ... to the disastrous consequences for the economy, to the destruction of the local culture and the implementation of the policy of the uprising”.

Secondly, “on the other side, during British colonial rule, India was far behind in development. He did an example of the works of R. Pierce and D. Mackenzie.

Thirdly, “many bourgeois historians suggest that alienation between the local and Russian population always grew steadily during the period of tsarism and the Soviet era, Mark Ruff stated that Russians pursued the russification of the peoples of Central Asia and the destruction of local cultures.

Fourthly, The claim that the Russian autocracy pursued a deliberate policy of exterminating the local population was a widespread demand. In accordance with this scheme, a consistent policy will be

developed, including the introduction of cotton, the development of irrigation facilities, the migration of Russian peasants and specialists.

As can be seen from the above, this position of G. Khidoyatov is stated from the point of view of the communist ideology.

One of the first scientific papers related to the subject of Anglo-Russian competitiveness in Central Asia was the book of Bahridin Salokhiddinovich Mannonov "From the history of Russian-Iranian relations of the late XIX - early XX century". This work was completely subordinated to the Soviet ideology [5].

From Uzbek scientists Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Honored Scientist of Uzbekistan Hamid Ziyev has published 186 articles about the English-Russian competition, 14 books about the Russian invasion of Central Asia[6].

The rejection of the stereotypical approach to the problem of the "Great Game" and study of works of foreign historians on the basis of new scientific approaches.

It is advisable to take into account S.Konkina, Y.Temirhodzhaev, K.A.Toktamushev, R.A.Khakimov, N.G.Hidoyatova, D.M.Nishonova, G.Ergahodzhaeva, B.Kusanov, A.M.Zhumashev's [7] researches.

Candidate of Historical Sciences D.N.Nishonov in his thesis on the theme "The English-Russian competition in Central Asia in modern foreign literature of the late XIX century", "Anglo-American Historical Research in Central Asia" (Recommendations for history teachers), tried to cover the "Great Game" policy in Central Asia based on new approaches in scientific researches.

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor G.A.Akhmadzhanov published (1995) his own monography entitled "The Russian Empire in Central Asia (History and Historiography of Tsarism's colonial policy in Turkestan)[8]", and in this book he emphasized the "Great Game" policy. In this work, the scientist drew attention to the works of Roulinson, McGregan, C. Marvin, F. Rodend, N. Dadwell and their articles.

The first President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Abduganievich Karimov met with a group of historians, intellectuals and public figures in 1998. He gave the task of restoring an objective review of the history of the Uzbek statehood, its removal from the "white spots" of the past, to study objectively the history of the Uzbek people during the period of Soviet Russia and the Soviet dictatorship[9].

3. RESULT

July 28, 1998, after, the resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On improving the activities of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan" the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the Academy of State and Social Construction under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan and the Center for New History of

Uzbekistan have further strengthened scientific research. The focus of the study was the Anglo-Russian competition at the end of the XIX century, the establishment of royal(tsar) rule in Central Asia. It should be noted that the following scientific articles are of fundamental importance in this respect[10].

4. CONCLUSION

As a result of the analysis of the "Great game" policy in the Uzbek historiography, it was concluded that in Soviet times, vulgar materialism prevailed, mostly until the end of the Cold War. Foreign observers are considered as "enemies", and "Russians" - as "ours". For many years, studies have been conducted to "expose" the falsification of foreign literature in the field of historiography. The "Great game" policy in the Uzbek historiography rose to a new level after independence and rejected a one-sided approach to the analysis of literature on foreign historiography and stepped toward rationalism.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Хидаятов Г.А. Из истории англо-русских отношений в Средней Азии XIX в. Ташкент, 1969.
- [2] Хидоятов Г.А. Илмий қиёфадаги ёлгон. Ўрта Осиёнинг Россияга қўшиб олиниши проблемаси ҳозирги замон буржуа историографиясида. \Тарих ва мафкуравий кураш.-Тошкент, 1988.-Б.52-66.
- [3] Ахмеджанов Г.А. Российская империя в Центральной Азии. \История и историография колониальной политики царизма в Туркестане\Т.:Фан, 1995.-С.177.
- [4] Хидоятов Г.А. Илмий қиёфадаги ёлгон. Ўрта Осиёнинг Россияга қўшиб олиниши проблемаси ҳозирги замон буржуа историографиясида. \Тарих ва мафкуравий кураш.-Тошкент, 1988.-Б.54.
- [5] Маннанов Б.С. Из истории русско-иранских отношений конца XIX начала XX века. Т.:»Наука». 1964
- [6] Ҳамид Зиёев Истиклол маънавият негизи. Т. 1999 ; Ҳамид Зиёев. Бахтли бўлай десангиз. Т. 2001; Ҳамид Зиёев. Тарих ўтмиш ва келажак кўзгуси. Т. 2000; Ҳамид Зиёев. Тарихнинг очилмаган саҳифалари. Т. 2003
- [7] Конкина С.К. Предпосылки Бухарской народной революции в освещении советологов\Актуальные проблемы истории и историографии Средней Азии. Душанбе. 1990.-С.112-123.; Темирходжаев Дж.П. Советская и зарубежная историография истории деятельности полномочных органов Коммунистической партии и Советского правительства в Средней Азии. Автореф. дисс. канд. ист. наук. Ташкент. 1991.; Токтамушев К.А. Великий К.А. Великий Октябрь и начало социалистических преобразований в Туркестане(1918-1924 гг) В новейшей советологии.

- Автореф. дисс. канд. ист. наук. Фрунзе, 1990; Хакимов Р.А. Народ и басмаческое движение в Средней Азии в освещении англо-американской историографии. Автореф. дисс. канд. ист. наук. Ташкент. 1992; Хидоятлова Н.Г. Басмаческое движение в современной советологии. Автореф. дисс. канд. ист. наук. Ташкент. 1993.; Нишонов Д.М. Англо-русский конфликт в Средней Азии в конце XIX в в современной зарубежной литературе. Автореф. дисс. канд. ист. наук. Т. 1994.- Б.118.; Англо-американская историография о Средней Азии в \Рекомендации учителям истории\ Т. 1994.-С.26.; Эргашхўжаева Г. 20 йиллар Ўрта Осиё хотин-қизлар эманципацияси француз тарихшунрслиги талқинида (50-80 йиллар адабиётлари асосида) Автореф. дисс. канд. ист. наук. Ташкент. 1996.-Б.120.; Кошанов Б., Джумашев А.М. Зарубежная и отечественная историография истории Туркестана, Хорезма и Каракалпакстана в первой четверти XX века. Нукус. Каракалпакстан. 1997.-С.45.
- [8] Ахмеджанов Г.А. Российская империя в Центральной Азии. \История и историография колониальной политики царизма в Туркестане\ Т.:Фан, 1995.-С.217.
- [9] Каримов И.А. Тарихий хотирасиз келажак йўқ. \Мулоқот, 1998, 5 сон.
- [10] Ўзбекистон тарихи: Янги нигоҳ. Жадидлар ҳаракатидан миллий мустақилликка қадар. Т. 1998.; Жадидчилик: ислохот, янгиланиш, муст ақиллик ва тараккиёт учун кураш (Туркистон ва Бухоро жадидчилиги тарихига янги чизгилар). Т., 1999.