

C E S R



Central Eurasian Studies Review

Volume 4

Number 2

The **CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES REVIEW (CESR)** is a publication of the Central Eurasian Studies Society (CESS). CESR is a scholarly review of research, resources, events, publications and developments in scholarship and teaching on Central Eurasia. The Review appears two times annually (Winter and Summer) beginning with Volume 4 (2005) and is distributed free of charge to dues paying members of CESS. It is available by subscription at a rate of \$50 per year to institutions within North America and \$65 outside North America. The Review is also available to all interested readers via the web. **Guidelines for Contributors** are available via the web at <http://cess.fas.harvard.edu/CESR.html>.

CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES REVIEW Editorial Board

Chief Editors: Marianne Kamp (Laramie, Wyo., USA), Virginia Martin (Huntsville, Ala., USA)

Section Editors:

Perspectives: Robert M. Cutler (Ottawa/Montreal, Canada)

Research Reports: Jamilya Ukudeeva (Aptos, Calif., USA)

Reviews and Abstracts: Shoshana Keller (Clinton, N.Y., USA), Philippe Forêt (Zurich, Switzerland)

Conferences and Lecture Series: Payam Foroughi (Salt Lake City, Utah, USA)

Educational Resources and Developments: Daniel C. Waugh (Seattle, Wash., USA)

Editors-at-Large: Ali İğmen (Seattle, Wash., USA), Morgan Liu (Cambridge, Mass., USA), Sebastien Peyrouse (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)

Copy Editor: Michael Davis (Kirksville, Mo., USA)

English Language Style Editor: Helen Faller (Philadelphia, Penn., USA)

Production Editor: Sada Aksartova (Washington, D.C., USA)

Web Editor: Paola Raffetta (Buenos Aires, Argentina)

Editorial and Production Consultant: John Schoeberlein (Cambridge, Mass., USA)

Manuscripts and related correspondence should be addressed to the appropriate section editors:

Perspectives: R. Cutler, rmc@alum.mit.edu; **Research Reports:** J. Ukudeeva, jaukudee@cabrillo.edu; **Reviews and**

Abstracts: S. Keller, skeller@hamilton.edu; **Conferences and Lecture Series:** P. Foroughi, Central-Asia@utah.edu;

Educational Resources and Developments: D. Waugh, dwaugh@u.washington.edu.

Other editorial correspondence (letters to the editors, formal responses to CESR articles, etc.) and inquiries about advertising in CESR should be addressed to: Dr. Virginia Martin, University of Alabama in Huntsville, Dept. of History RH402, Huntsville, AL 35899, USA, Fax: +1/256-824-6477, martinvi@email.uah.edu or Dr. Marianne Kamp, University of Wyoming, Dept. of History, Laramie, WY 82071, USA, Fax: +1/307-766-5192, mkamp@uwyo.edu.

Publishers should send their new books for review to: The Central Eurasian Studies Society (see below).

Business correspondence, including membership and subscription information, back issues, changes of address and related communications should be addressed to: The Central Eurasian Studies Society.

CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES REVIEW

c/o John Schoeberlein, Director, CESS Secretariat
Harvard Program on Central Asia and the Caucasus
1730 Cambridge Street., Room 327
Cambridge, MA 02138, USA



Central Eurasian Studies Review

Publication of the Central Eurasian Studies Society

Volume 4, Number 2

Summer 2005

ISSN 1543-7817 (On-line)

PERSPECTIVES

- Comparative Perspectives on Central Asia and the Middle East in Social Anthropology and the Social Sciences (Part 1 of 2)*, Gabriele Rasuly-Paleczek 2

RESEARCH REPORTS

Selected Papers from the 2005 CESS Conference

- Central Asians in Russia: Navigating Multiethnicity in Soviet and Post-Soviet Urban Worlds*, Jeff Sahadeo 18

- An Uyghur Meshrep Dichotomy*, Dilber Kahraman Thwaites 22

Report on Research Findings

- The Kyrgyz in Western Travel Books of the Late 19th and Early 20th Centuries*, Cholpon Turdalieva 25

REVIEWS AND ABSTRACTS

- Colette Harris, *Control and Subversion: Gender Relations in Tajikistan*. Reviewed by Najam Abbas 30

- Willard Sunderland, *Taming the Wild Field: Colonization and Empire on the Russian Steppe*. Reviewed by Marianne Kamp 32

- Hasan B. Paksoy, *Central Asia Reader: The Rediscovery of History*. Reviewed by Nathan Light 33

- Edward Schatz, *Modern Clan Politics: The Power of "Blood" in Kazakhstan and Beyond*. Reviewed by Virginia Martin 35

- Will Prentice, *Before the Revolution: A 1909 Recording Expedition in the Caucasus and Central Asia by the Gramophone Company*. Reviewed by Tanya Merchant 37

- Rafis Abazov, *Historical Dictionary of Turkmenistan*. Reviewed by Begench Karaev 39

CONFERENCES AND LECTURE SERIES

- IFEAC Regional Conference, "Tengrism as a New Factor in the Construction of Identity"*, Marlène Laruelle 40

- Situating the Uyghurs between China and Central Asia*, Ildikó Bellér-Hann, Cristina Cesàro, Rachel Harris, and Joanne N. Smith 41

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENTS

- Central Eurasia Across the Curriculum and Beyond Institutional Walls: A Tale from Real Life*, Ali F. İğmen and Daniel C. Waugh 43

- Overview of Activities in Central Asian Studies at the University of Chicago, September 2000-Present*, Kağan Arık 46

Perspectives

Comparative Perspectives on Central Asia and the Middle East in Social Anthropology and the Social Sciences (Part 1 of 2)

Gabriele Rasuly-Paleczek, Associate Professor, Institute for Cultural and Social Anthropology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria, gabriele.rasuly@univie.ac.at

This article argues that there is a need to examine critically the applicability to Central Asia of concepts and models developed in social anthropology in general and especially in the anthropology of the Middle East. It highlights some of the shortcomings in current approaches by focusing on the notion of segmentary lineage organization as a basic feature of tribal societies. Recently not only social anthropologists but also others, including political scientists, have applied this concept in analyzing political systems in post-Soviet Central Asia. Indeed, the notion of political system could be expanded to include the historical relations of tribal societies with states and empires in the region, as well as the clientelism prevalent in Central Asian politics today.

The emergence of a genuinely comparative approach may be illustrated by examining two key concepts in the Western tradition of social anthropology that social scientists in other disciplines now apply to Central Asia. These concepts are “tribe and state” and “segmentary lineage organization in tribal societies.” This discussion will also show why interdisciplinary approaches are necessary, particularly as other disciplines increasingly seek to make use of concepts from social anthropology.

The General Situation of Social Anthropological Studies of Central Asia

Social anthropology occupies an undeservedly marginal position within Central Asian studies, a field that was itself for decades a blind spot in Western scholarship. Social anthropology’s delay in beginning to create knowledge in the field of Central Asian studies contrasts with the growing number of studies published by scholars from other disciplines. The number of publications devoted to the social

anthropology of Central Asia is fairly limited, its scientific community is somewhat small, and the participation of social anthropologists in international meetings devoted to the region has in recent years been relatively restricted. Also, the position of social anthropologists studying Central Asia within social anthropology as a whole is rather peripheral. Beyond these weaknesses lie questions about which theoretical and methodological approaches proper to social anthropology would be appropriate to Central Asian studies.

There are a number of reasons for the weak state of the field today, related both to its history and to its present situation. For decades, with few exceptions, Soviet Central Asia remained closed to Western social anthropologists. The handful of Western social anthropologists who carried out research in Soviet Central Asia included Bacon (a few weeks in the 1930s and the 1960s) and Schoeberlein (extended fieldwork during 1986-91), while some other anthropologists (e.g., Aberle, Krader) did research with Soviet émigré groups and Soviet sources; a few also worked in other parts of Soviet Eurasia, including Dragadze in Georgia, Balzer in Sakha and Humphrey in Buryatia.¹ Scholars such as Bacon, Balzer and Humphrey were able to do fieldwork only in the context of officially controlled visits or within the framework of short-term field expeditions organized by Soviet ethnographers.

Prior to the breakup of the Soviet Union, Soviet ethnographers and anthropologists undertook most of the research in the region. Their research findings were usually published only in Russian, a language not widely used by Western social anthropologists. Consequently, their work found only a small readership in the best of cases. Also, a

¹ See bibliography for a listing of works by these scholars and those mentioned in subsequent sections of this article.

very limited number of Soviet anthropological works on Central Asia were translated into other languages; Khazanov (1984) is the only prominent exception, though it is based more on history than anthropological field research. Western scholars, such as Dunn and Dunn (1974), Balzer (1990) and Dragadze (1984), introduced their colleagues to the research of their Soviet counterparts through edited volumes. Western journals such as *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology* and *Central Asian Review* offered English translations of Soviet research in the social anthropology of Central Asia, while occasional articles appeared in edited volumes (e.g., Basilov (1984), Bikzhanova (1961), Dzhabbarov (1973-1975), Esbergenov (1964), Karmysheva (1981), Lobacheva (1967, 1969, 1975-1976), Snesarev (1958, 1963 a, 1963 b, 1971-1977, 1971 a), Zhdanko (1978).

However, the Russian language was not the only problem preventing Western scholars from considering the research results of their Soviet counterparts. The strength of ideological strictures on scholars and institutions in the Soviet Union led most Western social anthropologists to neglect or reject outright the research results of their Soviet colleagues, based on assumptions that research results were biased. The combination of limited access to the region, the language problem, and the neglect of Soviet research findings had both institutional and theoretical implications. Whereas Western social anthropology had well established research traditions regarding other regions of the world, research on Central Asia remained outside of mainstream social anthropology. Very few institutions had a long-standing commitment to the region, and few scholars could claim a background in fieldwork there. It follows that their research findings seldom shaped the discourse in social anthropology. Among the exceptions were Bacon's (1958) concept of the *obok*, Krader's (1955a, 1968, 1978, 1980) reflections on the emergence of the early state, work by Lindholm (1986) on kinship and marriage and by Barfield (1991) on tribe and state relations.

Only since the early 1990s have larger numbers of social anthropologists shifted their interest to the newly independent states of Central Asia and adjacent regions. Among senior European social anthropologists, those moving into Central Asian research often initially had carried out research on the Middle East and on Turkey in particular. Increased interest in Central Asia has led to a growth in curricula, institutions, and research

grants. CESS formed in North America, the European Society for Central Asian Studies [ESCAS] was established, and so were various special programs at American and European universities. The Central Asia Research Initiative of the Open Society Institute deserves mention for offering forums targeted at MA and PhD students in Central Asian studies. The Central Asian research program of the newly founded Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle/Salle, Germany, also is noteworthy (Max Planck Institute 2003). This rise in institutional resources has been accompanied by an increasing number of conferences, workshops, and panels at international conferences.

Topics concerning Central Asia that are under current or recent investigation by Western social anthropologists, and by other scholars who study similar themes, include mahalla structure, gender issues, religion and ritual and their place in post-Soviet Central Asian societies and politics, nomadism, NGOs, socioeconomic and environmental problems and survival strategies, sociopolitical transformation processes, identity questions and nationalism, migration, diaspora, and transnationalism.²

Yet despite rising interest and the removal of many earlier obstacles hindering research, the number of social anthropologists doing research on Central Asia is still small as compared to other regions. One important general reason for the small number of social anthropological publications and research projects — as compared to studies and publications by political scientists — derives from methodological approaches in social anthropology. Whereas political scientists refer mainly to quantitative and macrolevel data, social anthropologists conventionally pursue in-depth analysis based on long-term field studies to collect qualitative data.

Not only is the social anthropological research approach very time-consuming, but it also requires other resources. Depending on the topic and the chronological period, an individual social anthropologist may need to know Persian/Tajik, Chaghatay, modern Turkic languages, and Russian in order to collect data and use vast local archival resources, including results of Soviet period social anthropological research. Moreover, in order to

² For a specific listing of recent scholarly works on these topics, see the section immediately following this article's text, p. 9.

make good use of local anthropological studies, the Western anthropologist of Central Asia must be well versed in Soviet anthropological approaches.

Social anthropologists working on Central Asia still face a number of other challenges, mainly related to the marginal position of the social anthropology of Central Asia in anthropology as a whole, but also connected with mainstream anthropology's recent tendency to deemphasize the importance of fieldwork, especially in "unexplored" places, due to the popularity of "post-modernist" approaches. It is to these more particular obstacles that I now turn.

The Development and Fate of General Anthropological Concepts of State and Tribe

Conventionally a tribe has been defined as "a culturally homogeneous, non-stratified society possessing a common territory, without centralized political or legal institutions, whose members were linked by extended kinship ties, ritual obligations, and mutual responsibilities for the resolution of disputes" (Winthrop 1991: 307). Tribes were seen as primitive, illiterate, isolated and self-sufficient societies. Mainstream anthropology initially regarded tribe and state as successive stages of sociopolitical organization. Service (1975), for example, distinguished among bands, tribes, chiefdoms, and states; Fried (1967) differentiated egalitarian, ranked, stratified, and state societies; and Flannery (1972) saw a combination of egalitarian societies, chiefdoms, and stratified societies. In all these schemes, the crucial elements distinguishing different sociopolitical formations and access to resources were kinship ties and their function in the political domain: in general, bands, tribes, and chiefdoms were defined as societies and political entities in which kinship ties shaped politics; states, on the other hand, were seen as polities in which kinship ties had ceased to play a role. Closely related to this perspective was the distinction between stateless and state societies (Fortes and Evans-Pritchard 1940).

Moreover, following a model from Evans-Pritchard's (1940) findings on the Nuer, the segmentary lineage organization was considered as the ideal-type for conceptualizing the structure of tribal societies. In Evans-Pritchard's view, lineages integrated people horizontally by establishing their mutual relations on the basis of descent from a common ancestor. Such lineages acted as corporate

groups but were subject to processes of fusion and fission, and they lacked a distinctive leadership. These societies tended to segment along genealogical lines without creating a hierarchy among the different segmented lineages. These relations, defined by genealogy, established the pattern that linked individuals and groups to one another. (Other mechanisms for creating social cohesion might include such affiliations as secret societies, cult associations, and age classes.)

Another of Evans-Pritchard's assumptions that other anthropologists adopted widely was that segmentary tribal societies were acephalous and more or less egalitarian. In cases of conflict and need, specific blocs of individuals or groups would join against other blocs similarly formed. This mechanism was called "complementary opposition." Conceding that leading lineages might emerge, the proponents of this ideal-type of tribal society nevertheless believed that complementary opposition prevented the crystallization of strong and permanent leadership. Evans-Pritchard's focus on genealogical descent as the guiding principle of social organization gained enormous momentum, especially in the "descent theory" school.

The concept of tribal societies, indeed the very term itself, came under heavy criticism from various directions. First, the assumed isolation of tribal societies was called into question (Wolf 1966: 1). Second, how to define tribes was itself at issue. Helm (1968), for example, argued that no single definition could ever cover the wide range of different sociopolitical formations originally subsumed under the term "tribe." Third, in contrast with the received assumptions about egalitarianism, attention was drawn to tribal groups exhibiting a clear hierarchy in their social relations: it was found that different lineages or clans could be ranked according to their genealogical position relative to the group's real or fictive ancestor; these were called "conical clans" (Winthrop 1991: 32, Barfield 1991). Fourth, in view of the absence of structural and functional differentiation between tribes and other kin-based societies such as local communities, the very distinctiveness of the internal organizing principle of tribal societies was itself brought under criticism. As a result, many anthropologists started using the designation "ethnic group" in preference to "tribe," refusing even to mention the latter term.

Other scholars expanded the analysis of tribes by introducing various subtypes and by ceasing to focus on genealogical ties, which had earlier been

considered the backbone of tribal societies. Research came to focus on other mechanisms that shaped politics in this type of sociopolitical entity, such as the complementary character of various forms of associations. This approach included the analysis of organizational forms providing horizontal links between individuals and groups, such as secret societies, sodalities, networks, and age classes. Another major approach dealt with marriage as a way of creating social relations, not only in the sense of Lévi-Straussian alliance theory but also as political tools to create or to reaffirm existing political alliances (Bruck 1989; Cole 1984; Gingrich 1989; Peters 1990).

In contrast to the notion of a tribe, a typical anthropological definition of the state was “a society characterized by autonomous political institutions, sovereign control of territory, centralized appropriation of surplus, and support of authority through legitimate force” (Winthrop 1991: 272). Social anthropology originally focused primarily on the characteristics of early state formation, and numerous theories sought to address the motive forces behind it. Anthropological theories on the origin of the state were, like those concerning tribes, in the beginning highly conceptual and ideal-typical. For example, Carneiro (1970) argued that warfare represented the main origin of state formation. However, subsequent research led to a re-evaluation of the state as well: anthropologists abandoned monocausal approaches to explaining state formation. Scholars such as Claessen and Skalnik (1978) suggested that state formation was a long-term process. Such an approach could differentiate between the inchoate, i.e., nascent, state and its transitional and mature developments. Research on more recent state formations dealt with the problems of nation building in the post-colonial era.

In general, however, social anthropology did not consider the political sphere in its own right. As Seymour-Smith remarked, “while analysis of the political dimension has formed an important part of the majority of anthropological studies, this dimension has usually been interpreted as an aspect of or as embedded in other domains such as kinship, religion, economy, and so on, and has been little analyzed for the features of a political system per se” (Seymour-Smith 1986: 226). When anthropology eventually began to study the political domain, network analysis and action anthropology made the most significant contributions. These approaches analyze political action and interaction, as well as authority and power structures and the question of

legitimacy, by locating the individual in the framework of social organization. (An excellent precursor is Barth (1959).)

Anthropological reasoning on tribal and state societies became more realistic. Ideal-typical models were rejected in favor of more complex and multidimensional approaches, and earlier evolutionary concepts were abandoned. It was especially the anthropology of the Middle East that made crucial contributions to the current understanding of tribe and state in anthropology. Since this represents the background of a good number of senior social anthropologists now engaged in studies of Central Asia, it is to that subject that I now turn.

Concepts of Tribe and State in the Anthropology of the Middle East

The coexistence of tribe and state, together with their oft-observed mutual influences, motivated in anthropology a severe critique of the formerly prevailing evolutionary conceptualization, according to which tribes and states were two stages in the evolution of sociopolitical organization (Service 1975, Fried 1967). Among those who have argued that tribe and state cannot be analyzed in mutual isolation are Tapper (1983, 1991), Beck (1991), Barfield (1991), Gellner (1983, 1991), and Barth (1959). Tapper (1991: 51-52) and Gellner (1983: 438-39) in particular recognized that tribes and states have coexisted for centuries in the Middle East, and that the majority of the governing dynasties in the region originated from tribal backgrounds. These writers also address significant and interesting problems about the conceptualization and definition of tribal societies, the role of Islam and holy men in the formation of state entities, the cyclical model of dynasties, the variations of political structures in tribal societies, and related subjects.

So Western social anthropology of Middle Eastern societies rejected the aforementioned notion of tribal isolation. It was argued, instead, that research must focus on the interconnectedness between state and tribe, and on their complex and multiple interrelations. Indeed, Tapper (1983: 48-51, 1991: 66-71) has shown that the strategy applied by each depends upon factors, both external and internal, characterizing the respective political system and producing differentiated responses in the given tribe or state.

The interdependence of tribe and state became, indeed, one of the major postulates of the modern anthropology of the Middle East. Beck (1991: 191), focusing on Iran, remarks that “tribes and states need to be defined in relation to each other,” while Tapper, referring to Afghanistan and Iran, comments (1983: 67) that “there is ‘state’ within every tribe, and ‘tribe’ within every state; state is partly defined in terms of tribe [and] tribe in terms of state.” From this it follows that tribe and state may be considered, each, as a political system that interacts and changes with the other. For example, the state might transform the tribe and operate with institutions borrowed from the tribal systems, using tribal chiefs to become intermediaries between the tribe and the state (Salzman 1973, 1974). Similarly, the tribe may seek to undermine the authority of the state by manipulating state agencies and using the infrastructures of the state for its own benefits (Salzman 1973, 1974; Hager 1983; Tapper 1983: 53-54, 1991: 66-67; Beck 1991: 216-19). The use of tribal leaders as instruments of the state creates a double role for the former, who act as “intermediaries, mediators and brokers,” thereby constituting a link between the tribal and the state system. Yet at the same time, it provokes alterations within the tribe itself, since the power and influence of tribal leaders may be strengthened through their close relations with the state, permitting them in turn to develop relations with former tribal associates that are more like patron-client relations (Hager 1983: 94-95; Salzman 1973, 1974: 206, 2004; Beck 1991: 190-194; Tapper 1991: 70). These mutual and reciprocal influences thus lead to permanent changes in those social formations labeled as states or as tribes.

Another major contribution of the anthropology of the Middle East to the general debate on tribe and state was the rejection of the term “state.” In contrast to the general assumption that states are characterized “by the existence of a centralized government, which has a monopoly on the legitimate use of force by way of conducting public affairs within a specific territory” (Seymour-Smith 1986: 266), most Middle Eastern states do not exhibit these features. In spite of enhanced centralization and nation building efforts, particularly during the twentieth century, Middle Eastern states have rarely been successful in monopolizing political power and in penetrating society as a whole with their institutions. Likewise, attempts to create unity and a common patriotic feeling among their citizens have shown only limited

results. At best, state power and its institutions (administration, jurisdiction, and the capacity to take reprisals) controlled the capital — the seat of the ruler — and its immediate surroundings. The rest of the territory, by contrast, enjoyed extensive autonomy and was only indirectly bound to the center of power.

