

To conquer the people, it is necessary to destroy its culture: Konstantin von Kaufmann-Governor General of the Turkestan Territory in 1867-1882

Alisher Alimatov*

Department of Law, Tashkent State University of Law, Uzbekistan

Introduction

In this publication I want to share with my conclusions about the problems of national music that existed in the 20th century. My amateur studies have shown, in my opinion, essential facts on this issue. To understand these problems, I consider it important to describe the historical events that preceded them. In the second half of the 19th century, the Russian Empire began a campaign to conquer the territories of today's Central Asia. This territory included 3 state entities: Kokand Khanate, Khorezm (Khiva) Khanate and Bukhara Emirate. The campaign of conquest began with the siege of Tashkent in 1865, as one of the main cities of the Kokand Khanate. Gradually, the entire territory of the khanate was conquered, which also included the territory of Tajikistan, part of the territories of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. The annexed territory with its center in Tashkent became known as Turkestan. A Russian protectorate was established over the Bukhara Emirate and Khorezm. This strengthened the position of the Russian Empire by reuniting a vast territory, acquiring new natural economic resources, agricultural products and cheap labor. The conqueror, carrying out an aggressive expedition, has in mind, first of all, to cover the costs of this campaign at the expense of the conquered territories, as well as the constant extraction of material benefits in the future. This is what England, France, for example, did in relation to the peoples of India, Africa and further occupied by them. However, the ambitions of the Russian Empire differed from others in that it was not limited to economic benefits, but sought to suppress the identity and spirituality of the conquered peoples. The famous orientalist, academician Bartold wrote in his report to the Russian Academy of Sciences on the results of the Turkestan expedition: We have so far conquered the territories of peoples with a low level of culture relative to ours. And now in Turkestan we are faced with the opposite situation. The Turkestanis recognized our military superiority, but did not recognize it in the spiritual sphere. The challenge is to enforce it. It is too early to speak of complete victory without having won in the spiritual sphere. The famous scientist made this statement long before the October Revolution of the Bolsheviks. The October Revolution changed absolutely everything except the ambitions of the empire. The state was no longer an empire, but on the contrary was the antagonist of the empire, but in it the ambitions of the previous government in relation to other peoples were preserved, since they were based on the idea of Great Russian chauvinism. Regardless of the change in the socio-political formation, this has never changed and still exists. The statements of the conquerors were subsequently actively introduced into life by the Bolsheviks. If at the early stage of the formation of the new Russian statehood, the Bolsheviks rejected everything that was associated with the past, then in the 30s of the 20th century the situation changed and great cultural figures, their creations, etc. began to return to their fold and the negative attitude towards them was terminated. But this only affected Russian culture, the culture of the outskirts, first of all Uzbekistan, the attitude was still the same. This was facilitated by the leadership of the local authorities of the Bolsheviks. Let us turn to the facts: in 1929, a Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan was adopted, where, along with a number of spheres of public life, the culture of the past of the Uzbek

