

**Research Trends in Studies on the History of
Islam and Muslim Peoples (Bashkirs,
Volga and Siberian Tatars),
Conducted in European
Russia and Siberia ca.
1985-2000**

Marsel FARKHSHATOV and Christian NOACK

Introduction

This essay sketches the changing institutional framework for historical studies on Islam and Muslim peoples in the Russian Federation after 1985. The breakdown of the highly centralised political-administrative system and the redistribution of power in the late 1980s and early 1990s substantially influenced developments in Russian science. The first part of our essay sketches how and to what degree the institutional framework of historical research was altered. The focus will be on (1) the old and new institutions that pay special attention to the problems of the history of Islam and Muslim people and (2) the particular conditions under which these studies are, or are not, published. The third and longest part of our article discusses the main topics in current historical research on Islam and Muslim peoples.

The scope of our review is limited in both geography and content: Due to our personal fields of interest we confine ourselves to historiography on those Muslim people who are known today as the Bashkirs and the Volga and Siberian Tatars. This means that we will deal neither with the Crimean Tatars nor with the Muslim people of the Northern Caucasus. Similarly, the history of Russia's Muslim diaspora groups of non-European origin will not concern us here. We are, above all, interested in history. Ethnographical research, Islamic studies, or political science, flourishing in the background of the prolonged transitional crisis, will be included only if relevant publications contain significant historical sections or stress the importance of the historical and cultural context for an interpretation of current problems.

We are deeply indebted to our colleagues who conducted epistemological research in the last decade or included historiographical sketches in their publications.¹ It goes without saying that all inconsistencies and mistakes are our own.

1. Institutional Framework

1.1. *History in post-Soviet Russia: some general observations*

The collapse of the Soviet system fragmented a formerly rather uniform and self-contained scientific community and disintegrated a highly regulated communication space. The top-down approach of Soviet science certainly channelled and sometimes muted research in the humanities, and the restructuring of the system, initiated and performed largely on the level of the federation's subjects (in our case, national republics), dissolved the former hierarchical dependencies. The emancipation from ideological spoon-feeding on the one hand liberated scholars and allowed for new topics. On the other hand, however, more than a few historians began to miss guidance. Serious financial problems added to the uncertainty, and thus a significant number of researchers missed the sign to leave. As a result, the scientific field is characterised by the coexistence of innovations and anachronisms.

To begin with the innovations: Historians in the late 1980s somewhat reluctantly began to explore the blank spaces in historiography in the backwaters of journalism and public debate. But only the complete bankruptcy of the Soviet system, symbolised by the failed August *coup d'état*, revitalised historiography. The doors of the libraries and archives were flung wide open, and history boomed. But new chances resulted in new problems, even before political imprints began to reassert themselves, albeit on an incomparably lower level. The majority of Russia's historians reacted to the new freedom and the unknown accessibility of records in two ways. One was with a quest for a theoretical framework that would allow them to re-evaluate their previous work without questioning its substance. Nationalism and

¹ In particular we would like to mention Salavat ISKHAKOV's essay "Istoriya narodov Povolzh'ya i Urala: Problemy i perspektivy, natsionalizatsii" in *Natsional'nye istorii v sovetskom i postsovetskikh gosudarstvakh*, Moskva, 1999: 275-298, and Igor' KUCHUMOV, *Kryuch'ya pod rebro istorii: Etnitsizm v postsovetskoj istoriografii Bashkortostana*, Ufa, 2001 (electronic version). Michael KEMPER, *Sufis und Gelehrte in Tatarien und Baschkirien, 1789-1889: Der islamische Diskurs unter russischer Herrschaft*, Berlin, 1998: 8-15 and Allen FRANK, *Muslim Religious Institutions in Imperial Russia: The Islamic World of Novouzensk District and the Kazakh Inner Horde, 1780-1910*, Leiden, 2001: 5-16, contains pointed bibliographical sketches on important aspects of Soviet and post-Soviet research. The authors wish to express their gratitude to Dilyara Usmanova, Raoul Motika, Igor Kuchumov and Iskander Gilyazov for bring some recently published works to their attention.

the “civilization paradigm” were the most obvious solutions to their dilemma. Their other course was to adopt a nineteenth century positivist approach, collecting and recording evidence from the sources without striving for critical interpretations.

The fact that only a minority among Russia’s historians showed genuine interest in theory and methods currently under discussion internationally is probably as much due to language barriers (many signal contributions have been translated into Russian) as to a problem of human resources. Educational and scientific institutions suffer as much as other public spheres from a chronic lack of financial means. Poorly and irregularly paid, the better-trained and active historians looked for alternative sources of income. This meant as a rule that they left Russia’s academic institutions, either to go abroad or for employment in the expanding sectors of administration and economy. The most promising students likewise turned their backs on the universities. Only a very few institutions, most often the prestigious academic institutes or State universities, were able to explore the new prospects of fundraising. While these institutions were able to secure acceptable working conditions for specialists in the humanities, rank-and-file or provincial institutions had much greater difficulties. Their staffs consist overwhelmingly of poorly paid and poorly motivated scientists who started their academic careers during the Soviet period. This accounts for the sometimes surprising continuity in topics and approaches.

Islamic and oriental studies, and historical, cultural anthropological or ethnographical research on Russia’s Muslim people, have always required a broad interdisciplinary approach. This renders historiographical surveys a difficult task, the more so since the communication networks between scientific institutions largely broke down in the early 1990s. Moscow’s federal institutions are no longer in a position to force historians throughout the country to report on their research. Added to this, another formerly important tie between scientific institutions in the centre and throughout the country lost much of its significance: Under Soviet auspices, the most promising students from provincial universities were invited to pass their *aspirantura* in Moscow’s or St. Petersburg’s prestigious academic institutes. This enabled them to collect material for their dissertations in the central archive and libraries. Some of them stayed in Moscow, but most returned to their alma maters to pursue academic careers. Since this form of academic exchange is becoming rarer now, academic networks and, consequently, scientific communication become more and more locally restricted.

In addition, the immense costs for travelling and accommodation now prohibit prolonged work in archives or libraries outside the historian’s place of permanent residence. As a rule, historians have to rely on the material that is locally available. Meanwhile, the aggregated and often better processed materials at the central archives are frequented by Moscow and St. Petersburg historians almost exclusively. Researchers in the national republics or administrative territorial units remain limited to their local archives. This fact reinforces the Soviet tradition of regional

introspection, of restricting the range of historical research to Soviet administrative units. Tatar history, for example, often meant and still means the history of Tatars within the boundaries of Tatarstan as drawn in the early 1920s. At least two-thirds of Russia's ethnic Tatar population may thus be ignored.

1.2. The geography of research

The above-mentioned arguments call for a differentiation in the evaluation of pre-conditions for historical research and scientific publishing on three levels: (1) Moscow and St. Petersburg—the old and new scientific centres, (2) the national republics of Tatarstan and Bashkortostan, where most scientific research is located in the capitals of Kazan and Ufa, and (3) the Muslim ethnic and scientific diaspora² throughout the country. The latter category is certainly the most difficult to analyse exhaustively, due to scarce information and the heterogeneous conditions prevailing in different parts of the country. Nevertheless we hope that even a generalising treatment will encourage the reader to look beyond the established scientific centres, even if this requires complicated and time-consuming efforts.

Deserving mention in advance is that the traditions and structural composition of Russia's relevant scientific institutions resulted in a concentration of research in historical and ethnographic institutes; Oriental and, above all, Islamic studies play a minor role. *Islamovedenie* developed merely as a branch within the institutions devoted to the study and propaganda of “scientific atheism”—with the result that contemporary research methods in Russia hardly live up to Western or even Russian Imperial standards.³

1.2.1. Moscow and St. Petersburg

Weakened ties to the national republics notwithstanding, the traditionally leading academic institutes and State universities in the capital cities of the Russian Federation continue to contribute to Islamic studies and historical research on Russia's Muslim peoples. In some of these institutions, the retirement of senior experts in the field and, at the same time, a restricted influx of junior researchers entailed a certain restriction of the topical orientation. Most institutions focus now on the all-Russian or all-Soviet level. Tendencies to produce generalising surveys, already strong before 1990, have been reinforced by the above-mentioned overall

² Outside Moscow and St. Petersburg, research on the history of Islam or Muslim People is largely conducted by researchers with “ethnic backgrounds.”

³ Cf. FRANK, *Muslim Religious Institutions...* (note 1): 8-9.

conditions, and by an increasing political and public demand.

Among Moscow's academic research institutions, several are of major importance for the study of Muslim history on Russian territory: for example, the Institute for Ethnology and Anthropology for its role as think-tank for nationality politics under Yeltsin. This did not prevent staff members from taking a sometimes highly critical stance against official decisions, especially Moscow's operations in the Northern Caucasus. The institute engaged in the publication of important documentary records on the national history of the pre-revolutionary Muslim and Bashkir national movements, and the staff also comprises eminent specialists on Tatar history.⁴

Although the history of Russia's Muslim populations is not a particular concern of the Institute of Russian History, the pre-revolutionary Muslim movement figured in most of the anthologies and surveys produced in the recent years.⁵ At the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute, Muslim history played a lesser role, but at least one dissertation on Imperial Russia's Islam policies was defended there.⁶

⁴ GUBOGLU, M. N., ed. *Etnopoliticheskaya mozaika Bashkortostana*, vol. 2, Moskva, 1992; GUBOGLU, M. N., ed. *Islam i etnicheskaya mobilizatsiya: Natsional'nye dvizheniya v tyurkskom mire*, Moskva, 1998; BASILOV, V. N. and LOGASHOV, B. R., eds. *Islam i narodnaya kul'tura*, Moskva, 1998. The institute issues *Narody i kul'tury*, a new ethnographic series on Russia's peoples. The recently published volume on the Tatars was largely prepared in Kazan, however: URAZMANOVA, R. K. and CHESHKO, S. V., eds. *Tatary*, Moskva, 2001. Research on the symbolic dimensions of national and confessional politics is another priority of the institute: Cf. CHERVONNAYA, S. M., *Vse bogi s nami i za nas: Etnicheskaya identichnost' i etnicheskaya mobilizatsiya v sovremennom iskusstve narodov Rossii*, Moskva, 1999; IORDAN, M. V., KUZEEV, R. G. and CHERVONNAYA, S. M., eds. *Islam v Evrazii: Sovremennye eticheskie i esteticheskie kontseptsii sunnitskogo Islama, ikh transformatsiya v massovom soznanii i vyrazhenie v iskusstve musul'manskikh narodov Rossii*, Moskva, 2001.

⁵ ISKHAKOV, S. M., "Revolyutsiya 1905-1907 gg. i rossiiskie musul'mane," in *1905 god-nachalo revolyutsionnykh potryaseni v Rossii XX veka*, Moskva, 1996: 192-210; ISKHAKOV, S. M., "Musul'manskaya psikhologiya i evropeiskaya politika: Pervaya chetvert' XX veka," in *Revolyutsiya i chelovek: Sotsial'no-psikhologicheskii aspekt*, Moskva, 1996: 39-68; ISKHAKOV, S. M., "Musul'mane Rossii: Osobennosti sotsial'nogo povedeniya v nachale XX v.," in *Revolyutsiya i chelovek: Byt, nravy, povedenie, moral'*, Moskva, 1997:12-19; ISKHAKOV, S. M., "Obshcherossiiskaya partiya musul'man," in *Istoriya natsional'nykh politicheskikh partii Rossii*, Moskva, 1997: 214-239; ISKHAKOV, S. M., "Fevral'skaya revolyutsiya i rossiiskie musul'mane," in *1917 god v sud'bakh Rossii i mira: Fevral'skaya revolyutsiya*, Moskva, 1997: 189-207; ISKHAKOV, S. M., "Pervye shagi Sovnarkoma i rossiiskie musul'mane" in *1917 god v sud'bakh Rossii i mira: Oktyabr'skaya revolyutsiya*, Moskva, 1998: 207-237; ISKHAKOV, S. M., "Musul'manskaya kul'tura i rossiiskie musul'mane v nachale XX veka," in *Pravo, nasilie, kul'tura v Rossii: Regional'nyi aspekt (Pervaya chetvert' XX veka)*, Moskva-Ufa, 2001: 26-58.

⁶ VOROB'EVA, E. I., *Musul'manskii vopros v imperskoi politike rossiiskogo samodержaviya: Vtoraya polovina XIX veka-1917 g.*, (Diss.) S.-Peterburg, 1999.

Oriental studies in Russia have always been primarily philological. The Institutes of Oriental studies of the Academy of Science based in Moscow and St. Petersburg cover a wide range of topics, but the study of Russia's Islamic traditions and the cultural heritage of its Muslim population are not a top priority. Only one specific department at the Moscow branch is dedicated to the study of Islam in the CIS, and none for Russia proper. This has far-reaching consequences, since outside the capital cities, where research on Russian Islam is more actively pursued, specialists with a comparable linguistic training are generally lacking. Among the publications of Moscow and St. Petersburg scholars are some general surveys and introductions of interest to the student of Islamic history in Russia.⁷ Detailed research on domestic problems is an exception to the rule, however, as many publications re-issue findings by the leading scholars of Imperial Russia and the Soviet Union.⁸ As for compilations, St. Petersburg's Institute for Oriental Studies deserves special mention for the ambitious international project of a new encyclopaedia on Islam in Russia. Three volumes have appeared so far. While the sample of topics is sometimes disturbing, and the quantity and quality of the sections differ, the documents contain useful information that may be difficult and time-consuming to explore in other ways.⁹

The Institute of Asian and African countries at the Moscow State University and the Oriental faculty at the St. Petersburg State University train specialists in Oriental languages. To our knowledge, there is no institutionalised research on topics related to the history of Islam or Russia's Muslim peoples, except for the Caucasus: Imperial Russian traditions were revived by the re-institution of a "Chair of Central Asia and the Caucasus" at St. Petersburg State University.

Unfortunately, the historical faculties of the capital cities' universities likewise largely ignore the history of Islam and Muslim people in Russia. The periodicals

⁷ MALASHENKO, A. V., ed. *Islam v SNG*, Moskva, 1998 contains an epistemological article by the editor on Islamic studies at the Moscow academy institute (pp. 5-23). Cf. other publications from Moscow-based institutions: *Rossiya i Vostok: Problemy vzaimodeistviya*, ch. 1-2, Moskva, 1993; *Rossiiskie i zarubezhnye obshchestvennye i religioznye ob'edineniya: Spravochnik*, Moskva, 1993.

⁸ LANDA, R. G., *Islam v istorii Rossii*, Moskva, 1995 is an example for a hastily and uncritically compiled overview. The author has engaged in researches on Algeria for many years before. Likewise, the publication of epistemological material is symptomatic for the current situation. Cf. *Moskovskoe vostokovedenie: Ocherki, issledovaniya, razrabotki*, Moskva 1997; *Istoriya otechestvennogo vostokovedeniya s serediny XIX veka do 1917 goda*, Moskva, 1997; *Rossiiskaya vostokovedcheskaya nauka: Bibliografiya, 1726-1997*, Moskva, 1998; KULIKOVA, A. M., *Rossiiskoe vostokovedenie v litsakh*, S.-Peterburg, 2001.

⁹ *Islam na territorii byvshei Rossiiskoi imperii: Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, vyp. 1-3, Moskva, 1996f. Cf. also earlier projects like *Islam: Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, Moskva, 1991; *Islam: Istoriograficheskie ocherki*, Moskva, 1991.

edited by these faculties should be consulted, however, since they occasionally contain relevant articles or documents (cf. 2.3.1.). It is remarkable that the most eminent of the newly founded post-Soviet universities, the Russian Humanitarian State University in Moscow and the European University in St. Petersburg, have not yet contributed visibly to Islamic Studies.

Added to this, a few new centres for Oriental studies and the history of Muslim people sprang up in the post-Soviet period. The most important relating to subjects of the present article is the Moscow Carnegie Centre, even if its main focus is on contemporary problems.¹⁰ One should mention the scientific institutes of the central State agencies as well. Some of them conduct research on Islam too, concentrating on contemporary problems. If their publications touch on historical developments, however, they usually process second-hand data.¹¹

1.2.2. *The national republics*

The Tatar and Bashkir Autonomous Socialist Soviet Republics witnessed nationalist turns of their leadership around 1990. The “national” Tatar and Bashkir heritage gained prominence in the rhetoric of both presidents, Shaimiev and Rakhimov, as they tried to sustain their claims for more independence from Moscow with “historical rights” of the titular ethnic groups. Their alliance with the emerging national movements, however, proved to be tactical and relatively short-lived. In order not to provoke the significant non-titular populations of their republics (about 50% in Tatarstan, about 70% in Bashkortostan), they resolved on a “territorialization” of their policies, accompanied by a “tatarstanic” or “bashkortostanic” philosophy but retaining a certain emphasis on peculiar Tatar and Bashkir historic “traditions.”

One might expect that the institutional frameworks of historical studies in Tatarstan and Bashkortostan would have a share in this political conjuncture, but

¹⁰ Cf. YUNUSOVA, A. and MALASHENKO, A. V., eds. *Etnichnost' i konfessional'naya traditsiya v Volgo-Ural'skom regione*, Moskva, 1998. See also MALASHENKO, A. V. and OLCOTT, M. B., eds. *Islam na postsovetskom prostranstve: Vglyad iznutri*, Moskva, 2001; MALASHENKO, A. V., *Islamskoe vozrozhdenie v sovremennoi Rossii*, Moskva, 1998. A recently established and Moscow-based “Centre for Civilization and Regional Studies” conducts research in a similar vein.

