



STUDIES OF THE MODERN HISTORY OF THE REPUBLIC OF KARAKALPAKSTAN: PERSPECTIVES OF PERCEPTION

Genjemuratov Yakipbek

Karakalpak State University, assistant teacher,
Nukus, Republic of Uzbekistan

Article history:	Abstract:
Received: 10 th February 2022 Accepted: 11 th March 2022 Published: 28 th April 2022	In this article, the author, without claiming to be an exhaustive nature of the study, at the same time, for the first time in research practice, attempted to form a new view on the research of the modern history of Karakalpakstan. The paper presents the most popular foreign international scientific research centers that study the recent history of Central Asia. The historiographical basis of this research was the works of American, European and Karakalpak researchers devoted to the history of the Karakalpaks of modern times. When writing the article, the main method was the method of historicism, which allows to reveal the dynamics of the transformation of Russian historiography.

Keywords: Karakalpakstan, modern history, society, historical sources, foreign scientists, Central Asia, Karakalpaks.

The modern history of the Republic of Karakalpakstan is a part of our life. After all, everything that we see in modern Karakalpak society was created by the efforts of several generations, an endless series of which goes back to the distant past. The purpose of history is to try to realize the path we have traveled.

The more we study the history of Karakalpakstan, the less "smoothed" its history begins to seem to us and we are faced with a chaos of events for which it is difficult to isolate a single reason.

For example, for such an event as the collapse of the USSR, which included Karakalpakstan, there is a whole complex of reasons. Here one can even challenge the term "disintegration" itself, arguing that rather a gradual transition took place.

Well, each of the historical theories has the right to exist, but none of them can claim the monopoly of explaining the reasons for the collapse of the USSR.

Strictly speaking, history and our past are non-identical concepts. After all, we will never know for sure what an ordinary person felt during the acquisition of sovereignty by the Republic of Karakalpakstan, and what were the plans of the first President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov when he decided to begin transformative reforms in the Republic of Uzbekistan. All this has long since sunk into oblivion, and history seeks to restore events based on the preserved evidence of the past.

Modern Karakalpak scientists collect the history of our people, like a mosaic, from parts that are called "historical sources". As you know, the sources of historical information are divided into primary and secondary. The primary ones include written testimonies, for example, by the Russian scientist A.M. Zaretsky [1], who studied the peculiarities of the legal status of the Jokargy Kenes – the Parliament of the Republic of Karakalpakstan, and the secondary ones include references to A.M. Zaretsky with quotations. However, it is not always easy to separate primary and secondary sources of information. So, Professor Bakhyt Koschanov, who seriously studied the history of the Karakalpaks of the early XX century, is obviously only a secondary source of our knowledge about the Karakalpak people. But if we talk about the Karakalpaks of the period of sovereignty, then his records will be the primary sources of historical events.

History, like any other subject of study, looks different from different points of view. So, in principle, the events in Karakalpakstan that took place in 1989-2015 will be perceived quite differently than by foreign scientists of our time. Moreover, the interpretation of historical facts from different positions often turns out to be very ambiguous, and historians do not always agree on how some facts are related to others. After all, the view of the Karakalpak scientist Bakhyt Koshchanov differs significantly from the view of the same events of foreign historians Sh.Akiner and S.Yilmaz.

The modern history of the Republic of Karakalpakstan is called the period when Karakalpakstan received its sovereignty as part of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Until recently, we received most of the knowledge about the modern history of the Republic of Karakalpakstan mainly from local historians.

The negative consequences of Soviet society, the lack of pluralism of opinions and broad international scientific contacts, for many years made it difficult for historians of Karakalpakstan to turn to the materials of foreign authors. The negative consequences of ignoring the achievements of foreign historiography are still holding back progress in this area [2].

However, today, thanks to scientific integration, Karakalpak scientists can make comparative analyses of written data from foreign historiography.

Perhaps it would not be an exaggeration to say that the recent history of Central Asia in general and the Republic of Karakalpakstan in particular, is reflected differently in foreign historiography. And here the task of accurately linking domestic historiography to foreign historical data is far from simple.

The first foreign scientists studying the modern history of Central Asia in general and the Republic of Karakalpakstan in particular, appeared in the USA and Europe. Perhaps the spirit of the Cold War itself contributed to this.

Foreign historiography provides us with a lot of materials [3]. Although a large number of special works concerning the fate of the Karakalpak people in the studied period are not found among the world scientific studies, however, the similarity of the lifestyle of the peoples of Central Asia gives us the opportunity, based on analogy, to relate the conclusions and conclusions of foreign authors to the history of Karakalpakstan.