Under these power relations the state — which very frequently lacked sufficient economic and military means, skilled manpower, and a comprehensive ideology — was usually confronted with the problem of how to neutralize other contenders for power. Those controlling the state thus found themselves under permanent pressure to balance their own interests and the interests of those segments of society (tribes, non-tribal local groups, etc.) they aimed to control. The relationship between the state and the tribes living within its boundaries was especially crucial in this respect. This was so not just because many Middle Eastern states emerged from a tribal background. It was so also because the tribes remained militarily and politically effective opponents of the state, despite increasing attempts to centralize power in the hands of the state. The contradictory nature of the state’s claim to monopolize power was further hampered by the frequent disunity and struggle for power within the ruling elite of the state itself, whether these were dynastic quarrels, for example, or quasi-bureaucratic conflicts among the state’s administrative and military personnel.

These newer notions on the nature of tribe and state and their mutual interdependence have gained wide acceptance among anthropologists working on the Middle East and beyond. To summarize, states in the Middle East did not resemble the centralized, monopolistic polities conventionally defined as states. Gellner (1991: 109, 119), Tapper (1991: 69), Beck (1991: 192, 218), and others have proposed terms like “proto-state,” “tribal state,” or “tribal quasi state” to label these state-like political entities in the Middle East, so as to take into account the great impact of tribal structures on state structures and the lack of pervasive, monopolistic institutions. However, the assumption that all Islamic tribal peoples are fundamentally similar — especially in having egalitarian, segmentary, and genealogically defined sociopolitical structure — led those notions to be employed in a wider regional context, in particular in studies on Central Asia and Afghanistan. Yet comparative studies (Lindholm 1986; Barfield 1991) have demonstrated the

existence of significant structural differences within Islamic societies. I turn now to this question.

*Problems in Application: Barfield's
Analysis of Segmentary Lineage
Organization in Central Asia*

Some Western social anthropologists currently studying Central Asia, especially most of the senior ones, come from a background in Middle Eastern and/or Islamic studies. Their perspective on Central Asian societies is often colored as a result, so that they frequently seek to apply to Central Asia — either implicitly or explicitly — concepts and theories developed in anthropological studies of the Middle East. However, to do so assumes not only that Islam had a major impact on the pre-Soviet societies of Central Asia, but also that the whole Muslim world exhibits a degree of cultural uniformity. Many in the field of Islamic studies have acutely criticized the latter assumption — that there exists one uniform Islam — yet only a few anthropological studies seem so far to have highlighted the problematic nature of such an approach. Perhaps the most notable example of this procedure is the treatment of segmentary lineage organization as the backbone of kinship and politics in society. (Another is the prevalent dichotomy between “orthodox” and “folk” Islam.)

Lindholm (1986) and Barfield (1991) have compared kinship structures and tribe and state interactions in the Middle East and Central Asia (specifically Afghanistan), and they have illustrated the existence of major differences between the two regions' social and political relations, the common importance of Islamic traditions notwithstanding. Using Lindholm's comparison of tribal cultures of the Middle East and Central Asia as a starting point for his own analysis, Barfield highlights the presence of two distinct types of tribal cultural traditions with different styles of political organization.

The first type, egalitarian lineage groups, is dominant in the Middle East. These tribes are characterized by a strong emphasis on genealogical ties as an organizing principle for social and political relations, by a lack of perennial leadership due to complementary opposition, and by the prevailing occurrence of close kin marriages leading to the formation of rather inward-oriented lineages with little or no potential for creating large-scale alliances. In total these egalitarian tribes correspond significantly to the segmentary lineage model,

briefly described above, which had for a long time dominated in Western anthropology.

The second type, hierarchical Turko-Mongolian tribes, prevailed in Central Asia. Here “kinship terms made distinctions between elder and younger brothers, junior and senior generations, and noble and common clans. This created a structure of nested groups, called a conical clan, in which all patrilineally related members of common descent groups were ranked and segmented hierarchically along genealogical lines” (Barfield 1991: 164). This culturally accepted legitimacy of a hierarchical kinship organization not only rendered possible the emergence of strong, little contested leaders, but also allowed for the crystallization of elevated lineages from which hereditary leadership was drawn, producing dynasties of unparalleled duration.

The hierarchical cultural traditions in Central Asia provided the basis for a much less disputed leadership than the egalitarian cultural tradition of Middle Eastern tribes. Prevailing rules of exogamy and an emphasis on reciprocal marriages in Central Asia allowed the creation of “patterns of alliances that crosscut the seemingly rigid set of patrilineal relationships within a conical clan...” (Barfield 1991: 164) and helped to closely bind neighboring non-patrilineally related groups. Tribal leaders' polygynous marriages supported the incorporation of unrelated tribes into regular relationships.

Contrasting these two types of tribal cultures and the two styles of political organization — egalitarianism and hierarchy — Barfield then analyzed two manifestations of the state: large empires and small regional states. Empires “were centralized states that encompassed a wide variety of peoples and places whose resources could be mobilized against tribal peoples within the state and on its borders. Their political structures are remarkably stable, with long-lived dynasties and large standing armies.” Regional states “were organized around a far more limited set of resources that could support only relatively weak military forces ... Their political structures were inherently unstable and subject to regular collapse” (Barfield 1991: 155).

This distinction of two types of states led Barfield to look more closely into the foundations of the large Central Asian confederations. Similar to the Middle Eastern tribes, relationships among clans or lineages in Central Asia were closely tied to kinship roles. On the higher level of supratribal political organization, however, the ties were more

political than genealogical. Here, it was mainly the acceptance of hereditary leaders who usually originated from long established ruling lineages, and the occurrence of a variety of non-kin based loyalty patterns (e.g., the swearing of exclusive loyalty to the supreme leader by his followers), that created the potential for unifying large groups of people. Local lineages, clans, and tribes of various origins became the building blocks of political-military coalitions that formed enduring tribal confederations bound together by powerful leaders.

However, Barfield argued that the hierarchy of the Turko-Mongolian social structure does not fully account for the rise of strong leadership and enduring tribal confederacy. Another major element in securing cooperation and support was the ability to deliver goods and trade opportunities for the members of the confederacy. The predatory policy of the tribal rulers towards their neighboring sedentary states (especially China) provided them with tremendous wealth that they redistributed among their followers.

The confederations that eventually formed large empires emerged due to the relationship of the Turko-Mongolian tribes with their sedentary neighbors. "To deal with these powerful sedentary states, tribal societies had to organize their own state structures of sufficient power to force their neighbors to treat them as equals." The imperial confederacies thus could force their wealthier neighbors to trade with them. Barfield therefore concluded that "politically and financially, the imperial confederacy had its roots in foreign relations, not in the evolution of social organization on the steppe itself" (Barfield 1991: 167).

In sum, Barfield contrasted two ideal models: the egalitarian-lineage based groups, which he associated with the formation of regional states prevailing in Arabia and North Africa; and the Turko-Mongolian tribal confederation, which he associated with Central Asia and upon their spread further to the west with the creation of imperial states on the Iranian and Anatolian plateaus. While Turko-Mongolian tribes formed predatory confederacies, Arabian tribes "established more symbiotic relationships with regional states with whom they shared a common cultural background" (Barfield 1991: 180).

Barfield's focus on structural differences in the cultural traditions of tribal societies and states in the Middle East and in Central Asia was an important contribution to the understanding of tribe

and state relations as a whole. However, by creating a new (ideal) model — the hierarchical Turko-Mongolian tribe — that stands in sharp contrast to the prevailing model of the egalitarian Middle Eastern tribe, the combinations of egalitarian and hierarchical patterns in the sociopolitical framework of the region were once again left out of the equation. Furthermore, other equally relevant aspects such as specific historical developments, ethnicity, and nation building were not taken into account or only treated to a very limited extent in these models (Nölle 1997; Rasuly-Paleczek 1999). These issues will be addressed in the second section of this article (in CESR 5/1, Winter 2006), along with potentially stronger models, and proposals for new directions in Central Asian social anthropology.

Barfield's study demonstrates that it is highly problematic to undertake the wholesale transfer of models developed in the social anthropology of the Middle East to Central Asia. Many Western social anthropologists are aware of this difficulty, but social scientists from other disciplines (above all political science) and also many Central Asian scholars may use some of the assumptions arising from Middle Eastern scholarship for explaining Central Asia, perhaps without full awareness of the controversies over models such as "segmentary lineage organization" within social anthropology.

As outlined above, the concept of segmentary lineage organization was developed in social anthropology in the 1940s (Evans-Pritchard 1940). The political scientist Geiss has used it in order to attempt to come to terms with the political system in post-Soviet Central Asia. The idea that segmentary lineage organization was the basic feature of tribal societies was for a long time widely accepted and used as a fundamental category in the study of particular features of different tribal societies. Although Western anthropology has deeply criticized this concept more recently, nevertheless Western political scientists employ it widely in their studies of leadership, factionalism, and alignment structures in Central Asia. Other Western political scientists (Carlisle 2001, Collins 1999, 2002, Schatz 2004, 2005) have used the term "clan" as the basis of analyses of post-Soviet political systems in Central Asia. Even many Central Asian scholars, sometimes driven to distill their "genuine" cultural heritage and identity, apply the concept of segmentary lineage organization when studying their own pre-Soviet history, as a means to reject Soviet traditions in their respective scholarly disciplines. Likewise, scholars in Central Asia often look into

models developed in Western social anthropology to fill the theoretical and methodological vacuum that emerged after the rejection of the formerly prevailing Soviet ones.

Key issues of research in social anthropology have focused on the concepts of tribe and state. Studies of nearly every historical period and every global region have produced insights into tribal and state structures. Other social anthropological concepts used outside anthropology, in particular by historians, include the concepts of tribe and state relations (in the works of, e.g., Nölle 1997; Grevemeyer 1982, 1987; Holzwarth 1980, 1990). Approaches to ethnicity and identity formation first developed in anthropology are also applied by various scholarly disciplines such as history, sociology and political science. The concluding part of this article will continue the discussion of problems of applying concepts developed in the social anthropology of the Middle East to Central Asia.

Selected Recent Works in the Social Anthropology of Central Asia by Topic:

1. Mahalla structure (Abramson 1998; Koroteyeva and Perepelkin 1990; Rasanayagam 2002, 2003; Massicard and Trevisani 2000; Pétric 2002; Sievers 2002).
2. Gender issues (Kandiyoti 1998b; Bellér-Hann 2001; Tett 1994).
3. Religion and ritual and their place in post-Soviet Central Asian societies and politics, especially Islam and its diverse manifestations (Poliakov 1992; Privratsky 1997, 2001, 2002; Baldauf 1989; Bellér-Hann 2001, 2004; Shahrani 1991; Fathi 2004; Schoeberlein 2001).
4. Nomadism and its present significance (Barfield 1981, 1993; Finke 1995, 2004, Forthcoming; Finke, Robinson, and Hamann 2000; Humphrey 1983; Humphrey and Sneath 1996, 1999; Kerven 2003; Khazanov 1978b, 1984, 1990; Khazanov and Ginat 1998; Khazanov and Wink 2001; Shahrani 1978, 1979, 1986).
5. NGOs and their activities (Berg 2003, 2004; Sievers 2000; Liu 1997).
6. Socioeconomic and environmental problems and survival strategies (Finke 2000, 2003; Finke and Sancak 2001, 2002, Forthcoming; Hilgers 2002; Kandiyoti 1998a, 1998b, 2002; Rasanayagam 2003; Werner 1994, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2004; Werner et al. 2001; Zanca 1999; Sievers 2003).
7. Sociopolitical transformation processes (Liu 2002).
8. Identity questions and nationalism (Baldauf 1991, 1995; Esenova 1998, 2002; Ilkhamov 2002, Forthcoming; Khazanov 1995; Privratsky 1997; Schoeberlein-Engel 1994; Shalinsky 1979, 1982, 1986, 1994; Rasuly-Palczek 1993, 1998, 1999, 2001; Liu 1997).
9. Migration, diaspora, and transnationalism (Monsutti 2000, 2005; Darieva 1997, 2004).

References

Aberle, David F.

1953 *The Kinship System of the Kalmuk Mongols*. In series: University of New Mexico Publications in Anthropology, vol. 8. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Abramson, David MacKenzie

1998 "From Soviet to mahalla: Community and transition in post-Soviet Uzbekistan." PhD Dissertation, Dept. of Anthropology, Indiana University.

Bacon, Elizabeth

1958 *Obok: A Study of Social Structure in Eurasia*. In series: *Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology*, vol. 25. New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.

1966 *Central Asia under Russian Rule: A Study in Culture Change*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Baldauf, Ingeborg

1989 "Zur religiösen Praxis özbekischer Frauen in Nordafghanistan" [Toward the religious praxis of Uzbek women in North Afghanistan]. In: *Religious and Lay Symbolism in the Altaic World and Other Papers*. K. Sagaster and H. Eimer, eds., pp. 45-54. (Proceedings of the 27th Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference, Walberberg, Federal Republic of Germany, June 12-17, 1984). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

1991 "Some thoughts on the making of the Uzbek nation." In: *En Asie centrale soviétique: ethnies, nations, états*. O. Roy, ed., Special issue of *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*, 32 (1) 79-96.

- 1995 *Identitätsmodelle, Nationenbildung und regionale Kooperation in Mittelasien*. [Identity models, nation formation and regional cooperation in Central Asia]. In series: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Asienkunde Hamburg*, 243: Nationalismus und regionale Kooperation in Asien. B. Staiger, ed., pp. 21-57. Hamburg: Hamburger Institut für Asienkunde.
- Balzer, Marjorie Mandelstam
1979 "Strategies of Ethnic Survival: Interaction of Russians and Khanty (Ostiak) in Twentieth Century Siberia." PhD Dissertation, Bryn Mawr College.
- Balzer, Marjorie Mandelstam, ed.
1990 *Shamanism: Soviet Studies of Traditional Religion in Siberia and Central Asia*. Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe.
- Barfield, Thomas J.
1981 *The Central Asian Arabs of Afghanistan: Pastoral Nomadism in Transition*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
1991 "Tribe and state relations: The Inner Asian perspective." In: *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East*. P. S. Khoury and J. Kostiner, eds., pp. 153-182. London: I. B. Tauris.
1992 *The Perilous Frontier: Nomadic Empires and China, 221 BC to AD 1757*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
1993 *The Nomadic Alternative*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Barth, Fredrik
1959 *Political Leadership among Swat Pathans*. In series: London School of Economics Monographs on Social Anthropology, vol. 19. London: The Athlone Press.
- Basilov, Vladimir N.
1984 "Honour groups in traditional Turkmenian society." In: *Islam in Tribal Societies: From the Atlas to the Indus*. A. S. Ahmed and D. M. Hart, eds., pp. 220-244. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Basilov, Vladimir N., ed.
1989 *Nomads of Eurasia*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Beck, Lois
1991 "Tribes and the state in nineteenth-twentieth century Iran." In: *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East*. P. S. Khoury and J. Kostiner, eds., pp. 185-226. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Beller-Hann, Ildikó
2001 "Solidarity and contest among Uyghur healers in Kazakhstan." *Inner Asia*, 2001 (3) 73-98.
2004 "The micropolitics of a pilgrimage." In series: *Vienna Central Asian Studies I: Central Asia on Display*. (Proceedings of the VII. Conference of the European Society for Central Asian Studies.) G. Rasuly-Palczyk and J. Katschnig, eds., pp. 325-338. Vienna: LIT-Verlag.
- Berg, Andrea
2003 *Encountering Transition in Contemporary Uzbekistan: A Critical Perspective on Foreign Aid and Non-Governmental Organizations*. In series: IEE Working Paper 171: Social Research on Transformation in Developing Countries: Results of Interdisciplinary PhD School Participants. M. Dreger and A. Huenninghaus, eds., pp. 51-65. Bochum: Institute of Development Research and Development, Ruhr University Bochum.
2004 *Global Concepts versus Local Reality: A Study on Non-Governmental Organizations in Contemporary Uzbekistan*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag.
- Bikzhanova, Murshida A.
1961 "Family life in the kolkhozes of Uzbekistan." *Central Asian Review*, 9 (1) 16-23.
- Bruck, Gabriele
1989 "Heiratspolitik der Prophetennachfahren" [Marriage politics of the Prophet's descendents], *Saeculum*, 40 (3/4) 272-295.
- Carlisle, Kathleen
[2001] "Clans and politics in Uzbekistan." PhD Dissertation, Dept. of Political Science, Boston College.
- Carneiro, Robert L.
1970 "A theory of the origin of the state," *Science*, 169, 733-738.
- Claessen, Henri J. M., and Peter Skalnik, eds.
1978 *The Early State*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Cole, Donald P.
1984 "Alliance and descent in the Middle East and the 'problem' of patrilineal parallel cousin marriage." In: *Islam in Tribal Societies: From the Atlas to the Indus*. A. S. Ahmed and D. M.

- Hart, eds., pp. 169-187. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Collins, Kathleen
 1999 "Clans, pacts, and politics: Understanding regime transition in Central Asia." PhD Dissertation, Dept. of Political Science, Stanford University.
 2002 "Clans, pacts, and politics in Central Asia," *Journal of Democracy*, 13 (3) 137-152.
 2003 "The political role of clans in Central Asia," *Comparative Politics*, January 35 (2) 171-190.
 2004 "The logic of clan politics: Evidence from the Central Asian trajectories," *World Politics*, 56 (2) 224-261.
 (Forthcoming) *The Logic of Clan Politics in Central Asia: Regime Transformation from the Soviet to the Post-Soviet Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Darieva, Tsypylma
 1997 "Kasachen, Kirgisen und Usbeken in Berlin: Zuwanderer aus den nicht-europäischen Sowjetrepubliken" [Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and Uzbeks in Berlin: Immigrants from the non-European Soviet Republics]. In: *Postsowjetische Ethnizitäten: Ethnische Gemeinden in St. Petersburg und Berlin/Potsdam*. I. Oswald, ed., pp. 240-260. Berlin: Berliner Debatte Wissenschaftsverlag.
 2002 "Von anderen Deutschen und anderen Juden: zur kulturellen Integration russischsprachiger Zuwanderer in Berlin" [From other Germans and other Jews: Toward the cultural integration of Russian-speaking immigrants in Berlin]. In: *Inspecting Germany: Internationale Deutschland-Ethnographie der Gegenwart*. T. Hauschild and B. J. Warneker, eds., pp. 405-420. Münster: LIT-Verlag.
 2004 *Russkij Berlin: Migranten und Medien in Berlin und London* [Russian Berlin: Migrants and media in Berlin and London]. In series: *Zeithorizonte Perspektiven Europäischer Ethnologie*, 9. Münster: LIT-Verlag.
- Dragadze, Tamara, ed.
 1984 *Kinship and Marriage in the Soviet Union: Field Studies*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Dunn, Stephan Porter, and Ethel Deikman Dunn, eds
 1974 *Introduction to Soviet Ethnography*. Berkeley: Highgate Road Social Science Research Station.
- Dzhabbarov, I. M.
 1973-1975 "Crafts of the Uzbeks of southern Khorezm in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: A historical-ethnographical sketch," *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology*, 12 (1) 34-64, 12 (2) 3-33, 12 (4) 82-116, 13 (3) 13-18, 13 (4) 3-14.
- Esbergenov, Khozhakhmet
 1964 "On the struggle against survivals of obsolete customs and rites: The Karakalpak 'As' memorial feast," *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology*, 3 (1) 9-20.
- Esenova [Yesenova], Saulesh
 1998 "'Tribalism' and identity in contemporary circumstances: The case of Kazakhstan," *Central Asian Survey*, 17 (3) 443-462.
 2002 "Narratives and Kazakh ethnic identity," *Journal of the Institute of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 22 (1) 11-38.
- Evans-Pritchard, Edward Evan
 1940 "The Nuer of the Southern Sudan." In: *African Political Systems*. Meyer Fortes and E. E. Evans-Pritchard, eds., pp. 272-296. London: Oxford University Press.
- Fathi, Habiba
 2004 *Femmes d'autorité dans l'Asie centrale contemporaine: quête des ancêtres et recompositions identitaires dans l'islam postsoviétique* [Women of authority in contemporary Central Asia: The quest for ancestors and restructured identities in post-Soviet Islam]. Paris: Maisonneuve & Larose / Tachkent: Institut français d'études sur l'Asie centrale.
- Finke, Peter
 1995 "Kazak pastoralists in western Mongolia: Economic and social change in the course of privatization," *Nomadic Peoples*, 36/37: 195-216.
 2000 *Changing Property Rights Systems in Western Mongolia: Private Herd Ownership and Communal Land Tenure in Bargaining Perspectives*. In series: *Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Working Papers*, 3. Halle/ Saale.
 2001 "Zwischen Markt und Mangel: Die Neuordnung ökonomischer und sozialer

- Beziehungen im ländlichen Kasachstan und Kirgizstan” [Between market and dearth: The new economic order and social relations in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan]. In: *Zwischen Markt- und Mangelwirtschaft: Berichte eines Feldforschungsaufenthaltes im ländlichen Kasachstan und Kirgizstan im Jahre 1999*. P. Finke and M. Sancak, eds., pp. 104-107. Almaty: Friedrich Ebert-Stiftung.
- 2003 “Does privatization mean commoditization? Market exchange, barter, and gift-giving in post-socialist Mongolia.” In: *Anthropological Perspectives on Economic Development and Integration*. N. Dannhaeuser and C. Werner, eds. Amsterdam: Elsevier JAI.
- 2004 *Nomaden im Transformationsprozess: Kasachen in der postsozialistischen Mongolei* [Nomads in the Process of Transformation: Kazakhs in Post-Socialist Mongolia]. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- (Forthcoming) “Property rights in livestock among pastoralists in western Mongolia: Categories of ownership and categories of control.” In: *Proceedings of the Conference: Collective and Multiple Forms of Property in Land and Animals: Cattle, Camels, Reindeer*. G. Schlee and A. Khazanov, eds., Halle/Saale: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology.
- Finke, Peter, Sarah Robinson, and Bettina Hamann
2000 “The impacts of decollectivization on Kazak pastoralists: Case studies from Kazakhstan, Mongolia, and the People’s Republic of China,” *Journal of Central Asian Studies*, 4 (2) 2-33.
- Finke, Peter, and Meltem Sancak
2001 *Zwischen Markt- und Mangelwirtschaft: Berichte eines Feldforschungsaufenthaltes im ländlichen Kasachstan und Kirgizstan im Jahre 1999* [Between a Market Economy and an Economy of Scarcity: A Report on Ongoing Field Research in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan in the Year 1999]. Almaty: Friedrich Ebert-Stiftung.
- 2002 *Wandel sozialer Strukturen im ländlichen Mittelasien* [Change in social structures in pastoral Central Asia]. In series: *Mitteilungen des Orient Instituts*, 63: Zentralasien und Islam/ Central Asia and Islam. A. Strasser, S. Haas, G. Mangott, and V. Heuberger, eds., pp. 137-149. Hamburg: Orient Institut Hamburg.
- (Forthcoming) “Migration and risk taking: A case study from Kazakstan.” In: *Migration and Economy: Global and Local Dynamics*. Society for Economic Anthropology Monographs. L. Trager, ed. Lanham, Md.: AltaMira Press.
- Flannery, Kent V.
1972 “The cultural evolution of civilizations,” *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 3: 399-426.
- Fortes, Meyer, and E. E. Evans-Pritchard, eds.
1940 *African Political Systems*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Fried, Morton
1967 *The Evolution of Political Society: An Essay in Political Anthropology*. New York: Random House.
- Geiss, Paul G.
2001 “Mahalla and kinship relations: A study of residential communal commitment structures in Central Asia of the nineteenth century,” *Central Asian Survey*, 20 (1) 97-106.
- 2002a *Political Community and Islam in Central Asia*. In series: *Mitteilungen des Orient Instituts*, 63: Zentralasien und Islam/ Central Asia and Islam. A. Strasser, S. Haas, G. Mangott, and V. Heuberger, eds., pp. 173-189. Hamburg: Orient Institut Hamburg.
- 2002b “Communal and political change in Central Asia: Some preliminary findings,” *Central Eurasian Studies Review*, 1 (3) 10-15.
- 2003 *Pre-Tsarist and Tsarist Central Asia: Communal Commitment and Political Order in Change*. London: Routledge.
- 2004a “The problem of political order in contemporary Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan.” In: *The Caspian Region: A Re-emerging Region*. Moshe Gammer, ed., pp. 203-227. London: Routledge.
- 2004b “The problem of political order in the khanate of Khokand: Between tribalism and patrimonialism,” *Central Asia on Display: Proceedings of the VII: Conference of the European Society for Central Asian Studies*. G. Rasuly-Paleczek and J. Katschnig, eds., pp. 53-65. Vienna: LIT-Verlag.
- Gellner, Ernest
1983 “The tribal society and its enemies.” In: *The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan*. R. Tapper, ed., pp. 436-447. London: Croom Helm / New York: St. Martin’s Press.