¹¹ The “Russian Academy of State Service,” for example, publishes actively on the relationship between the state and the confessions in Russia. Cf. *Gosudarstvenno-tserkovnye otnosheniya v Rossii*, ch. 1-2, Moskva, 1996; *Religiya, svoboda sovesti, gosudarstvenno-tserkovnye otnosheniya v Rossii: Spravochnik*, Moskva, 1996; BASIROV, L. A., *Islam i etnopoliticheskie protsessy v sovremennoi Rossii*, Moskva, 2000. Other administrative unites published or co-published brochures like ALOV, A. A. and VLADIMIROV, N. G., *Islam v Rossii*, Moskva, 1996; *Gosudarstvenno-tserkovnye otnoshenii*, Moskva, 1993.

institutional changes were in fact insignificant. The upgrade of formerly local branches of the Russian academy of sciences to “national” academies (1992) was rather symbolical and did not result in substantial enlargements or a better financial situation. For the time being, mere task forces set up for the compilation of the prestigious encyclopaedias enjoyed additional state funding. This enabled the establishment of new departments that conduct limited research programmes.

As for Kazan, the most remarkable institutional change occurred in 1996 when an independent Historical Institute split off from the Institute for Archaeology, Languages and History (now the Institute for Archaeology, Languages and Arts). This was basically due to the feud between “Bulgharists,” primarily archaeologists and linguists, and “Tatarists,” overwhelmingly historians (cf. 3.2.1.). The latter used the backing they found in the presidential administration to organise independently, with Shaimiev’s political advisor Khakimov becoming head of the new institute.

A second remarkable event was the revival of Oriental studies. They had been practically banned from the university, and became a prerogative of N. M. Ilminskii’s circle at Kazan’s *Dukhovnaya akademiya*, when the university’s faculty was moved to St. Petersburg in 1855. A chair for Oriental studies was reopened at the Tatar faculty of the State University in 1990 but upgraded to an institute only in 2000. It can certainly help to redress the lack of philologically trained specialists in Kazan. Time will tell whether its staff will renew the tradition and study local Muslim languages and cultures beforehand.¹² In addition to the academic research institutes, the Tatar faculty of Kazan State University is a focal point for relevant historical studies. In other institutions of higher learning, research is conducted only occasionally and depends on the personal inclinations of individual staff members.

The scientific institutions in Bashkortostan developed comparably: In 1991/92 the former branch of Russia’s Academy of Sciences re-emerged as the national Academy of Science of Bashkortostan without, however, breaking the ties with Moscow or changing essentially within. Nationalization did not result in better financial endowments either. As in Kazan, the establishment of an independent Historical Institute was discussed, but here it was eventually not realised. Within the Academy, the former Department of the Peoples of the Ural was upgraded and became the Centre for Ethnological Research. Outside the Academy institutes, research is mainly conducted by historians at the Bashkir State University in Ufa. The Republic’s claim for more control of higher education in the early 1990s mate-

¹² Cf. MIKHAILOVA, S. M., “Razvitie orientalistiki v Kazanskom universitete v XIX veke,” in *Kazan’, Moskva, Peterburg: Rossiiskaya imperiya vzglyadom iz raznykh uglov*, Moskva, 1997: 275-301; VALEEV, R. M., *Kazanskoe vostokovedenie: Istoki i razvitie (XIX v.-20-e gg. XX v.)*, Kazan’, 1998. The actual dean of the faculty recently published a survey on regional Islamic literature: ZÄINULLIN, Zh. G., *XVIII-XX iöz bashynda tatar rukhani ädäbiyäte*, Kazan, 1998.

rialised as a “State Committee for Science, Higher and Specialised Education,” but the institution seemingly did not live up to the expectations of its founders and was liquidated in 2001 after barely ten years of existence.

Collaboration between the scientific structures of these two republics is limited. Traditionally, Kazan and Ufa researchers came to see themselves as competitors, and unfortunately little has changed for the better. As a result, scholars from Kazan usually ignore findings by their colleagues from Ufa and vice-versa. Books from the neighbouring republics are difficult to obtain. This reinforces the Soviet tradition of limiting research to the confines of administrative units. Broader or comparative approaches remain exceptions to the rule.

Among the historians from both republics, some “schools” can be identified. Historians trained at the chair of history of the Tatar people at Kazan State University generally share a pronounced interest in the study of Islamic manuscripts and printings in addition to Russian language sources, whatever their specific subjects may be. Within the new Academy Institute of History we find on one hand some eminent specialists in ethnography, but another group of researchers is firmly rooted in the local tradition of social history. Bashkir nationalism found its strongest expressions in the publications of historians located at the State University. Most of the staff at the Centre of Ethnological Research, meanwhile, remained somewhat detached from political trends and refused to study Bashkir ethnic history without crediting the strong mutual influence of the different local populations. Historians trained at the Academy, some of them now freelancing, take a middle position. Here innovative approaches slowly gained ground, and the academic milieu reacted rather cautious when confronted with political advances. University historians were rewarded for their staunch “Bashkirism,” when the political administration found them worthy of compiling a voluminous new “History of the Bashkir People” to outdo the “History of Bashkortostan” prepared by the Academy. The new history had abundant nationalist interpretations of Bashkir ethnic history.¹³

Most literature on the history of Islam and Muslim people in Russia is at present published in Tatarstan and Bashkortostan. In general, publications from both national republics reflect a re-evaluation of historical traditions rather than intensive research on formerly blank areas. While bibliographical work intensified in certain sectors, for example concerning the pre-revolutionary Muslim press¹⁴ or the

¹³ The new edition of a history of the Bashkir peoples has not yet been published. The academic’s *Istoriya Bashkortostana s drevneishikh vremen do 60-kh gg. XIX v.*, Ufa, 1996 sustains, for example, the thesis of autochthonous ethnogenesis in the Urals. Cf. section 3.2.1. on ethnogenesis.

¹⁴ NURULLINA, R. M., sost. *Gazety i zhurnaly na tatarskom yazyke, 1905-1985*, Kazan’, 1989; *Kazan’skaya periodicheskaya pechat’ XIX-nachala XX veka: Bibliograficheskii ukaz-*

Bashkir State building 1917–1921,¹⁵ the large body of manuscripts and printed works in Arabic script remains to be systematically explored.¹⁶ Recently issued collections of source material as a rule rely on earlier publications,¹⁷ and only a minority of accounts on the history of Islam or the political movements of Muslim peoples is based on intensive archival research. This is probably because certain aspects of ethnic and national history in the republics have been politicised to a higher degree than elsewhere, and the imprints are well traceable to the present day. On the other hand individual researchers demonstrate that this does not necessarily have to be so. In the third section of our survey, summing up recent research trends, we will attempt to identify the critical topics and respective political implications.¹⁸

1.2.3. Research in other areas of the Russian Federation

Soviet authorities as early as the 1920s muted the vivid and rather independent development of regional studies (*kraevedenie*). Any collection of historical documents and evidence became a risky business under Stalin. General suspicion added

tel', Kazan', 1991; 'Äl-islakh' gazetasyning bibliografik kürsätkeche, Kazan, 1991; XX iöz bashy tatar täglim-tärbiyä zhurnallarynyng bibliografik kürsätkeche: "Tärbiyäitfal'," "Tärbiyä," "Mäktäp," "Mögallim," Kazan, 1997; GAINANOV, R. R., MARDANOV, R. F. and SHAKUROV, F. N., *Tatarskaya periodicheskaya pechat' nachala XX veka: Bibliograficheskii ukazatel'*, Kazan', 2000; GOSMANOV, M. A. and MÄRDÄNOV, R. F., 'Shura' zhurnalnyng bibliografik kürsätkeche, Kazan, 2000; KHISMATOVA, G. N., "Iktisad zhurnalnyng (1908-1913) fänni-bibliografik kürsätkeche," *Gasyrlar avazy-Ekho vekov 2001/1-2*: 284-320.

¹⁵ *Bibliograficheskii ukazatel' po istorii Bashkirskoi ASSR*, I, Ufa, 1988; BAGUMANOVA, M. Kh., *Ukazatel' literatury o bashkirakh*, ch. 1-3, Ufa, 1994f.; RYAZAPOV, R. F., *Stanovlenie bashkirskoi gosudarstvennosti: Bibliograficheskii ukazatel'*, Ufa, 1997; SATAEVA, L. V. and SALIKHOV, A. G., *Bashkortostan v zarubezhnykh issledovaniyakh: Bibliograficheskii ukazatel'*, Ufa, 1996.

¹⁶ FRANK, *Muslim Religious Institutions...* (note 1): 3, 15-16.

¹⁷ *Materialy i dokumenty po istorii obshchestvenno-politicheskogo dvizheniya sredi tatar, 1905-1917*, Kazan', 1992 (reprinted 1997); GUMEROV, F. Kh., ed. *U istokov bor'by za suverenitet Bashkortostana, 1917-1925 gg.*, Ufa, 1997; YULDASHBAEV, B. Kh., ed. *Uchreditel'nyi kurultai avtonomnogo Bashkortostana, Dekabr' 1917 g.: Dokumental'nye materialy*, Ufa, 1997; YAMAEVA, L. A., ed., *Musul'manskie deputaty Gosudarstvennoi dumy Rossii, 1906-1917: Sbornik dokumentov i materialov*, Ufa, 1998; YULDASHBAEV, B. Kh., ed. *Bashkirskoe natsional'noe dvizhenie*, v 4 t., t. 1-2, Ufa, 2002. The standards of commentaries and the references are as a rule not satisfactory. For discussion of the translation and presentation of the memoirs of Zaki-Validi and other material concerning his role in Bashkir state-building, see section 3.3.5.

¹⁸ The lack of interest in new sources is particularly evident when the core issues of the new national narratives—"Tatar" jadidism and Bashkir state-building—are concerned. See sections 3.3.1. and 3.3.5.

to the twofold change of script resulted in a dramatic loss of written sources. Many people preferred to destroy or hide historical documents, books, and manuscripts. The reduction of historical material and knowledge heavily biased historical consciousness and facilitated annihilation of a formerly dynamic Islamic culture within the confines of Russia. This could not help but leave deep imprints in Muslim collective memory. History was locked up in the Soviet research institutes, and professional historians under close ideological surveillance decided on “scientific” grounds what the past had been.

The collapse of the Soviet regime substantially changed the framework for the study of Muslim and Islamic history outside the capital cities and the national republics. On one hand, the unseen accessibility of historical records in libraries and archives allowed for a renaissance of regional studies. On the other hand, state-sponsored structures of minority cultures were no longer financed by federal or regional budgets. Substantial diaspora groups of Tatars scattered throughout the Russian federation and its larger cities find it increasingly difficult to preserve their cultural outlook. They cannot share in the upgrading of ethnic cultures characteristic for the national republic. Tatarstan’s declarations to support the Tatar diaspora were never realised on a large scale, probably not so much due to lack of money as to a reluctance to provoke neighbouring Bashkortostan and other territories of the federation. The same problems, albeit on a smaller scale, apply to the Bashkir minorities outside Bashkortostan. As a result, *kraevedenie* outside the ethnic republics lacks institutional support. This renders bibliographical surveys difficult. Nevertheless, territories like Yekaterinburg, Orenburg¹⁹ and Southern Siberia (Troitsk or Chelyabinsk), with numerically strong and historically important Muslim minorities, either do not contribute significantly to the renaissance of Muslim *kraevedenie* or confine themselves to the history of Kazakh today. (For the Siberian Tatars, see section 1.2.4.)

What is worse, local amateur historians see themselves exposed to a growing concurrence by researchers and collectors from Kazan and Ufa who, as a rule, compete more successfully for grants. With the help of these funds, they search for and buy manuscripts for private collectors.²⁰ At present Islamic institutions, such as the regional Muslim boards and individual mosques and mahallas, apparently subsidize historical research in diaspora areas. Whether this is a general trend or not, only

¹⁹ *Khristianstvo i islam na rubezhe vekov: Materialy Vserossiiskoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii*, Orenburg, 1998. KOSACH, G., “A Russian City between Two Continents: The Tatars of Orenburg and State Power,” in *Russia at a Crossroads: History, Memory and Political Practice*, ed. N. Schleifman, London, 1998: 33-88 provides a useful survey.

²⁰ A case in point is the collection of Madina Rakhimkulova. During her lifetime she had collected important documents and records on Orenburg’s Tatar merchants and ulema. She translated and re-issued pre-revolutionary accounts like FAKHRETDIN[EV], R., *Akhmed bai*, Orenburg, 1997 (Russ. trans.: FAKHRETDIN, R., *Akhmed-bai*, Orenburg, 1991). Cf. also

time will tell. However, a couple of publications with high professional standards deserve mention. They appeared recently in Nizhnii Novgorod, Saratov or Voronezh provinces, mostly dealing with the history of Muslim communities within the confines of former *guberniyas*.²¹

1.2.4. The Siberian Tatars

The situation is certainly different for the autochthonous Muslim minorities in Siberia. The Omsk ethnographic school led by Nikolai Tomilov has published broadly on the history of different ethnic groups and subgroups among Siberian Tatars.²² Tomilov and his collaborators obviously got a strong hold on the new series issued by the Siberian branch of Russia's academy of science, called "Kul'tura narodov Rossii."²³ Tomilov occasionally collaborates with the Kazan-

RAKHIMKULOVA, M., "*Medrese Khusainiya*" v Orenburge, Orenburg, 1997 and her biographical sketches: RÄKHIMKULOVA, M., *Akhmed bai*, Orenburg, 1995; RÄKHIMKULOVA, M., *Rämievlar*, Orenburg, 1995. After her death, historians from Kazan and Ufa competed to obtain her personal collections.

²¹ IDRISOV, U. Yu., Sentyukin, S. B., Sentyukina, O. N. and Guseva, Yu. N., *Iz istorii nizhegorodskikh musul'manskikh obshchin v XIX-30-x godakh XX veka*, Nizhnii Novgorod, 1997 (outstanding); KHAFIZOV, M. Z., *Nizhegorodskie tatars: Ocherki istorii*, Nizhnii Novgorod, 1998; BAYAZITOV, R. Zh. and MAKARIKHIN, V. P., *Vostochnaya Meshchera v srednie veka*, Nizhnii Novgorod, 1996; SMIRNOVA, N. A., "Materialy o tatarskom naselenii Saratovskoi gubernii," in *Trudy Saratovskogo oblastnogo muzeya kraevedeniya*, vyp. 4, Saratov, 1996: 196-206; GOROSHKOV, N. P., *Protsess stanovleniya i razvitiya pantyurkizma*, (Diss.) Voronezh, 1997.

²² TOMILOV, N. A., *Etnicheskaya istoriya tyurkoyazychnogo naseleniya Zapadno-Sibirskoi ravniny v kontse XVI-nachale XX v.*, Novosibirsk, 1992; SELEZNEV, A. G. and TOMILOV, N. A., eds. *Etnicheskaya istoriya tyurkskikh narodov Sibiri i sopedel'nykh territorii: Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*, Omsk, 1998; SELEZNEV, A. G. and TOMILOV, N. A., eds. *Khozyaistvo i sredstva peredvizheniya sibirskikh tatar v kollektivyakh muzeya arkheologii i etnografii Omskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, Novosibirsk, 1999. S. A. Dudoignon's *avant-propos* to the topical issue of the *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 41/2-3 (2000), "En islam sibérien" provides a useful introduction the historiography of Siberia's Muslim and Turkic minorities. Added to this, the issue features contributions by Russian authors in English translations: TOMILOV, N. A., "Ethnic Processes within the Turkic Population of the West Siberian Plain, Sixteenth-Twentieth Centuries," 221-232; KORUSENKO, S. N., "Ethnic Make-up and Intercommunity Relationships among Mid-Irtysh Tatars, Late Eighteenth-Late Twentieth Centuries: A Study of Some Demographic and Geneological Reports," 233-244; SELEZNEV, A. G., "The Islam/Paganism Syncretism among West Siberia's Turkic Peoples," 341-356.

²³ VALEEV, F. T. and TOMILOV, N. A., *Tatarsy Zapadnoi Sibiri: Istoriya i kul'tura*, Novosibirsk, 1996 (Kul'tura narodov Rossii, t. 2); KORUSENKO, S. N. and KULESHOVA, N. V., *Genealogiya i etnicheskaya istoriya barabinskikh i kurdakso-sargatskikh tatar*,

based senior specialist in the field, Fuat Valeev.²⁴ Stressing the individual and rather independent development of the various small diaspora groups of Siberian Tatars, they strongly argue against other Kazan historians stating a strong cultural influence as a result of the massive movement of Volga and Ural Tatars into Western Siberia during the 19th and early 20th centuries.²⁵

2. Publishing

2.1. General remarks

Before the collapse of the Soviet system, any author had to take into account beforehand whether his work accorded to the general principles of censorship, and to the more or less obvious scientific guidelines defined by party decrees or eminent authorities in the field. No legal publishing existed outside the established system or abroad. The scope of what was tolerable changed in time and with the distance to Moscow, but in the case of Islamic studies and the history of Muslim people it was rather narrow.²⁶ Only the breakdown of the Soviet system brought full freedom of expression. Political circumstances and editorial conditions limit scientific publishing to an incomparable minor degree today.