Today, the problems of studying the modern history of Central Asia have become the most popular among foreign international scientific research centers. Especially active are: Humboldt University in Berlin; Frankfurt University (Germany), Central European University (Hungary), Department of History Research, King's College, Cambridge University (UK), University of Birmingham, Center for Russia and East European Studies, Illinois University, Chicago University, University of California, The George Washington University, Center of Scientific investigation of Central Asia (USA), University of Western Ontario (Canada), Institute of Central Asia (France), Souderton University (Sweden), International Relations multidisciplinary doctoral school (Poland), The Department of Political Science and Public Administration (Turkey), Institute of International Policy Studies (Japan), Institute of Russian History of the Academy of Sciences of the Russian Federation, etc.

Foreign practice in the methodology and methodology of the study of history, their careful study will give new syllogisms for comparative analysis for historical science. In most cases, conclusions in history, that is, in "history" as in past events and in "history" as in a system of knowledge, much depends on how a person thinking about this or that moment will look at.

Therefore, the works of such foreign scientists as M. Blok, L. Fevre, M. Barth, A. Toynbee, J. Tosh, H. Ortega-i-Gasset, K. Jaspers, P. Sorokin, F. Fukuyama [4] are very important for us.

At present, the Karakalpak historical science is accumulating and discovering new facts, theory is being improved taking into account the development of other branches of knowledge (cultural studies, historical psychology, sociology, etc.), methods of processing and analyzing sources (for example, the use of mathematical methods). Many facts, events, phenomena of our history with the discovery of new sources, with the expansion of our horizons, the improvement of theoretical knowledge are evaluated differently today than five to ten years ago. All this is evidence that history is being rewritten not only out of political conjuncture, but also in response to the expansion of the palette of our knowledge about the past.

During the Soviet period, historians of Uzbekistan, including Karakalpakstan, were particularly successful in studying socio-economic issues, the movement of the masses. New historical sources were identified and introduced into scientific circulation. However, the dominance of only one Marxist-Leninist concept in the theoretical sphere significantly constrained the creativity of scientists. They proceeded from the defining role of material production in people's lives and saw the meaning of historical development in the transition from one socio-economic formation to another, culminating in the construction of a communist society on earth.

The modern history of Karakalpakstan is part of the world historical process. On the basis of foreign historiography, forming a new look at the research of the modern history of our country, today it is necessary to show how the Central Asian space evolved within the framework of global patterns, how nature and climate affected its development, the ratio of the size of the territory and its population, the composition of the population, the need to develop the territory, as well as external factors.

REFERENCES

1. Zaretsky A.M. Features of the legal status of the Jokargy Kenes – Parliament of Karakalpakstan // The world of modern science. Moscow, 2014. No. 2.
2. Koshchanov B.A., Ametov T.A., Genjemuratov Ya.B., Koshchanova S.B. Essays on foreign historiography of the modern history of the Republic of Karakalpakstan. Monograph. Nukus: Qaraqalpaqstan, 2016. 96 p.
3. Schoeberlein J. The Growth and Development of Central Asian Studies in the West. Доклад, представленный в IFEAC (Французский Институт Исследования Центральной Азии). Ташкент, 11 июня 2007; Савкович Е.В. Центрально-азиатские исследования в КНР: историография в первой половине 1990-х гг. // Вестник Томского государственного университета. 2012. Вып. №354. С. 109-112; Bregel Yu. Notes on the study of Central Asia // Papers on Inner Asia. - №28. – Bloomington: Indiana University Research Institute for Inner Asia Studies, 1996. P. 61; Suny R.G. Rethinking Soviet studies: bringing the non-Russians back in // Beyond Soviet studies / Ed. by D. Orlovsky. Washington: Woodrow Wilson center press, 1995. P. 107-111; Stokes G. Framing post-Soviet nationalities studies // Beyond Soviet studies. P. 155; Richardson David, Richardson Sue. Qaraqalpaqs of the Aral Delta. Prestel Verlag. 2012; Salih Yilmaz. Karakalpak Türkleri Ve Karakalpakistan Tarihi. Ankara. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayinlari. 2008. P. 534; Bodio T.