- 1991 "Tribalism and the state in the Middle East," In: *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East*. P. S. Khoury and J. Kostiner eds., pp. 109-127. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Gingrich, Andre
1989 *How the Chief's Daughters Marry: Tribes, Marriage Patterns and Hierarchies in Northwest Yemen*. In series: *Wiener Beiträge zur Ethnologie und Anthropologie*, 6: Kinship, Social Change and Evolution. A. Gingrich, Sylvia Haas, Siegfried Haas, and G. Paleczek, eds., pp. 75-87. Wien-Horn: Karl Berger & Söhne.
- Grevemeyer, Jan-Heeren
1982 *Herrschaft, Raub und Gegenseitigkeit: Die politische Geschichte Badakhshans 1500-1883* [Lordship, Predation, and Reciprocity: The Political History of Badakhshan, 1500-1883]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
1987 *Afghanistan: Sozialer Wandel und Staat im 20. Jahrhundert* [Afghanistan: Social structure and the state in the 20th century]. Berlin: Express Edition.
- Hager, Rob
1983 "State, tribe and empire in Afghan inter-polity relations." In: *The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan*. R. Tapper, ed., pp. 83-119. London: Croom Helm / New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Helm, June, ed.
1968 *Essays on the Problem of Tribe*. Proceedings of 1967 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society. Seattle: American Ethnological Society/University of Washington.
- Hilgers, Irene
2002 "Transformationsprozess im Norden Kirgistans: Sozioökonomischer Wandel am Beispiel eines Dorfes" [The process of transformation in Northern Kyrgyzstan: Socio-economic structure through the example of one village]. MA thesis, Department of Social Anthropology, University of Cologne.
- Holzwarth, Wolfgang
1980 *Segmentation und Staatsbildung in Afghanistan: Sozio-politische Organisation in Badakhshan, Wakhan und Sheghnan* [Segmentation and State Formation in Afghanistan: Sociopolitical Organization in Badakhshan, Wakhan and Sheghnan]. In series: Mardom Nameh: Jahrbuch zur Geschichte und Gesellschaft des Mittleren Orients: Revolution in Iran und Afghanistan. K. Greussing and J. Grevemeyer, eds., pp. 177-236. Frankfurt am Main: Syndikat.
- 1990 *Vom Fürstentum zur afghanischen Provinz, Badakhshan 1880-1935: Soziale Prozesse in einem zentralasiatischen Grenzgebiet* [From principality to Afghan province, Badakhshan 1880-1935: Social process in one Central Asian borderland]. Berlin: Mimeo.
- Humphrey, Caroline
1983 *Karl Marx Collective: Economy, Society and Religion in a Siberian Collective Farm*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Humphrey, Caroline, and David Sneath
1999 *The End of Nomadism? Society, State and the Environment in Inner Asia*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Humphrey, Caroline, and David Sneath, eds.
1996 *Culture and Environment in Inner Asia*. Vols. 1 and 2. Cambridge: White Horse Press.
- Ilkhamov, Alisher
(Forthcoming) "Archeology of Uzbek Identity." Working Paper Series. Halle/Saale: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology.
- Ilkhamov, Alisher, ed.
2002 *Etnicheskii atlas Uzbekistana* [Ethnic Atlas of Uzbekistan]. Tashkent: Institut "Otkrytoe obshchestvo."
- Kandiyoti, Deniz
1998a "Rural livelihoods and social networks in Uzbekistan: Perspectives from Andijan," *Central Asian Survey*, 17 (4) 561-578.
1998b "Crafts, entrepreneurship and gendered economic relations in southern Xinjiang in the era of socialist commodity economy," *Central Asian Survey*, 17 (4) 701-718.
2002 *Agrarian Reform, Gender, and Land Rights in Uzbekistan*. Geneva: United Nations, Research Institute for Social Development.
- Karmysheva, Balkis Kh.
1981 "Versuch einer Typologisierung der traditionellen Formen der Viehwirtschaft Mittelasiens und Kasachstans am Ende des XIX. und Anfang des XX. Jahrhunderts" [An attempt at typology of the traditional forms of the livestock business of Central Asia and Kazakhstan at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries]. In: *Die Nomaden in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. (Beitrag zu einem internationalen

Nomadismus-Symposium am 11. und 12. Dezember 1975 im Museum für Völkerkunde Leipzig, Red. Rolf Krusche) pp. 91-96. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Kerven, Carol

2003 *Prospects for Pastoralism in Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan: From State Farms to Private Flocks*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Khazanov, Anatoly M.

1978a "Some theoretical problems of the study of the early state." In: *The Early State*. H. J. M. Claessen and P. Skalnik, eds., pp. 77-93. The Hague: Mouton.

1978b "Characteristic features of nomadic communities in the Eurasian steppes." In: *The Nomadic Alternative: Modes and Models of Interaction in the African-Asian Deserts and Steppes*. W. Weissleder, ed., pp. 119-126. The Hague: Mouton.

1980 "The origin of Genghiz Khan's state: An anthropological approach," *Etnografia polska*, 24 (1) 29-39. Warsaw.

1981 "The early state among the Eurasian nomads," In: *The Study of the State*. H. J. M. Claessen and P. Skalnik, eds., pp. 155-177. The Hague: Mouton.

1984 *Nomads and the Outside World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

1990 "Ecological limitations of nomadism in the Eurasian steppes and their social-cultural implications," *Asian and African Studies*, 24 (1) 1-15.

1995 *After the USSR: Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Politics in the Commonwealth of Independent States*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Khazanov, Anatoly M., and Joseph Ginat, eds.

1998 *Changing Nomads in a Changing World*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.

Khazanov, Anatoly M., and Andre Wink, eds.

2001 *Nomads in the Sedentary World*. Richmond: Curzon Press.

Koroteyeva, V., and L. Perepelkin

1990 *Several Cities in One or a Multi-Ethnic City? Urbanization Patterns in Uzbekistan*. Moscow: Institute of Ethnography and International Sociological Association.

Krader, Lawrence

1955a "Principles and structures in the organization of the Asiatic steppe-

pastoralists," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 11 (2) 65-92.

1955b "The ecology of Central Asian pastoralism," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 11 (4) 301-326.

1963a *Peoples of Central Asia*. In series: Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 26. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

1963b *Social Organization of the Mongol Turkic Pastoral Nomads*. The Hague: Mouton.

1968 *Formation of the State*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

1978 "The origin of the state among the nomads of Asia," In: *The Early State*. H. J. M. Claessen and P. Skalnik, eds., pp. 93-109. The Hague: Mouton.

1980 "Note on the emergence of the Mongol state," *Production pastorale et société*, 6: 21-23.

Lindholm, Charles

1986 "Kinship structure and political authority: The Middle East and Central Asia," *Journal of Comparative History and Society*, 28, 334-355.

Liu, Morgan

1997 "The perils of nationalism in independent Uzbekistan," *The Journal of the International Institute*, 4 (2) (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor).

2002 "Recognizing the Khan: Authority, space, and political imagination among Uzbek men in post-Soviet Osh, Kyrgyzstan." PhD Dissertation, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Michigan.

Lobacheva, Nina P.

1967 "Wedding rites in the Uzbek SSR," *Central Asian Review*, 15 (4) 290-299.

1969 "On the shaping of new marriage ceremonial among the peoples of Uzbekistan," *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology*, 7 (4) 3-12.

1975-1976 "A sketch of the culture and daily life of the pioneer collective farmers of the Kyzyl Kum desert," *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology*, 14 (3) 3-17, 14 (4) 27-44, 15 (1) 3-21.

Massicard, Elise, and Tommaso Trevisani

2000 "Die usbekische Mahalla zwischen Staat und Gesellschaft" [The Uzbek Mahalla

- between state and society], *Anthropos*, 95, 206-218.
- Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology
2003 *Report 2002-2003*. Halle/Saale: Druck-Medienverlag.
- McChesney, Robert D.
1991 *Waqf in Central Asia: Four Hundred Years in the History of a Muslim Shrine, 1480-1889*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Monsutti, Alessandro
2000 "Nouveaux espaces, nouvelles solidarités: la migration des Hazaras d'Afghanistan" [New spaces, new solidarities: Migration of the Hazaras of Afghanistan]. In: *Les défis migratoires* (Colloque CLUSE. Neuchâtel 1998). P. Centlivres and I. Girod, eds., pp. 333-342. Zurich: Editions Seismo.
2005 *War and Migration: Social Networks and Economic Strategies of the Hazaras of Afghanistan*. New York: Routledge.
- Nölle, Christine
1997 *State and Tribe in Nineteenth-Century Afghanistan: The Reign of Amir Dost Muhammad Khan 1826-1863*. Richmond, UK: Curzon Press.
- Peters, Emrys L.
1990 *The Bedouin of Cyrenaica: Studies in Personal and Corporate Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pétric, Boris-Mathieu
2002 *Pouvoir, don et réseaux en Ouzbékistan post-soviétique* [The poor, charity, and networks in post-Soviet Uzbekistan]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Poliakov, Sergei P.
1992 *Everyday Islam: Religion and Tradition in Rural Central Asia*. Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe.
- Privratsky, Bruce G.
1997 "Turkistan: Muslim landscape and Kazakh identity," *Journal of Central Asian Studies*, 2 (1) 46-61.
2001 *Muslim Turkistan: Kazak Religion and Collective Memory*. Richmond: Curzon Press.
2002 "Islam in Central Asia." In: *Encyclopedia of Modern Asia*. D. Levinson and K. Christensen, eds. New York: Scribner.
- Rasanayagam, Johan
2002 "Spheres of communal participation: Placing the state within local modes of interaction in rural Uzbekistan," *Central Asian Survey*, 2 (1) 55-70.
- 2003 *Market, State and Community in Uzbekistan: Reworking the Concept of the Informal Economy*. In series: Working Papers, vol. 59. Halle/ Saale: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology.
- Rasuly-Paleczek, Gabriele
1993 "Ethnische Identität und Zentralstaat: Die Usbeken Nordost-Afghanistans und der afghanische Zentralstaat" [Ethnic identity and the central state: The Uzbeks of Northeast Afghanistan and the Afghan central state]. In: *Kultur, Identität und Macht: Ethnologische Beiträge zu einem Dialog der Kulturen der Welt*. T. Fillitz, A. Gingrich, G. Rasuly-Paleczek, eds., pp. 73-89. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation.
1998 "Ethnic identity versus nationalism: The Uzbeks of Afghanistan and the Afghan state." In: *Post-Soviet Central Asia*. T. Atabaki and J. O'Kane, eds., pp. 204-230. London, New York: Tauris Academic Studies in association with the International Institute of Asian Studies, Leiden, Amsterdam.
1999 "Kollektive Identitäten und ihre Transformationen am Beispiel Afghanistans" [Collective identities and their transformation through the example of Afghanistan], *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 129: 175-187.
2001 "The struggle for the Afghan state: Centralization, nationalism and their discontents." In: *Identity Politics in Central Asia and Muslim World: Nationalism, Ethnicity and Labour in the Twentieth Century*. W. van Schendel and E. J. Zürcher, eds., pp. 149-188. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Salzman, Philip C.
1973 "Continuity and change in Baluchi tribal leadership," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 3: 428-439.
1974 "Tribal chiefs as middlemen: The politics of encapsulation in the Middle East," *Anthropological Quarterly*, 47: 203-210.
2004 *Pastoralists: Equality, Hierarchy, and the State*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Schatz, Edward
2004 *Modern Clan Politics: The Power of "Blood" in Kazakhstan and Beyond*. Seattle: University of Washington Press

- 2005 "Reconceptualizing clans: Kinship networks and statehood in Kazakhstan," *Nationalities Papers*, 33 (2) 231-254
- Schoeberlein, John S.
1994 "Identity in Central Asia: Construction and Contention in the Conceptions of 'Özbek,' 'Tajik,' 'Muslim,' 'Samarqandi' and other Groups." PhD Dissertation, Dept. of Anthropology, Harvard University.
2001 "Islam in the Ferghana Valley: Challenges for new states." In: *Islam in Politics in Russia and Central Asia, Early Eighteenth to Late Twentieth Centuries*. H. Komatsu and S. A. Dudoignon, eds., pp. 323-339. London: Kegan Paul.
- Service, Elman R.
1975 *Origins of the State and Civilization: The Process of Cultural Evolution*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Seymour-Smith, Charlotte
1986 *Macmillan Dictionary of Anthropology*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Shahrani, M. Nazif
1978 "The retention of pastoralism among the Kirghiz of the Afghan Pamirs." In: *Himalayan Anthropology: The Indo-Tibetan Interface*. J. F. Fischer, ed., pp. 233-249. The Hague: Mouton / Chicago: Aldine.
1979 *The Kirghiz and Wakhi of Afghanistan: Adaptation to Closed Frontiers and War*. Seattle: University of Washington Press. New edition 2002.
1986 "The Kirghiz khans: Styles and substance of traditional local leadership in Central Asia," *Central Asian Survey*, 5 (3/4) 255-273.
1991 "Local knowledge of Islam and social discourses in Afghanistan and Turkmenistan in the modern period." In: *Turko-Persia in Historical Perspective*. R. L. Canfield, ed., pp. 161-188. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shalinsky, Audrey C.
1979a "History as self-image: The case of Central Asian émigrés in Afghanistan," *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*, 3 (2) 7-19.
1982 "Islam and ethnicity: The northern Afghanistan perspective," *Central Asian Survey*, 1 (2/3) 71-83.
1986 "Uzbek ethnicity in northern Afghanistan." In: *Die ethnischen Gruppen Afghanistans: Fallstudien zu Gruppenidentität und Intergruppenbeziehungen*. E. Orywal, ed., pp. 290-304. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.
- 1994 *Long Years of Exile: Central Asian Refugees in Afghanistan and Pakistan*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.
- Sievers, Eric W.
2000 "How NGOs abandoned governance in the Caspian region." In: *The Caspian Sea: A Quest for Environmental Security*. W. Ascher and N. Mirovitskaya, eds., pp. 219-33. Dordrecht, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
2002 "Uzbekistan's mahalla: From Soviet to absolutist residential associations," *International and Comparative Law at Chicago-Kent*, 2: 91-158.
2003 *The Post-Soviet Decline of Central Asia: Sustainable Development and Comprehensive Capital*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Snesarev, Gleb P.
1958 "The survival of religion and social customs in Uzbekistan," *Central Asian Review*, 6 (1) 5-15.
1963a "Pachiz: An ethnographic relic of ancient ties between India and Khorezm," *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology*, 2 (1) 8-15.
1963b "Ethnography of the peoples of the Soviet Union," *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology*, 2 (1) 8-15.
1971-1977 "Remnants of pre-Islamic beliefs and rituals among the Khorezm Uzbeks," *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology*, 9 (3) 204-225, 9 (4) 329-352, 10 (1) 3-36, 10 (3) 253-289, 11 (3) 211-253, 11 (4) 331-380, 12 (4) 3-31, 13 (1) 3-37, 13 (2) 3-32, 15 (4) 3-49, 16 (2) 3-35.
1971a "Khorezmian demonology and remnants of shamanism," *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology*, 10: 3-36.
- Tapper, Richard
1983 "Introduction." In: *The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan*. R. Tapper, ed., pp. 1-83. London: Croom Helm; New York: St. Martin's Press.
1991 "Anthropologists, historians and tribespeople: On tribe and state formation in the Middle East." In: *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East*. P. S. Houry and J. Kostiner, eds., pp. 48-74. London: I. B. Tauris.

- 1997 *Frontier Nomads of Iran: A Political and Social History of the Shahsevan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tett, Gillian
 1994 "“Guardians of the faith”? Gender and religion in an (ex)Soviet Tajik village.” In: *Muslim Women’s Choices: Religious Belief and Social Reality*. C. F. El-Solh and J. Mabro, eds., pp. 128-152. Providence, R. I.: Berg.
- Werner, Cynthia
 1997 “Marriage, markets and merchants: Changes in wedding feasts and household consumption patterns in rural Kazakhstan,” *Culture and Agriculture*, 19 (1/2) 6-13.
 1998 “Household networks and the security of mutual indebtedness in rural Kazakstan,” *Central Asian Survey*, 17 (4) 597-612.
 2000 “Gifts, bribes and development in post-Soviet Kazakhstan,” *Human Organization*, 59 (1) 11-22.
 2003 “The new Silk Road: Mediators and tourism development in post-Soviet Central Asia,” *Ethnology*, 42 (2) 141-59.
 2004 “Women, marriage, and the nation-state: The rise of nonconsensual bride kidnapping in post-Soviet Kazakhstan.” In: *Transformations of Central Asian States: From Soviet Rule to Independence*. P. Jones Luong, ed., pp. 59-89. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Werner, Cynthia, et al.
 2001 “Radionuclide contamination at Kazakhstan’s Semipalatinsk test site: Implications for human and ecological health,” *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment*, 7 (4) 943-955.
- Winthrop, Robert H.
 1991 *Dictionary of Concepts in Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Wolf, Eric R.
 1966 *Peasants*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Zanca, Russell
 1999 “The repeasantization of an Uzbek kolkhoz: An ethnographic account of postsocialism.” PhD Dissertation, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Illinois.
- Zhdanko, T. A.
 1978 “Ethnic communities with survivals of clan and tribal structure in Central Asia and Kazakhstan in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.” In: *The Nomadic Alternative: Modes and Models of Interaction in the African-Asian Deserts and Steppes*. W. Weissleder, ed., pp. 137-146. The Hague: Mouton.

Research Reports

Selected Papers from the 2004 CESS Conference

Central Asians in Russia: Navigating Multiethnicity in Soviet and Post-Soviet Urban Worlds

Jeff Sahadeo,¹ Assistant Professor, Institute of European and Russian Studies and Department of Political Science, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, jeff_sahadeo@carleton.ca

Central Asian migration to Russia's "two capitals" of St. Petersburg and Moscow has swelled in recent years. New arrivals, attracted by economic opportunity, are joining the significant diaspora from the Soviet period. The collapse of the USSR has provided new challenges to Central Asians in Russia, who face official and unofficial harassment from a host society no longer bound to Soviet ideology. Cultural, linguistic, and economic links and legacies nonetheless continue to bind Central Asia to Russia. Migrant labor fuels the growth of Russia's showcase cities. Central Asian migrants contribute substantially to their home countries' economies as well. One recent study has estimated that Tajik migrants contribute between one-third and one-half of the nation's Gross Domestic Product (Pannier 2004).

This paper presents initial research for my new project, which will examine the Central Asian diaspora in Russia in the late Soviet and post-Soviet periods. The project has several goals. It will investigate the role of the Soviet state, society, and economy in shaping migration patterns from Central Asian republics, particularly the Tajik and Uzbek SSRs. It will consider late Soviet cities as multinational "contact zones." It will analyze the effect of the Soviet collapse on the volume and patterns of migration. Primarily, however, I will examine the process of migration through the eyes of Central Asians themselves. What motivated, or

forced, them to leave Central Asia? How did migration to Russia affect their material situation and their sense of identity? What were their relations with those they left behind and those they encountered in their new environments? I hope to tell provocative stories of how migrants navigated shifting, complex societies and eras to make new lives for themselves and their families.

