TURK ELI

International Scientific Journal



Volume 1 | Issue 1 | 2026

Manas, Kyrgyz Republic

www.turkeli.science

TURK ELI
INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

The journal is officially registered as a mass media outlet by the Justice Department of Manas Region under the Ministry of Justice of the Kyrgyz Republic in accordance with Registration Certificate No. 10339 dated March 11, 2024. The journal is registered under the title “TURK ELI” International Scientific Journal and is authorized for publication in Kyrgyz, Turkish, Uzbek, Kazakh and English languages.

Honorary President
Sarvar Ispahi

Editor-in-Chief
Jenishbek Duysheev

Deputy Editor in-Chief
Rahmonali Hasanov

Editorial Board:

Ablat Khodjaev (Prof. Dr.)
Shakimashrip Ibraev (Prof. Dr.)
Shohistahon Uljaeva (Prof. Dr.)
Kubanychbek Kalchakeev (Prof. Dr.)
Abdimajid Madraimov (Prof. Dr.)
Shukhrat Sattorov (Prof. Dr.)
Ibrahim Kush (Dr.)
Faig Elekberli (Dr.)
Erdenebayar Nasanbat (Dr.)
Gulnara Anarbaeva (Dr.)
Nurgul Aldabek (Dr.)
Nurjamal Myrzabaeva (Dr.)
Takhirjan Kazakov (Dr.)
Elmira Hazratkulova (Dr.)
Azamat Kaliev (Dr.)
Abdulvakhidkhon Nuriddinov (Dr.)

Technical Editor
Laziz Baxtiyorov

Publisher: turkeli.science
E-mail: editor@turkeli.science

Contents

N.Erdenebayar **B.Jargalsaikhan**	Skiing Tradition of Altai Uriankhai	**4**
E.A.Avazov **Zh.A.Duisheev**	The Andijan Uprising of 1898: Main Issues of Discussion in the Historiography of the Colonial and Soviet Era	**7**
Sh.Kh.Sattarov	Service Diversification And Economic Efficiency	**13**
S.Dj.Saidova	Leadership Competence and Creativity in Managing Challenging Personnel in Higher Education Institutions	**16**
Kh.I.Mamadaliyev	Urban History of the Fergana Valley (1876–1924): A Case Study of Osh	**21**
A.B.Zuftarov	Development of The Service Sector in The Context of the Digital Transformation of Azerbaijan's Economy	**24**
I.K.Usarov **Sh.T.Karimova** **M.Y.Badalbayeva** **A.A.Beknazarov** **Sh.T.Uljayeva**	Enhancing Students' Lexical Competence Through Systematic Use of Authentic Texts: a Task-based and Corpus-supported Methodology	**29**
B.R.Karimov	Challenges in the Development of Turkic Civilization Languages: Perspectives on the Formation of a Common Turkic Language and a Unified Turkic Script System	**32**
N.Juraev	The Philosophy of the Soul and the Heart in Ibn Sina's Thought	**35**
N.Nazarov	Interethnic Relations and Societal Development in Central Asia	**42**
Kh.J.Barotova	The Representation of Nature in the Epic Farhod and Shirin	**46**
Sh.Kh.Buriev	Conservation of Museum Objects and the Preservation of Historical Memory: A Key Factor in Societal Development (The Case of Uzbekistan, 1991–2025)	**50**
K.M.Gulomova	Scientific and Pedagogical Foundations of Fostering Independent Thinking in Higher Education Students	**53**
D.S.Saparboeva	Organizing Didactic Games in Primary Education	**56**
İ.H.Cəbrayılov	Contemporary Approaches to History Education: Challenges of Learning and Teaching	**58**
O.Musaev	Peculiarities of National Policy Implementation in Multinational Countries	**62**
E.Sultanova **R.Hasanov**	The Organization of Turkic States: A Significant Political Actor on the Global Stage	**66**
O.Musaev **Z.Murodova**	The Historical Development of International Relations and the Processes of Their Transformation	**70**
R.Yarkulov	Mechanisms for Improving Students' Creative Engagement through Digital Technologies: A Case Study of the Logistics Education Program	**74**
R.Hasanov	The Person of Amir Temur and His Martyr Art and State Administration	**79**
R.Khalikova	Amir Temur's Personality and Political Activities as Reflected in Historical Sources	**81**