- (ed.). Uzbekistan. Historia–spolecznstwo–politika. Warszawa: IPS UW, 2001. P. 536; Bodio T., Jakubowski W., Zalenski P. (eds.). Azja Centralna — problemy historii I wspolczesnosti. Pultusk: Pismo Edukacyjne, 2007. P. 376; Olcott M.B. Central Asia's Catapult to Independence // *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1992. P. 108—130; Kangas R. Uzbekistan in the Twentieth Century. Political Development and the Evolution of Power. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995. P. 304; Fourniau V. Histoire de l'Asie Centrale. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994. P. 128; Зарецкий А.М. Особенности правового статуса Жокаргы Кенеса – Парламента Каракалпакстана // *Мир современной науки*. 2014. №2. С. 3-12; Fierman W. Political Development in Uzbekistan: Democratization? // Eds. by K.Dawisha and B.Parrott. Conflict, Cleavage, and Change in Central Asia and the Caucasus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. P. 368; Roy O. The New Central Asia. The Creation of Nations. London, New York, 2000. P. 26; Critchlow J. Nationalism in Uzbekistan: A Soviet Republic's Road to Sovereignty. Boulder (CO): Westview Press, 1991. P. 67; Gleason G. Uzbekistan: From Statehood to Nationhood // *Nations and Politics in the Soviet Successor States*. Eds. by I. Bremmer and R. Taras. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, P. 351-53; The Failure of Reform in Uzbekistan: Ways Forward for the International Community. Osh/Brussels: ICG, 2004. P. 56; Akiner Sh. Cultural Change and Continuity in Central Asia. England: Kegan Paul International, 1991. P. 377; Micklin P.P. Dessication of the Aral Sea: A water management disaster in the Soviet Union// *Science*. American Association for Advancement of Science. Washington, 1988. № 241. P. 1170-1176// <http://www.ciesin.org/docs /006-238/006-238.html>; Steven Kyle and Phillipe Chabot. Agriculture in the Republic of Karakalpakstan and Khoerzm oblast of Uzbekistan //Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. 1997; Pétric B.-M. Pouvoir, don et réseaux en Ouzbékistan post-soviétique. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2002. P. 76; Мамедов Н. Каракалпакская литература. Баку: Баку Славян университети, «Китаб алями» нашрият-полиграфия маркази, 2007. 295 с.; Yuasa Takeshi. Central Asia in the Context of Japanese-Russian Relations // *The China and Eurasia Forum Quarterly (ISDP, Stockholm)* 2010. Vol. 8. N 2, P. 120—135; Jesse Russel, Ronald Cohn. Каракалпакский язык. VSD. 2013. ISBN: 978-5-5109-4342-9. 82 с.; Karakalpakstan: Webster's Timeline History. 1221 – 2007. By Icon Group International. Paperback – February 23, 2009; Susanne Anna. Russische Avantgarde. Aus dem Kunstmuseum Nukus Karakalpakstan Zeichnungen, Aquarelle, Gouachen. Published by Daco-Verlag G. Blase (1995) ISBN 10: 3871350265 / ISBN 13: 9783871350269; Karakalpaks et autres gens de L'Aral // *Entre rivages et deserts*. Cahiers d'Asie Centrale. IFEAC/EHESS. Paris. 2002; Birgit N.Schlyter. The karakalpaks and other language minorities under Central Asian State rule //Democracy in Central Asia. Papers read at a Conference in Istanbul, 1-3 june 2003. Edited by Birgit N.Schlyter. Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul Transactions vol.15; Karakalpakstan: A Population in Danger. The impact of the Aral Sea disaster and a worsening economic climate on the health and wellbeing of the people of Karakalpakstan. Médecins Sans Frontières. Tashkent, Uzbekistan. // website on www.msf.org/aralsea; Disaster by Design: the Aral Sea and its lessons for sustainability. Edited by Michael R.Edelstein, Astrid Cerny, Abror Gadaev. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. Howard House. 2012.
4. Blok M. The apology of history or the craft of a historian. Moscow, 1986; Fevre L. Fights for history. Moscow, 1991; Barth M. Categories and methods of historical science. Moscow, 1984; Toynbee A. Comprehension of History. Moscow, 1991; Tosh J. The pursuit of truth. How to master the skill of a historian. Moscow, 2000; Ortega-i-Gasset H. The uprising of the masses. Questions of Philosophy, 1989, No. 3-4; Jaspers K. The meaning and purpose of the story. Moscow, 1991; Sorokin P. Man, civilization, society. Moscow, 1991; Fukuyama F. The end of History. Questions of Philosophy, 1990, No. 3.