2.2. Book printing

In the USSR scientific book printing was monopolised by printing shops associated with the major academic institutes and universities. As already mentioned, Islamic studies under Soviet rule could be published on the demand of the estab-

Novosibirsk, 1999 (Kul'tura narodov Rossii, t. 5); MALINOVSKII, V. G. and TOMILOV, N. A., *Tomskie tatory i chulminskie tyurki v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka: Khozyaistvo i kul'tura (po materialam Pervoi pudushnoi perepisi naseleniya Rossii 1720 goda)*, Novosibirsk, 1999 (Kul'tura narodov Rossii, t. 3). Most of the articles published in *Material'naya kul'tura narodov Rossii*, Novosibirsk, 1995 (Kul'tura narodov Rossii, t. 1) are related to the Turkic ethnics of Siberia, too.

²⁴ Cf. VALEEV, F. T., *Sibirskie tatory*, Kazan', 1993.

²⁵ Cf. ISKHAKOV, Damir, *Fenomen tatarskogo dzhadidizma: Vvedenie k sotsiokul'turnomu osmysleniyu*, Kazan', 1997: 49-54. As a result, Iskhakov speaks of a common cultural orientation. For him the Siberian Tatars form at the turn of the 20th century a regional subgroup of a common Tatar nation in the process of formation.

²⁶ The seminal study remains TILLET, L., *The Great Friendship: Soviet Historians on the Non-Russian Nationalities*, Chapel Hill, 1969. A valuable addition is provided by SHNIREL'MAN, V. A., *Who Gets the Past? Competition for Ancestors among Non-Russian Intellectuals in Russia*, Washington, D.C., 1996. See also section 3.3.1.

lished research institutions. Since the top positions in many of these institutions were held by the same personnel as before, even after 1990 official and university publishers continued to print work essentially by the same orders and authors or their *protégés*.

Once the ban on imported print and reproduction technology was lifted, printing shops mushroomed inside and outside the federal and republican capitals. Newly set up private enterprises eagerly issued books on Islamic topics. Reacting to the demands of a fairly large reading audience, however, the bulk of these publications dealt with current political and sociological problems, or presented Russia's Islamic traditions and Muslim history in popularised form.

Moreover, a growing Islamic print market added to the above. Developing around the mosques and in the market places, most books sought to acquaint their audience with the ritual and theological requirements of Islamic faith. While the bulk of this literature is either imported or translated, some of Russia's Islamic boards and mosques started to edit journals popularising, among other things, local Muslim history (cf. 2.2.4.).²⁷ Another field of activity of Russia's Islamic publishers is the re-issue of pre-revolutionary literature by or about famous Russian ulama.²⁸

2.2.1. Monographs

Historians today make use of incomparably more opportunities to see their works published as monographs than in the Soviet period. Mention should be made, however, that it is not yet common to publish candidate or doctoral dissertations.²⁹ If a publication would not find the necessary support within academic structures, the author today may turn to commercial publishers. If authors consent to bow before what is regarded as the consumer's taste, that is, leave out what supposedly seems

²⁷ The most important regional Islamic boards are listed at http://www.nasledie.ru/oboz/N12_93/12_17.htm (Dec. 2002). Some of them published anthologies containing relevant material. Cf. *Islam: Voprosy istorii, kul'tury, filosofii*, Nizhnii Novgorod, 1995; MURTAZIN, M. F. and NURULLAEVA, A. A., eds. *Islam i musul'mane Rossii*, Moskva, 1999.

²⁸ The Kazan-based editors "Iman" translated and published, for example, G. Battal-Taymas's study on Musa Bigiev (1997) and Yusuf Akchura's biography of Galimdzhan al-Barudi (1997), and reissued Fakhrutdinov's brochure "Islam."

²⁹ Interested researchers have either to consult the short *avtoreferaty* in the libraries or review the manuscripts in a separate reading room of the Lenin State Library with limited capacities for photocopying in the Moscow suburb of Khimki. It is located at 15, Bibliotechnaya ulitsa. For further information consult http://www.rsl.ru/eng/e_tot7_14.htm (Dec. 2002).

too scientific for the general public, these publishers might issue works at their own financial risk. As a rule such books are printed without footnotes, bibliographies or statistical data. Alternatively, the author can pay for the printing himself, which as a rule means that he himself is responsible for the final edition and the distribution of the book. Fees for postal services and public transport have multiplied, with the result that neither books nor authors can travel extensively. As a result, many do not appear in current bibliographies, and these titles can be obtained only directly from the authors or their institutes. Collecting books and publications has become a difficult task for both libraries and fellow researchers.³⁰

2.2.2. *Anthologies*

Anthologies retained their importance, too. Many scholars subscribe to longterm projects of their host institutions, and they are expected to contribute outlines of their current research for such collective works. Publication of conference papers is also becoming more important. Although the notorious volumes containing numerous three-page-“theses” by junior researchers on desperately diverse topics continue to be published,³¹ other volumes supply evidence for a raised standard of scientific ventures. As international co-operation and successful fundraising enable conference organisers to invite foreign contributors fairly regularly, the choice of topics and the subsequent sample of contributions tend to become more coherent.³²

Russian remained the standard language of scientific publishing, although the prestige of the national languages (Tatar and, to a slightly lesser degree, Bashkir) has been significantly raised during the 1990s. The choice of languages by historians may serve as an indicator of to what extent they aim at a larger reading public. Meanwhile, the increasing use of Tatar and Bashkir in periodicals has didactic implications.

The situation on the book market thus remains complex: While state and party censorship on scientific publishing ceased to exist and the control of the scientific elite on printing matters loosened, historians increasingly have to take market conditions into consideration. The print market makes modern technology more easily available, but at the same time demands either sponsorship and personal fundrais-

³⁰ The situation is described in detail by AFANAS'EV, M. D., “Die Geschichtswissenschaft in Russland und die Bibliotheken: Dimensionen der Zusammenarbeit,” in K. Eimermacher, ed. *Das historische Gedächtnis Russlands*, Bochum, 1999: 9-36.

³¹ A certain number of publications is a requirement for any academic degree in Russia.

³² See, for example, *Kazan', Moskva, Peterburg: Rossiiskaya imperiya vzglyadom iz raznykh uglov*, Moskva, 1997; DUDOIGNON, S. A., ISKHAKOV, D. and MUKHAMETSHIN, R., eds. *Islam v tatarskom mire: Istoriya i sovremennost': Materialy mezhdunarodnogo simpoziuma, Kazan', 29 aprelya-1 maya 1996 g.*, Kazan', 1997.

ing or a readiness to compromise to the alleged taste of a broader public. As the Russian readers' craze for history books ends, authors will probably find it increasingly difficult to see their books printed in the future.

2.2.3. Textbooks

Against the background of the above-mentioned problems for scientific publishing, the composition and publication of textbooks has become an interesting supplementary business for historians. Beginning with perestroika, the Soviet curricula on history have been exposed to scathing criticism. Federal authorities essentially restricted themselves to periodical discussion and announcement of new state standards. Meanwhile the national republics tried to fill the gap. The authorities invited researchers to write or re-write textbooks according to the watered-down nationalist versions of the past they favoured. For historians, the composition of textbooks printed in tens of thousands of copies often means an enterprise more worthy financially than intellectually.

A consideration of textbooks may be rewarding in several respects. First of all, they present, as anywhere in the world, the most concentrated versions of the dominant historical narratives. Second, they may contain historical and literary sources of different origin that might otherwise be rather difficult and time-consuming to research or translate.³³ Finally, university textbooks can be considered as a niche on the printing market: Most universities added so-called "special courses" to their standard curriculum. This provides historians, especially younger historians, with an opportunity to teach subjects they actually do research on and to issue small brochures containing documents and bibliographies for their students.³⁴

³³ To cite examples: ALISHEV, S. Kh., ed. *Tatar tarikhy: Onytylmas säkhifälär*, Kazan, 1994 (Excerpts from eminent historians like Zaki Validi, Mardzhani, Gubaidullin, Atlasi; Fakhrutdinov); SINITSINA, K. R., *Istoriya Tatarstana i tatarskogo naroda, Uchebnoe posobie dlya srednykh obshcheobrazovatel'nykh shkol, gimnazii i litseev*, ch. 1-2, Kazan', 1995.

³⁴ Cf. KHABUTDINOV, A. Yu., *Tatarskoe obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie v dosovetskii period, 1900-1918 gg., Uchebnoe posobie po kursu "Istoriya Tatarstana,"* ch. 1-2, Kazan', 1997. Other examples are USMANOVA, D. M., *Dukhovnaya zhizn' tatarskogo naroda v nachale XX veka: Programma spetskursa*, Kazan', 1996; MINULLIN, Dzh. S., *Tatar khalky tarikhy (XIX-XX iöz bashy) kursynnan seminar däresläre öchen kullanna*, Kazan, 1995.

2.3. Periodicals

Most of the relevant Soviet periodicals survived the end of the Soviet Union. This is not a matter of course, since many editing institutions faced hard times financially. The highly subsidised postal distribution became quite expensive in the latter years, too.

Added to this, an important number of new periodicals sprang up in the field of historical or Islamic studies. Some of them appeared in connection with the establishment of new scientific, educational or administrative structures dealing with Russia's Muslims and their respective history. Others appeared at the initiative of individuals or groups of scholars more or less independently. Some of them issued a few numbers only to disappear again; the stability of others bears testimony to professional standards and the devotion of their editors.

The following index lists periodicals to consult according to their place of issue. Since many established journals changed their Soviet-style titles, we will occasionally refer to both the old and the new name.

2.3.1. Moscow, St. Petersburg

Most of the central academic institutions located in Moscow or St. Petersburg retained their journals. They report more or less frequently on issues of Muslim or Islamic history in Russia. Of special interest are the following editions in Russian language (in alphabetic order):

Title	Editor
<i>Aziya i Afrika segodnya</i>	Institute of Oriental studies, Institute for Asian and African countries of the Russian Academy of Sciences
<i>Dialog</i> (ex <i>Agitator and Politicheskoe obrazovanie</i>)	Dialog Publishers
<i>Druzhiba narodov</i>	Union of Writers
<i>Etnograficheskoe obozrenie</i> (ex <i>Sovetskaya etnografiya</i>)	Institute for Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences
<i>Nauka i religiya</i>	Association "Znanie"
<i>Otechestvennye arkhivy</i> (ex <i>Sovetskie arkhivy</i>)	Russian Federal State Administration of Archives
<i>Svobodnaya mysl'</i> (ex <i>Kommunist</i>)	Fond Gorbachev
<i>Otechestvennaya istoriya</i> (ex <i>Istoriya SSSR</i>)	Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences
<i>Voprosy istorii</i>	Historical departments of the Russian Academy of Sciences
<i>Vostok-Oriens</i> (ex <i>Narody Azii i Afriki</i>)	Institute of Oriental studies, Institute of Africa of the Russian Academy of Sciences

One should similarly examine the oriental series of the bulletins issued by Moscow's and St. Petersburg's state universities (*Vostokovedcheskie serii Vestnika Moskovskogo/Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*). Finally, *Tyurkologiya* (ex *Sovetskaya tyurkologiya*), jointly published by scholars from Russia and Azerbaïdzhân in Baku, should be consulted.

Besides these established journals a few Moscow-based newcomers are remarkable:

Title	Editor
<i>Evraziya</i> (1993-)	Centre of Demography and Ecology, Moscow
<i>Istoricheskii arkhiv</i> (1993-)	Russian Federal State Administration of Archives
<i>Rodina</i> (1989-)	Presidential Administration of the Russian Federation
<i>Rossiya i musul'manskii mir</i> (1993-)	Institute for Scientific Information, Institute for Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences
<i>Tyurkskii mir</i> (1999-)	?
<i>Vestnik Evrazii</i> (1995-)	Centre for Research and Publishing "Vestnik Evrazii"

To our knowledge, only one new journal from St. Petersburg, *Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie*, covers the subjects discussed here.

2.3.2. Periodicals published in Tatarstan and Bashkortostan

The following index lists journals that were already published before 1990, some of them under different titles. The languages of publication are indicated in brackets.

Title	Editor
<i>Agizel</i> Ufa (Bashkir)	Bashkir Union of Writers
<i>Iadkar'</i> Ufa (Bashkir)	Academy of Science of the Republic of Bashkortostan
<i>Idel</i> Kazan (Tatar, Russian)	Youth journal by the Tatar Union of Writers
<i>Kazan</i> Kazan (Russian and Tatar editions with differing contents, 1999- Tatar only)	State council of the Republic of Tatarstan with the City of Kazan
<i>Kazan utlary</i> Kazan (Tatar)	Tatar Union of Writers
<i>Mägarif</i> Kazan (Tatar)	Ministry of Education of the Republic of Tatarstan
<i>Shongkar</i> Ufa (Bashkir)	Youth journal by the Bashkir Union of Writers
<i>Tulpar</i> Ufa (Tatar)	Tatar department of Bashkir Union of Writers
<i>Tatarstan</i> Kazan (Russian and Tatar editions with differing contents, since 1998 only Tatar)	Government of the Republic of Tatarstan
<i>Vestnik Akademii Nauk Respubliki Bashkortostan</i> Ufa (Russian)	Academy of Science of the Republic of Bashkortostan

Fortunately, the formerly limited selection of relevant periodicals from the national republics has grown recently, and some of the newcomers like *Ab imperio* and *Ekho vekov* are very welcome additions due to the sample or the quality of the material they contain. The languages of publication are indicated in brackets.

Title	Editor
<i>Ab Imperio</i> Kazan, 2000- (Russian)	Kazan-based Historians
<i>Argamak</i> Nab. Chelny, 1991- (Tatar, Russian)	City of Naberezhnye Chelny
<i>Gasyrlar avazy/Ekho vekov</i> Kazan, 1995- (Tatar, Russian)	Archival administration of the Republic of Tatarstan
<i>Iman nury</i> Kazan, 1993- (Russian, Tatar)	Apanaev Mosque, Kazan
<i>Miras</i> Kazan, 1991- (Tatar)	Tatar World Congress
<i>Nauchnyi Tatarstan</i> Kazan, 1995- (Russian)	Academy of Science of the Republic of Tatarstan
<i>Panorama Forum</i> Kazan, 1995- (Russian)	Academy of Science of the Republic of Tatarstan, Historical Institute
<i>Vatandash</i> Ufa, 1996- (Russian, Bashkir, some English summaries)	Bashkir World Congress

Tatarica: Zvezdnyi chas tatarskoi istorii (1997) and *Mir Islama* (1999), both from Kazan, seemingly came out in just one issue each.

The sample of periodical publications presented here is necessarily not exhaustive and to a degree reflects personal preference. Added to this, a number of periodicals published outside the capital cities and the national republics may contain relevant material as well. We are, unfortunately, not in a position to list them here.

3. Recent Research Trends

3.1. Ethnicity, nation, Islam-introductory remarks

The political changes of the late 1980s and early 1990s created an ideological atmosphere in Russia that rendered national issues a top priority in intellectual discussion and public opinion alike. Russian historians found themselves caught between Scylla and Charybdis, discussing the pros and cons of a renewed Imperial or a Russian national historical scheme. For non-Russians, “nationalization” of historiography was the order of the day. It did not merely propose the most obvious and viable solution in order to fill the ideological vacuum in the humanities, it also helped historians to preserve their relevance in the socio-political discourses. Therefore it would be insufficient just to blame the political elites for consciously manipulating historiography to their profit. The nationalist discursive framework

prevailed at least until the mid-1990s and forced even ideologically disengaged researchers to take the nationalist euphoria into account.³⁵

As we have already said, the majority of relevant publications comes from Tatarstan and Bashkortostan, and the nationalist historiographic turn in the ethnic republics of the Russian left substantial imprints on recent research. Due to the particularities of the region's historical development, we find issues of ethnicity, nationality and confession—Islam—closely interrelated in many publications. Of the three currents, ethnicity has certainly been the least problematic category in Soviet sciences, since it was perceived in rather static terms and neatly confined to “objective” features. Nationalism in the sense of mobilised ethnicity, on the other hand, was generally seen as a negative and retrograde phenomenon, and any researcher had to remind his readers duly about this fact. Nationalism had of course been a topic of historical study before, but these studies had to be biased in accordance with the underlying schemes of historiography. Apologetic interpretations were certainly not suitable, although, as we shall see, contemporary nationalistic narratives are deeply rooted in the Soviet tradition. Given the Soviet ideological contempt for religion, Islamic studies were maybe even more determined by the stipulations of “scientific atheism,” and theoretically and methodologically even less developed than the studies of ethnicity and nationalism.

If we distinguish in the sections to follow between (1) the ethnic and (2) the national history of the Muslim peoples, and (3) the history of Islam, this is a heuristic distinction with respect to scientific conventions in Russia and the Soviet Union. One should keep in mind, however, that the reconciliation of ethnicity, nationality issues, and Islam is one of the major targets of current national Tatar and Bashkir historiography. As they dominate historiography on Islam and Muslim peoples in Russia, only the final paragraphs of this section will be devoted to other recent

³⁵ Indeed, some scholars took upon themselves the task of counterbalancing the new nationalist trends in historiography. A case in point the hagiographic character of literature on the first Bashkir leader, Akhmed Zaki-Validi (listed in section 3.3.5.). ISKHAKOV, S. M., “A.-Z. Validov: Prebyvanie u vlasti,” *Otechestvennaya istoriya* 1996/6: 55-75 heavily criticised the Ufa edition of Validi's memoirs and published an alternative version with abundant annotations: Compare the Ufa edition [VALIDI-] TOGAN, Z., *Vospominaniya: Bor'ba narodov Turkestana i drugikh vostochnykh musul'man-tyurkov za natsional'noe bytie i sokhranenie kul'tury*, kn. 1-2, Ufa, 1994-1998 and the Moscow alternative, [VALIDI-] TOGAN, Z., *Vospominaniya: Bor'ba musul'man Turkestana i drugikh vostochnykh tyurok za natsional'noe sushchestvovanie i kul'turu*, Moskva, 1997. For other accounts by Moscow's scholars cf. BURMISTROVA, T. Yu., *Akhmet Zaki Validi Togan: Zhizn' i tvorchestvo*, Moskva, 1996; CHERVONNAYA, S. M., “Akhmetzaki Validi i Dzhafer Seidamet: Dve kontseptsii natsional'noi avtonomii,” in *Vostokovedenie v Bashkortostane: Istoriya, kul'tura*, Ufa, 1992, kn. 2: 24-27; LANDA, R. G., “Akhmed-Zaki Validov (Zaki Validi Togan) kak vostokoved i obshchestvennyi deyatel',” *Vostok* 2000/1: 122-137.

trends in the study of social and cultural developments.