This project seeks to contribute to a number of bodies of literature. Engaging diaspora studies, I will scrutinize interconnected relationships between the migrant, homeland, and host country (Shuval 2000) through the comparative prism of the Soviet and post-Soviet eras, seeking new ways to conceptualize the genesis, evolution, and persistence of diaspora identities. I also expect to highlight migrants' complex calculations in deciding to remain in an increasingly hostile host society. Diaspora experiences will be used to fashion, in Stuart Hall's words, a "narrative of displacement" (Hall 1990: 236), as waves of migrants serve as dynamic and destabilizing forces within sending and host societies. As a contribution to urban and colonial studies, my conceptualization of St. Petersburg and Moscow as postcolonial cities joins them to other centers where peoples of the periphery struggle to find their place, yet have a profound influence at the "heart of empire" (Jacobs 1996: 38-102).

Preliminary research for this project was carried out in 2004-2005. My research assistant, MA student Lisa Greenspoon, interviewed Tajiks and Uzbeks in St. Petersburg in conjunction with her thesis work on the Afghan refugee community. We did not seek a representative sample. Initial interviewees, who were guaranteed anonymity, were recruited through Ms. Greenspoon's contacts at the

¹ The author thanks Lisa Greenspoon for her research work and Michael Rouland, Virginia Martin, and Jamilya Ukudeeva for their comments. Field research received clearance from the Ethics Committee at Carleton University.

St. Petersburg Red Cross; she then used the “snowball method” to recruit others. Interviews, in Russian, lasted between one and two hours. Ms. Greenspoon also gathered material through participant observation. Subjects whom she knew well would not repeat relevant, previously-recounted stories in a formal interview. Ms. Greenspoon interviewed ten Tajiks and four Uzbeks. Five had lived in Soviet Leningrad, and nine had arrived since the collapse. My goal was to gain an initial sense of issues confronting these migrants, and their view of the relationship between the Soviet and post-Soviet eras.

Central Asian migration to Russia is primarily a Soviet phenomenon. Communist leaders encouraged significant numbers of Central Asians to study at Leningrad and Moscow universities (Park 1957: 134-6). Large-scale migration began after World War II. The official 1970 Soviet census noted that Central Asians were more likely than those in other regions to migrate outside their own republics, with the RSFSR as their primary destination (Maksimov 1976: 248-9). Central Asians profited from the USSR’s image as a multicultural society that offered superior rights and opportunities to formerly colonized populations. Leningrad and Moscow appeared to offer open arms towards repressed peoples of the world (Roman 2002: 2).

Racism lurked under the surface of the Russian-dominated state. Russian nationalist groups decried Central Asian migrants, claiming the latter’s higher birth rates would dilute Russian superiority in the RSFSR and USSR (Bushnell 1990: 157). Central Asians’ second-class citizenship in Russian cities was periodically confirmed. Moscow police swept poor, recently-migrated “Blacks,” a term extended to those from the Caucasus and Central Asia, from the markets and streets in advance of the 1980 Olympics.² Yet Western and Soviet demographers agreed that labor shortages in the Russian core and demographic pressures in the Central Asian republics established Central Asian migration as a “major influence upon Soviet society” (Lewis et al. 1976: 354-81).

Following a dip in the aftermath of the Soviet collapse, a new migratory wave has intensified since 1994-1995. An estimated two million labor migrants, including 600,000 from Tajikistan and 700,000 from Uzbekistan, have traveled to Russia,

where wages are often ten times higher than at home (Pannier 2004). Remittances from abroad play critical roles in local economies and family survival strategies (International Crisis Group 2003: 8, 51). Linguistic and cultural connections, as well as established networks, make Russia the destination of choice for Central Asian migrants. In St. Petersburg, police count Uzbeks and Tajiks behind Ukrainians and Belarusians as the largest illegal migrant nationalities (Titova 2004).

Our research sought to privilege migrants’ agency within these wider trends. We first asked respondents their reasons for migrating. Those who arrived in the Soviet period claimed they had little choice, but no strong objection. Their degree program or employment dictated that they come to Leningrad. Post-Soviet arrivals unanimously cited economic motives. Existing networks of family and friends influenced their choice of St. Petersburg. All knew Russian very well before migrating. All had come directly to the city, except for one recent arrival who left Moscow for St. Petersburg due to high prices, a lack of job opportunities, and intense police harassment.

Migrants who had lived in Leningrad did not consider the Soviet collapse especially traumatic. One interviewee mentioned that it was welcome, given the uncertainties of Perestroika, with its combination of shortages and high prices. Others, when pressed, gave stock answers such as “life became harder, more expensive.” One had lost his job at a dairy plant, while another lost her savings. One of our respondents’ favorite phrases was “this would have never happened during Soviet times.”

In terms of residence, those who arrived in the Soviet period stayed in the ubiquitous *obshchezhitie* [dormitory]. The difficulty of finding apartments forced students to live there even after finishing their studies. One couple, however, reported that they received from Soviet authorities a “normal” flat in St. Petersburg, something they said would never happen now. Those who arrived after the collapse, except for two students, stayed in increasingly crowded apartments of friends, dotted throughout the city. None complained about their conditions, but reports of Tajik migrant workers in Russia have noted that they often live in squalid, cramped quarters that include unused railroad cars (International Crisis Group 2003: 20).

The next questions dealt with the authorities. Interviewees were very reluctant to speak. Respondents speaking about the Soviet era claimed

² Personal communication with Diane P. Koenker, Urbana, Ill., USA, Fall 1994.

that relations with the authorities then were “normal.” When pressed, they said variants of: “the police treated us the way they treated everyone else.” Male interviewees spoke of changes in their attitudes towards the militia pre- and post-collapse. They reported a constant fear of being stopped and questioned. Specific examples of harassment were revealed outside the interview setting. Subjects described abusive behavior from police, who subjected them to humiliating searches. One recounted falling victim to a common police tactic that involved shaking down market traders at the end of the day, when they had the most cash. The Russian press has recorded incidents of police violence, including an April 2004 case when Moscow officers detained two Uzbeks, drove them into a forest, and beat them with batons until they paid \$400 (Moscow News 2004). Men and women reported intensified police harassment since 2001.

We then moved to relationships with ethnic Russians. All who lived in Soviet Leningrad reported that they mixed easily with Russians, as well as other nationalities. Respondents fondly recalled the “melting pot” of the dormitory. But when pressed, respondents admitted that their close friends were co-nationals. There was reticence in discussing present views on Russians during interviews. The standard “normal” response was trotted out. Outside the interview setting, one Tajik noted that her 17-year-old daughter blended in easily at an overwhelmingly Russian school. Tajik women nonetheless noted that they did not wear traditional clothing and spoke only Russian on the street. Respondents discussed neighborhoods where they felt uncomfortable, but fear of racists and skinheads was not pervasive. Tajik women discussed their “distaste” for Russians, particularly women. They denigrated Russian women’s “permissive” child-rearing, “provocative” dress, and “loose” morals. Russian women were also accused of “manipulating” their husbands, driving these “weak” men to drink.

Asked about relations with their “native lands,” all respondents reported sending money home. One with family still in Dushanbe said: “We came here to help our children!” None reported difficulties in transferring money, accomplished by bank transfers and five-day train rides between St. Petersburg and Central Asia. Recent reports have noted that migrants pose tempting targets for Kazakh and Uzbek border patrols and customs agents. All interviewees said that they had considered returning permanently. One reported that relatives, who told

her the situation in Tajikistan was far worse than in Russia, persuaded her to stay. Others have traveled back to Central Asia with the intention of settling, but returned due to a lack of job opportunities.

One remarkable difference between Soviet and post-Soviet migrants is their sense of St. Petersburg as “home.” All “Leningraders,” though they came as a result of state policy, considered St. Petersburg home. After the initial turmoil surrounding the Soviet collapse, they no longer contemplated returning to Central Asia. More recent migrants, who came as a result of individual choice, felt no such attachment. This division may be simply a function of time spent in the city. Yet I would argue that this is indicative of a far less inviting, if in some respects far more tempting, post-Soviet Russian urban space. New arrivals stated simply that between work, sleep, and finding affordable goods, they had no time to “enjoy” the city. They romanticize their homeland as a land of relaxation, sunshine and fresh melons, even as they foresee no opportunities to return.

Ms. Greenspoon did not ask certain questions, including our interviewees’ legal status in St. Petersburg. The complexities and deliberate mismanagement of city registration systems have facilitated the deportation and abuse of thousands from Central Asia and the Caucasus (Roman 2002: 12). A February 2003 law requires foreigners who do not need visas to Russia (primarily inhabitants of the former Soviet states) to carry “migration cards.” The Interior Ministry said the law will protect jobs for Russian citizens and that foreigners are responsible for 40 percent of crimes in St. Petersburg and Moscow (Munro 2003). Even before these cards were introduced, counterfeits were on sale in Khujand, Tajikistan (International Crisis Group 2003: 19). Documentation offers no guarantee against fines or detention, given the hostility towards “Black” migrants throughout the police and court system. Bribes continue to be the primary way to deal with the authorities in post-Soviet Russia. We believed questions surrounding this issue would, understandably, not be fully and truthfully answered, and perhaps result in the termination of the interview.

We also did not ask respondents how they earned money. Interviewees who volunteered the information worked (or had spouses who worked) in a variety of occupations, including university professor, lawyer, sous-chef, kiosk sales clerk, construction worker, produce seller, and auto

repairman. Many had found employment related to their training, another key reason for their presence in St. Petersburg. Respondents reported that while they integrated easily into primarily Russian workplaces, they did not associate with Russian colleagues after hours.

Our interviews and observations allowed an initial snapshot into individual migrant experiences. Over 2005-2006, I will undertake a thorough review of the literature on late Soviet and post-Soviet urbanization and migration and then conduct library and archival research and a more thorough round of interviews and observation. Ms. Greenspoon and I believe that an Uzbek or Tajik trained in Western social science methods would be the ideal person to aid me with interviews.

Central Asian migration continues unabated. Some argue that migration works as a safety valve in the Central Asian states, lessening the threat of massive youth unemployment, allowing those opposed to authoritarian governments to leave, and contributing heavily to domestic economies. Yet it also creates a “brain drain,” with educated Uzbeks and Tajiks exploring futures in Russia. Central Asian officials, awakening to the scope of issues related to migration, have yet to formulate clear responses.³ In Russia, even as leading figures allow harassment, arbitrary detention, and violence against Asian minorities, economic and demographic supply and demand favor migration. The Soviet legacy assures continued close ties between Russia and Central Asia.

References

- Bushnell, John
1990 *Moscow Graffiti: Language and Subculture*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Hall, Stuart
1990 “Cultural identity and diaspora.” In: *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. J. Rutherford, ed., pp. 222-237. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- International Crisis Group
2003 “Tajikistan: A roadmap for development,” *Asia Report*, 51, April 24. Osh/Brussels.
- Jacobs, Jane M.
1996 *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*. London: Routledge.
- Lewis, Richard A., Richard. H. Rowland, and Ralph S. Clem
1976 *Nationality and Population Change in Russia and the USSR: An Evaluation of Census Data, 1897-1970*. New York: Praeger.
- Maksimov, G. M.
1976 *Vsesoiuznaia perepis' naseleniia 1970 goda: Sbornik statei* [The all-Union population census of 1970: Collection of articles]. Moskva: Statistika.
- Moscow News*
2004 “Moscow police mug, kidnap two Uzbeks,” *Mosnews.com*, April 12, 2004, <http://www.mosnews.com/news/2004/04/12/police.shtml>.
- Munro, Robin
2003 “New foreigners law targets minorities,” *St. Petersburg Times*, March 25, 2003, http://www.sptimes.ru/archive/times/854/top/t_9047.htm.
- Pannier, Bruce
2004 “Labor migration conference opens in Dushanbe,” *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*, April 29, 2004, <http://www.rferl.org/featuresarticle/2004/04/1907d541-d916-4d26-afcd-7f67a3f17bb8.html>.
- Park, Alexander G.
1957 *Bolshevism in Turkestan, 1917-1927*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Roman, Meredith L.
2002 “Making Caucasians black: Moscow since the fall of Communism and the racialization of non-Russians,” *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 18 (2) 1-27.
- Shuval, Judith T.
2000 “Diaspora migration: Definitional ambiguities and a theoretical paradigm,” *International Migration*, 38 (5) 41-57.
- Titova, Irina
2004 “Detention center for migrants in planning,” *St. Petersburg Time*, March 12, 2004, http://www.sptimes.ru/archive/times/951/news/n_11922.htm.

³ The International Crisis Group, the International Organization for Migration, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe have invited state officials to high-profile conferences on the issue in Dushanbe and Tashkent.

An Uyghur Meshrep Dichotomy

Dilber Kahraman Thwaites, PhD, Independent scholar, Deakin, Australia, dilber@thwaites.com.au

In Uyghur tradition, the *meshrep* is a form of cultural entertainment for men. The Uyghur writer Zunun Kadir [Qadir, Qadiri] (1912-1989) from Xinjiang described the meshrep in his writings as a part-educational, part-cultural event that engages participants in poetry, music, dance, and conversation within a structured context. Contemporary Uyghurs have been using meshreps to combat corruption and demoralization of their youth by drugs, alcohol, and unemployment in a social climate of dispossession and disempowerment arising from Han Chinese colonization. Therefore, it is useful to put the meshrep and its political evolution within the perspective of national and international politics.

In this paper I draw upon references in Zunun Kadir's works, and on some more recent events since his death, to identify changes in the practice of the meshrep which parallel the changing contemporary political climate. The subject of the meshrep demonstrates a dichotomy between its perception and use by Chinese authorities on the one hand and by Uyghur people on the other. The dichotomy finds parallels in the way that Chinese authorities have applied cultural policies of loosening, tightening, and punishing,¹ producing responses from Uyghurs in the form of submission, acceptance, and rebellion.

Chinese Politics in Xinjiang

What happens politically in Xinjiang cannot be separated from what happens in China proper. Leaders in Xinjiang are selected first for their loyalty to the Chinese state and the Communist Party, including the military-based "Construction and Production Corps" that is a key instrument of Han colonization of Xinjiang. The line of authority extends from Han Chinese officials in Beijing to Han Chinese officials in Xinjiang, then to Uyghur leaders considered loyal to Han officials of the

¹ The choice of the terms loosening, tightening, and punishing reflects my own interpretation of political trends of the times. For example, loosening at the beginning of Deng era, tightening in the mid-1980s, followed by punishing in crackdowns.

Chinese government. Under Han supervision, Uyghurs are usually frustrated in their jobs, while their promotions are often blocked. Even when an Uyghur has superior qualifications for a position, a Han immigrant is often given the promotion.

The period of liberalization under Communist Party leader Deng Xiaoping, from 1978 and into the early 1980s, originating with the slogan "Seek Truth from Facts,"² created new hope among Uyghurs. Hu Yaobang, as Communist Party Secretary-General, asserted that minority nationalities should be given greater autonomy. For the first time since the Manchu conquest, there was scholarly acknowledgment in China that Uyghurs were of Turkic as opposed to Chinese origin (Tyler 2003: 152).

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, economic and security relations with the West and with the USSR were improved, but the political climate of liberalization changed in the mid-1980s as Deng Xiaoping did not want his faction to lose power. This change also was reflected in Xinjiang. When China began to crack down on dissident Uyghurs, the world powers remained silent. Since the 1980s there has been increased Chinese rhetoric of creating separate cultures, or "othering," of the minorities, especially the Muslim Uyghurs. This served the consolidation of Han nationalism.

Zunun Kadir

Zunun Kadir, born into a poor and conservative family under Chinese rule, became a writer who was committed to nationalism and socialism in the belief that these would serve as the basis for the advancement of the Uyghur people. He witnessed the absorption of the East Turkistan Republic (1944-1949) into the People's Republic of China (PRC), and he continued to work as a writer under the PRC government.

Zunun was eventually subjected to official criticism by PRC officials as a "rightist," his works were condemned, and he was sent to the Tarim

² Deng Xiaoping's speech to 11th Party Congress in 1978 (Deng 1995: 150-163).

Desert in 1961 to undergo labor reform. After 17 years of exile he was rehabilitated in 1979, and he returned to Urumchi to resume his career as a writer.³ Beginning in 1986, his earlier works were republished, with some changes. His later work indicates a degree of disillusionment and caution.

Zunun Kadir's Gulnissa and Remembrance

The dichotomy between the Uyghur view of the meshrep and the Chinese authorities' view can be illustrated through consideration of two pieces of writing by Zunun Kadir, *Gulnissa* and *Remembrance*. These two pieces portray meshreps in ways that illustrate how cultural elements can be used by Uyghurs as a means of cultural and political assertion and by Chinese authorities as a target for "othering" of Uyghur culture and suppression of nationalistic aspirations.

The first example is from the play *Gulnissa* (Kadir 1992a), written in 1942 under the influence of socialist realism. Here, the meshrep is presented from an ideological standpoint that is secular, coeducational, and expressive of Uyghur national conditions. The girl Gulnissa is an orphan who is treated unjustly by her stepmother, Ayhan. The only place that she can find some comfort is in the meshrep, but her stepmother wants to prevent her from participating.

In this piece, the meshrep is an important Uyghur educational, cultural, and political event for Uyghur youth. It is a place and an occasion in which young men and women can meet and entertain themselves. It also includes some satirical criticism of dishonest religious figures. Unfortunately, in this case the stepmother comes and breaks up the meshrep, intimidating the youth into giving up their loyalties to each other.

The meshrep has traditionally been a male bonding activity that includes the playing of music, recitation of poetry, and witty conversation. But in *Gulnissa* we see this male bonding activity evolving to include women, becoming a kind of coeducational youth club in which male and female youth can meet under the supervision of meshrep rules.

In my second example, the short story *Remembrance* (Kadir 1992b), Zunun Kadir takes a slightly different angle on the meshrep. This story was originally written in 1959, but was probably

revised later, as Zunun Kadir said that some of his works were revised, and this piece seems to reflect some of the sociopolitical atmosphere of the 1980s in Xinjiang, and also more broadly in China. In this story one can see evidence of the political pressure under which Zunun Kadir was writing in the period shortly before his condemnation. Newly rehabilitated from 17 years of punishment, Zunun could have been understandably cautious in accepting changes to his work for publication in the 1980s.

In *Remembrance* the meshrep is portrayed in a recollection from the author's own childhood, and it is a very traditional form of meshrep. In contrast to the secular description of meshrep in *Gulnissa*, here there is specific reference to the Muslim holy month of Ramadan. There are no women at the meshrep, and there is a hierarchical structure to the event.⁴

In the story, Zunun Kadir recalls attending a meshrep when he was nine years old. Discipline is enforced by a *passip begi* [disciplinary leader] with a split cane in his hand, and the 30 young men sing a song of loss and sadness in traditional *muqam* form. This *muqam* song expresses a sense of grievance among Uyghurs disappointed after some initial hope of cultural tolerance. As this meshrep is developing toward a feast, the atmosphere is suddenly disturbed by a rival meshrep's participants parading in the streets outside. The two meshrep groups challenge each other, and a fight starts between them.

The political atmosphere of the 1980s encouraged Uyghurs to go back, to some extent, to their roots. During this period many mosques were reopened or new ones built, subject to Chinese government approval and conditions. The veiling of women gained some approval and even promotion, with the publication of a photograph on the cover of the official publication *Xinjiang min zu wen xue* (1981) of Uyghur women wearing veils. During this period some meshreps also may have included Quranic readings.

The meshrep in *Remembrance* ends in violence among rival groups, and fierce competition destroys the intended atmosphere. Zunun Kadir strongly disapproves of this kind of competition:

⁴ Hierarchical structure refers to the system of a man in charge of discipline (*passip begi*), and a leader of 30 boys (*yigit bashi*). It also includes the sitting arrangement according to rank, where the most senior people sit in a special place [*tor*] opposite the door (Kadir 1992b: 167).

³ Author's interview with Zunun Kadir's wife, Zileyhan, and other family members, Urumchi, June 12, 1998.

“The events involved not only youth, but affected the adults as well. Hatred and blood feuds were started, and many people were destroyed by these causes” (Kadir 1992b: 171).

This piece is about meeting a childhood friend, and in this context a meshrep from their childhood is described, published from the perspective of the 1980s. This story reminds us that in the late 1980s there were several uprisings in Xinjiang against the Chinese authorities, as well as the Tiananmen incident in Beijing. In the current atmosphere of global concerns about terrorism, it has been convenient for the Chinese state to equate any Uyghur national aspirations with terrorism. This label is applied not only to real separatist activity, but also to the public raising of grievances, and the assertion of Uyghur economic or political interests.

The Symbolism of the Meshrep in the late 1980s and 1990s

In the 1980s and 1990s, the meshrep became an important cultural symbol for Uyghurs, as well as a means of countering the dire conditions of Uyghur youth faced with the hopelessness of ever-strengthening Chinese colonization of their homeland. Unemployment, alcohol, drugs, and gambling were tragically common problems, destroying not only the demoralized youth but also their whole families and the community. Meshreps could function as a kind of rehabilitation center where those youth willing to participate could find mutual support under the supervision of meshrep rules. The deteriorating environment in the late 1980s led some successful Uyghur community members to promote meshrep activity as a remedy to the ills in Uyghur society.

Unfortunately, two trends negatively influenced this effective cultural process: the Islamization of meshreps and the politicization of Islam. These made the meshrep a target for later Chinese suppression. The Chinese state seems to have become increasingly suspicious of any kind of Uyghur gathering. The growth of religious content in meshreps seems to have provided the Chinese administration with an excuse to repress the gatherings.

For example, according to Uyghur sources, in April 1995 a young Uyghur from Gulja named Abdul Helil set up and led a meshrep association with membership rules forbidding the use of drugs, alcohol, or participation in criminal activity. Nonetheless, when the Chinese authorities launched

the “Strike Hard” campaign in April 1996, Abdul Helil, who had committed no illegal acts, was one of many young people arbitrarily arrested. He was beaten and tortured while held in jail without charge, then eventually killed in prison, and his family was not allowed to see his body (Sing tao jih pao 1997).