people was sharply criticized as reactionary, in particular makom, a classical musical genre, was given a class meaning and naturally banned. But even before the release of that Resolution, the press was very actively discussing the state of Uzbek national music. Supporters of the Soviet cultural revolution proposed to completely turn away from national music, believing that it had nothing to do with the Uzbek people, but was brought in from other eastern peoples, from Arabs, Turks and Persians. Mukhiddin Kari Yakubov, Gulom Zafari, Zaki Validiy, Abdurauf Fitrat, who were later repressed, spoke out against this and in defense of national music. There were a lot of publications on this topic in the press of that time. Notable is the article by Botu, known at that time, about music, in particular, about the state of attitudes towards folk classical music. It was published in the republican newspaper "Kizil Uzbekiston". A skirmish ensues between Botu and Zie Said, who openly opposes Botu, accusing him of reactionary thinking. In 1933, V. Belyaev's book "Musical Instruments of Uzbekistan" was published in Moscow, one copy of which was donated by the author to V. Uspensky, I was lucky to read and study. This book made a huge impression on me, like a real document, a scientific collection. It seems to me that there is still no better collection about Uzbek folk instruments than this one. The author describes not only the structure and purpose of musical instruments, but also their inherent character, manner of performance. That is, he writes like a musician who has devoted his whole life to playing these instruments. This indicates a high scientific, professional level of the scientist. At the same time, the book is permeated with a thin thread of disdain, as to a backward culture, and sometimes an open hostile attitude towards this or that instrument breaks out. In particular, about the tanbur instrument, he writes that it is the main musical instrument of the Uzbeks for performing classical works, it is conservative in nature, does not obey other instruments. In the same way, the moaning sound of tanbur connects the people with their past. And this hinders the attraction of the people to the common socialist culture of the Soviet people. From this, the scientist concludes that it is necessary to withdraw tanbur from use and its possible preservation only as a museum exhibit. Further, he writes that it is necessary to take measures to gradually reduce interest in tanbur among the population, for example, its use as part of a European orchestra, where its sound will be suppressed by the powerful sound of the orchestra. The conclusions of the scientist gradually began to be applied in practice. This became especially true after the decision was made to transform musical instruments and Ashot Ivanovich Petrosyan, who had nothing to do with Uzbek national

*Corresponding author: Alisher Alimatov, Department of Law, Tashkent State University of Law, Uzbekistan, Tel: +998140977200, E-mail: 00alisher00@inbox.ru

Received November 20, 2021; Accepted November 27, 2021; Published December 03, 2021

Citation: Alimatov A (2021) To conquer the people, it is necessary to destroy its culture: Konstantin von Kaufmann-Governor General of the Turkestan Territory in 1867-1882. J Civil Legal Sci 10: 302.

Copyright: © 2021 Alimatov A. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

music, was involved in this work as the head of the laboratory for the reconstruction of folk instruments. Although at that time the experimental laboratory was headed by the famous folk master Usman Zufarov, invited by V. Uspensky. A large-scale project of elimination of truly national music began, forcing the transition to a European scale system, changing the timbre and modes of musical instruments, followed by a complete ban on their use. That is, the genocide of national music, unprecedented in any country in the world, began to be carried out by changing the system of auditory perception of an entire people! The fruits of those creations are being reaped now. Yes, there were individuals who sought to prevent this, but the forces were not equal, the state ideological machine worked at full speed with the use of any measures, up to the elimination of those who disagreed. Beginning in 1952, a ban was introduced on the use of truly national folk instruments, carriers of national music, singers, instrumentalists were dismissed, ensembles and circles were disbanded, and truly national music was completely removed from theaters. The now reconstructed instruments with a changed scale and sound began to be called folk instruments, and the works performed on these instruments began to be called national music. This continues to this day. After the Khrushchev Thaw, only in the orchestra of national instruments at the Radio Committee, since 1957, several musicians were allowed to use their instruments, and this is for the whole Republic. In the 60s, little by little, *dutar* began to be used, accompanied by some other instrument, and the followers of the *dutar* gradually began to increase, the spread of *tanbur*, which the authorities still tried not to advertise, slowly began to develop. So, since then, truly folk instruments had to come up with a name. It's good that