3.2. *Ethnic history*

While the “subjective” features of nation-building, such as the history of nationalist thought or the development of nationalist parties and movements, were a critical issue in Soviet historiography, the cultural traditions and social customs of the nationalities were relatively safe areas. The “objective” features of ethnic groups could be dealt with unless they were ascribed political significance. Against this background Soviet ethnography and ethno-sociology, employing comparatively innovative approaches and methods, functioned as a niche for those who were interested in research on the history of the non-Russia minorities. Methodologically, ethnography represented a lesser evil, given its strong inclination toward taxonomy. This meant in practice that researchers as a rule divided would-be nations into ever smaller units and subgroups and analysed their peculiarities, rather than stressing the common features of the larger collective.³⁶ To be sure, ethnic history, too, had to remain within the limits set by the neo-imperial historiographical doctrines re-established in the 1930s, and pay at least lip service to the “friendship-of-the-peoples” myth.

As a result, ethnographical and ethno-sociological studies often contained historical sections with alternative and sometimes more accurate information than was in historical works. Post-Soviet ethnography and ethnology, both in the centre and the republics, continue to contribute considerably to the historical study of Islam and Muslim people in Russia.³⁷ Any student in the field should therefore not only be encouraged to take into consideration the growing body of ethnographical surveys, but also the detailed studies on folk belief and literature or customs of regional subgroups.³⁸

³⁶ Cf. SUSLOVA, S. V., ed. *Etnokul'turnoe raionirovanie tatar Srednego Povolzh'ya*, Kazan', 1991; ISKHAKOV, D. M., *Etnograficheskie gruppy tatar Volgo-Ural'skogo region: Printsipy vydeleniya, formirovaniya, rasseleniya i demografiya*, Kazan', 1993.

³⁷ Some of the eminent researchers even “changed” professions and can today be labeled as historians. Damir Iskhakov from Tatarstan's Academy of Sciences, Institute of History, is probably the leading example.

³⁸ On Bashkirs: BIKBULATOV, N. V., *Bashkiry: Etnograficheskii ocherk*, Ufa, 1995; YUL-DASHBAEV, B. Kh., *Bashkiry i Bashkortostan*, Ufa, 1995; KUZBEKOV, F. T., *Istoriya kul'tury bashkir*, Ufa, 1997; KUZEEV, R. G., *Etnopoliticheskaya istoriya i sovremennost' Bashkortostana*, Ufa, 1997.

On Tatars: ISKHAKOV, D. M., *Tatary*, Naberezhnye Chelny, 1993; *Tatary*, Moskva, 2001 (A volume on the Bashkirs is to follow.). On Tatar subgroups: AMINOV, D. A., *Tatary v St. Peterburge*, S.-Peterburg, 1994; ARSLANOV, P. S., *Tatary Nizhnego Povolzh'ya i Stavropol'ya*,

The following two sections will examine two issues of particular concern for post-Soviet Tatar and Bashkir national narratives: the problems of ethnogenesis and ethnodemography.

3.2.1. *Ethnogenesis*

The concepts of ethnogenesis and continuous ethnic development from time immortal to the present day are an important pillar in any nationalist historical narrative. Therefore it is hardly surprising that the Soviet regime tried to impose statutory versions of ethnic histories. As to the Great Russians, the theories developed under Stalin barely concealed nationalist approaches within their socialist phraseology. Soviet researchers projected the ethnic history of the Eastern Slavs deep into antiquity and were eager to prove that their ethnic territory, where they were said to have settled incessantly, largely coincided with European Russia. If the other peoples historically inhabiting the European parts of Russia were not simply denied the prestigious marker “autochthonous,” they were reduced to “younger brothers,” a role they had to play according to the “friendship of the peoples” narrative.³⁹

In the case of the Tatars, debates on ethnogenesis reveal an essential cleavage between the so-called “Bulgharists” and “Tatarists.” The issue at stake is how individual scholars evaluate the role of the Mongol conquest in Tatar ethnic history: While the “Bulgharists” stress ancient autochthonous roots and downplay the impact of the invaders from the Steppes, the “Tatarists” ascribe major significance to the “Kipchak” element. A well-established historical school that emphasised the Golden Horde’s dominion over Eastern Europe as an important stage in the ethnic history of the modern Tatar nation was ideologically suppressed in 1944. Stalinist Soviet

Naberezhnye Chelny, 1995; *Astrakhanskie tatory*, Kazan’, 1992; DUMIN, S. B., *Belorusskie tatory*, Moskva, 1993; GRISHIN, Ya., *Pol’sko-litovskie tatory: Nasledniki Zolotoi ordy*, Kazan’, 1995; ORLOV, A. M., *Meshchera, meshcheryaki, mishare*, Kazan’, 1992; *Priural’skie tatory*, Kazan’, 1990; ROZENBERG, L. I., “Tatory v Moskve: XVII-seredine XIX veka,” in *Etnicheskie gruppy v gorodakh evropeiskoi chasti SSSR: Formirovanie, rasselenie, dinamika kul’tury*, Moskva, 1987: 16-26; SADUR, V., “Tatarskoe naselenie Moskvy, 1860-1905 gg.,” in *Etnicheskie gruppy v gorodakh evropeiskoi chasti SSSR: Formirovanie, rasselenie, dinamika kul’tury*, Moskva, 1987: 26-49; SADUR, V., “Moskvichi s XVI veka: Nekotorye svedeniya iz istorii moskovskikh tatar,” *Nauka i religiya* 1990/6: 2-7; SHARIFULLINA, F. L., *Kasimovskie tatory*, Kazan’, 1991.

On the baptised Tatars (kryasheny): *Mol’keevskie kryasheny*, Kazan’, 1993; GLUKHOV, M., *Tatarica-Entsiklopediya*, Kazan’, 1997. Cf. also MUKHAMETSHIN, Yu. G., *Tatory-kryasheny*, Moskva, 1977.

³⁹ Cf. BORDYUGOV, G. and BUKHAREV, V., “Natsional’naya istoricheskaya mysl’ v usloviyakh sovetskogo vremeni,” in *Natsional’nye istorii...* (note 1): 21-73; KUCHUMOV, *Kryuch’ya pod rebro...* (note 1): 12-13.

historiography treated the Mongols in good Imperial tradition as arch-villains, and Tatar historians were forced, first, to deny any meaningful connection between the Horde and the earlier Volga-Bulgarian State or the later Khanates in the region, and second to “prove” the role their peoples played in the war they allegedly waged commonly with the Russian people against the Mongol invaders. This inevitably linked the ethnic history with the history of the Volga-Bulgars, settling in the Volga-Urals at least from the 8th century AD.⁴⁰ Consequently, the supposed borders of the Volga-Bulgarian State were claimed as the borders of a genuinely ethnic Tatar territory. This gave the Tatars an indigenous status in the whole Volga-Ural region. As soon as the ideological pressure on historiography diminished in the 1950s, the cleavages between “Tatarist” and “Bulgharist” schools in ethnic history re-emerged. The official sanctions for the Soviet “Bulgharist” version notwithstanding, “Tatarist” historians continued to stress the impact of Kipchak and Mongol elements on the ethnic history of the Tatars.⁴¹

The controversy almost immediately sharpened when in the late 1980s the TASSR’s leadership bowed to a growing nationalistic sentiment among intellectuals and dismissed the “friendship of the people” myths. The annexation of Kazan by Ivan the Terrible in 1552, bearing “progressive significance” before, was now labeled a national catastrophe. Inevitably, the Golden Horde was hailed as an important and highly civilised Empire, and correspondingly revalued in the national historical narrative. This added to a broader trend among non-Russian intellectuals, who “rediscovered” their “Turkic heritage” or developed neo-Eurasian interpretations of Russia’s Imperial traditions. The “turkization” of Tatar history, moreover, allowed for an incorporation of the descendants of other Golden Horde successor-states, like the Tatars of Astrakhan or Siberia, into the modern Tatar nation.⁴²

Although for the time being lacking political support, the Bulgharist version

⁴⁰ Unfortunately, ethnic historians and linguists from the neighbouring republic of Chuvashia also stubbornly claimed the Islamic Volga-Bulgarian heritage.

⁴¹ The problem of Tatar ethnogenesis has been broadly discussed in historiography. Cf. FRANK, A. J., *Islamic Historiography and ‘Bulgar’ Identity among the Tatars and Bashkirs of Russia*, Leiden, 1998: 178-186; ISKHAKOV, *Istoriya...* (note 1): 279, 282 (and annotation). For a programmatic “Tatarist” point of view see ISKHAKOV, D. M., “O kontseptual’nykh problemakh tatarskoi istoricheskoi nauki i zadachakh zhurnala *Tatarica*” *Tatarica* 1 (zima 1997/98 goda) Kazan’, 1997: 2-11. The Bulgharist position finds expression in ZAKIEV, M. Z. and KUZ’MIN-YUMANADI, Ya. F., *Vol’zhskie bulgary i ikh potomki*, Kazan’, 1993.

⁴² Cf. ISKHAKOV, *Istoriya...* (note 1): 275-276. A notorious example of “tyurkophilia” is ADZHI, M., *Polyn’ polovetskogo polya*, Moskva, 1994. SHNIRELMAN, *Who Gets the Past?:* 44-45 has correctly noted that the “Tatarist” and “Bulgharist” conceptions do not differ substantially in this respect, since the historical borders of the Bulgar empire could likewise be re-defined large enough to incorporate other ethnic groups like the Bashkirs, the Astrakhan or the Siberian Tatars.

nevertheless persisted. Radical “Bulgharists” even launched a public campaign to urge their compatriots to renounce the ethnonym “Tatar” for “Bulgars.”⁴³ The discussion remained purely emotional, although eminent Tatar historians actively participated.⁴⁴ Their participation, however, did not mean that new research on the rel-

⁴³ On radical “neo-bulgarism” see FRANK, *Islamic Historiography...* (note 41): 190-194. The debate was an incentive for many scholars to popularise their respective “Tatarist” or “Bulgharist” interpretations. Cf. KHALIKOV, A. Kh., *Proiskhozhdenie tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan', 1987; KARIMULLIN, A., *Tatary*, Kazan', 1989; KARIMULLIN, Ä., *Tatarlar*, Kazan, 1991; KHALIKOV, A. Kh., *Kto my—bulgariya ili tatary? Kem bez—bulgarlarmy, tatarlarmy?*, Kazan', 1992; FAKHRUTDINOV, R., *Tatar ugly tatarmyn*, Yar Chally, 1993; KHALIKOV, A. Kh., *Mongoly, Tatary, Zolotaya Orda, i Bulgariya*, Kazan', 1994.

⁴⁴ While studies on the Golden Horde continue to be published in the West and in Central Asia (cf. OSTROWSKI, D., *Muscovy and the Mongols: Cross-cultural Influences on the Steppe Frontier, 1304-1589*, Cambridge, 1998; ABDIROV, M., *Khan Kuchum: Izvestnyi i neizvestnyi*, Almaty, 1997), there is little research conducted in Russia proper on the medieval Islamic states on Russian soil.

The Kazan archaeologist Khuzin almost monopolised publishing on Volga Bulgaria: KHUZIN, F. Sh., ed. *Arkheologiya Volzhskoi Bulgarii: problemy, poiski, resheniya*, Kazan', 1993; KHUZIN, F. Sh., “Bulgaria na Volge i Kame do mongol'skogo zavoevaniya,” in *Materialy po istorii tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan', 1995: 95-117; KHUZIN, F. Sh., *Volzhskaya Bulgariya v domongol'skoe vremya (X-nachalo XII vekov)*, Kazan', 1997; ISKHAKOV, K. Sh. and KHUZIN, F. Sh., eds. *Arkheologicheskoe izuchenie bulgarskikh gorodov*, Kazan', 1999; KHUZIN, F. Sh., *Velikii gorod na Cheremshane: Stratigrafiya, khronologiya, problemy Bilyara-Bulgara*, Kazan', 1995; KHUZIN, F. Sh., *Bulgarskii gorod v X-nachale XIII vv.*, Kazan', 2001.

On the Golden Horde cf. AMIRKHANOV, R. M., *Tatarskaya sotsial'no-filosofskaya mysl' srednevekov'ya (XIII-XVI vv.)*, v 2 kn. Kazan', 1993; KHALLULLIN, I. Kh., “Srednee Povolzh'e i Nizhnee Prikam'e v XIII v.,” in *Materialy po istorii tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan', 1995: 118-135; MALOV, N. M., MALYSHEV, A. B. and RAKUSHIN, A. I., *Religiya v Zolotoi Orde*, Saratov, 1998 (Textbook); MUKHAMADIEV, A. G., “Zolotaya orda,” in *Materialy po istorii tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan', 1995: 138-185; POKHLEBKIN, V. V., *Tatary i Rus': 360 let otsheniya Rusi s tatarskimi gosudarstvami v XIII-XVI vv., 1238-1598: Spravochnik*, Moskva, 2000; RAKUSHIN, A. I., *Musul'manstvo u zolotoordynskikh kochevnikov Nizhnego Povolzh'ya v XIII-XV vv.*, (Diss.) Saratov, 1998; *Srednevekovaya Kazan': Vozniknovenie i razvitie*, Kazan', 2000. See also *Istochnikovedenie Ulusa Dzhuchi (Zolotoi Ordy): Ot Kalki do Astrakhani, 1223-1556*, Kazan', 2002. The anthology features essays by E. I. Kychanov, M. G. Kramarovskii (Petersburg), I. V. Zaitsev, V. V. Trepalov (Moscow), Yu. A. Zelenev (Ioshkar-Ola) and S. I. Valyulina, I. L. Izmailov, A. G. Mukhamadiev, D. I. Iskhakov (Kazan') on different kinds of sources on the Horde's history.

On the successor States: ALISHEV, S. Kh., “Kazanskoe khanstvo: Vozniknovenie i razvitie,” in *Materialy po istorii tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan', 1995: 186-200; ALISHEV, S. Kh., *Kazan' i Moskva: Mezhhosudarstvennye otsheniya v XV-XVI vv.*, Kazan', 1995; ISKHAKOV, D. M., “Seidy v pozdnezolotoordynskikh tatarskikh gosudarstvakh,” *Tatarica* 1997/1: 42-95; KHAFIZOV, G. G., *Raspad Mongol'skoi imperii i obrazovaniya Ulusa Dzhuchi*, Kazan', 2000; KHAMIDULLIN, B., *Narody Kazanskogo khanstva*, Kazan', 2002; RAKHIMZYANOV, E. V., “Vnutrennee ustroistvo Kasimovskogo tsarstva v pervyi period sushchestvovaniya,” in *Tochka zreniya*, vyp. 2, Kazan', 2000: 65-73.

evant time periods has been conducted. In fact, virtually no new evidence or new source material could be presented.⁴⁵ Most publications referred to the same arguments that were exchanged again and again, and each party eagerly engaged in reprinting “classical” studies in the field.⁴⁶

The telling fact that only a minority of Tatar researchers tried to reconcile the “Bulgharist” and “Tatarist” versions but preferred to enlist in one of the camps instead has to be related to a general quest for reconstruction of the “historical truth” in post-Soviet historiography. “Truth,” particularly the “truth” that has allegedly been voluntarily biased by Soviet historians, seemingly does not allow for competing versions of history to exist. This is particularly apparent in public debates, notwithstanding that other eminent scholars developed more appropriate schemes for regional ethnic history. A case in point is the work of the late ethnographer R. G. Kuzeev. Detached from both Tatar and Bashkir nationalist influences, Kuzeev for over 30 years resisted exclusiveness in his studies on Tatar or Bashkir ethnic history. His classical study of Bashkir ethnogenesis, published in 1974, rejected simple modes of explanation. Carefully analysing the streams of migration and the complex interplay in the historical development of all peoples settling in the Volga-Urals, he portrayed the development of Bashkir ethnicity as an enduring process unrolling between 500 and 1500 AD. Moreover, Kuzeev denied that indigenous elements played a substantial role in the formation of the Bashkirs. His poly-ethnic account on ethnic history in his “Peoples of the Middle Volga and Southern Ural” (1992) is probably the most appropriate approach published in Russia.⁴⁷

Unfortunately, complex explanations of this kind do not set the tone. Instead, rather straightforward efforts to prove the antiquity and autochthonous qualities of both Tatar and Bashkir existence in the Volga-Urals prevail. Due to the lack of written sources, academics and journalists tried to surpass each other with speculations based on a methodologically dubious combination of archaeological, linguistic and historical evidence. Even if one were to try, a critical evaluation would hardly be possible. If there is any annotation, the references usually pertain to various older publications, frequently by the same author. This is as true for contemporary Bashkir specialists like Mazhitov, Sultanova, or Ivanov as it is for Tatar academics. While the former trace Bashkir ethnic history in the Urals back to the second mil-

⁴⁵ Local genealogical literature (*shezhere*) has rarely been analysed. The eminent exceptions to the rule are KUZEEV, R. G., *Bashkirskie shezhere*, Ufa, 1960, and AKHMETZANOV, M., *Tatarskie shezhere*, Kazan', 1991.