In *Remembrance*, the meshrep that ended violently is perhaps a political reflection of violence between Han and Uyghur, as well as between Uyghur and Uyghur. Historically, China has used divide and rule tactics to subjugate nationalities such as Uyghurs. In Zunun Kadir’s story, the fighting takes place within Uyghur society and is initiated by leaders. Zunun Kadir works in dichotomy: while he disapproves of internal bigotry and violence in general, in the context of the 1980s, Uyghur readers would be strongly reminded to be vigilant about the divide and rule tactics of Chinese policy.

Edward Said has maintained that “Stories are at the heart of what explorers and novelists say about strange regions of the world; they also become the method colonized peoples use to assert their own identity and the existence of their own history” (cited in Walia 2001). So Zunun Kadir’s representations of meshrep in two different works can be seen to reflect aspects of the condition of Uyghurs in a contemporary world. China continues to assert by force its claim to sovereignty over the Uyghurs, at the same time using every means to exclude Uyghurs from all significant power structures, including those related to scholarship and the economy. For purposes of distraction, divisions are fostered between Uyghurs themselves.

In this, China benefits from an international climate in which the national aspirations of any group with Muslim culture are regarded as “terrorism,” persuading the US government and its allies to accept China’s suppression of Uyghur national aspirations, however mild and non-violent, in the name of the “war on terror.”

References

Deng Xiaoping

1995 “Emancipate minds, seek truth from facts and unite as one in looking to the future.” In *Selected Works of Deng Xiaoping*, 2: 150-163. Beijing: Foreign Language Press.

Kadir, Zunun

1992a “Gulnissa.” In: *Zunun Kadir Eserliri* [Works of Zunun Kadir], Polat Muhammet,

ed., pp. 336-391. Urumqi: Xinjiang Peoples Publishing House.

1992b “Eslesh” [Remembrance]. In: *Zunun Kadir Eserliri* [Works of Zunun Kadir], Polat Muhammet, ed., pp. 160-175. Urumqi: Xinjiang Peoples Publishing House.

Sing tao jih pao

1997 *Sing tao jih pao*. Hong Kong, March 10.

Tyler, Christian

2003 *Wild West China: The Taming of Xinjiang*. London: John Murray.

Walia, Shelley

2001 *Edward Said and the Writing of History*, Cambridge: Icon Books.

Xinjiang min zu wen xue

1981 *Xinjiang min zu wen xue* [Xinjiang Nationalities' Literature], Urumqi: Xinjiang Renmin Chubanshe, 2, cover page.

Report on Research Findings

The Kyrgyz in Western Travel Books of the Late 19th and Early 20th Centuries

Cholpon Turdalieva, Fulbright Visiting Scholar, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., USA, Associate Professor, Dept. of Eastern Languages and Cultures, I. Arabaev Kyrgyz State Pedagogical University, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, cholpon@freenet.kg

In the late 19th-early 20th centuries, as part of the Great Game, Western travelers competed in the exploration of Central Asia. They had different occupational, educational, religious, and cultural backgrounds. Books, maps, records, accounts, photos, and drawings resulting from the trips became popular among Western readers interested in the region. Most of the books contained elements of both enchanting novels and formal scholarly accounts.

In the fall of 2004, with funding from the Fulbright program, I started a project to explore the history of the Kyrgyz people and Kyrgyzstan based on the English-language accounts of Western visitors to the region in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.¹ The primary sources of my research are:

¹ In 2000, after having conducted research in Central Asian libraries, I curated an IREX-funded exhibition on Russian and Western travelers to Central Asia at the National Historical Museum of the Kyrgyz Republic in Bishkek. In 2002 a Central Asian Research Initiative grant from the Open Society Institute supported my research on European travelers. The project allowed me to develop a course called “Kyrgyz History and Culture in the Works of European Travelers of the 19th Century,” and to organize an international conference in 2003 in Bishkek on the subject of “Historical Sources: The History and Perspectives of Development.”

travel accounts found in the libraries of the University of Washington; documents from the Central State Archive of the Kyrgyz Republic, the Central State Archive of Uzbekistan, and the State Archive of Omsk Province in Russia; and historical and ethnographic collections of the National Historical Museum of the Kyrgyz Republic. I was able to find only a small number of these travel accounts in Central Asia itself. Soviet-era historiography on Central Asia considered Western travel writing unreliable and not valuable academically. Today, these travel books are found primarily in libraries in Europe and the United States. For example, the library of the Academy of Sciences in Bishkek has Sven Hedin’s *Through Asia* (1899) translated into Russian, and the Alykul Osmonov National Library has Ármin Vámbéry’s *Puteshestvie po Srednei Azii* [Travels in Central Asia] (1867). The Alisher Navoi State Library in Tashkent holds one of the two original copies of *Turkestanskii sbornik* [Turkestan Collection], compiled by the Russian bibliographer V. I. Mezhov,² which contains articles and book extracts by various Western travelers.

² V. I. Mezhov compiled this collection in the 1860s-1880s. It includes more than 500 volumes. For information on travelers mentioned in this report, see volumes 67, 100, 178, 200, 206, 238, and 301-302.

What can we learn from these sources? What is their contribution to our knowledge about Kyrgyzstan and the Central Asian region in general? Official Kyrgyz history is mostly based upon the descriptions and observations made by Russian travelers and explorers (e.g., Aristov 2001; Grum-Grzhimailo 1948; Przhival'skii 1947; Semenov-Tian'-Shanskii 1946; Severtsov 1947). As a result, scholars developed only one point of view regarding the formation of Kyrgyz identity during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Sources about Kyrgyz people and Kyrgyzstan written by Westerners provide a novel source of materials, which have caused people in the West to have a different base of knowledge about and a certain image of Kyrgyz people. Travel books written in the "contact zone"³ (Pratt 1992: 5-6) were products of European supremacy, and thus provide material for the study of the colonial encounter and discourse. As such, they contain significant biases provoked by their presumed superiority, as well as by a lack of basic knowledge about nomadic people. We need to keep these factors in mind when examining these works.

Research Methods

Interdisciplinary, historical, and comparative analyses are my principal research methods. To check the reliability of the Western sources, I compare them with Russian travel accounts, archival materials, and contemporary studies on Central Asia. I also employ textual analysis as a method with a focus on questions of authorship, publishing, republishing, and translation. I am interested in finding answers to the following questions: Why were books about Central Asia published and later republished several times in the West, and why were they translated into Russian and English in the 19th and 20th centuries? Was this due to Central Asia's popularity as a topic among Western politicians and the general reading public, or was it perhaps a product of competition between Western and Russian Oriental studies?

Intertextual and chronological comparison of travel accounts by Western travelers provides some unexpected results. Explorers in the early and mid-19th century (e.g., Burnes 1835; Wood 1872) focused their investigations primarily on geographic particulars and the political and economic situation in Central Asia. By contrast, investigations dating

from the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Bonvalot 1889; Dunmore 1893; Hedin 1899; Huntington 1907) sought geographic and anthropological information, reflecting on issues such as "man and his relationship to landscape." Ellsworth Huntington, an American geographer who traveled to Kyrgyzstan in 1903, went further. He saw an interconnection among three aspects: environment, nomadic economy, and traditions of the Kyrgyz nomads.⁴

The first and most important geographic feature of the Tian-Shan plateau is, as we have seen, the pamirs, or plains of rich grass. They determine the character of animal life, including man... The completeness with which Khirghiz life and character are determined by natural surroundings makes the relation between physiography and life far more evident than in the case of more highly civilized people (Huntington 1907: 109, 125).

I classified Western travelers' works according to the themes they explored. These included ethnic history, nomadic households, the political situation, dwellings, dress, food, religion, and folklore of the Kyrgyz people. This thematic classification is appropriate for my research because travelers' descriptions of the aspects of Kyrgyz life listed above differ in quantity and quality. For example, some travelers focused on Kyrgyz dwelling spaces, while others gave their attention to geography and political conditions.

I tried to contextualize and explain travelers' accounts of the origins and the tribal and social history of the Kyrgyz people. I discovered that some accounts of tribal characteristics were superficial and overly generalized. This puzzled me greatly because Western accounts of the social and tribal characteristics of, for example, indigenous Australians or Americans, are much more detailed and descriptive. I suggest that there are three reasons for this difference in degree of detail. First, Western travelers visited Central Asia after it had already become part of Russia. Consequently, their mobility and ability to observe Central Asian life were restricted by the Russian authorities in Turkestan.⁵

⁴ Subsequently, Huntington founded the field of social geographical studies based on the relationship between human beings and their environment. For more information, see Huntington and Carlson (1929).

⁵ The Turkestan Governor-Generalship developed a procedure for foreign travelers seeking to enter the region. See the Central State Archive of Uzbekistan, Fund 1, Chancellery of the Turkestan Governor-Generalship:

³ "Contact zone" refers to a space in which peoples who are otherwise separated by geography and history come into contact with each other.

They were often accompanied by Russian officers and soldiers both to ensure their security and to control their movements. Second, some gathered information from interpreters representing the local Russian colonial administration or they hired local Uzbeks, Tatars, and Persian-speakers to accompany them. For instance, French traveler Gabriel Bonvalot hired local people from villages near Termiz,⁶ who accompanied him in his expedition to the Pamirs (1889: 1-3). These interpreters often had poor knowledge of the Kyrgyz people's past and contemporary life and gave mistaken information about them. Third, in that time in the West there was a lack of information about Kyrgyz people.

I pay specific attention to accounts by Western women. They never traveled alone or headed an expedition. Usually, Western women accompanied their husband or brother during the latter's expeditions to the region. For example, the British woman Ella Sykes accompanied her brother, Brigadier-General Sir Percy Sykes, to Kashgar. In 1920 she published a book about her trip (Sykes and Sykes 1920). French explorer Charles-Eugene Ujfalvy de Mezö Kövesd and British Consul in Kashgar Sir Clarmont Skrine were accompanied by their wives Marie de Ujfalvy-Boudon and Doris Skrine, respectively. In his book, Clarmont Skrine describes his wife's effort to collect information about the Kyrgyz in the Eastern Pamirs. Women travelers also recorded their observations concerning how Kyrgyz women expressed their self-determination through their family and tribal roles. In their writings, women gave more careful attention to anthropological details than men.

Research Content and Questions

My research focuses on the ethno-historical, tribal, material, and spiritual identity of the Kyrgyz as portrayed in the books of Western travelers. These accounts show variety and uncertainty

op. 1, d. 1255, "*O peresmotre pravil poseshcheniia inostrantsami Turkestanskogo kraia*," 8 apr. 1908; op. 2, d. 298, "*O razresheniikh na priezd v Turkestanskii krai inostrantsev podannykh evropeiskikh stran-germantsev i anglichan i dr.*" 31 dek. 1913; op. 20, d. 8730, "*Po pis'mu presidenta Russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva ob okazanii sodeistviia uchenomu professoru vyshei shkoly vostochnykh iazikov Parizha Karlu Uifal'vi pri puteshestvii ego v Turkestanskii Krai*;" op. 27, d. 167, "*O razreshenii vremennogo priezda v Krai angliiskogo podannykh indusov, prozhivaiushchikh v Bukhare.*"

⁶ Termiz is located on the territory of modern Uzbekistan.

regarding basic information. I will give just two examples from my research so far.

One focus of my research is travelers' records of pastoral nomadism. I am interested in the following questions: Did travelers from the West observe the nomadic economy, especially the quantity and quality of livestock and its production? Did they see any changes and challenges to Kyrgyz nomadic households after Russian colonization? How and why did they describe the contacts of nomadic and neighboring sedentary people? The English missionary Henry Lansdell traveled in the districts of Pishpek (present day Bishkek) and Sokuluk in 1882. While he described in detail Russian peasants' environment, including their farmland, church, school, and a botanical garden planted by the Russian botanist Fetisov in Pishpek, he wrote nothing about their relationship with Kyrgyz people (Lansdell 2003 [1885]: 360-361). My research attempts to understand the reasons for such omissions. Were such descriptions omitted on purpose to avoid tensions with Russia, or for some other reasons? Most Western travelers did not portray the relationships between the Russian administration, colonists, and Kyrgyz nomads accurately, and exaggerated the civilizing role of Russia among nomads. For example, Huntington considered Russian colonizers capable of civilizing nomadic people by giving them goods and creating a market for livestock products (Huntington 1907: 126). In fact, Russia's invasion into the nomadic space and time had negative as well as positive effects on Kyrgyz people. The occupation of valley pastures by Russians brought about the brutal destruction of pastoral migration and the Kyrgyz tribes had to settle. Russians used a "divide and rule" policy among the Kyrgyz tribes, and supported intertribal hostility. Such policies later resulted in the great popular revolt throughout the region in 1916. But at the same time, a settled existence gave the Kyrgyz an opportunity to join a different culture, and internationalize their own national development.

Another example is representation of Kyrgyz cultural life. Most travelers considered nomadic culture to have primitive and uncivilized forms and expressions. Describing Kyrgyz dress, dwellings, and food, travelers often compared them with European culture. They tried to substitute local names such as *yurt* and *bos-üy* with the European or Russian words — "tent," "white house," "nomadic dwelling" and "*kibitka*" [Russian for "hut"]. In their descriptions travelers described themselves as being surrounded by an unfamiliar cultural space. For

instance, Sven Hedin wrote about the Kyrgyz instrument *komuz*: “How many and many nights did I not spend thus during the long years that followed, listening to the dreamy sounds of that primitive Kirghiz instrument!” (Hedin 1899: 133) The national cultural codes are also depicted by words such as “deprived,” “discrimination,” and “privacy” (Sykes and Sykes 1920: 115-116) that reflect travelers’ aspirations to incorporate their own social and cultural values into nomadic reality and make the place and people more understandable for Western readers. It was a kind of a technique developed by travelers that I would call a “verbal bridge,” referring to the extension of European thinking and cultural superiority into the non-European space.

Conclusion

I believe that travelers and their books could involve the West and Central Asia in one global network of cross-disciplinary learning and understanding. Westerners colorfully described physical, geographical, biological, and zoological features of the region. But they did not avoid some imperious biases and serious mistakes, especially in the anthropological sphere. Most of them lacked professional geographical or anthropological knowledge. Furthermore, during their journeys travelers had to be aware of surveillance by Russian and Chinese authorities, and had to agree with official orders and restrictions. However, we can see elements of both picturesque novels and dry serious accounts, even though most travelers did not have professional literary skills.

Descriptions and observations about the Kyrgyz people are important because they help to reconstruct a national identity and enrich Kyrgyz history. They might be classified into three types of information: 1) ready information about the origin of the Kyrgyz and their tribal history borrowed from Russian sources (most Western travelers honored Russian explorers); 2) information based on fresh, first-hand observations and conclusions concerning nomadism and its material and spiritual consequences in the life of the Kyrgyz people; and 3) photos and drawings that visually reflect Kyrgyz cultural codes, images, characters, and tribal specifics and traits. My on-going research seeks to evaluate in depth each of these types of information.

References

- Aristov Nikolai Aleksandrovich
2001 *Usuni i kyrgyzy ili kara-kyrgyzy: ocherki istorii i byta naseleniia zapadnogo Tian'-Shania i issledovaniia po ego istoricheskoi geografii* [Usuns and Kyrgyz or Kara-Kyrgyz: Essays on the history and mode of life of the population of the western Tian-Shan and explorations of its historical geography]. Bishkek: Ilim.
- Bonvalot, Gabriel
1889 *Through the Heart of Asia: Over the Pamir to India*. Vol. 2. London: Chapman.
- Burnes, Alexander
1835 *Travels into Bokhara; containing the narrative of a voyage on the Indus from the sea to Lahore, with presents from the King of Great Britain; and an account of a journey from India to Cabool, Tartary and Persia*. London: John Murray.
- Dunmore, C. A. M., Earl of
1893 *The Pamirs: Being a Narrative of a Year's Expedition on Horseback and on Foot through Kashmir, western Tibet, Chinese Tartary, and Russian Central Asia*. Vol. 2. London: John Murray.
- Grum-Grzhimailo, Grigorii Efimovich
1948 [1896] *Opisanie putesthestviia v zapadnyi Kitai* [Description of travel to western China]. Moskva: Gos. izdatel'stvo geograficheskoi literatury.
- Hedin, Sven
1899 *Through Asia*. Vol. 2. New York and London: Harper and Brothers.
- Huntington, Ellsworth
1907 *The Pulse of Asia: A Journey in Central Asia Illustrating the Geographic Basis of History*. Boston/New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Huntington, Ellsworth, and Fred A. Carlson
1929 *Environmental Basis of Social Geography*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Lansdell, Henry
2003 [1885] *Russian Central Asia including Kuldja, Bokhara, Khiva and Merv*. Brighton, Mass.: Adamant Media Corporation.
- Pratt, L. Mary
1992 *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Przheval'skii, Nikolai Mikhailovich

1947 [1879] *Ot Kul'dzhi za Tian'-Shan' i na Lob-Nor* [From Kulja across the Tian-Shan and to Lob-Nor]. Moskva: Gos. izdatel'stvo geograficheskoi literatury.

Semenov-Tian'-Shanskii, Petr Petrovich

1946 *Puteshestvie v Tian'-Shan' v 1856-1857 godakh* [Travels to Tian-Shan in 1856-1857]. Moskva: Gos. izdatel'stvo geograficheskoi literatury.

Severtsov, Nikolai Alekseevich

1947 [1873] *Puteshestvie po Turkestanskomu kraiu i issledovanie gornoj strany Tian'-Shania* [Travels to the Turkestan Territory and exploration of the mountainous country of the

Tian-Shan]. Moskva: Gos. izdatel'stvo geograficheskoi literatury.

Skrine, Clarmont Percival

1926 *Chinese Central Asia*. London: Methuen.

Sykes, Ella and Percy Sykes

1920 *Through Deserts and Oases of Central Asia*. London: Macmillan.

Vámbéry, Ármin

1867 *Puteshestvie po Srednei Azii* [Travels in Central Asia]. Moskva: Izdatelstvo A. I. Mamontova.

Wood, John

1872 [1841] *A Journey to the Source of the River Oxus*. London: John Murray.

Reviews and Abstracts

Colette Harris, *Control and Subversion: Gender Relations in Tajikistan*. London: Pluto Press, 2004, 216 pp., glossary, bibliography, index. ISBN 0745321674, \$27.50 (pbk.).

Reviewed by: **Najam Abbas**, PhD, Research Fellow, Central Asian Studies Unit, Institute of Ismaili Studies, London, UK, nabbas@iis.ac.uk

This book offers an analysis of some of the pressures people in Tajik society face at both the macro and micro levels. Broadly, they face the burden of their own traditionalism plus that of traditions imposed by Communism. Over the years, this has led people to cultivate their own strategic responses — some passive, some aggressive — to psychological colonialism after the actual colonialism has ended. The book also reflects a tussle between yesterday's traditions and today's realities and examines how the younger Tajik generation copes with that conflict. The author illustrates how gender masks are used as a shield permitting the public display of conformity but concealing considerable deviation, albeit within the narrow limits of Tajikistan's tradition-dominated environment. These masks are not mere posturing but are a vital strategy, used by both sexes, especially women, to preserve their inner selves intact, while enacting roles crucial for preserving their social status. Harris's work, grounded in the anthropology of gender, and using Judith Butler's theory of performativity as a theoretical framework, draws on family histories of Tajiks whom she encountered while working with an NGO in southern Tajikistan's Khatlon Province.

The book documents the tensions men and women in Tajikistan face around the issue of choice or lack of choice when trying to find a life partner. Harris lists several factors that usually complicate relations within couples and with those living close to them. For many Tajik girls, the choice of a husband not only depends on his qualities but on what kind of mother-in-law the bride will face. The groom's parents attempt to maintain control of resources even after their sons have married and started to raise families. Reading of the painful conditions that Tajik rural women encounter triggers both sadness and sympathy.

Harris worked with Christian Aid and Care International, and received EU/TACIS funding for

the Tajik NGO Gamkhori with which she worked between 1995 and 2001. She had an opportunity to be a participant-observer, carrying out her fieldwork as an associate of a project for improving women's health in central Tajikistan.

A look at Harris' sources suggests that her approach is more a portrayal and explanation of the past than a discussion of the present or how the future may unfold. At times, the book refers to practices that may be current in Tajik society, but cites quarter-century-old references from Soviet times or even earlier. In Tajikistan marriages between first cousins (in the maternal line) are quite common, perhaps, notes the author, because marriage arrangements are often initiated by women; she adds that a number of women in cousin marriages complained bitterly about the frequency of birth defects in their children. The author then goes on to say that "in general, Tajiks appear unaware of the dangers of this when we brought up the subject with health project participants" (p. 105). This leaves one wondering why there are no references on what the contemporary medical literature has to say on such trends as observed by local gynecologists and family medicine practitioners.

Citations of experts' opinions and specialists' views may support the author's observations concerning the physical and psychological health of the women she studied. However, despite working for a number of international and national organizations on health issues, Harris does not quote any Tajik experts who would enrich her information on demographic, social, and psychological conditions of the women particularly since the country's independence in 1991. For example, the book claims that "ignorance of sexual matters has to be one of the greatest causes of pain and suffering ... many divorces occurred because of young couples' sexual ignorance" (p. 5). This, the author says, is because most Tajik men do not appear to consider

their wives' needs, while the girls rarely have an understanding of sexual feelings and continue to inhibit their sexual feelings even after marriage (p. 155); many women "associate sex solely with pain and discomfort" (p. 158).

Some clarification would have been helpful to justify the choice of narrators for this study. To what extent does a case study of five families (24 individuals in all) adequately represent the situation faced by Tajikistan's female and male populations? How far are we able to generalize the situation of a selected group of women and even a smaller number of men over conditions in the country in general? The author also does not mention whether she made any attempts to approach male psychologists or psychotherapists who could have helped her understand what made Tajik men behave in a particular way toward Tajik women, such as whether men's behavior was determined by economic conditions, social circumstances, traditions, cultures, or religion.