there is such a thing as tradition. Now our national instruments are called traditional and so is music. In any educational institution you may come across these names, but in the conservatory, now at the Institute of National Music, there is a department of traditional music. For the reconstructed instruments, only the shape reminds a little of the similarity with national instruments, the Uzbek people, its history and national culture has nothing to do with it. The reconstructed instruments still could not replace real instruments both in everyday life and in society. Yes, there are orchestras of folk instruments, concerts are given, people are applauding. I've been to several of these concerts. The success was mainly due to the repertoire, nostalgia for famous and popular works. I don't want to beg the professionalism of the leaders and musicians, on the contrary, I think that the musical literacy there is very high, I will not be mistaken if I say that it is higher than among traditionalist musicians, to my regret. But all this, I think, was the result of the measures mentioned above. I am absolutely not opposed to the development of various musical genres, including purely European ones too. I enjoy listening to the works of the great composers Bach, Mozart, Chopin, Tchaikovsky, Shostakovich and many others performed by European symphony orchestras. I am also not bad at rock music. Twice I was at a concert of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, at a concert of the Rolling Stones for 50,000 spectators in the Alps. I try to objectively express my opinion on this matter. The development of musical art, the introduction of the population to a new form of art for them should not be at the expense of the culture of a given nation, all the more a barbaric device. We must be aware of this and honestly treat what happened, and not retouch it.

Variable	Coefficient	s.e.	t-Test	p-value
Intercept	138.24	32.84	4.21	0.0001
X1	0.00007	0.0001	0.698	0.49
X2	0.0005	0.0003	1.56	0.13
X3	0.00004	0.00001	2.7	0.01
X4	-0.00001	0.00001	-1.14	0.26
X5	-0.0000001	0.00001	-0.009	0.99
X6	-0.00001	0.000005	-2.2	0.03
X7	-0.001	0.0005	-2.07	0.04
X8	-0.203	0.0685	-2.97	0.005
X9	0.0001	0.00088	0.12	0.9
n = 50	R2 = 0.93	R2 = 0.91	σ^2 =28.7	df = 40

Table 4: Estimated Regression Coefficients.

Row	C _i	H _i	State	C _i	H _i
1	0.002	-0.149	26	0.0001	-0.035
2	0.000002	0.0045	27	0.00005	-0.02
3	0.005	0.229	28	0.0006	-0.079
4	0.002	-0.149	29	0.0004	0.06
5	0.89	-2.969	30	0.1012	-1.006
6	0.0059	0.241	31	0.0101	-0.318
7	0.0005	-0.07	32	0.013	-0.356
8	0.0001	-0.034	33	0.129	-1.213
9	0.0368	-0.6	34	0.0001	-0.03
10	0.164	1.269	35	0.009	-0.298
11	0.0004	-0.06	36	0.039	0.643
12	0.0003	-0.05	37	0.0026	-0.158
13	0.008	-0.28	38	0.46	-2.165
14	0.002	0.122	39	0.0021	-0.143
15	0.0006	-0.07	40	0.021	-0.462
16	0.0001	0.03	41	0.0002	-0.04
17	0.0157	0.4	42	0.042	0.67
18	0.211	1.636	43	0.743	2.74
19	0.0027	-0.162	44	0.00006	0.024
20	0.015	-0.386	45	0.0012	-0.102
21	0.0045	0.209	46	0.241	1.79
22	0.0156	-0.395	47	0.0101	0.317
23	0.0085	-0.292	48	0.0033	-0.18
24	0.002	-0.139	49	0.0035	0.186
25	0.0006	0.07	50	0.000004	0.007

Table 5: Influence Measures from Fitted Model.

Variable	Coefficient	s.e.	t-Test	p-value
Intercept	148.29	34.09	4.35	0.0001
X_1	0.00005	0.0001	0.53	0.601
X_2	0.0004	0.0003	1.25	0.22
X_3	0.00007	0.00003	2.68	0.01
X_4	-0.00004	0.00002	-1.77	0.09
X_5	-0.00003	0.00003	-1.13	0.27
X_6	-0.00001	0.00001	-1.31	0.2
X_7	-0.0012	0.0005	-2.36	0.02
X_8	-0.23	0.073	-3.15	0.003
X_9	-0.00006	0.001	-0.06	0.96
n = 48	$R^2 = 0.895$	$R^2 = 0.87$	$\sigma^2 = 25.8$	df = 38

Table 6: Estimated Regression Coefficients With Outliers Remove.