⁴⁶ *Na styke kontinentov i tsivilizatsii*, Kazan', 1996 is a case in point. The anthology comprises classical Soviet studies on the history of the medieval Bulgar Empire and the Golden Horde. KHAMIDULLIN, B., *Iz glubiny stoletii*, Kazan', 2001 is a recent popularization.

⁴⁷ KUZEEV, R. G., *Proizkhozhdenie bashkirskogo naroda*, Moskva, 1974; KUZEEV, R. G., *Narody Srednego Povolzh'ya i Yuzhnogo Urala: Emogeneticheskii vzglyad na istoriyu*, Moskva, 1992.

lennium BC and subsequently label any material testimony as “Bashkir,”⁴⁸ the latter do the same for the Tatars. Thus, M. Zakiev, director of the Institute of Archaeology, Literature and Arts of Tatarstan’s Academy of Science, defined the inhabitants of a mysterious antique state of “Byarym” to be the ancestors of the Tatars. In a way similar to the Bashkir scholars, Zakiev speculated about blood relations and cultural ties of the ancient Turks (read: early Tatars) with other world civilizations of the Middle East.⁴⁹

3.2.2. Ethno-demography

Historical demography had already been well developed in the Soviet period, and contemporary students have abundant data stemming from Russian or Soviet revisions and censuses at their disposal.⁵⁰ Using statistics on Tatars and Bashkirs, any student should keep in mind that the modern Tatar and Bashkir nations came into being only in the 20th century, and that the historical use of these ethnonyms may deviate considerably from contemporary semantics. Any qualification of social collectives as “Tatar” or “Bashkir” before the Soviet period is therefore an estimation, more or less justified. Moreover, the perplexing ethno-demographic mosaic of the Volga-Urals and the dispersed ethnic settlements of Tatars and Bashkirs throughout the region renders statistical accounts not only difficult, but also politically sensitive. Due to intensive eastward migration of Tatars and other peoples into the Urals as a result of Russian conquest and colonization, Tatar and Bashkir zones of settlement overlap in large parts of the Urals. On one hand, this means that populations of Tatar and Bashkir origin were exposed to protracted mutual influence, and on the other hand the peculiar legal and social framework led to development of a

⁴⁸ MAZHITOV, N. A. and SULTANOVA, A. N., *Istoriya Bashkortostana s drevneishikh vremen do XVI v.*, Ufa, 1994: 70-75; *Istoriya Bashkortostana s drevneishikh vremen do 60-x gody XIX v.*, Ufa, 1996. These are certainly the most radical exponents. Nevertheless, it seems to be common sense among Bashkir researchers that the Bashkirs already formed a distinct ethnic community before the Mongol conquest, that is, 300 years earlier than Kuzeev argued. Cf. KUCHUMOV, *Kryuch’ya pod rebro...* (note 1): 10-22.

⁴⁹ ZAKIEV, M. Z., *Tatary: Problemy istorii i yazyka*, Kazan’, 1995; ZAKIEV, M. Z., “Problemy etnogeneza tatarskogo naroda,” in *Materialy po istorii tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan’, 1995: 12-94. For commentaries see ISKHAKOV, *Istoriya...* (note 1): 279, 282. For other “early” ethnic histories see ISKHAKOV, D. M., *Etnopoliticheskaya istoriya tatar v VI-pervoi chetverti XV v.*, Kazan’, 2000.

⁵⁰ DAISHEV, S. I., “Migratsiya naseleniya Srednego Povolzh’ya,” *Argamak* 1995/2: 122-128; 1995/3: 160-181; *Demograficheskie protsessy na Urale v epokhu feodalizma*, Sverdlovsk, 1990; ISKHAKOV, D. M., *Istoricheskaya demografiya tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan’, 1993. Cf. also KUZEEV, *Narody...* (note 47), passim.

confusing multitude of social, regional and ethnic identities. With the emergence of national consciousness, Tatar and Bashkir nationalists began to claim groups of settlements as Bashkir or Tatar, while the patterns of self-identification of the population in question shifted significantly over time.⁵¹ Under the Soviet regime, the borders of “Malaya Bashkiriya” were enlarged in the 1920s. Larger territories of the former gubernia of Ufa were incorporated into the autonomous republic, with the result that substantial groups of a Tatar-speaking population found themselves citizens of Soviet Bashkiria. Since then, neither the complaints from Tatar nationalists on this “historical injustice” nor the refutations of “Tatar expansionism” from the Bashkir side have calmed. Both sides usually use ethno-demographic statistics to underline their respective claims.⁵²

3.3. Nationalism, nation- and state-building

Although studies in nationalism developed under strict supervision by Soviet authorities, it would be incorrect to date the renaissance of Tatar and Bashkir national historiography from the post-Soviet period only. Already, in the political detente during and after the thaw, revisionist reconsideration of Muslim intellectual history emerged. With respect to the ideological framework, these reappraisals of pre-revolutionary Muslim intellectual life could hardly be more than a partial rehabilitation, pertaining to “progressive” (in the sense of Marxist teleology) elements in their writings.

⁵¹ During the 19th century “Bashkir” was as much a socionym as it has been an ethnonym. Cf. ISKHAKOV, *Istoricheskaya demografiya...* (note 50): 107; YULDASHBAEV, B. Kh., *Istoriya formirovaniya bashkirskoi natsii: Dooktyabr'skii period*, Ufa, 1972: 70, 107, 167, 172; KUZEEV, *Narody...* (note 47): 138. This is aptly illustrated by WERTH, P. W., “Tsarist Categories, Orthodox Invention, and Islamic Conversion in a Pagan Udmurt Village, 1870s-1890s,” in *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*, vol. 2, eds. A. von Kügelgen *et al.*, Berlin, 1998: 385-415. See also RODNOV, M. I., “Chislennost' i sostav tyurkskogo krest'yanstva Ufimskoi gubernii v nachale XX veka,” in *Etnotaficheskoe obozrenie* 1996/6:121-131.

⁵² DAVLETSHINA, Z. M., *Tatarskoe naselenie Bashkortostana: Etnodemograficheskoe issledovanie*, Ufa, 2001; ISKHAKOV, D. M., “Dinamika chislennosti i osobennosti razmeshcheniya tatar v Volgo-Ural'skom regione v XVI-nachale XX vv.,” in *Materialy po istorii tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan', 1995: 257-297; YULDASHBAEV, B. Kh., *Bashkiry i Bashkortostan XX v.: Etnostatistika*, Ufa, 1995; MURZABULATOV, M. V., ed. *Bashkiriya i bashkiry v zerkale statistiki*, Ufa, 1995; KUL'SHARIPOV, M. M., “Tragicheskaya demografiya,” in *Aktual'nye problemy istorii i etnografii Bashkortostana: Proshloe i sovremennost'*, Ufa, 1993.

3.3.1. *Jadidism and "New Tatar Historiography"*

The most eminent target for such rehabilitation was the so-called jadid reform movement of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Historians like Ya. Abdullin interpreted jadidism as the successful attempt of Tatar elites to forge a modern national consciousness among the Muslim population, thus leaving aside everything that would not fit to their purpose, above all the Islamic features of reformism. Prominent ulama and secular intellectuals among Tatars and Bashkirs re-emerged as "enlighteners" or "secularists" in these accounts, and the genealogy of reformist thinking was protracted back to early 19th century figures like Kursavi and Utyz-Imani.⁵³ These nationalist interpretations were largely based on jadid self-assessments in the pre-revolutionary press and early Soviet accounts, like those of Dzh. Validov or G. Gubaidullin.⁵⁴ Consequently, this kind of literature adopted clichés like the jadids' overestimation of their public support or their distorting presentations of "traditionalist" Islamic thought and institutions.

Contemporary Western specialists were quite aware of the political impacts of what they labeled "New Tatar Historiography."⁵⁵ Nevertheless many Western scholars uncritically adopted the interpretative framework.⁵⁶ The same is true, unfortunately, for post-Soviet research in Russia. Jadidism is attracting the attention of students of the late Imperial Islamic discourse almost exclusively, and no fundamental re-evaluation of the role of Islam or Islamic institutions beyond the reform movement is discernible so far. This is especially true for Tatar scholars, who practically monopolised the study of jadid thought in the Volga-Urals.⁵⁷ Bashkir histo-

⁵³ Cf. the classical accounts by ABDULLIN, Ya. G., *Tatarskaya prosvetitel'skaya mysl': Sotsial'naya priroda i osnovnye problemy*, Kazan', 1976 and YULDASHBAEV, *Istoriya formirovaniya bashkirskoi natsii...* (note 51). For critical discussions see KEMPER, *Sufis und Gelehrte...* (note 1): 12-13, 466-475.

⁵⁴ GUBAIDULLIN, G., *Istoriya tatar*, Moskva, 1926; VALIDOV, Dzh., *Ocherk obrazovannosti i literaturny volzhskikh tatar*, vyp. 1., Moskva-Petrograd, 1923.

⁵⁵ LAZZERINI, E. J., "Ethnicity and the Use of History," *Central Asian Survey* 1/4 (1983): 61-69; LAZZERINI, E. J., "'Tatarovedenie' and the 'New Historiography' in the Soviet Union: Revising the Interpretation of Tatar-Russian Relationship," *Slavic Review* 40/4 (1981): 625-635; RORLICH, A.-A., "Not by History Alone: The Retrieval of the Past among the Tatars and Azeris," *Central Asian Survey* 3/2 (1984): 87-98.

⁵⁶ RORLICH, A.-A., *The Volga Tatars: A Profile in National Resilience*, Stanford, 1986. See also the critical review in FRANK, *Muslim Religious Institutions...* (note 1): 10-14.

⁵⁷ As Allen Frank remarked, "Part and parcel of this emphasis on the national aspect has led post-Soviet historians to view jadidism and Islamic modernism as manifestations of the Tatar national genius." FRANK, *Muslim Religious Institutions...* (note 1): 14. Cf. the programmatic title of ISKHAQOV, D. M., "Dzhadidizm kak natsiestroitel'stvo," in *Iman Nury* 1996/4: 20-27. Other recent accounts are ABDULLIN, Ya. G., *Dzhadidizm sredi tatar: Vozniknovenie, razvitiye i istoricheskoe mesto*, Kazan', 1998; ISKHAQOV, D. M., *Fenomen*

rians, concentrating on the socio-economic developments, during the 1970s somewhat reluctantly joined the trend and contested the exclusiveness of the Tatar claim to the reformers' heritage.⁵⁸

Even the "Islamic turn" in historiography in the second half of the 1990s (cf. 3.4.) has not changed much yet: The history of Islamic thought is almost exclusively viewed through the prism of jadidism, resulting in the postulate that the Tatars had developed a historically unique variant of Islam, a modernist "Euro-Islam." This coining quickly found its way into the political vocabulary of the republics' elites and administrations and serves as a kind of guideline for religious policies pursued both in Tatarstan and Bashkortostan.⁵⁹

3.3.2. *Pan-Turkism, pan-Islamism*

Against the background of global political changes, one might expect the history of pan-Turkism and pan-Islamism to re-emerge as substantial problems for contemporary scholarship. Although the Republic of Turkey made advances, at least symbolically, to the Turkic republics within Russia and the new Central Asian states, historical interest in pan-Turkism remained insignificant.⁶⁰ Pan-Islamic movements emerged as a major political concern only in the second half of the 1990s in connection with the protracted political crisis on the Southern borders of Central Asia and in the Northern Caucasus. Russia's mass media quickly adopted "wahhabism" as a label; the bulk of publications on pan-Islamic movements can not be regarded as methodically scientific. A second incentive was provided by the development of Islamic institutions and movements of the Muslim diaspora in large Russian cities. Their spokesmen occasionally allude to the traditions of the pre-revolutionary all-

tatarskogo dzhadidizma: Vvedenie k sotsiokul'turnomu osmysleniyu, Kazan', 1997; YUZEEV, A. N., *Tatarskaya filosofskaya mysl' kontsa XVIII-XIX vekov*, Kazan', 2001; MUKHAMETSHIN, R. M., "Dzhadidizm: Vremya poiskov novykh podkhodov," *Tatarstan* 1995/9-10: 87-89; MUKHAMETSHIN, R. M., *Islam v tatarskoi obshchestvennoi mysli v nachale XX veka*, Kazan', 2000; *Ocherki istorii tatarskoi obshchestvennoi mysli*, Kazan', 2000.

⁵⁸ YULDAZHBAEV, *Istoriya formirovaniya bashkirskoi natsii...* (note 51) was heavily criticised when it appeared in 1972 for its emphasis on ideological developments and for concluding that the Bashkirs already formed a bourgeois nation before 1917. For more recent attempts to upgrade Bashkir cultural traditions cf. KUCHUMOV, *Kryuch'ya pod rebro...* (note 1): 24-26.

⁵⁹ MUKHAMETSHIN, R. M., *Kadimizm, dzhadidizm i evroislam v postsovetском Tatarstane*, Paper delivered at the ICCEES World conference, Tampere 31.7.2000.

⁶⁰ GOROSHKOV, N. P., *Protsess stanovleniya i razvitiya pantyurkizma: Istoriko-politologicheskii analiz*, (Diss.) Voronezh, 1997; MUKHAMMETDINOV, R. F., *Zarozhdenie i evolyutsiya tyurkizma*, Kazan', 1996; *Pantyurkizm i natsional'naya bezopasnost' Rossii*, Moskva, 1994.

Russian Muslim movement. However, all attempts to revive an all-Russian Muslim political movement have proved abortive so far.

In addition to the above, the history of pan-Islamism and pan-Turkism as clichés of pre-revolutionary and Soviet political discourse remains to be studied thoroughly.

3.3.3. *Political movements and parties*

As already mentioned, only the collapse of Soviet rule allowed the re-evaluation of the pre-revolutionary Muslim movements and the emerging Tatar and Bashkir nationalism to spread to overtly ideological and political features. While Tatar historians focus today on developments prior to 1917 and tend to blur the distinction between “Tatar” and “Muslim” issues, Bashkir specialists extensively discuss the emergence of an independent Bashkir movement in 1917 and the subsequent efforts to secure a Bashkir territorial autonomy through the troubles of the Civil War and under Soviet rule.

Historically, the political mobilization of Russia’s Muslim population significantly increased after the Great Reforms. When by the second half of the nineteenth century Russian nationality policies increasingly interfered in Muslim religious and educational matters, popular dissatisfaction found its expression in different ways. Bashkir and Tatar historians tend to interpret the rallying of the Muslim villagers and townspeople around their Islamic institutions as a sign of growing national consciousness and popular support for the emerging jadid reform movement. With respect to the modest development of the reform movement before 1905, this is certainly an exaggeration, and popular support was rather a sign of the stability and strength of traditional Islamic structures.⁶¹

The Russian legal framework allowed for political movements to organise openly only after 1905. Following the first Russian revolution, jadid reformers and secular intellectuals gained support at least among the urban Muslim population, and the regional elite’s networks soon developed into an all-Russian Muslim movement. “Ittifak” failed, however, to develop fully as a party before 1907, and after Stolypin’s *coup d’etat* the Muslim factions of the State Duma remained the only functioning political organization. “Ittifak” has been the subject of much publica-

⁶¹ While VALIDOV, *Ocherk obrazovannosti...* (note 54): 47, 50 was quite outspoken on this fact, later Soviet and post-Soviet accounts overemphasised the popularity of jadidism. Cf. the citations and annotation in YEMELYANOVA, G. M., “The National Identity of the Volga Tatars at the Turn of the 19th Century: Tatarism, Turkism and Islam,” *Central Asian Survey* 16/4 (1997): 543-572, here pp. 543-544, 558. Cf. also the generalization in ISKHAKOV, D. M., *Problemy stanovleniya i transformatsii tatarskoi natsii*, Kazan’, 1997.

tion, but most accounts produced no new evidence, as they rely heavily on a narrow sample of published contemporary sources⁶² or concentrate on the biographies of individual intellectuals.⁶³ As a result, many questions persist. This is especially true for the history of the local branches of the Muslim movement, for the degree to which they were organised during the revolution and the problem of their continued existence after the official denial of party status. The growing network of charitable and educational associations also remains to be systematically studied (cf. 3.5.3.).

On the other hand, the history of the Muslim Duma factions has been intensively studied in Moscow, Kazan and Ufa alike. This is certainly due to the extensive source material available: most researchers use protocols from the Duma and its commissions, and some include evidence from the contemporary press. In varying degrees post-Soviet studies are eager to portray the Muslim deputies as an integral part of the Russian liberal movement, but sometimes their potential, efforts, and achievements are judged critically.⁶⁴ In any case, the impression of linear and unhampered development of “Muslim liberalism” in the last decade of Imperial Russia, as presented in some accounts, should be seriously questioned.