Though Harris concedes that there is a problem with using local incidents to interpret national or even regional trends, a reader should be given more convincing justification for the basis on which the author classifies and characterizes groups of people. For example, an interviewee is quoted saying "in Tajikistan a girl who has reached the age of 18 without her hand being asked in marriage is considered an old maid" (p. 86). Moreover: "It is inconceivable to most people in Tajikistan that a girl might postpone marriage in order to be able to concentrate better on her studies" (p. 86). An ideal approach would have been to check the statistics with the central and provincial marriage register bureaus. Furthermore, the growing number of female applicants seeking admission to universities in Tajikistan and abroad may not corroborate such claims. "Most girls in Tajikistan today get married on leaving high school and study afterwards," claims the book (p. 86). Citation of references to such sources as Save the Children's "State of the World's Mothers" (SOWM), which annually ranks the status of mothers and children in 110 countries based on ten indicators pertaining to health and education, would have provided readers with a fuller picture. The 2001 edition of SOWM reports that in Tajikistan the average age at first marriage for

women was 22 (SOWM 2001: 38). On some parameters such as youth literacy, education access and secondary education enrollment for women, Tajikistan figures ahead of Turkey, Egypt and India (SOWM 2005: 40).

This book attempts to give meaning to the multiple identities and strategies related to status, responsibilities and roles that Tajiks assume as individuals both within their own communities and with outsiders. This book also reflects on the contradictions observed as a result of the interaction between Tajik traditions and the Soviet ideology of the past. It looks into the interface of tradition with the explosion of new cultural stimuli that fascinate the young and horrify their elders.

The book's back cover blurb claims this study's relevance "to many other Muslim societies, particularly those of the remaining Central Asian republics ... as an essential reading for anyone interested in Central Asia, the lives of Muslim women, or gender in a Muslim context." To justify that claim, the book would need to provide more examples outside its particular geographical and historical setting; to determine if the practices and attitudes discussed were specific to a particular rural or urban area; and to determine whether differences in ethnic and geographic origins supported or deviated from this book's many assumptions. Considering the author's rare exposure to women's lives in Khatlon, this book would have made a more meaningful contribution if some pointers and suggestions were offered for future researchers interested in exploring various dimensions of gender studies in Central Asia.

References

- Save the Children
 2001 "State of the World's Mothers, 2001." Westport, Conn.: Save the Children, <http://www.savethechildren.org/publications/sowm2001.pdf>.
- 2005 "State of the World's Mothers, 2005: The Power and Promise of Girls' Education." Westport, Conn.: Save the Children, http://www.savethechildren.org/mothers/report_2005/images/SOWM_2005.pdf.

Willard Sunderland, *Taming the Wild Field: Colonization and Empire on the Russian Steppe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004, xv + 239 pp., index, maps, ill. ISBN 0801442095, \$35.00 (cloth).

Reviewed by: **Marianne Kamp**, Associate Professor of History, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., USA, mkamp@uwyo.edu

Willard Sunderland's *Taming the Wild Field: Colonization and Empire on the Russian Steppe*, surveys several centuries of Russian expansion into the steppe zone that stretches from present day Moldova to Orenburg. In the process the book explores Russian ideas about empire and colonialism with detailed attention to changes in practices and attitudes. The work also draws comparisons with the larger body of historical scholarship on frontiers and borderlands. This volume provides a careful overview of Russian expansion, Russian approaches to settler colonialism, and some examples of Russian governmental treatment of conquered Central Eurasian peoples, such as Kalmyks [Kalmuks], Bashkirs [Bashkorts], and Nogays [Noghays].

The first chapter, "Frontier Colonization," addresses Russia's interactions with its steppe nomad neighbors from the founding of Rus' to the late 1700s. Until Russia's conquest of Kazan, and even in the following century, this relationship was one of exchange, and Russian colonization of borderlands was limited to building forts, settling soldiers and a few farmers, and trying to make use of Cossacks against nomadic groups. But under Peter I, as Sunderland demonstrates, the court believed that land could be transformed, and that steppe lands could and should be made "useful." Colonization was not systematic, but when Russian forces seized eastern lands and established Orenburg in the mid-18th century, tens of thousand of Russian settlers began moving into Bashkir lands. Bashkirs were forced to come to terms with the Russian Empire, either by declaring loyalty or by rebelling.

Catherine the Great presided over the next phase, the subject of the second chapter, which Sunderland terms "enlightened colonization." Russia defeated the Ottoman Empire in several wars, and thus took control of the steppe lands north of the Black Sea and Crimea. Sunderland explores the enlightenment philosophy that guided the state's efforts to colonize Russia's new steppe lands, where nomads like the Kalmyks and Nogays were made Russian subjects and pressured to settle. Like other European enthusiasts for empire and colonialism, the Russian elite saw their expansionist project as bringing civilization to empty lands and backward

peoples. At the same time, there was some romanticizing of nomads: as Sunderland puts it, "The image of the nomad as noble savage began to be embraced in the very late 1700s largely because the threat of the nomad as ignoble savage was receding; but nomadism itself was still seen as deficient, and change was still necessary" (p. 63). The Enlightenment project called for knowledge, and Russian administrators began systematic exploration of the steppe, mapping the land and enumerating and describing the people. More than half a million foreign and Russian peasant settlers went to the newly conquered lands, with the state providing strong tax and material incentives and large land grants.

From the early 1800s to the 1840s, in a process that Sunderland names "bureaucratic colonization," the Russian government tried to encourage and regulate colonization in the steppes. It did so by laying out precise conditions for immigration to those lands, and by providing material support for colonists. Best treated were the foreign colonists, who received large land allotments, tax privileges, and exemption from the draft. The bureaucrats also promoted state peasant colonization, despite their relative contempt for Russian peasants. The government wanted to people "unused" lands, but serfs were too hard to move. Instead, in "land-poor" central regions of Russia, state peasant communes could determine which of their members to release for colonization. Those peasants were directed to settle unfarmed lands in Bessarabia, Crimea, the North Caucasus, or the Orenburg region. The author examines changes in state decrees and the shifting of bureaucratic control of colonization from one government ministry to another, as well as official characterizations of colonizing groups (Mennonites, Jews, Tatars, Nogays), and the state's inability to fully control the process, so that "illegal" colonization always accompanied planned colonization.

From the 1840s until Emancipation (1861), in a period Sunderland refers to as "reformist colonization," government officials tried to regulate but encourage settlement and colonization, and began to use those two terms interchangeably.

During this period, foreign colonization decreased, but settlement by Russians and “Little Russians” [Ukrainians] from the interior to the frontier provinces expanded. The state also sent Jews to steppe lands, with the goal of turning them into farmers. The state clearly valued farmers over nomads, regarding the latter as backward potential enemies who needed to be settled, Russified, and civilized. Because Sunderland focuses on movement into colonized areas, he downplays movement out of those areas. The expulsion of hundreds of thousands of Muslims from Crimea and the North Caucasus after the Crimean War merits only two pages of commentary. The Adyge [Cherkess or Circassians], who loomed large in the Russian imperial imagination, and who were the largest group exiled, receive no mention at all; fortunately the topic has been handled in greater detail elsewhere (Fisher 1987; Jaimoukha 2001; Karpat 1985).

The final chapter discusses the expansion of colonization in the late 19th century, and government policies — now “scientifically” based — that favored distributing Russians throughout the empire so that they could civilize and assimilate the aliens. This chapter, and the conclusion, are explicitly comparative; Sunderland compares Russian colonialism with colonialisms elsewhere in the world. He notes that Russian officials in the late 19th century compared their own efforts to those of other empires, discussing whether Russia was engaged in colonialism, imperialism, internal colonization, or something unique and incomparable; they usually decided that their approach was superior and less harmful to natives than that of other empires. Sunderland also uses his wide readings in literature on frontier and borderland throughout the world to compare Russian geographical and environmental attitudes to those of other imperial regimes.

The author draws on a wealth of primary and secondary sources, and bases much of the work on research in central and provincial archives. The footnotes lead the reader to a vast spectrum of literature on empire and colony; unfortunately, the volume does not provide a bibliography. Sunderland uses the names of Russian provinces for the lands under discussion, but he provides no map of those provincial outlines, so the reader is left knowing that “New Russia” was a new name for “New Serbia,” but has no concept of New Russia’s or New Serbia’s location. The author also uses “Tauris” to refer to Crimea (translating the Russian *Tavrida*), and again, does not help the reader to make the connection between the familiar and the unfamiliar place name. Finally, the author’s lens is so broad that the whole volume is a series of generalizations. This reader wishes that the author would focus briefly on several particular places, to produce a deeper understanding of the experience of one or two groups that colonized, or one or two groups of local peoples who were affected by the waves of immigration. Regardless of these small matters, *Taming the Wild Field* is a valuable and comprehensive treatment of Russia’s colonial expansion into nomadic territories.

References

Fisher, Alan

1987 “Emigration of Muslims from the Russian Empire in the years after the Crimean War,” *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, 35 (3) 356-371.

Jaimoukha, Amjad

2001 *The Circassians: A Handbook*. Richmond: Curzon Press.

Karpat, Kemal

1985 *Ottoman Population 1830-1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hasan B. Paksoy, ed., *Central Asia Reader: The Rediscovery of History*. Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 1994, ix + 206 pp., index. ISBN 156324201X, \$106.95 (cloth); 1563242028, \$35.95 (pbk.)

Reviewed by: **Nathan Light**, Postdoctoral Fellow, Havinghurst Center for Russian and Post-Soviet Studies, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, USA, nlight@utoledo.edu

In Chingiz Aitmatov’s novel *The Day Lasts More than a Hundred Years*, Aitmatov invents the *mankurt*, a slave whose complete docility and obedience to his Zhuanzhuan captors results from the erasure of his memory. The *mankurt* forgets his

tribe and his name, and cannot even “remember his childhood, father and mother — in short, he could not recognize himself as a human being” (p. 126). Aitmatov’s *mankurt* was a thinly veiled image of

Soviet peoples whose obedience to Russian rule resulted from forgetting their own history.

Although he does not mention Aitmatov's *mankurt*, H. B. Paksoy frames this reader as a collection of examples from the process of rediscovering and publicizing Central Asian history in the aftermath of Soviet-era denial and forgetting of history. Paksoy's collection makes translations of important sources accessible to non-specialists, and it is useful for teaching the historical and political debates from the past century of ideological conflict in Turkic Central Asia. However, he is misleading when he claims that these represent some of the few "bits of true history" (p. vii) that were published during the Soviet period. The falsification of "true history" was more complex than he allows, and some of these pieces have yet to be rediscovered in Central Asia.

In the field of Central Eurasian studies, there are few excellent collections or readers. This work merits the attention of specialists and, with adequate explanation of the material, can be used to supplement classes. Paksoy himself did not undertake to make this work very useful to non-specialists: it is a miscellany that is insufficiently integrated or comprehensive, and lacks an overall presentation to explain the significance of the pieces. These are largely of pieces that Paksoy has translated himself or that were published in the *Bulletin of the Association for the Advancement of Central Asian Research* during his editorship. The resulting collection discusses both history that had been forgotten and the political conflicts over remembering.

The best articles pertain specifically to Paksoy's areas of interest and expertise. An important influence on Paksoy's own political commitments — his anti-Russian feelings, Turkic nationalism, and rejection of the partitioning of Turkic ethnicity into the Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Turkmen, and Azerbaijani groups — can be found in the writings of Zeki Velidi Togan. Paksoy's valuable "Excerpts from the Memoirs of Zeki Velidi Togan" (pp. 127-152) should be read first, since it introduces many of the early 20th century political issues that are implicit in most of the articles in this collection. The other selection from Togan [Toğan], "The Origins of the Kazaks and the Özbeks" (pp. 25-39), is a less enlightening presentation of historical data, but it reflects Paksoy's interest in deconstructing these ethnic identities.

David S. Thomas' brief biography of Yusuf Akchura [Akçura] and his translation of Akchura's important *Üç tarz-i siyaset* [Three types of policies], originally published in 1904 (pp. 101-16), as well as Hisao Komatsu's translation and commentary of "The Program of the Turkic Federalist Party in Turkistan (1917)" (pp. 117-126), are other highlights of this collection. They will be useful for the classroom with appropriate commentary by the instructor.

The clear significance of Akchura and Togan's early works contrasts with other political documents that appear in this collection. The latter give glimpses of political and cultural conflicts from the perspectives of both Turkic nationalists and Soviet propagandists, but still resemble the undigested translations that appear in the *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press* and the *Daily Report of the Foreign Broadcast Information Service*. Without better annotation they do not stand on their own.

The two translated and annotated articles on Turkic *dastan* epics (another area of Paksoy's expertise) are also useful introductions to this field, although the annotations for the two articles differ greatly. Shawn T. Lyons simply glosses people and words, but gives no other context in his translation of Naim Karimov's "Exposing the Murderer of *Alpamysh*" (pp. 43-58), while Paksoy's introduction to Memmed Dadashzade's "Ethnographic Information Concerning Azerbaijan Contained in the *Dede Korkut Dastan*" (pp. 59-76) situates the article within the literature, and makes a good starting point for further research.

Unfortunately, in his praise for the article Paksoy seems to endorse Dadashzade's problematic claim that the *Dede Korkut* epic reflects the culture of the Oghuz Turks during the ninth through the eleventh centuries. Dadashzade says the epic shows "no compliance with the Islamic 'precepts'" since it depicts the Oghuz enjoying wine, music and dance, but this cannot be taken as proof of his assertion that "Islam had still not attained a dominant position" (p. 71). Further, Dadashzade shows that these supposed ninth-eleventh century Turks already used words borrowed from Arabic and Persian, such as *shalvar* (loose trousers), *nishanli* (engaged), *ashik* (minstrel), and *naghara* (kettle drums). As such words should make clear, the *Dede Korkut* epic likely reflects considerably later influences (perhaps as late as the fifteenth century when it was first written down). A more nuanced analysis would be

necessary to situate this epic chronologically and to draw conclusions about its reflection of religious practices.

The other discussions of cultural history in Paksoy's volume are weaker. Kahar Barat's brief article on the discovery of the supposed tomb of "Kashgarli Mahmud" (Mahmud Kashghari) in the village of Opal in Xinjiang (pp. 77-81) recounts reports from the Xinjiang press, but has none of the critical assessment that such a momentous discovery should entail. Bahtiyar Nazarov's rather empty article on the *Kutadgu Bilig* (pp. 82-88) barely begins to address its topic before closing with a vague call for further study of this work. The one brief paragraph introducing the translation of a 1982 *Sovyet Uzbekistani* [sic] editorial criticizing religious proselytizers, "Deceivers: Observations Pursuant to Judicial Proceedings," (pp. 89-97), fails to point out the connections of this polemic to a pattern of similar attempts to control popular religious expression.

The final section of Paksoy's collection consists of an interview published in Azerbaijan, and representative reports from the journal *Turkestan*,

which was published in Estonia but circulated in Almaty in the early 1990s. These pieces have no annotation at all, so that while they serve as examples of the increasingly public discussions of urban unrest, the anti-nuclear movement, and the predicament of the Crimean Tatars of that time, a non-specialist will have no sense of how these instances fit into ongoing history.

Paksoy's reader is not the accessible collection with a wide spectrum of usefully annotated readings that Central Asian history sorely needs, and now, in 2005, surely many more documents from the decade and a half of the post-Soviet period could be added. Still, in light of the absence of alternatives, researchers and teachers already equipped to assess the significance of particular pieces will find much of value in this volume.

References

Aitmatov, Chingiz

1983 *The Day Lasts Longer than a Hundred Years*. John French, trans. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Edward Schatz, *Modern Clan Politics: The Power of "Blood" in Kazakhstan and Beyond*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2004. xxvi + 250 pp., map, tables, notes, bibliography, index. ISBN 0295984465, \$50.00 (cloth), 0295984473, \$22.50 (pbk.).

Reviewed by: **Virginia Martin**, Associate Professor, Department of History, University of Alabama in Huntsville, Huntsville, Ala., USA, martinvi@email.uah.edu

One important goal of this clearly written and interesting study is to theorize a state political structure for Kazakhstan that does not reject subethnic (clan, kin-based) identity in modern politics, as do Weberian rationalization/modernization theories and international development norms. That clans and clan politics "persist" today is a "central puzzle" (p. x) that Schatz's study attempts to solve. In the end, he prescribes a future for Kazakhstan (and other clan-rich polities) that brings kinship identities, functions and divisions completely above ground: "... states must ... relegitimize kinship as a basis for social organization and political life" (p. 171). By thus embracing the "developmentally useful purposes" that clans can serve, states such as Kazakhstan may help themselves to avoid the potential for instability that politics based on ethnic/national divisions have engendered in other parts of the world.

Schatz comes to these conclusions after an admirable amount of empirical study of the political culture of Soviet and post-Soviet Kazakhstan. He employs a variety of research techniques: archival research, interviews, ethnographic observation, focus groups, statistical analysis, as well as a broad reading of theories and models of modernization and identity politics, in both the former USSR and other parts of the world. The book is organized into three parts (seven chapters), plus an introduction and a conclusion. The first part, "The Reproduction of Clans," attempts to explain why Kazakh clan politics survived from pre-Soviet times through the post-Soviet era. Part Two, "The Political Dynamic of Informal Ties," provides analyses of clan-based networks and how they function, both as facets of the ruling regime (at the national, regional and local levels) and as tools of the opposition. Part Three, "Managing Clans," takes issue with primordialism

and concludes that clan behavior in the modern world is shaped to a significant extent by the constructionism of the state in identity politics.

Schatz culminates his study with this last point, so everything rests on its persuasiveness. For the most part, he succeeds. He argues that clans continued to play a role in Soviet political culture and that they are influential in politics today *because* the actions and policies of the state created effective “mechanisms of identity reproduction” for them (pp. 13-20). Under Soviet rule clans were deemed antithetical to the Soviet modernization project, and were thus rejected in favor of creating other types of identity (internationalist, ethnic, class); but rather than eliminating them, this state policy only caused them to conceal their functions and thrive as tools of survival in the Soviet shortage economy. In the post-Soviet era, clan networks operate more freely, but they still function in a socioeconomic and political context of shortage and authoritarian control. The state practices clan “clientelism” and “balancing” (p. 111), and individuals respond by contemplating and utilizing their kin-based identities in, e.g., access networks and group “metaconflicts” (see Chapter 6, which is particularly impressive for its interrogation of “insider” perspectives on the meanings and functions of clans across geographic and socioeconomic divides). Thus, for Schatz, “[s]tate action may be ... the core reason for the persistence of clans” in Kazakhstan (p. 163). It is worth noting that Schatz understands both that there may be other reasons beyond state action and that there is real complexity rather than causal unidirectionality in the relationship between states and clans (“they construct each other” [p. 164]).

While one might quibble with the central role that Schatz constructs for the state in his examination of Soviet and post-Soviet identity politics, what is worth challenging more firmly is his vision for a clan-inclusive future that is “managed” by the state. That is, Schatz argues that the state must actively accommodate clan identities (and the multiple levels at which they function) by crafting policies that effect transparency in governance. Such policies include creating open “flows of information,” instituting open local and regional elections, and providing knowledge of kinship identity in public records of bureaucrats and politicians, as well as promoting a more equitable distribution of wealth (pp. 167-71). But does it make sense to so optimistically theorize the Kazakhstani state taking the lead toward “depoliticizing” clans in these ways, when, as Schatz admits (p. 171), the

post-Soviet state of Kazakhstan has “moved precisely in the opposite direction” and furthered clan politics? Schatz clearly appreciates the complexity of his puzzle, but in his goal of theorizing beyond Weber, primordialists, and the “conceptual blind spot” (p. 3) that international political theory has for clan politics, he may have missed an opportunity to problematize group behavior even more by stepping back from the state to contemplate a role for non-state social and cultural activism.

Certainly, he missed a different sort of opportunity that in my view is more serious, and it involves his historical perspective (As a historian myself, I cannot help but react to his suggestion that the reader can grasp the central argument of the book without reading carefully its main historical chapter [p. 21]). The question is: at what point did “the state” begin to shape the subethnic identities that Kazakhs claim today? How far back in history should one look for evidence of the state’s role in “the reproduction of clans”? Schatz’s answer is the 1920s: “Statehood was a Soviet creation, so the impact of state structures emanated not from indigenous institutions that predated Soviet rule but rather from Soviet efforts themselves” (p. 191, n. 1). I take issue with this view, not because I support the official historiographical position in Kazakhstan today that statehood predated Russian rule in the 18th century. Rather, my point is that Schatz seriously underestimates the extent and effect of the transformative policies that the imperial Russian state crafted for the nomads. Alas, his understanding of the “pre-Soviet” era (pp. 33-37) is rooted largely in now-dated secondary literature that continues to lead even the best contemporary observers astray.

As numerous recent works have shown (e.g., Bykov 2002; Geraci 2001; Khodarkovsky 2002; Schorkowitz 2001), tsarist policy sought substantial social and political transformation of its populations within the Russian state. In the Kazakh Steppe beginning in earnest in 1822 (but practiced unsystematically for decades before that), policies were aimed at, among other things, settling the nomads and encouraging agriculture, criminalizing certain customs, rewarding politically loyal native elites, and transferring clan identity from a supposedly “primordial” kin basis to localized, territorially-defined administrative units. These are all policies and effects that Schatz attributes only to Soviet rule in the 20th century (pp. 37-45), but they all occurred earlier as well. Even if identity was not as deeply and broadly transformed under imperial

Russian rule, it cannot be dismissed as inconsequential. In fact, I would suggest that it was not simply “because of Soviet rule” (p. 147) that clans persisted. It was most likely their long struggles to accommodate Russian state structures into the steppe economy, culture and political arena in the period 1820s-1920s that prepared them to “persist” and thrive in the Soviet years.