⁶² Most accounts rely on BIGI, M., *Islakhat äsaslary*, Petrograd, 1917. ISKHAKOV, S. M., “Revolutsiya 1905-1907 gg. i rossiiskie musul'mane...” (note 5) and ISKHAKOV, S. M., “Obshcherossiiskaya partiya musul'man...” (note 5) refer to contemporary police records from the Moscow State Archive. SALIKHOV, R. R., “L'implication des Tatars musulmans dans les institutions sélectives d'autoadministration de la ville de Qazan, au tournant des XIX^e et XX^e siècles,” in *L'Islam de Russie: Conscience communautaire et autonomie politique chez les Tatars de la Volga et de l'Oural, depuis le XVIII^e siècle*, eds. S. A., Dudoignon, et al. Paris, 1997: 155-174 uses sources from Kazan's City Duma. Probably the best insights into the local developments based on the contemporary press are presented by KHABUTDINOV, A. Yu., *Tatarskoe obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie v pervoi chetverti XX veka*, (Diss.) Kazan', 1996.

⁶³ The biographical genre is very popular, and the following list of publications on political leaders and intellectuals is by far not complete. BIKBAEV, R. T., *Shaekhzada Babich: Zhizn' i tvorchestvo*, Ufa, 1995; KARIMI, Fatikh, *Nauchno-biograficheskii sbornik*, Kazan', 2000; GAFFAROVA, F. Yu., “Bertugan Maksudilar,” in *Zakazan'e: Problemy istorii i kul'tury*, Kazan', 1995: 75-78; GAFFAROVA, F. Yu., *Min milätemneng balasymyn (Sadri Maksudi)*, Kazan, 1997; GAFFAROVA, F. Yu., *Sadri Maksudi v istorii tatarskogo naroda nachala XX veka, 1906-1924*, (Diss.) Kazan', 1997; AKHMAROV, Gainetdin, *Tarikh-dokumental' dzhyentyk*, Kazan 2000; KAMALOV, T., *Ziya Kamali: Myslitel', prosvetitel', religiozni deyatel'*, Kazan', 1997; KHAIRUTDINOV, R., SALIKHOV, R. and DVOENOSOVA, G., “Otdavaya polnuyu spravedlivost' trudam i zaslugam,” *Ekho vekov* 1996/1-2: 42-52 (on Sh. Alkin); *Sadri Maksudi (1879-1957)*, Kazan', 1996; TAIROV, N. I., *Akchuriny*, Kazan', 2002. For Zaki-Validi and Sultan Galiev see 3.3.5., for religious figures 3.4.2.

⁶⁴ FAKHRUTDINOV, R. R., *Tatarskii liberalizm v kontse XIX-nachale XX veka*, Kazan', 1998; YAMAEVA, L. A., *Musul'manskii deputaty Gosudarstvennoi dumy Rossii, 1906-1917: Sbornik dokumentov i materialov*, Ufa, 1998; YAMAEVA, L. A., *Musul'manskii liberalizm*

3.3.4. Traditions of statehood-lost and found

A second pillar of modern Tatar and Bashkir national historiography is the discussion of their respective statehood traditions. These traditions are projected back into antiquity, with the result that the sovereignty of the contemporary republics appears like the redemption of a historical legacy. Tatars track their statehood traditions down to the medieval Volga-Bulgarian empire, the Golden Horde and its successor states.⁶⁵ More or less mythic earlier states, like the Great Khaganate of the 7th century AD, are occasionally, reclaimed by virtually all contemporary Turkic states as part of “their” statehood tradition, or the above-mentioned “Byarym” are declared “Tatar” or “Bashkir” states. Referring to Bashkir associations with the Khaganate, Bashkir researchers concluded that their ancestral tribes simply must have had the same kind of state-like political organization prescribed to this early steppe empire.⁶⁶ Others postulate the existence of a Bashkir khanate (“bashkirskoe Tabynskoe khanstvo”) from the 11th to 13th century.⁶⁷

It goes without saying that nationalist narratives present the four hundred years of Russian dominion as a historical anomaly with detrimental consequences. At the same time, lost statehood and references to the history of resistance against foreign dominion play equally important roles in the construction of national historiography, since they compel the modern nation to render these “historical sacrifices” meaningful. Accordingly, one of the first symbolical steps of the nationalization of policy in Tatarstan was the declaration of the date in 1552 when Kazan fell as a day

nachala XX veka kak obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie: Na materialakh Ufimskoi i Orenburgskoi gubernii, Ufa, 2002; TSIUNCHUK, R. A., “Razvitie politicheskoi zhizni musul'manskikh narodov Rossiiskoi imperii i deyatel'nost' musul'manskoi fraktsii v Gosudarstvennoi dume Rossii, 1906-1917gg.,” in *Imperskii stroi Rossii v regional'nom izmerenii*, Moskva, 1997: 176-223; USMANOVA, D. M., “The Activity of the Muslim Faction of the State Duma and its Political Significance in the Formation of a Political Culture Among the Muslim Peoples of Russia,” in *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*, vol. 2, eds. M. Kemper *et al.*, Berlin, 1998: 417-455; USMANOVA, D. M., *Musul'manskaya fraktsiya i problemy “svobody sovesti” v Gosudarstvennoi dume Rossii (1906-1917)*, Kazan', 1999.

⁶⁵ ISKHAKOV, D. M., *Etnopoliticheskaya istoriya tatar v VI-pervoi chetverti XV v.*, Kazan', 2000; TAGIROV, I. R., *Istoriya natsional'noi gosudarstvennosti tatarskogo naroda i Tatarstana*, Kazan', 2000.

⁶⁶ For Zakiev cf. 3.2.1. For the Bashkirs see VALEEV, D. Zh., *Natsional'nyi suverenitet i natsional'noe vozrozhdenie*, Ufa, 1994: 17, 40; MAZHITOV and SULTANOVA, *Istoriya Bashkortostana...* (note 48): 207-209. For further reference cf. KUCHUMOV, *Kryuch'ya pod rebro istorii...* (note 1): 22-24.

⁶⁷ KUL'SHARIPOV, M. N., *Natsional'noe dvizhenie Bashkirskogo naroda, 1917-1921*, Avtoreferat diss. Ufa, 1998: 31.

of remembrance.⁶⁸ One might thus expect post-Soviet Tatar and Bashkir national historiography to have simply converted the Soviet “friendship of the people” myth into its opposite, to have rewritten the history of Russian dominion as a history of stubborn resistance. While such interpretations appeared in popular genres, historians as a rule refrained from oversimplification. Due to the resilience of Soviet traditions, some authors continued to portray Russian dominion as a history of social rather than national suppression.⁶⁹ Others steered a middle course between Western interpretations, generally stressing the ideologically disengaged and pragmatic quality of Imperial nationality policies, and the former Soviet cliché of the “prison of the peoples.”⁷⁰ The negative impact the various phases of Russia’s conversion policies had on the Islamic culture, the ensuing alienation of secular elites of landholders, and their final absorption into the Russian nobility find critical assessment, but positive features in the sense of a modified modernization scheme are not dismissed. In particular, the instrumental albeit affirmative actions under Catherine II are duly characterised, since they resulted in the institutional and spiritual renaissance of Islam in the Volga-Urals, and facilitated the emergence of new secular elites in the form of Tatar merchants and entrepreneurs.⁷¹

⁶⁸ One has to keep in mind, though, that the open turn of the Republics’ leaderships was a rather short episode in recent history. Both republican leaders, Shaimiev and Rakhimov, were not interested in raising ethno-national tensions within their republics and resolved for “territorial,” that is “tatarstanic” or “bashkortostanic” rhetoric rather than openly nationalist Tatar or Bashkir.

⁶⁹ Cf. the analysis by KUCHUMOV, *Kryuch'ya pod rebro...* (note 1): 6-10.

⁷⁰ GILYAZOV, I. A., “Die Islampolitik von Staat und Kirche im Wolga-Ural-Gebiet und der Batirshah-Aufstand von 1755,” in *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*, vol. 1, eds. M. Kemper et al., Berlin, 1996: 69-89; ISKHAKOV, D. M., “O nekotorykh aspektakh formirovaniya gorodskoi kul'tury volgo-ural'skikh tatar na natsional'nom etape, XVIII-nachalo XIX vv.,” in *Kazan', Moskva, Peterburg: Rossiiskaya imperiya vzglyadom iz raznykh uglov*, Moskva, 1997: 249-264.

⁷¹ ALISHEV, S. Kh., “Zavoevanie tatar russkim gosudarstvom” in *Materialy po istorii tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan', 1995: 224-242; ALISHEV, S. Kh., *Ternisty put' bor'by za svobodu: Sotsial'naya i natsional'naya bor'ba tatarskogo naroda, Vtoraya polovina XVI-XIX vv.*, Kazan', 1999; GILYAZOV, I. A., “Politika tsarizma po otnosheniyu k tataram srednego Povolzh'ya vo 2-oi polovine XVI-XVIII vekov,” in *Materialy po istorii tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan', 1995: 243-255; MUFTAKHUTDINOVA, D. Sh., *Evolyutsiya politiki Rossiiskogo gosudarstva po otnosheniyu k musul'manam Povolzh'ya i Priural'ya*, (Diss.) Kazan', 1999; NOGMANOV, A. I., *Rossiiskoe zakonadatelstvo vtoroi poloviny XVI-XVIII vv. kak istochnik po istorii tatarskogo naseleniya Srednego Povolzh'ya i Priural'ya*, (Diss.) Kazan', 1994. See also 3.5.2.

Tsarist nationalities policies in general and towards the Muslim people in particular have also been researched by Moscow and St. Petersburg scholars: DYAKIN, V. S., *Natsional'nyi vopros vo vnutrennei politike tsarizma (XIX-nachalo XX veka)*, S.-Peterburg, 1998; *Imperskii stroi Rossii v regional'nom izmerenii, XIX-nachalo XX veka*, Moskva, 1997; VOROB'eva,

While independent Tatar statehoods ended with the Russian conquest of the Khanates of Kazan (1552) and Astrakhan (1556), the Russian penetration into the southern Ural was a long-term process of colonization. In allusion to the rearrangements between the Federal Centre and the Federation's subjects in the mid-1990s, some Bashkir historians lay emphasis on the contractual character of Russia's advance into the region. The Bashkirs had thus been able to preserve their rights on the soil, their inner autonomy, and their culture, but not statehood.⁷² The acknowledgement of "progressive meaning" according to the Soviet interpretation shows some resilience, but in general Bashkir historians have good reason to complain of the economic and ecological consequences.⁷³ Other aspects of the "contractual relationship" that left deep imprints in the social development, such as the Bashkir militia organization of the 19th century, have found relatively little attention recently.

One peculiar feature of the nationalization of historiography is the Tatar-Bashkir debate on Tatar engagement in the Bashkir revolts of the 18th century and the Pugachev rebellion. These revolts were the very core of the Soviet Bashkir historical mythology, and one of Pugachev's field commanders, Salavat Yulaev, embodied the Soviet nationalist policies. Bashkir in form, the content was class struggle. According to the friendship of the people myth, Russian, Tatar and Bashkir peasants fought against Russian, Tatar and Bashkir landholders and oppressors.⁷⁴ After 1990 the 18th century rebellions remained an import element for the history-based construction of Bashkir identity; extensive, sometimes quite innovative, research is conducted on that subject. Bashkir historians, however, tend to nation-

E. I., *Musul'manskii vopros v imperskoi politike rossiiskogo samodержaviya: Vtoraya polovina XIX veka-1917 g.*, (Diss.) S.-Peterburg, 1999; ZORIN, V. Yu., AMANDZHOLOVA, D. A. and KULESHOV, S. V., *Natsional'nyi vopros v Gosudarstvennykh dumakh Rossii: Opyt zakonotvorchestva*, Moskva, 1999.

⁷² For example KUL'SHARIPOV, *Natsional'noe dvizhenie...* (note 67): 17-18. The interpretation of the Russian advance as colonization was further popularised by the translation of Alton Donnelly's *Russian Conquest of Bashkiria*, Ufa, 1994 (first published in 1969). Recently, one historian compared the colonization of Bashkiria with the advance of the frontier in the American West, a comparison familiar to students of Russia's acquisition of Siberia: ZINUROV, R. N., *Bashkirskie vosstaniya i indeiskie voyny—fenomen v mirovoi istorii*, Ufa, 2001. For recent accounts or documentations of State policy in the Urals see SEMENOVA, N. L., "Deyatel'nost' Ufimskikh i Simbirskikh general-gubernatorov po upravleniyu voennym naseleniem Orenburgskogo kraia v 1781-1796 gg.," in *V tsentre Evrazii*, vyp. 1, Sterlitamak, 2001: 68-79; GUMEROV, F. Kh., ed. *Zakony Rossiiskoi imperii o bashkirakh, teptyaryakh i bobylyakh*, Ufa, 1999.

⁷³ KUL' BAKHTIN, N. M., *Gornozavodskaya promyshlennost' v Bashkortostane: XVIII vek*, Ufa, 2000. Cf. the highly critical review by KUCHUMOV, *Kryuch'ya pod rebro istorii...* (note 1): 6-10. See also 3.5.1.

⁷⁴ Cf. KUCHUMOV, *Kryuch'ya pod rebro istorii...* (note 1): 31-37.

alise what had been depicted as social protest and negate larger participation by ethnic Tatars. On the contrary, they tend to stress the role ethnic Tatar elites and colonists played in the suppression of the revolts. Recent Tatar accounts, on the other hand, underline the role of ethnic Tatar mullahs in the mobilization of resistance.

3.3.5. 1917 and state-building under Soviet auspices

The re-emergence of the Muslim movement in 1917 has attracted only a small number of researchers, if we leave the Bashkir split-off aside. This is above all true for the local level, but even the all-Russian movement and its congresses have found little attention outside Moscow.⁷⁵ A comparison of Bashkir and Tatar historiography on the period between the revolutions immediately reveals that Bashkir scholars interpret the breakup of the Muslim movement as a success story, since it resulted in the foundation of an autonomous republic that covered a substantial portion of the territory claimed as ethnically Bashkir. It is largely ignored, however, that the contemporary Bashkir leader Validi initially aimed at a larger coalition with the neighbouring Kazakh, and potentially even a larger Turkestan movement for territorial autonomy, and at the same time hesitated to dissociate with the Tatar movement prematurely.⁷⁶ Tatar historians, on the other hand, obviously interpret the Bashkir split-off as a betrayal of the common cause. Their interpretations often judge the Bashkirs through a cultural prism as a largely assimilated collective and deplore their unjustified egoism. The socio-economic background of the Tatar-Bashkir feud, the fundamentally diverging interests of Bashkir landholders and landless Tatar peasants are neglected—only the latter figured in the political programmes of the Muslim movement before the split. And Validi, his verbal radicalism notwithstanding, found support primarily from the Bashkir landowners.⁷⁷

The few Tatar accounts as a rule deal with the alternative models of State building, like the territorial solution of a Volga-Ural-State with a predominantly

⁷⁵ The protocols of the 1st all-Russian Muslim congress in Moscow (May 1917), which set the course for the territorialization of Muslim autonomy demands, were translated and published in Turkey, but not in Russia. The Moscow-based scholar Salavat Iskhakov published a series of articles devoted to the all-Russian structures of the Muslim movement, mainly based on documents from the Russian State Archive (cf. note 5).

⁷⁶ VALEEV, *Natsional'nyi suverenitet...* (note 66): 20-21 mentions them; KUL'SHARIPOV, *Natsional'noe dvizhenie...* (note 67) does not.

⁷⁷ Cf. ISHEMGULOV, N. U., *Bashkirkoe natsional'noe dvizhenie, Avtoferat Diss. Ufa, 1996*. Other authors are quite eager to show that the Bashkir independence movement was supported by other strata of the population as well. Cf. KUL'SHARIPOV, *Natsional'noe dvizhenie...* (note 67): 31.

non-Russian population, or a common Tatar-Bashkir republic, temporarily favoured by Soviet authorities.⁷⁸ The critical assessment of the Soviet authorities' role in the establishment of the national republics is historically rooted in the reluctance to accept a territorial mode of autonomy, which has to be related to the geography of scattered Tatar settlements throughout Russia. Indeed, two-thirds of the ethnic Tatar population actually live without the confines of Tatarstan.⁷⁹

Tatar and Bashkir scholars thus differ in their attitudes towards the post-1917 state-building processes. The Bashkirs, who perceive themselves as exposed to "Tatar imperialism" both historically and historiographically, appreciate the split of what by the summer of 1917 remained of the all-Russian Muslim movement.⁸⁰ Against this background it is hardly surprising that the Bashkir historiography and press in the 1990s replaced the Soviet-style embodiment of Bashkir national pride, Salavat Yulaev, by the leader of the Bashkir movement, Akhmet-Zaki Validi. It soon turned out, however, that it is no easy task to adapt the complex historical biography of Validi to the needs of plain national symbolism. As already mentioned, the highly selective presentations by Ufa nationalists, including a poorly translated and commentated autobiography, met serious rebuke from other scholars.⁸¹

Stressing and monopolising the heritage of pre-revolutionary Muslim

⁷⁸ KHABUTDINOV, A., *Organy natsional'noi avtonomii tyurko-tatar musul'man vnutrennei Rossii i Sibiri v 1917-1918 gg.*, Vologda, 2001; KHAIRUTDINOV, R. G., *Trudnoe vozrozhdenie: Fevral' 1917-1920 gg.*, Kazan', 1992; MUKHAMETDINOV, R., *Natsiya i revolyutsiya: Transformatsiya natsional'noi idei v tatarskom obschestve pervoi treti XX veka*, Kazan', 2000; USMANOVA, D. M., *Voprosy natsional'no-gosudarstvennogo samoopredeleniya na stranitsakh tatarskoi periodicheskoi pechati, 1917-aprel' 1918 gg.*, (Diss.) Kazan', 1994.