Although this corrective leaves Schatz’s major argument intact — that clan identity is neither primordial nor necessarily destined to decline, but constantly (re-)constructed through state actions — still its implications are important. If Kazakh state and clan politics are contemplated from a deeper historical perspective — taking into consideration a 180-year (or longer) history of clans and clan networks working within a framework of a modernizing state wary of their existence — then perhaps the “potential for subversiveness” (p. 173) of clan politics so easily conjured by observers of modern states may turn out (in the case of Kazakhstan, at least) to be minimal indeed.

References

Bykov, A. Iu.

- 2002 “Proekty i reformy N. S. Mordvinova i M. M. Speranskogo po upravleniiu Kazakhstanom

v nachale XIX veka” [Projects and reforms of N. S. Mordvinov and M. M. Speranskii on administration of Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 19th century]. In: *Vostokovednye issledovaniia na Altae*, 3. [Orientalist research in the Altai, 3], V. A. Moiseev, ed., pp. 55-70. Barnaul: Izdatel’stvo Altaiskogo gos. universiteta.

Geraci, Robert P.

- 2001 *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Khodarkovsky, Michael

- 2002 *Russia’s Steppe Frontier: The Making of a Colonial Empire, 1500-1800*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Schorkowitz, Dittmar

- 2001 *Staat und Nationalitäten in Russland: Der Integrationsprozess der Burjaten und Kalmücken, 1822-1925* [State and nationality in Russia: The integration process of Buryats and Kalmyks, 1822-1925]. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Will Prentice, *Before the Revolution: A 1909 Recording Expedition in the Caucasus and Central Asia by the Gramophone Company*. London: Topic Records, 2002. TSCD 921, \$18.98.

Reviewed by: **Tanya Merchant**, PhD candidate in Ethnomusicology, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif., USA, tmerch@ucla.edu

Before the Revolution is an important and informative collection that allows the listener to have access to some of the earliest surviving recordings of Caucasian and Central Asian music; they are certainly the earliest recordings currently available on the mass market. With the diverse tracks on the album, the listener is able to follow the progress of a recording expedition made in 1909 by Franz Hampe for the Gramophone Company. The recording expedition’s purpose was primarily to collect music for local consumption, as well as for American and European markets. This practice was very successful: according to the liner notes, 95 percent of the recordings made on the trip were released to the public.

Will Prentice, a conservation specialist for the British Library National Sound Archive (BLNSA),

compiled these recordings, which are currently housed in the BLNSA International Music Collection. The recordings on this CD are similar to recordings I have listened to in the archives of the Uzbek State Radio, the Smithsonian, and the BLNSA. These samples support and go beyond descriptions of music made by travelers in Central Asia. Since the Europeans traveling in Central Asia in the pre-Soviet era were not usually trained musicians, the descriptions of music in that era leave much to be desired. Stephen Graham’s description of a “Sart Orchestra” is an excellent example of this: “I listened to an unearthly hubbub of bands — or of fire hooters, I could not tell which” (Graham 1916: 105). In light of these unenlightening and desultory comments in the literature, this recording should be mandatory listening for anyone interested in early 20th century Central Asian culture. It

provides a rare glimpse into the musical and cultural production of the era, as well as audio examples that supplement the body of ethnomusicological literature documenting the beginnings of the recording industry (Gronow 1975, 1981; Racy 1976).

The liner notes are extremely thorough and provide the contextual information necessary for educated listening. They include detailed descriptions of each track and biographical information about the performers (when available), as well as an account of the recording expedition. This very poignant sound artifact helps show the level of cultural imperialism at the time, which was supported by trade in cultural objects. Although the Tsarist government had little interest in Central Asian music, the Gramophone Company saw the value of importing European recording technology in order to profit from local audiences and their music. By bringing gramophone and phonograph technology, these companies were creating markets in Central Asia, and demand from Central Asian populations. Similar ventures in creating local markets were successful in India and Egypt in the early 20th century (Gronow 1975; Racy 1976). *Before the Revolution* provides a very interesting glimpse into the early recording industry and its attempt to open up Asian markets.

One can conjecture that this prerevolutionary era was a time of intense musical change. One possible means of ideological resistance against the Russian colonizers was the conservation of musical traditions. This disc allows the listener to compare the very different musical traditions from the Caucasus and Central Asia, and demonstrates contrasts between traditional music as it is currently played under the influences of Soviet ideology and “improved” technology. Much of the Caucasian music is similar to South Slavic or Balkan music, while the music from the Central Asian regions sounds more similar to Persian, Afghan, and Arabic musical traditions.

The recordings have been skillfully remastered; the hum of the older technology is minimal. Nonetheless, by listening to other cues, it is

possible to hear how the technology of the time shaped the types of recordings that Hampe was able to make. The most noticeable similarity between all these tracks is the length: all 23 tracks on this album are between 2:42 and 3:09 minutes in length. This explicitly illustrates the role of recording technology in shaping the musical objects that people had available to them. Of course one cannot really know how much technology shaped the live performance of any of these works, but it has certainly done much to shape many popular genres; even today, most popular songs are still around three minutes in duration. Some tracks exhibit these limits by ending in the middle of a section, or by cutting a section short in order to play a conclusive phrase before the end of the track. The liner notes mention that during this era, Gramophone switched from producing one-sided discs to two-sided discs, which effectively doubled the possible length for one recording.

This recording represents a real victory for the BLNSA in an age when archives are searching for methods to provide the public with better access to their collections. I had a chance to play this disc for my colleagues in Uzbekistan. Everyone who heard it was very excited by the content, and wished that the Uzbek State Radio would release a similar disc so that more people could hear the early recordings that are kept in its archives. Hopefully this disc will serve as a catalyst for similar remastering projects by other archives.

References

- Graham, Stephen
1916 *Through Russian Central Asia*. London: Cassel.
- Gronow, Pekka
1975 “Ethnic music and the Soviet record industry,” *Ethnomusicology*, 19 (1) 91-99.
1981 “The record company comes to the Orient,” *Ethnomusicology*, 25 (2) 251-284.
- Racy, A. J.
1976 “Record company and Egyptian traditional music 1904-1936,” *Ethnomusicology*, 20 (1) 23-48.

Rafis Abazov, *Historical Dictionary of Turkmenistan*. Historical Dictionaries of Asia, Oceania and the Middle East Series, No. 53. Lanham, Md.: The Scarecrow Press, 2005, 344 pp. ISBN 0810853620 \$65.00 (cloth).

Reviewed by: **Begench Karaev [Karayev]**, Fulbright Scholar, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., USA, karbens2004@yahoo.com

Turkmenistan is the second largest independent state that emerged in Central Asia after the collapse of the former Soviet Union in 1991. It is a strategically important country not only because of its large oil and natural gas reserves, but also due to the fact that it occupies a natural transportation corridor between Russia and Iran, the Caucasus, and China. Yet Turkmenistan has not been the subject of comprehensive research in Western academia. Publication of the *Historical Dictionary of Turkmenistan* is one of first steps in filling the existing gap in studies of this country.

This work covers modern history of the Turkmen people and Turkmen statehood in a concise form within the context of Central Asian and Middle Eastern history. It is designed as a reference source, where students and scholars can find facts about the history of the Turkmen nation and about its political, social, and economic development. The volume contains statistical data, a chronology, and an extensive bibliography.

The extended historical introduction of this book provides a useful framework for understanding the history and political and economic development of Turkmenistan in the 19th and 20th centuries. The author puts in historical perspective the establishment of the political and social institutions of modern Turkmenistan. He illustrates how traditional political institutions of the tribal society interacted with the Soviet-style one-party political institutions of the totalitarian state during the Soviet and post-Soviet eras.

The dictionary itself, which is the main body of the book, consists of information on the most important issues, personalities, geographic locations, institutions, and political parties, as well as most significant international partners in the region and critical regional issues. Current information and statistical data make this section of the book a valuable and useful resource on a wide range of topics. Readers will find particularly useful the author's concise and comprehensive description of historical, national, and political topics. Abazov not only portrays historical personalities and depicts developments in Turkmenistan, but he also shows that Turkmen intellectuals and scholars are re-

evaluating and rethinking many aspects of Turkmen history. This is especially important for understanding some developments in the ancient, medieval, and contemporary history of the Turkmen people in light of new historical findings and access to some archival materials for scholars.

The book concludes with a concise review of the historical literature on Turkmenistan and an extended bibliography. This part of the work is divided into smaller subsections, making it easy to navigate through hundreds of titles of the most important works in various fields, including economics, politics, international relations, and demography. This extensively researched section represents a valuable and up-to-date supplement for all scholars and students who study contemporary Central Asia.

In the end, I have several critical notes about this publication. First of all, in the introduction the author devotes very few lines to Turkmenistan's foreign policy, though detailed discussion of the regional security environment and relations with regional powers would contribute to a better understanding of domestic and international policies of the country. There are very few biographies in the dictionary sections. The author could have included more biographies of the many important historical personalities, writers, poets, and politicians who made significant contributions to Central Asian and Middle Eastern culture. I was also disappointed not to find the text of the Constitution of Turkmenistan, though publications in this series traditionally include the full English texts of the constitutions of the covered countries. The Constitution is the most important document shaping Turkmenistan's legal environment. In the bibliographical section of the book I found very few publications by Turkmen authors in the Turkmen language, though Turkmen scholars made numerous groundbreaking discoveries and wrote important books on various issues.

Despite some minor shortcomings, this very solid work goes beyond what is expected in a simple reference work. The *Historical Dictionary of Turkmenistan* is valuable reading for anyone interested in understanding the modern history of Turkmenistan and important regional issues.

Conferences and Lecture Series

IFEAC Regional Conference, “Tengrism as a New Factor in the Construction of Identity”¹

Almaty, Kazakhstan, February 25, 2005

Reported by: **Marlène Laruelle**, Scholar at the French Institute for Central Asia Studies, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, marlenelaruelle@yahoo.com

The French Institute for Central Asian Studies (IFEAC) held a regional conference on its premises in Almaty on the movement to promote Tengrism. It was attended by Kazakh, Kyrgyz, and Tatar scholars. Tengrism can be defined as an intellectual and religious phenomenon found in Central Asia and Mongolia and among Turkic Muslim and Buddhist peoples in Russia. Its adherents aim to present Islam (and, to a lesser extent, Buddhism) as a foreign belief for these peoples and to rehabilitate the ancient cult of the god Tengri.

This movement appeared in the 1990s in Naberezhnye Chelny (Tatarstan) where the only Tengrist journal, *Bizneng yul*, is still published; from there it spread throughout Central Asia. The movement, which is so far minimally institutionalized, is however organizing itself: there is now in Bishkek a Tengrist society, “Tengir Ordo,” which organized an international conference promoting Tengrism in 2003 and, in Almaty, a gallery of Tengrist paintings, “Tengri Umai.” There are more and more articles about this topic in scholarly publications of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. Proponents of this movement can be found in academic and artistic circles. They try to exert influence in political circles and have succeeded in spreading their concepts to political power holders. Evidence of the latter includes references that Kazakhstan President Nazarbaev and especially former Kyrgyzstan President Akaev have made to Tengrism as the Turks’ national and natural religion.

Several scholars taking part in the IFEAC conference proposed in their papers a very nationalist conception of the role of Tengrism in

Central Asian societies. Among the local specialists of this question, two scholars from the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Kazakhstan, Napil Bazylkhan and Kenje Torlanbaeva, pointed out that Tengrism must be presented as monotheism: different gods would be only incarnations of the supreme God, Tengri. These scholars claim that Tengrism is a natural religion whose last traces can be found in shamanism. Proponents of Tengrism assert that this religion proposes a cosmogony which would perfectly match the contemporary world: it is an ecological religion and would invite man to live in harmony with nature; it advocates tolerance and accepts coexistence with other religions; it is an individualist religion, with no holy book, dogmas, interdiction, or prayers.

Nigmat Ayupov, Professor of Philosophy at the National Pedagogical University (Almaty, Kazakhstan) and Amanjol Kasabekov, Professor of Philosophy at the Academy of Law of Kazakhstan (Almaty) focused in their presentations on the cosmogonic aspects of contemporary Tengrism. They argued that Central Asian Tengrism can be viewed as a Turkic version of Russian neopaganism already present in intellectual circles in Russia. Slavic neopaganism also exists in Ukraine, and other forms of Tengrism can be found among Crimean Karaites (Jews). The rehabilitation of Zoroastrianism in Tajikistan can also be included in this tendency. Indeed, by denying the universality of the main monotheist religions and by asserting that Islam would serve foreign interests, Tengrism constitutes the religious version of many Kazakh, Kyrgyz, and Tatar nationalist discourses.

Zira Nauryzbaeva, editor of the culturological journal *Rukh-Miras*, published in Astana, Kazakhstan, promulgates the official discourse of

¹ The title of the conference in French was “Le tengrisme comme nouveau facteur de construction identitaire.”

the government's program on "National Heritage." Her presentation echoed the journal's approach, which views Tengrism as an important part of contemporary nation building in Central Asia. That is, Tengrism is part of the current culturological movement that asserts the unique originality of a people, its presence on the national territory over several millenia, its ethnic continuity since antiquity, and its specific religious conceptions. Several supporters of Tengrism do not hide their political commitment, such as in Tatarstan, where Tengrists support the independence of the republic, or in Central Asia, where Tengrists support the "purification" of their countries of foreign influences coming from both Russia and the Middle East.

The movement to promote Tengrism is striking in its extreme instrumentalization of the religious idea, which is actually completely subjected to the nationalist feeling; for example, in her presentation, Zira Nauryzbaeva stressed the idea that religion can only be national: each people has its own religion. Nothing in the field of religion can be

supranational. From this we can probably attribute the current spreading of Tengrism to the legacy of Soviet atheism: that is, certain nationalists searching for a strictly national system have difficulty accepting the Muslim or Christian message and prefer a so-called religion that has no regular ritual practices and theological foundation, and that exalts the nation and the motherland.

This conference gave rise to lively debates. For example, some Tengrism proponents challenged the IFEAC attempt to analyze this question scientifically and refused to accept the idea that Western researchers have the right to express their views on the phenomenon. They objected to any constructivist approach aiming to explain that identity referents are not "natural," voicing those objections first in the name of the "national 'authenticity' of Tengrism," and, second, because the Central Asian peoples are "recovering" today some ancient cultural elements after the Russian-Soviet "parenthesis."

Situating the Uyghurs between China and Central Asia

Center of Contemporary Central Asia and the Caucasus, School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), London University, London, UK, November 5-6, 2004

Reported by: **Ildikó Bellér-Hann**, Center for Oriental Studies, Martin Luther University, Halle/Saale, Germany, ildiko.beller-hann@owz.uni-halle.de; **Cristina Cesàro**, independent scholar, Trieste, Italy, cristinacesaro@virgilio.it; **Rachel Harris**, SOAS, London University, London, UK, rh@soas.ac.uk; and **Joanne N. Smith**, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, Newcastle, UK, j.smith@newcastle.ac.uk

Sixteen academics and scholars based in Europe, China, the United States, and Australia, who work on Uyghur culture and society from diverse perspectives, were invited to participate in this conference which was primarily funded through grants from the China and Inner Asia Council of the Association for Asian Studies (CIAC/CCK, Conferences in China and Inner Asia Studies Grants Program), and the British Academy, which supported travel and accommodation for two speakers.

To facilitate discussion during the event and feedback to the authors, papers were circulated among participants in advance. The conference — the first of its kind focusing on the Uyghurs to be held in the UK — attracted an unanticipated level of interest. More than 50 people audited the event,

including students, members of the Uyghur community, academics, writers, and representatives of NGOs and the media. Speakers and auditors contributed to lively but always amicable discussion of presentations. Two extra presentations were included at short notice, the first by Jun Suguwara of the Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa in Tokyo, Japan, on a new Uyghur database; the second about a recent fieldwork trip around Xinjiang's Sufi shrines, with stunning photos by Lisa Ross, independent photographer from New York, and accompanying text by Alexandre Papas of the School of Social Sciences in Paris.

The tightly focused conference theme worked very well. A great deal of original research was presented in the course of the two days, and the cross-disciplinary and broad range of backgrounds

of the speakers produced many fascinating juxtapositions and contrasts. A paper by Laura Newby of Oxford University on Uyghur identity in the 19th century, drawing on Qing Dynasty sources, contrasted well with the work of Ablät Kamalov of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Kazakhstan (Almaty) on the early Russian ethnographers and nation builders in the region. Gardner Bovington of Indiana University's Department of Central Eurasian Studies (USA) spoke on the diminishing possibilities for peaceful Uyghur opposition from within the Central Asian states, while Nicolas Becquelin of Human Rights in China (Hong Kong) discussed possibilities for the "betterment" of the Uyghurs within the Chinese state framework. Two speakers from Xinjiang University (Urumchi, China) — Rahilä Dawut and Asad Sulayman — showed how Uyghur intellectuals based within Xinjiang are pressing for small changes in concrete ways. Dawut's paper on Islamic shrines and tourism provoked particular interest. David Wang of the University of Queensland (Brisbane, Australia), formerly of the Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps, produced some previously unreleased figures demonstrating the disparities in income and living standards between the different ethnic groups in the region.

A paper by Joanne Smith from the University of Newcastle upon Tyne on ethnography of identity formation among Chinese-educated Uyghurs in Xinjiang contrasted with that of Sean Roberts of the United States Agency for International Development on Uyghur communities in Kazakhstan. And a presentation by Ildikó Bellér-Hann of Martin Luther University in Germany on ritual practices across the

wider region provided a useful framework for the fieldwork-based study of Edmund Waite of the Institute of Education, London University (UK), on the rise of orthodox forms of Islam. Rachel Harris of SOAS provided a survey of musical traditions across the region, while independent scholar Cristina Cesàro of Italy demonstrated the complex interplay of Chinese influences and Uyghur identity formation in the sphere of food culture. In addition, Arie Dwyer of the University of Kansas, USA, provided insight into local Uyghur identities through the lens of language usage. And Michael Friederich of Bamberg University (Bamberg, Germany) considered new trends in contemporary Uyghur literature, while Nathan Light of the University of Toledo (Ohio, USA) argued that shifting metaphors used by Uyghur writers reflect shifts in Uyghur cultural identity.

In seeking to answer the question of how far Chinese rule has succeeded in disembedding the Uyghurs from the Central Asian cultural context and integrating them into China, the Uyghurs' "in-between-ness" was explored through the varied dynamics of historical and contemporary sociocultural assumptions and practices. The strong attendance and lively discussions following the delivery of each paper, together with the generally positive atmosphere, testify that the conference succeeded in its aim of promoting dialogue across national and disciplinary borders, bringing together Xinjiang specialists who have hitherto worked in relative isolation and narrowing the chasm of perspectives between Sinology and Central Asian studies.

Educational Resources and Developments

***Editors' Note:** With this issue, the Educational Resources and Developments section begins a series that profiles programs for graduate study of the Central Eurasian region at universities around the world. The series begins with two accounts from US universities, the University of Washington and the University of Chicago. Our intent in presenting this series is to inform CESR readers — prospective students, instructors, researchers, agencies seeking qualified employees, and others — of the variety of programs and resources that universities provide and the challenges that institutions face in maintaining and developing their programs. We encourage you to contact the Editors with a proposal for a profile of your institution's programs (or your experiences in them) that is analytical and reflective in nature. The articles in this series are not meant to be free advertising for recruitment purposes; rather, they should be conceived as a way to help fellow specialists keep abreast of institutional and programmatic developments, as resources for the study of Central Eurasia grow and shift.*

Central Eurasia Across the Curriculum and Beyond Institutional Walls: A Tale from Real Life

Ali F. İğmen, PhD, Department of History, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., USA, igmen@u.washington.edu; **Daniel C. Waugh**, Professor, Department of History, Department of Slavic Languages and Literature, Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., USA, dwaugh@u.washington.edu

The focus of this essay is the array of opportunities and challenges for graduate study of Central Asia at the University of Washington. UW is an institution long known for its specialization in Central Asia, but students here must nevertheless enlist resources across departmental boundaries and even beyond the walls of the university itself. The essay draws upon the personal experience of Ali İğmen, who defended his doctoral dissertation on Central Asian history in 2004. Ali came to the History Department with a master's degree from the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization (NELC). Daniel Waugh was a member of his PhD committee. We expect that Ali's experience is far from unique among those who pursue their education as Central Eurasia specialists in North American universities.

The collapse of the Soviet Union provided an opportunity and the encouragement for an unprecedented expansion of teaching and research on Central Asia, and the tragic events of 9/11 and their aftermath have been a further stimulus to the expansion of programs. It is ironic that these developments occurred at a point where, at the University of Washington and some other institutions, existing programs had suffered from key

retirements and diminished institutional support. The early 1990s saw the decline of the once pre-eminent Tibetan program and the disappearance of regular instruction in Mongolian and Manchu. Fortunately, the prominent Central Asianist Prof. Ilse Cirtautas, in collaboration with other UW faculty, continued to maintain a program that offered a variety of languages and course options. Still, with so much of the program dependent upon a single individual, and without large numbers of students in it, there was a constant danger that Central Asia would be marginalized in the face of higher departmental priorities.

A related challenge is exemplified in the continuation of the Cold War division of the world embodied in US Department of Education Title VI programs. While the Title VI Centers are now very much encouraged to teach Central Asia, and in fact there has been a substantial increase in funding for relevant language fellowships, it is not clear where the aspiring regional specialist should find his or her appropriate program or departmental home (see more on this below). It is extremely rare that an institution has resources and enough faculty to create an autonomous Central Asia program, and, as we

know, Central Asia in any event does not constitute a unified, historically defined cultural region. So at the UW, as elsewhere, instruction on Central Asia is located in several departments.