⁷⁹ The reprint of anti-Soviet accounts by exiled pre-1917 leaders reinforces this evaluation. Cf. ISKHAKI, *Idel'-Ural*, Naberezhnye Chelny, 1993.

⁸⁰ Cf. the works of Yuldashbaev, Kul'sharipov, Valeev.

⁸¹ See 3.1. The Bashkir Validiana comprise bibliographies, documentary records and a great number of monographs and anthologies. The following list is not complete: *Akhmed Zaki Validi Tugan, 1870-1970: Materialy k izucheniyu zhizni i tvorchestva*, Ufa, 1990; YULDASHBAEV, A. M., *Istoriya, voshedshii v istoriyu: Politicheskaya i nauchnaya deyatel'nost' professora Stambul'skogo universiteta A. Validi*, Ufa, 1992; YULDASHBAEV, A. M., ed. *Izvestnyi i neizvestnyi Validi v pamyati svoikh sovremennikov*, Ufa, 2000; KHUSAINOV, G. B., *Akhmetzaki Validi Togan: Istoriko-biograficheskaya kniga*, Ufa, 2000; *Materialy nauchnoi konferentsii, posvyashchennoi 100-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya Zaki Validi Tugana (Akhmetzaki Akhmetshakhovicha Validova): 20-21 dekabrya 1990 g.*, Ufa, 1992; *Materialy k biografii Akhmet-Zaki Validi Togana*, Ufa, 1996; KHAFIZOVA, R. Kh., ed. *Akhmet Zaki Validi Togan: Rekomendatel'nyi ukazatel' literatury*, Ufa, 2000. Recent Bashkir studies at least mention Validi's opponents like G. KURBANGALIEV. Cf. YULDASHBAEV, B. Kh., *Uchreditel'nyi kurultai avtonomnogo Bashkortostana, Dekabr' 1917 goda*, Ufa, 1997; KUL'SHARIPOV, *Natsional'noe dvizhenie...* (note 67): 51.

reformism, Tatar nationalists were quite reluctant to hail their post-1917 leaders. Several reprintings and collective works were devoted to the most likely candidate, the Tatar national Communist Sultan-Galiev,⁸² but the interest of a broader public ceased with the general public dismissal of the Soviet experience. The Revolutions of 1917 and the civil war have been largely ignored by contemporary Tatar history.⁸³

In contrast, the complicated and confusing fate of the Bashkir movement during the civil war is intensively discussed in Ufa.⁸⁴ The frequent change of allies is explained reasonably enough by the peculiarities of the Southern Ural war theatre. A certain Soviet nostalgia becomes evident when some researchers stress the fact that the Bashkir national leadership tried continuously to negotiate with socialist parties and Soviet authorities, while still allied to the Whites.⁸⁵ Finally, both sides are said to have “betrayed” the Bashkirs, for Soviet authorities rewarded the Bashkir’s final support with a territorially and politically limited Bashkir autonomy, *Malaya Bashkiriya*, in 1920. Only in 1922 did Moscow reluctantly agree to an enlargement of territories from the former *guberniya* of Ufa.

3.3.6. *Tatar and Bashkir Soviet history*

In general, studies of the history of Islam and the Muslim peoples during the Soviet era have not been a priority of researchers, either in the capital cities or the national republics. A couple of surveys have been devoted to the Soviet period. Soviet nationality policies, although heavily criticised for linguistically de-nationalising Tatars and Bashkirs and depriving them of their written heritage by the twofold change of script (from Arabic to Latin and from Latin to Cyrillic within 10 years), remain to be studied systematically in their historical development and consequences. In the republics, research focused on other topics, like the anti-religious

⁸² SAGADEEV, A. V., *Mirsait Sultan-Galiev i ideologiya natsional'no-osvoboditel'nogo dvizheniya: Nauchno-analiticheskii obzor*, Moskva, 1990; SULTANBEKOV, B. F., *Pervaya zhertva Genseka: Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev: Sud'ba, lyudi, vremya*, Kazan', 1991; *Neizvestnii Sultan-Galiev: Rassekrechennye dokumenty i materialy*, Kazan', 2001.

⁸³ For the few exceptions see note 78. To our knowledge, no studies on the October revolution and the Civil war focussing on the Muslim participation in the Volga-Urals have been recently provided by Moscow or St. Petersburg reseachers either.

⁸⁴ *Resursy mobilizirovannoi etnichnosti*, Moskva, Ufa, 1997 samples assessments of the Soviet Bashkir autonomy by Ufa’s leading specialists.

⁸⁵ ISHEMGULOV, *Bashkirskoe natsional'noe dvizhenie...* (note 77): 16-18; KUL'SHARIPOV, *Natsional'noe dvizhenie...* (note 67): 45-50; VALEEVEV, *Natsional'nyi suverenitet...* (note 66): 22-30.

policies and practices of the Soviet authorities⁸⁶ and the history of forced or deliberate emigration.⁸⁷ While these subjects allow for nationalist interpretations of Muslim nationalities and Islam as victims of the regime, this is certainly difficult for the history of collaboration of Tatars, emigrants, and prisoners of war with German authorities during the Second World War. One study recently cast doubt on the universal validity of the state-sponsored myth of the Soviet peoples unanimously fighting the fascist enemy.⁸⁸ In sharp contrast to the above-mentioned trends to criticise the Soviet nationality policies, studies on Soviet cultural institutions and on the development of arts under Soviet auspices tend to be rather apologetic.⁸⁹

3.4. Islam

For the history of both peoples discussed here, the nationalist turn in historiography inevitably demanded a re-evaluation of the Islamic heritage. And, indeed, after the hitherto unprecedented boom in ethnic and national studies in the first half of the 1990s, "Islamic Studies" began to flourish from the mid-1990s onwards. But the starting point was rather different: The study of the history of Islam and Islamic institutions was either completely neglected or presented substantially distorted in

⁸⁶ ALEKSEEV, V. A., *Illyuzii i dogmy: Vzaimootnosheniya Sovetskogo gosudarstva i religii*, Moskva, 1991; YUNUSOVA, A. B., *Islam v Bashkirii*, Ufa, 1994; VASILE'EVA, I. G., *Vzaimootnosheniya Sovetskogo gosudarstva i religii, 1917-1920-e gody*, Ufa, 1998; KHURULLAEV, A. A., *Musul'manskie religioznye organizatsii v sovetskom obshchestve: Evolyutsiya ideologicheskikh ustanovok i kul'tovoi praktiki*, (Diss.) Moskva, 1990; NABIEV, R. A., *Politika Sovetskogo gosudarstva po otnosheniyu k religii i tserkvi v 1920-1930-e gody*, (Diss.) Kazan', 1992.

⁸⁷ GAINETDINOV, R. B., *Tyurko-tatarskaya politicheskaya emigratsiya, nachalo XX veka-30 gody: Istoricheskii ocherk*, Naberezhnye Chelny, 1997; ISKHAKOV, S. M., ed. *Iz istorii Rossijskoi emigratsii: Pis'ma A.-Z. Validi i M. Chokaeva (1924-1932)*, Moskva, 1999; KARIMULLIN, A. G., "Po kontinentam," in *Materialy po istorii tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan', 1995: 455-467; MIKHAILOVA, S. M., "Sovetskii opyt i natsional'nyi vopros: Tyurko-tatarskaya liniya emigrantskoi literatury v 20-30-kh gg.," in *Rossiya v XX veke: Sud'by istoricheskoi nauki*, Moskva, 1996: 454-462; NADIROV, I. N., "Tatary v Finlyandii," in *Materialy po istorii tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan', 1995: 468-485; *Nauchnoe nasledie bashkirskikh uchenykh-emigrantov i voprosy sovremennosti*, ch. 1-4, Ufa, 1995; VALEEVA, D. Zh., MADYARI, A., URAKSIN, Z. G. and YULDASHBAEV, A. M., *Nauchnoe nasledie bashkirskikh uchenykh-emigrantov*, Ufa, 1995.

⁸⁸ GILYAZOV, I. A., *Na drugoi storone: Kollaboratsionisty iz povolzhsko-priural'skikh tatar v gody Vtoroi mirovoi voyny*, Kazan', 1998. Cf. KABIROVA, A. Sh., "Tatary v gody velikoi otechestvennoi voyny," in *Materialy po istorii tatarskogo naroda*, Kazan', 1995: 439-454.

⁸⁹ For example ARSLANOV, M., *Tatarskoe rezhisserskoe iskusstvo: 1941-1956*, Kazan', 1996; ISKHAKOVA-VAMBA, R.A., *Tatarskie narodnye pesni sovetskogo perioda*, Kazan', 2000.

the context of scientific atheism: “(...) primarily concerned with revealing the ‘true’ class nature of religion (...) [h]ostility and contempt for the religious heritage of the Tatars and Bashkirs were not only unconcealed by these scholars, but were *de rigueur*, and the dismissal of religion as a legitimate historical category was the centrepiece of their methodology.”⁹⁰ To be sure, Soviet treatments contain important information on Muslim religious history in Russia, but from a post-Soviet perspective, “scientific atheism” offered considerably less theoretical and methodological compatibility for a renaissance of Islamic Studies than Soviet ethnology and historiography had suggested for Tatar and Bashkir nationalist narratives of the past. Moreover, the institutional basis for serious Islamic studies remained restricted in the national republics (cf. 1.2.2). As a result, a large proportion of researchers in the Republics of Bashkortostan and Tatarstan lacks substantial training, and the conceptual framework of Russia’s Islamic historiography is rather underdeveloped. On the other hand, Islamic studies in Moscow’s and St. Petersburg’s traditional strongholds are absorbed, either with *Grundlagenforschung* or by functioning as political advisors. If Russia’s academic institutes list “Islam in Russia” as a specific focus, it means as a rule that they are almost exclusively dealing either with current problems or with the “hot spots” in the Northern Caucasus.

3.4.1. *Islamic discourse, Islamic practices*

As a result, apart from jadidism (cf. 3.1.1.) researchers in capital cities and the national republics alike have so far largely neglected Russia’s indigenous Islamic discourse.⁹¹ The information in recent manuals and encyclopaedias is largely derived from pre-revolutionary or Western sources. There are but a few exceptions: Sufism, historically playing an important role in the Volga-Urals, seems to have attracted more attention recently. While a monograph published by St. Petersburg’s Institute of Oriental Studies deals with the Naqshbandiya’s ritual practices, an anthology issued in Kazan in the Russian and Tatar languages is a first regional approach to the problem.⁹² A conference in Ufa recently dealt with Islamic law;

⁹⁰ FRANK, *Muslim Religious Institutions...* (note 1): 8.

⁹¹ Except for ZÄINULLIN, XVIII-XX *iöz bashynda tatar rukhani ädäbiyäte* (note 12).

⁹² KHISMATULLIN, A. A., *Sufitskaya ritual'naya praktika: Na primere bratsva Nakshbandiya*, S.-Peterburg, 1996; *Idel buenda sufichylyk: Tarixy hämüzenchälëklare/Sufizm v Povolzh'e: istoriya i spetsifika*, Kazan', 2000. On Troick's important sheikh Rasulev see NASYIROV, R., *Zäynulla ishan*, Kazan, 2000. For students of sufism a recently published village history might be of interest: MAKHMUDOV, M. G., *Sterlibash, gorzhus' tvoei sud'boyu: Istoriya Sterlibashevskogo raiona*, Ufa, 2000. The bulk of recent Russian publications on sufism deals with the Northern Caucasus.

selected papers were published.⁹³ Ethnographical studies sometimes cover Islamic rituals, practices and beliefs, too. A typical feature already apparent in Soviet Studies is the continued distinction between “high” Islam and folk beliefs, the latter often referred to as being “pre-Islamic.”⁹⁴

3.4.2. Religious figures

Although the biographical genre had been well developed in the Volga-Ural region before 1917, a concise study of the ulama is still lacking. Fortunately, some of the classic works of local Muslim authorities have been reprinted in modern Tatar or Bashkir,⁹⁵ and a few biographical studies deal with the most famous among 19th and early 20th century figures, mostly hailing them, however, for their factual or alleged merits in the processes of modernization or secularization. The available scope perfectly illustrates the hagiolatry of “advanced thinkers” developed already in the late Soviet period: Kursavi, Utyz-Imani, Mardzhani, Fakhrutdinov, Bigi(ev).⁹⁶ Researchers interested in the activities of the village Imams and their role in the everyday life of the Volga-Ural Muslims have either to refer to primary sources, to occasional quotations in sometimes heavily biased studies from the pre-revolution-

⁹³ *Shariat: Teoriya i praktika: Materialy mezhhregional'noi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii, Ufa, 26-28 sentyabrya 2000 g.*, Ufa, 2000.

⁹⁴ Cf. FRANK, *Muslim Religious Institutions...* (note 1): 9-11. For a recent publication cf. BASILOV, V. N. and LOGASHOVA, B. R., eds. *Islam i narodnaya kul'tura*, Moskva, 1998.

⁹⁵ FÄKHREDDINEV, R., *Bolgar vä Kazan töreklare*, Kazan, 1993; KURSAVI, G., *Keshelärne tugry iulga künderü (Äl-irshad lil-iyibad)*, Kazan, 1999; MÄRDZHANI, Sh., *Möstäfadäl-äkhbar fäkhvali Kazan vä Bolgar*, Kazan, 1989 (2nd ed.); UTYZ IMÄNI ÄL-BOLGARI, G., *Shigyr'lär ham poemalar*, Kazan, 1988. See also note 20.

⁹⁶ BAIŠEV, F. N., *Obshchestvenno-politicheskie i nraivstvenno-eticheskie vzglyady Rızy Fakhretdinova*, Ufa, 1996; GARAEVA, N., “Murad Ramzi, 1855-1934,” in *Iz istorii Al'met'evskogo regiona*, vyp. 1, Al'met'evsk, 1999: 187-198; “Gataulla Bayazitov,” [Reprint of an obituary from 1911], *Ekho vekov* 1996/3-4: 164-171; YUZEEV, A., *Mardzhani, Kazan'*, 1997; KHAIRUTDINOV, A. G., *Poslednii tatarskii bogoslov: Zhizn' i nasledie Musy Dzharullakha Bigieva*, Kazan', 1999; KHAIRUTDINOV, A. G., *Nasledie Musa Dzharullakha Bigieva: Sbornik dokumentov i materialov*, v 2 t., Kazan', 2000; KHÖSÄENOV, G. B., *Mökhämmäsälüm Ömötbaev*, Öfö, 1991; KHÖSÄENOV, G. B., *Rizaitdin bin Fakhretdin: Tarikhi biografik kitap*, Öfö, 1997; *Mardzhani: Nasledie i sovremennost': Materialy mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii*, Kazan', 1998; *Mardzhani: Uchennyi, myslitel', prosvetitel'*, Kazan', 1990; *Rizaetdin Fakhretdin: Nauchno-biograficheskii sbornik*, Kazan', 1999; *Tvorchestvo Rızy Fakhretdinova: Sbornik statei*, Ufa, 1988. Fakhrutdinov's biographical series *Asar* is expected to be republished, too. Note that the 1915 posthumous honoration of Mardzhani by the jadids was reprinted in a shortened version: *Shihabetdin Märdzhani*, Kazan, 1998.

ary and Soviet periods, or to a few studies focusing on mahallas on the regional level (cf. 3.4.4.).

3.4.3. *Legal and political framework*

Apart from some general surveys and introductions to Islam, most recent studies in the field concentrate on what might be labeled the social and political history of Islam in Russia. A considerable number of studies has been devoted to the legal framework of Muslim life in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union.⁹⁷ Others discuss the changing attitudes and policies of State agencies towards Islam.⁹⁸ Probably due to the location of the Muslim Spiritual Board within the confines of the Republic, the 20th century development is better covered for Bashkiria, while publications from Tatarstan usually concentrate on pre-revolutionary or post-Soviet problems.⁹⁹ The absence of contemporary research on the Orthodox mission is remarkable.¹⁰⁰ This may be related to the fact that this subject had been one of the officially “permitted” ones under Soviet rule, since it helped to illustrate the Tsarist oppression of the non-Russian nationalities. Recently published proceedings of thematically related conferences show, however, that leaders of both republics today eagerly stress the indigenous traditions of harmonic coexistence of the nationalities and confessions.¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ DORSKAYA, A. A., *Vopros o svobode sovesti v rossiiskom zakonotvorchestve 1905-1917 gg.*, (Diss.) S.-Peterburg, 1997; *Islam v Rossiiskoi imperii: Zakonodatel'nye akty, opisaniya, statistika*, Moskva, 2001; *Islam v zakonodatel'stve Rossii, 1554-1929 gg.*, Ufa, 1998; NOGMANOV, A. I., *Rossiiskoe zakonodatel'stvo vtoroi poloviny XVI-XVIII vv. kak istochnik po istorii tatarskogo naseleniya Srednego Povolzh'ya i Priural'ya*, (Diss.) Kazan', 1994; NOGMANOV, A., “L'évolution de la législation sur les musulmans de Russie, de la conquête de Qazan à la guerre de Crimée,” in *L'Islam de Russie* (note 62): 115-130.

⁹⁸ FAIZOV, G. B., *Gosudarstvenno-islamskie otnosheniya v Povolzh'e i na Urale*, Ufa, 1995; GILYAZOV, “Die Islampolitik...” (note 70); *Islam v Rossiiskoi imperii: Zakonodatel'nye akty, opisaniya, statistika*, Moskva, 2001; ODINTSOV, M., *Gosudarstvo i tserkov' v Rossii, XX vek*, Moskva, 1994. See also section 3.3.4. and 3.3.6.

⁹⁹ Cf. YUNUSOVA, A. B., *Islam v Bashkortostane*, Ufa, 1999; MUKHAMETSHIN, R. M., *Islam v obshchestvennoi zhizni tatar v nachale XX veka*, Kazan', 2000; MUKHAMETSHIN, R. M., *Islam v obshchestvenno-politicheskoi zhizni Tatarstana v kontse XX veka*, Kazan', 2000.

¹⁰⁰ ISLAEV, F. G., *Pravoslavnye missionery v Povolzh'e*, Kazan', 1999.

¹⁰¹ *Mezhetnicheskie i mezkhkonnessional'nye otnosheniya v Respublike Tatarstan*, ch. 1, Kazan', 1993; *Islamsko-khristianskoe pogranich'e: Itogi i perspektivy izucheniya*, Kazan', 1994; *Religiya v sovremennom obshchestve: Istoriya, problemy, tendentsii*, Kazan', 1998; *Khristianstvo i islam na rubezhe vekov...* (note 19); *Islam v Tatarstane: Opyt tolerantnosti i kul'tura sosushchestvovaniya*, Kazan', 2002.

3.4.4. Islamic institutions

The historical study of Islamic institutions is developing even more rapidly. The scope ranges from valuable works on the Orenburg Muslim Spiritual Assembly¹⁰² to regional and local studies on Muslim life within the scattered Muslim mahallas of the Volga-Urals. The latter draw on source material from Russian provincial archives or from documents issued by the Orenburg Spiritual Assembly to reveal in greater or lesser detail the building of mosques and schools in Tatar or Bashkir villages.¹⁰³ Other potential sources like village histories remain to be studied.¹⁰⁴ The above-mentioned literature devotes considerable space to individual donators or members of the clerisy.¹⁰⁵

Muslim schools have already been subject to intense research in the Soviet Union. Scholars in the field tended to present the late 19th development of Islamic schools merely as conflict between outdated inadequate “traditional” and progressive “reformed” schools, with inappropriate concentration on the few jadid madrasas and maktabas then existing. While their number was minimal before 1905 and never reached those of their alleged rivals by 1917, these jadid schools played an important role in Tatar and Bashkir historiography ever since, for they fitted into the religious-modernist, Soviet-reformist, and ethnic nationalist cliché of autochthonous

¹⁰² AZAMATOV, D. D., *Orenburgskoe magometanskoe dukhovnoe sobranie v kontse XVIII-XX vv.*, Ufa, 1999. See also in English: AZAMATOV, D. D., “Russian Administration and Islam in Bashkiria,” in *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia...* vol. 1 (note 70): 91-111; AZAMATOV, D. D., “The Muftis of the Orenburg Spiritual Assembly in the 18th and 19th Centuries: Their Struggle for Power in Russia’s Muslim Institution,” in *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia...* vol. 2 (note 64): 355-384; USMANOVA, D. M., “L’Assemblée Spirituelle musulmane au début du XX^e siècle: Les projets de réforme face au pouvoir politique russe,” in *L’Islam de Russie* (note 62): 175-191. The archive of the Spiritual Assembly is stored at the National Archive of the Republic of Bashkortostan in Ufa.

¹⁰³ To quote just a few examples: BRASLAVSKII, L. Yu., *Islam v Chuvashii*, Cheboksary, 1997; GABIDULLIN and I. R., IBRAGIMOVA, R. R., “Mektebe i medrese Bugul’minskogo i Menzelinskogo uezdov v kontse XIX-nachale XX vekov,” in *Iz istorii Al’met’evskogo regiona*, vyp. 1, Al’met’evsk, 1999: 174-179; IDRISOV *et al.*, *Iz istorii nizhegorodskikh musul’manskikh obshchin...* (note 21). Cf. also SUKHOPAROV, A. “‘Ne ostavlyajte sebya bez nadezhdy’: Proshloe i nastoyashchee musul’manskoi obshchiny v Moskve,” *Aziya i Afrika segodnya* 1993/11: 76-78.

¹⁰⁴ See the introduction in FRANK, *Muslim Religious Institutions...* (note 1): 21-29. DAVLETBAEV, B. S., *Bol’shaya Oka: Istoriya sela*, Ufa, 1992; ABSALYAMOV, Yu. M. and YUNUSOVA, A. B., *Urshak: Novaya i staraya istoriya urshaklintsev*, Ufa, 1995; MAKHMUDOV, *Sterlibash...* (note 92) are still exceptions to the rule.

¹⁰⁵ AZAMATOV, D. D., *Iz istorii musul’manskoi blagotvoritel’nosti: Vakufy na territorii Evropeiskoi chasti Rossii i Sibiri v kontse XIX-nachale XX veka*, Ufa, 2000 has filled a long-standing gap only recently.

progress.¹⁰⁶ Especially the leading reformed madrasas of Orenburg, Ufa, and Kazan—to which the jadids in Volga-Urals turned their attention beforehand, while the Crimean Tatar Gasprinskii had been preoccupied with maktab—*are well covered by monographs and collective works. Almost all of the “traditional schools” are superficially treated and labeled for their alleged shortcomings, or simply neglected.*¹⁰⁷

3.5. *Social and cultural history*

Ethnicity, nationalism, and Islam thus constitute the main focus of historical studies on the Muslim peoples of Russia today. This historiographical survey would nevertheless be incomplete if we did not at least mention some recent developments in social and cultural history as well. Due to the lack of earlier sources, research on social and cultural developments concentrates on the period of Russian dominion from the 16th century onward.

3.5.1. *Socio-economic developments in the traditional strata of Tatar and Bashkir societies*

Study of the peasantry and agricultural developments had already been well developed in the Soviet Union, and new studies of non-Russian peasantry are still published within and outside the national republics.¹⁰⁸ Bashkir scholars clearly contin-

¹⁰⁶ I borrowed the coinings from Allen Frank's historiographical essay on the historiography of Muslim education: See FRANK, *Muslim Religious Institutions...* (note 1): 218-223. Cf. also section 3.3.1.

¹⁰⁷ There still but a few notable exceptions to the rule. RAKHIMOV, S., “Sotsial'no-pravovoi status tatarskikh uchebnykh zavedenii poslednoi chetverti XVIII-nach. XX vv.,” in *Islam v tatarskom mire: Istoriiya i soveremennost'*, Kazan', 1997: 71-82; FARKHSHATOV, M. N., *Narodnoe obrazovanie v Bahkirii v poreformennyi period, 60-e-90-e gody XIX v.*, Moskva, 1994.

¹⁰⁸ KHALIKOV, N. A., *Khozyaistvo tatar Povolzh'ya i Urala*, Kazan', 1995; RODNOV, M. I., *Agrarnye otnosheniya v Ufimskoi gubernii nakanune Velikoi Oktyabr'skoi sotsialisticheskoi revolyutsii, 1912-17 gg.*, (Diss.) Kazan', 1988; RODNOV, M. I., *Krest'yanstvo Ufimskoi gubernii v nachale XX v. (1900-1917 gg.)*, Ufa, 2002; ZAGIDULLIN, I. K., *Tatarskie krest'yane Kazanskoi gubernii vo vtoroi polovine XIX v. 60-90-e gg.*, (Diss.) Kazan', 1992. One should also consult the ethnographical literature on that subject, like GALLYAMOV, R. F., *Posle padeniya Kazani: Etnosotsial'naya istoriya Predkam'ya, Vtoraya polovina XVI-nachalo XVIII vv.*, Kazan', 2001. For the early 20th century: SHAI DULLIN, R., *Krest'yanskie khozyaistva Tatarstana: Problemy i puti ikh razvitiya v 1920-1928 gg.*, Kazan', 2002. The development of agrarian market conditions is analysed by TAGIROVA, N. F., “Rynok Povolzh'ya v

ue to emphasise the distinct socio-cultural development of the nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes, however, since these peculiarities have always played a substantial part in explaining the divergent collective consciousness which led to the emergence of political “Bashkirism” in the early 20th century.¹⁰⁹ Tatar historians, on the other hand, rediscovered the faith of the Tatar nobility and devoted a few studies to them. These cover the time period of the Golden Horde’s successor states, and subsequent development under Russian dominion until the 19th century.¹¹⁰

As for the material culture, a couple of essays on the indigenous architectural traditions appeared recently. As a rule, they are well documented for the late 18th and the 19th centuries, since monuments and documents from these periods are well preserved. Added to this, the reader is confronted by speculations on the architectural heritage prior to the 18th century, since only a few architectural monuments, particularly in the site of Staryi Bolgar, have come down to us.¹¹¹

3.5.2. *The “Golden Age” of Tatar merchants and entrepreneurs*

The fundamental social and cultural changes that occurred among ethnic Tatars and, to a lesser degree, among Bashkirs during the 19th century used to be interpreted by Soviet scholars as part of the general development of Russia’s imperial society and economy from feudalism to capitalism. Indigenous historians used to stress the far-reaching integration of the Muslims into a fairly linear modernization process, and drew a rather simplistic picture of class interests and struggles as characteristics of the contemporary society. Post-Soviet studies, while still clinging to a slightly modified modernization paradigm, begin to analyse these structural changes in greater detail. Catherine II is accurately credited for changes in the legal and polit-

kontse XIX-nachale XX vv.,” in *Imperskii stroi Rossii v regional’nom izmerenii, XIX-nachalo XX veka*, Moskva, 1997: 149-175.

¹⁰⁹ AKMANOV, A. I., *Zemel’naya politika tsarskogo pravitel’stva v Bashkirii, Vtoraya polovina XVI-nachalo XX vv.*, Ufa, 2000; YANGUZIN, R. Z., *Sotsial’naya struktura bashkirskogo obshchestva v XVIII-XIX vv.*, Ufa, 1987; MULLAGULOV, M. G., *Lesnye promysly bashkir*, Ufa, 1994; YANGUZIN, R. Z., *Khozyaistvo bashkir dorevolyutsionnoi Rossii*, Ufa, 1989; SHEIKHISLAMOV, R. B., *Sotsial’no-ekonomicheskoe razvitie gosudarstvennoi derevni Yuzhnogo Ural v pervoi polovine XIX v.*, Ufa, 1998.

¹¹⁰ ENIKEEV, Said murza, *Ocherk istorii tatarskogo dvoryanstva*, Ufa, 1999; ISKHAKOV, “Seidy...” (note 44); KHAIRUTDINOV, R., “Les problèmes d’intégration de l’aristocratie féodale tatare dans la “noblesse de service” russe au tournant des XVIII et XIX siècles,” in *L’Islam de Russie...* (note 52): 131-153.

¹¹¹ Cf. AIDAROVA, G. N., *Tatarskie slobody Kazani: Arkhitekturno-gradostroitel’noe razvitiie i metodologicheskie aspekty rekonstruktsii*, Kazan’, 1999 (Textbook); KHALIT, N., *Ocherki po arkhitekture khanskoi Kazani: Groteskii, fakty, razmyshleniya*, Kazan’, 1999.

ical framework of Muslim life in Imperial Russia. This policy resulted on the one hand in the regional Islamic cultural and institutional renaissance (cf. 3.4.3.); on the other hand, it was a prerequisite for the establishment of a new secular elite among the scattered Tatar settlements throughout the Volga-Urals. This economic elite, stemming largely from the former service nobility, is the subject of rather intensive research. A couple of studies have been devoted to one of the most important centres of Tatar trade operations, the Tatar *slobody* (suburbs) of Kazan.¹¹²

While some historians credit the “Tatar bourgeoisie” rather uncritically for their engagement in the financing of Islamic institutions and other common causes, more informed studies analyse various strategies by the secular elites to secure their political and social influence within local societies. These works contribute substantially to a new understanding of the elite networks and their internal cleavages, and create the preconditions for the necessary reinterpretation of late 19th century Muslim intellectual and public life.¹¹³

3.5.3. *Muslim press, public and society in late Imperial Russia*

Soviet historiography used to enshrine the developments of public discourses in what was called the “history of public thought” (“istoriya obshchestvennoi mysli”). Based on a rather voluntary sample of contemporary monographs and periodicals, these works usually characterised articles and authors with the help of stereotypes like “progressive” or “obscure,” “democratic” or “oppressive.”¹¹⁴ While these clichés have not disappeared entirely, the study of Muslim public life on the local level has significantly advanced for the period from 1860 to 1917. This is not only true

¹¹² GALEEV, N. R., “Die tatarische Kaufmannschaft Kazan’s im 19. Jahrhundert,” in *Berliner Jahrbuch für osteuropäische Geschichte: Unternehmertum in Rußland*, Berlin, 1997; DE-VYATYKH, L., *Iz istorii kazanskogo kupechestva*, Kazan’, 2002; GILYAZOV, I. A., “Tatarskie slobody goroda Kazan’ i vo 2-oi polovine XVI-seredine XIX vv.,” in *Das Mittlere Wolgagebiet in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, eds. K. Heller and H. Jelitte Frankfurt a. M., 1994: 33-46; *Starotatarskaya sloboda: Ot proshlogo k nastoyashchemu*, Kazan’, 2001; SVERDLOVA, L. M., *Na perekrestke torgovykh putei*, Kazan’, 1991.

¹¹³ SALIKHOV, R. R. and KHAIRUTDINOV, R. R., *Respublika Tatarstan: Pamyatniki istorii i kul’tury tatarskogo naroda, Konets XVIII-nachalo XX vekov*, Kazan’, 1995 is, despite its title, basically a biographical study. See also SALIKHOV, R., *Tatarskaya burzhuziia Kazani i natsional’nye reformy vtoroi poloviny XIX-nachala XX v.*, Kazan’, 2001.

¹¹⁴ Abdullin’s interpretational pattern (see section 3.3.1.) proves still very influential: Cf. *Problema preemstvennosti v tatarskoi obshchestvennoi mysli*, Kazan’, 1985; AMIRKHAHOV, R. U., ed. *Tatarskaya demokraticeskaya pechat’, 1905-1907 gg.*, Kazan’, 1988; *Metodologicheskie problemy izucheniya istorii obshchestvennoi mysli: Na materiale narodov RSFSR*, Kazan’, 1990.

for the investigation of the contemporary press and literature,¹¹⁵ but for other forms of sociability as well: Muslim participation in agencies of local self-administration, economic and social development of an urban and village environment, foundation of schools and libraries, and participation in welfare and educational associations and societies.¹¹⁶ Most researchers in the field are rather perceptive for new approaches to these questions. Cautiously emancipating themselves from the Soviet dichotomy of “progress” and “backwardness,” they now resolve to use more subtle applications of modernization theory like those provided by the current Western historiography on Civil or Local Societies. While the occident remains the measure, the role of the Russian mediator in westernization and europeanization is at least verbally played down. The oriental heritage has found a more benevolent assessment only very recently.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ AMIRKHANOV, R. U., *Tatarskaya dorevolyutsionnaya pressa v kontekste “Vostok-Zapad” (na primere razvitiya russkoi kul’tury)*, Kazan’, 2002; KARIMULLIN, A. G., *U istokov tatarskoi knigi*, 1993 (2nd ed.); MARDANOV, R. F., *Voprosy literatury v zhurnale “Shura,” 1908-1917*, (Diss.) Kazan’, 1999; USMANOVA, D. M., “Die tatarische Presse 1905-1918: Quellen, Entwicklungsetappen und quantitative Analyse,” in *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia...* vol. 1 (note 70): 239-278. KARIMULLIN, A. G., *Tatarskoe gosudarstvennoe izdatel’stvo i tatarskaya kniga Rossii (1917-1932)*, Kazan’, 1999 adds to the author’s series on the history of Tatar printing; the book is based on an earlier (1989) edition.

¹¹⁶ BLAGOV, Yu., “K istorii ‘Vostochnogo kluba,’” *Tatarstan* 1997/5: 78-80; MAKHMUTOV, H., ILYALOVA, I. and GYZZAT, B., *Oktyabr’ga kadarge tatar teatry*, Kazan, 1988; MINNULLIN, Z. S., “Iz istorii tatarskikh blagotvoritel’nykh obshchestv kontsa XIX-nachala XX v.” in *Supplement to the Journal Tatarstan* 11-12/1995: 23-27; MINNULLIN, Z. S., “Dobrye lyudi iz Zakazan’ya,” in *Zakazan’e: Problemy istorii i kul’tury*, Kazan’, 1995: 82-86; MINNULLIN, Z. S., “Zur Geschichte tatarische offentliche Bibliotheken vor der Oktoberrevolution,” in *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia...* vol. 1 (note 70): 207-237; MINNULLIN, Z. S., “Fraternal and Benevolent Associations of Tatar Students in Muslim Countries at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century,” in *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia...* vol. 2 (note 64): 271-280.

¹¹⁷ BATUNSKII, M. A., “Vliyanie Zapada na kul’turnoe samosoznanie musul’manskikh myslitel’ei Rossii kontsa XIX-nachala XX veka,” in *Tsivilizatsii i kul’tury*, vyp. 1, Moskva, 1994: 222-238; ISKHAQOV, “Musul’manskaya psikhologiya...” (note 5); ISKHAQOV, “Musul’mane Rossii: Osobennosti sotsial’nogo povedeniya...” (note 5); MIKHAILOVA, S. M., *Kazanskii universitet v dukhovnoi kul’ture narodov Vstoka Rossii*, Kazan’, 1991; *Ocherki po istorii tatarskoi kul’tury v kontekste “Zapad-Vostok,”* Kazan’, 2001.