Given this situation, it took a fairly high degree of entrepreneurship and creativity on Ali's part in order to construct a first-rate doctoral program from resources at the UW and even further afield. Ali was first attracted to the UW's NELC by Professor Cirtautas' courses in language and culture, as well as by NELC's intensive summer program, which in the early 1990s offered all the major Central Asian languages. As a returning graduate student, his first task, language training, was facilitated by native knowledge of Turkish. An opportunity to teach in a US Information Agency / Portland State University education project in Osh, Kyrgyzstan, in 1995 was a valuable first in-country experience. Of particular interest was the opportunity in Professor Cirtautas' courses to focus on Kyrgyz literature, ranging from the epic *Manas* to the prose of Chingiz Aitmatov. Apart from the Turkic languages, he added Tajik and began the long road to mastering Russian in our Slavic Department. One of the secrets to the breadth of offerings through NELC was the regular presence of visiting faculty from Central Asia, among them the Uzbek poet Muhammad Ali and the Kyrgyz scholar of linguistics Gulnara Jamasheva. NELC continues to be at the core of Central Asian studies here: in both academic year and summer programs students are studying Uzbek, Uyghur, Kazakh and Kyrgyz. Title VI Center funding now makes possible individualized language instruction "on demand" in cases where only one or two students may want a language. NELC courses in all the major languages of the Middle East and on the region's cultures are oversubscribed; the new replacement hire for Persian has a strong interest in seeing that the program continues to accommodate students whose focus is Tajik.

Regularly scheduled meetings of student study groups provide in effect a permanent core seminar for Central Asianists, with a wide range of topics, such as medieval Uzbek poetry, Kazakh funeral rituals in China, Kyrgyz musical traditions, and Tajik-Uzbek diplomatic relations. An annual conference dedicated to the memory of Nicholas Poppe is an opportunity for students to present their academic research. Although lectures by visitors are no substitute for regular interaction with faculty specialists on the region, the program here benefits from a steady stream of distinguished guests. The

Seattle-Tashkent Sister City Association, one of the oldest sister-city arrangements in the US, sponsors a significant number of Central Asian visitors to Seattle and has maintained a close relationship with the university.

Even without a single departmental home here for graduate students like Ali wishing to study Central Asia, several programs bring together scholars who are interested in the region. In addition to NELC, degree options are available at the master's (MA) level in the Jackson School of International Studies' interdisciplinary program in Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies, at the PhD level in the Department of Asian Languages and Literatures, and in the Graduate School's Interdisciplinary PhD Program in Near and Middle Eastern Studies. After spending a year in the interdisciplinary program, Ali decided to choose a more "traditional" field in history. Graduate students who stay in the interdisciplinary program, however, have been very successful in obtaining teaching positions.

Central Asia-specific language and culture courses naturally are not enough. No serious student of Central Asia can avoid studying Russian and Soviet history and politics or avoid taking courses on Islam and the Middle East outside of Central Asia. In Ali İğmen's case, technically his main field was Soviet history (his dissertation is entitled "Building Soviet Central Asia, 1920-1939: Kyrgyz Houses of Culture and Self-fashioning Kyrgyzness"), but he developed a strong specialization on the modern Middle East, with course work supervised by several members of the History Department and NELC. Ali's work on Soviet history was strengthened by the expertise of his main adviser, Prof. Glennys Young, who currently supervises another graduate student working on early 20th century Central Asia, Gregory Tomasin. Only one of the history faculty, Prof. Waugh, devotes substantial time to teaching about Central Asia, even though his main area of expertise is early modern Russia. One of the strengths of a university known for its area studies faculty was the opportunity here for Ali to study as well with China specialists who work on minority issues analogous to those encountered in Russian and Soviet Central Asia. Thus he was able to add course work with anthropologist Stevan Harrell, a specialist on minorities of China, and distinguished visiting faculty such as historian Jonathan Lipman, who writes on Chinese Muslims. Since Central Asia has long been an interest of members of our Geography

Department — W. A. Douglas Jackson, now emeritus, and Craig ZumBrunnen — there were also opportunities for coursework in that field, so critical for an understanding of ecological and resource management issues today.

Effective graduate programs must provide their students and recently minted PhDs with opportunities to interact in professional settings with future colleagues; departmental support made possible Ali's participation in a number of conferences around the United States. Central Asianists obviously benefit from interdisciplinary and transnational programs; two such projects sponsored here in part by our Center for the Humanities provided venues for him to present his work. One is an ongoing project "The Modern Girl Around the World," which provided a forum for presentation to a diverse audience of a key part of Ali's dissertation on the Kyrgyz actress Sabira Kümüşaliyeva. This transnational project deals with issues of ethnicity, nationality, and gender. A second opportunity was a recent conference on "Islam, Asia and Modernity," whose presenters included distinguished scholars from around the world, among them Partha Chatterjee and several prominent Central Asianists. Of particular importance for shaping the final stages of Ali's dissertation work was his participation in April of 2003 in the Eurasia Program Dissertation Development Workshop, organized by the Social Science Research Council and the Center for Russian and East European Studies at the University of Michigan. At this conference, Bruce Grant of NYU agreed to become a formal member of his defense committee. In general, these workshops have been a valuable forum for good graduate students working on Central Asia to interact with their peers and with select faculty experts. This can

help break down the sense of isolation one sometimes feels when working within a relatively small program.

The landscape for Central Asian studies here is changing, and for the better. Title VI funding has supported new courses (for example, on the transition economies of Central Asia¹ and on the Central Asian states since independence); a major new endowment to honor retired history professor Herbert Ellison is going to extend considerably what Title VI does. Several faculty affiliated with the Russian, East European, and Central Asian Studies Program have funded research projects on Central Asia, and a US State Department grant for a collaborative project with Uzbek institutions teaching comparative religion has strengthened existing exchanges. Finally, patient negotiation with the administration is beginning to pay off with new faculty appointments, including the recent hirings of an anthropologist specializing in Islamic movements in Asia and, starting next year, a historian with a high level of Central Asia expertise. There are commitments for additional appointments that may well strengthen the "field" and should guarantee the continuation of key language instruction.

Does a vigorous Central Asian studies program require a single departmental home? The experience here suggests such need not be the case. In fact, one may argue that the strength of the field lies precisely in the interdisciplinarity without which the Central Asia area specialist cannot begin to encompass the diversity of this huge and fascinating region. A further lesson here is that inter-institutional cooperation is not only desirable but essential for the strength of the field. Our students can only benefit by creatively engaging the expertise of faculty at other universities.

¹ See CESR vol. 4, no. 1 (Winter 2005) for an article about the University of Washington's course on this subject.

Overview of Activities in Central Asian Studies at the University of Chicago, September 2000-Present

Kağan Arik, Lecturer in Uzbek and Central Asian Studies, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., USA, kagana@uchicago.edu

Since September of 2000, I have been a Lecturer in Uzbek and Central Asian Studies in the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization (NELC) at the University of Chicago. My primary duties are to teach Uzbek language courses, as well as several courses per year within my main areas of interest, on topics pertaining to Central Asia. My work is an integral element of the Central Eurasian Studies Committee (CESC). CESC was established in 2002 as an interdisciplinary, interdepartmental academic committee, bringing together several area studies centers and some twenty faculty members. I am currently the committee member in charge of curricular organization for Central Asian studies. In May 2003, CESC held a planning conference to establish a permanent program in Central Asian studies at the University of Chicago, with the participation of a number of eminent specialists in the field. CESC maintains a website at <http://centralasia.uchicago.edu>. In this article, I would like to give a brief overview of some of the activities carried out by our faculty towards the development of a program in Central Asian/Central Eurasian studies at the University of Chicago.

Courses

The lifeblood of Central Asian studies at the University of Chicago are the language courses, some of them funded by US Department of Education Title VI grants, which are offered through area studies centers. The primary Central Asian language taught is Uzbek at the first-, second-, and third-year levels; the second and third years can also be considered literature courses. In addition, Kazakh, Tajik, Georgian and Lak (a northeast Caucasian language) are offered periodically, and Armenian language and culture courses are offered every year. There are plans to offer Tibetan and Mongolian in the near future.

There have long been a number of popular academic courses on topics relating to Central Asia at the University of Chicago, including (but not limited to) the history courses taught by Prof. John Woods on the Mongols, Timurids and Safavids; Prof. Adam Smith's courses in the archaeology of

Eurasia, such as "The Archaeology of Eurasia: The Caucasus and the Central Steppe," and "Eurasian Complex Societies;" Prof. Bruce Craig's courses on the Mamluks; and Prof. Ronald Suny's "Nations and Nationalism in Eurasia." In the near future, there are plans to implement a sequence (two-three academic quarters) on Central Asian History and Civilization, to be taught jointly by several faculty members.

In addition, there have been a number of visiting appointments conferred to scholars in fields related to Central Eurasian studies. These include historian Michael Khodarkovsky, who taught "Islam in Central Asia" and "Islam in the Caucasus," and senior archeologist Boris Marshak, who taught a course on "Cultural Contacts along the Silk Road."

My own teaching contribution to the development of Central Asian studies at this university consists of the three levels of Uzbek language, and five standard academic courses on Central Asia, including three history courses and two culture courses. These courses are usually cross-listed in several departments, such as NELC, History, Anthropology, and Music. They have become a core body of courses which are taught on a recurring basis, with the goal of strengthening interest in Central Asia. "Introduction to the Turkic Peoples of Central Asia" covers the history and cultural anthropology of Central Asia from roughly the time of the Scythians to the present day, with an emphasis on the Old and Middle Turkic periods (roughly 200-1200 CE). The focus is on the formation of Turkic, Iranian, Mongol, and other ethnicities in Central Asia prior to the rise of Chinggis Khan's world empire. "Contemporary Central Asia" is also an introductory course on the history and cultural anthropology of Central Asia, but this time with an emphasis on current affairs, and on the more recent history (17th-20th centuries) of Central Asia. The focus is on the post-Mongol states in Central Asia, and the ensuing gradual Russian and Chinese conquests in the region, culminating in the Soviet and post-Soviet modern periods. "Introduction to the History of Central Asia" focuses on the *early* history of Central Asia, from about 400 BCE to 1100 CE, and interactions at

various periods between Huns, Kōk Turks, Soghdians, and Chinese. "Introduction to the Musical Folklore of Central Asia" is an exploration of Central Eurasian cultures, with respect to ethical, aesthetic, cosmological, magic-spiritual, and other cultural domains, via the medium of traditional folk music and art music. "Shamans and Oral Poets of Central Asia" is related to the musical folklore course, but focuses on the musical and lyrical aspects of the performances of shamans, oral poets, and other related specialists in Turkic, Mongolian, and Iranian societies of Central Asia. Also featured in this course is an exploration of various magical, spiritual, or religious traditions that have shaped the musical folklore of Central Asia. There is an emphasis on the healing traditions of Central Asian peoples, and the role of musical and poetic performance therein.

Central Asian Studies Society

In 2000, a number of University of Chicago students formed a student organization, the Central Asian Studies Society (CASS). The purpose of this organization is to promote Central Asian studies at the University of Chicago by sponsoring and organizing special events. Some of these events have included performances by the Bukharan Jewish Ensemble Shashmaqom, Kyrgyz performer Elmira Kōchumqul-qizi, Kazakh oral poet Ābdīghani Jienbay, the Bengi Ensemble from Turkey, and local Mongolian musicians, as well as three Central Asian film festivals featuring Kyrgyz, Kazakh, and Uzbek films. In addition, we maintain an ongoing lecture series of visiting scholars from Central Asia or US scholars in the field. The organization grew from five members and a pizza budget in 2000, to almost 100 members and a budget of \$5,000 in 2003.

It has become somewhat of a tradition for CASS students enrolled in Central Asian history courses to present their papers at the annual Middle East History and Theory Conference (MEHAT) at the University of Chicago. Thanks to their efforts, and to the participation of scholars from Central Asia and from other universities elsewhere, the existence of two or three Central Asian studies panels at the MEHAT Conference has become standard. And at the 2002 conference, the keynote address itself pertained to Central Asia.

Outreach

The Center for Middle East Studies (CMES) maintains an active and strong outreach program

under the direction of Mr. Rashid Hossein, and some of the outreach activities in recent times have pertained to Central Asia. Audiences range from local high school students to the United States Department of Homeland Security's Citizenship and Immigration Services. Lectures have been on such topics as "Iran and Central Asian Society and Culture: An Introduction to the Middle East and the Islamic World," "Central Asian Islam," and "Current Affairs in the Islamic World — the US, Afghanistan, and the War on Terror."

Future Prospects

The Central Asian studies program at this university benefits from being young and dynamic, but also tries to accomplish its objectives without disturbing established *modus operandi* which predate its inception and development. Until recently, a number of students who wanted to learn Uzbek language (and in the case of some students, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, and Tatar), could not do so because their available language course time slots were already filled up with other mandatory courses. Some had to wait until their fourth year before beginning study of Uzbek, which was not ideal. However, as Central Asian studies became more firmly established as a subfield within the NELC concentration, and it became better known to the student body that languages such as Uzbek and Kazakh can enable one to receive FLAS funding, enrollments began to increase markedly at all three levels of language instruction

Currently, the Center for Middle East Studies is the main sponsor and the "home" of our Central Asian studies program. This is consistent with developments in Central Asia itself, where the movement away from "Soviet" identity has, since 1991, increasingly taken the direction of a renewal of ties with the medieval heritage of the region. The formerly Soviet states of Central Asia are implementing programs of cultural revival and renewal drawing upon this Turko-Islamic past, which serve as a vibrant backdrop for the dynamic programs of economic, technological, and sociopolitical reform that are taking place at dizzying speeds. The rich and turbulent historical heritage of this region, as well as its multifaceted array of modern identities, and its unique and progressive interpretations of older ethical values, make it a fertile and viable field of study for current and future generations of students.

Central Eurasian Scholars Network

The **Central Eurasian Scholars Network (CESN)** is the email listserv of the **Central Eurasian Studies Society**. The purpose of the network is to provide a forum for scholars to exchange information and requests with their peers. The network is moderated by CESS members. Any interested members are encouraged to volunteer as moderators by sending an email to Laura Adams at lladams2@earthlink.net.

Note that this service is available only to members of the Central Eurasian Studies Society.

The scope of the Central Eurasian Scholars Network includes the following:

- Requests for research partners.
- Requests for collaborators in conference panels and similar projects.
- Requests for peer assistance in grant writing.
- Requests for peer assistance in the preparation of academic publications or presentations.
- Requests for institutional collaboration.
- Requests for assistance locating scholarly resources.
- Announcements of grants and other opportunities that are specifically collaborative in nature and relate to Central Eurasian studies.

To join the network, if you are already a CESS member, just send a request to CESS@fas.harvard.edu. If you are not a CESS member, you can sign up for the CESN network when filling out the webform for CESS Membership Registration at: http://cess.fas.harvard.edu/CESS_Membership.html. If you do not have good web access, you may write to CESS@fas.harvard.edu to request the MS Word version of the Membership Form.

Basic Information about the Central Eurasian Scholars Network (CESN)

Purpose: Information exchange network to encourage collaboration among scholars of Central Eurasia. Open to members of the Central Eurasian Studies Society (CESS).

Current members: ca. 1,500 (open only to CESS members)

Established: July 2003

Posting: Moderated (see list guidelines for restrictions on the list webpage)

Chief Moderator: Laura Adams, lladams2@earthlink.net

List webpage: http://cess.fas.harvard.edu/CESS_CESN.html

About the

Central Eurasian Studies Society



The CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES SOCIETY (CESS) is a private, non-political, non-profit, North America-based organization of scholars who are interested in the study of Central Eurasia, and its history, languages, cultures, and modern states and societies. We define the Central Eurasian region broadly to include Turkic, Mongolian, Iranian, Caucasian, Tibetan and other peoples. Geographically, Central Eurasia extends from the Black Sea region, the Crimea, and the Caucasus in the west, through the Middle Volga region, Central Asia and Afghanistan, and on to Siberia, Mongolia and Tibet in the east.

The CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES SOCIETY's purpose is to promote high standards of research and teaching, and to foster communication among scholars through meetings and publications. The Society works to facilitate interaction among senior, established scholars, junior scholars, graduate students, and independent scholars in North America and throughout the world. We hold an Annual Conference, and coordinate panels at various conferences relevant to Central Eurasian studies. The Society also works to promote the publication of peer-reviewed scholarship and other information essential to the building of the field.

The CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES SOCIETY is a not-for-profit organization incorporated in Massachusetts.

We invite anyone who shares these interests to become a member and participate in our activities.

To become a member of CESS or join the mailing list for occasional announcements concerning CESS activities, visit the website or contact the address below. Annual dues range from gratis to \$50, depending on income. CESS publications, the Membership Directory, conference paper abstracts and other information are available online at: <http://cess.fas.harvard.edu>.

All inquiries may be directed to:

CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES SOCIETY

John Schoeberlein, Director, CESS Secretariat

c/o Harvard Program on Central Asia and the Caucasus

1730 Cambridge Street, Room 327

Cambridge, MA 02138 USA

Fax: +1/617-495-8319

E-mail: CESS@fas.harvard.edu

<http://cess.fas.harvard.edu>

Members of the Executive Board of the Central Eurasian Studies Society

Adeeb Khalid, President (Northfield, Minn., USA)

Alexander Knysh, President-Elect (Ann Arbor, Mich., USA)

Thomas Barfield, Past President (Boston, Mass., USA)

Laura Adams (Princeton, N.J., USA)

Pınar Akçalı (Ankara, Turkey)

Shoshana Keller (Clinton, N.Y., USA)

James Millward (Washington, D.C., USA)

Scott Levi (Louisville, Ky., USA)

Douglas Northrop (Ann Arbor, Mich., USA)

Officers (non-voting Board members) of the Central Eurasian Studies Society

Director of the CESS Secretariat: **John Schoeberlein** (Cambridge, Mass., USA)

Secretary: **Eric W. Sievers** (Chicago, Ill., USA)

Treasurer : **Maureen Nemecek** (Anapolis, Md., USA)

Central Eurasian Studies Review

CALL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

CESR offers scholars, researchers and educators engaged in the study of Central Eurasia a review of current research, recent publications, scholarly meetings and new educational resources. We encourage contributions which reflect the regional and disciplinary breadth of the field.

Brief descriptions of each section follow. For more complete descriptions and submission instructions, please read the Information for Contributors on the CESR webpage: http://cess.fas.harvard.edu/CESR_contribution.html. **Contributors are urged to read CESR's format guidelines and transliteration tables carefully before submitting articles.**

Perspectives: state of the field pieces and interdisciplinary assessments of scholarship in Central Eurasian studies. The editors seek proposals for pieces that discuss and analyze the practices and changes in Central Eurasian studies in various national contexts, and pieces that compare developments and transformations in the construction of knowledge about Central Eurasia internationally. Length may vary. Contact Robert Cutler with proposed topics, rmc@alum.mit.edu.

Research Reports: 1) reports on findings and methods of on-going or recently completed research; or 2) conditions of doing research in Central Eurasian studies (up to 1,500 words). Contact: Jamilya Ukudeeva, jaukudee@cabrillo.edu.

Reviews and Abstracts: reviews (800-1,000 words) and abstracts (150-250 words) of books and other media (e.g., films, websites, music CDs, CD ROM encyclopedias) of scholarship in all social science and humanities disciplines in Central Eurasian studies. Contact: Shoshana Keller, skeller@hamilton.edu.

Conferences and Lecture Series: summary reports (500-1000 words) of conferences and lecture series devoted to the field of Central Eurasian studies as well as reports about selected panels on Central Eurasian studies at conferences held by professional societies in the humanities or social sciences. Contact: Payam Foroughi, Central-Asia@utah.edu.

Educational Resources and Developments: materials which will help develop an informed public awareness of the Central Eurasian region, such as ideas on curriculum development; discussions of teaching methodology; descriptions of specific courses (with links to their syllabi); reviews of textbooks, films, electronic resources; discussion of public education undertakings. Contact: Daniel Waugh, dwaugh@u.washington.edu.

Deadlines for submissions: Summer issue — April 1; Winter issue — November 1.

Copyright. Unless otherwise indicated, the materials appearing in CESR are not copyrighted and readers are encouraged to copy and distribute such materials as widely as possible for the use of other scholars, students, organizations, and others interested in Central Eurasia. In the event that you wish to republish any part of CESR not otherwise copyrighted, you require no permission from the Central Eurasian Studies Society as long as the republication clearly acknowledges CESR as the source, you do not claim copyright, and you insure that prompt notice of such republication is sent to the Chief Editors of CESR, Dr. Virginia Martin, martinvi@email.uah.edu and Dr. Marianne Kamp, mkamp@uwyo.edu.

The Sixth Annual Conference of the Central Eurasian Studies Society

September 29-October 2, 2005
Boston University, Boston, Mass., USA



The Central Eurasian Studies Society (CESS) will hold its Sixth Annual Conference at Boston University on September 29-October 2, 2005. Paper and roundtable proposals are no longer being accepted, but the conference is open to the public and all are welcome to attend. For full details about the program and registration, please see the conference websites:

http://cess.fas.harvard.edu/CESS_Conference.html

<http://www.bu.edu/cess/>

Deadline for pre-registration (on-site registration fees are higher): September 2, 2005.

Highlights of the conference will include:

- Keynote address by Dr. Fiona Hill of the Brookings Institution on Friday, September 30
- A reception and dinner for registered conference participants
- Screenings of feature films from Central Eurasia
- Over 60 panels and roundtables dealing with all aspects of the humanities and social sciences as they relate to Central Eurasia

Correspondence should be directed to:

CESS 2005 Annual Conference

c/o Harvard Program on Central Asia and the Caucasus
1730 Cambridge Street, Room 327
Cambridge, MA 02138 USA
tel.: +1 / 617-496-2643
fax: +1 / 617-495-8319
e-mail: CESSconf@fas.harvard.edu

CESS Conference Committee Co-Chairs:

Dr. Laura Adams (Princeton University)
Prof. Thomas Barfield (Boston University)

For full information about CESS 2005 in Boston:

Main conference website: http://cess.fas.harvard.edu/CESS_Conference.html

Conference facilities, lodging and activities at Boston University: <http://www.bu.edu/cess>

Central Eurasian Studies Society

c/o Harvard Program on Central Asia and the Caucasus
1730 Cambridge St., Room 327
Cambridge, MA 02138