The Andijan Uprising of 1898: Main Issues of Discussion in the Historiography of the Colonial and Soviet Era

E.A. Avazov (Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor)[1]
ernis-ist@mail.ru | ORCID: 0009-0008-7165-6361
Zh.A. Duisheev (Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor)[2]
duysheev@mail.ru | ORCID: 0009-0006-1179-5533
[1.] Manas State University named after B. Osmonova,
Manas city, Kyrgyz Republic
[2.] International University named after K. Sh. Toktomamatova,
Manas city, Kyrgyz Republic

Abstract.
This article examines the historiography of the 1898 Andijan uprising in the Fergana Valley and analyzes the changing interpretations of the event in pre-revolutionary, Soviet, and post-Soviet historical literature. The study demonstrates that assessments of the uprising were closely connected with the political and ideological priorities of different historical periods. In historiography, the event has been interpreted through various concepts, including "ghazavat" (holy war), "workers' protest movement," "revolutionary action," and "national liberation movement." The article argues that both the Russian imperial administration and Soviet historiography shaped their interpretations in accordance with the political interests of state authorities. By comparatively analyzing the continuity and transformation of historical thought, the authors critically reconsider the dominant narratives surrounding the uprising and challenge interpretations that portray it solely as an expression of Muslim fanaticism or as a revolutionary movement against the Tsarist regime.
Keywords: Andijan, Fergana, 1898, uprisings, research, historiography

Introduction. As one of the vivid examples of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the multinational Fergana Valley against the colonial system of Russia, the uprising of 1898, known in historical science as the Andijan (the events took place on May 17, 1898 in the city of Andijan, now the regional center of the Republic of Uzbekistan – A.E., D.Zh.). The leader of the uprising was Muhammad Ali Khalif Sabyr Sopuoglu, one of the Sufi leaders of the trend Naqshbandi. He was a resident of the village of Min-Tyube of the Margalan district of the Fergana region (the modern village of Markhamad of the Republic of Uzbekistan). The Kyrgyz called him Madali or Iyikchi ishan, and the Uzbeks and Tajiks called Dukchi ishan, according to the tradition of his ancestors, he was engaged in making spindles, which is why he received the nickname. Ishan is the head of the Muslim dervish brotherhood (order), to which ordinary members of the brotherhood obeyed without question, who gave Ishan part of their income (See: Abashin S. N. Ishan // Islam on the territory of the former Russian Empire. Encyclopedic Dictionary.M., 1999.T .2.P. 40-41). He was popular, especially among the Kyrgyz population. And among the sedentary population, some representatives of the ulema took an oppositional position towards Dukchi Ishan. Therefore, the bulk of his murids (follower, student - A.E., D.Zh.) were Kyrgyz. Armed with sticks, hoes, pitchforks, partly with firearms, the revolted crowd of about two thousand approached the city of Andijan and attacked the barracks in which the soldiers of the 4th company of the 20th Turkestan line-personnel battalion were stationed. The collision lasted a quarter of an hour. Having received strong resistance, the rebels began to scatter. On the night of May 19, Madali Ishan was detained. In the Russian garrison, 22 soldiers were killed, 18 were wounded. At the scene of the clash, the rebels left 18 killed. In addition, the rebels captured 39 rifles from the barracks. The intervention was quickly and brutally suppressed. A team of hunters and a Cossack detachment from Ferghana Semirechye and Auliyat were immediately sent to capture the escaped participants.

On June 1, 1898, a military court in the city of Andijan under the leadership of Major General Terentyev sentenced Madali Ishan's group to death. The second group of rebels was convicted on June 27-28, the third group – July 8-9, the fourth - July 18, the fifth, sixth – August 2-3, the seventh and eighth groups - September 15-17. The trial over the accused lasted 3 months. Its results are presented in different ways in different sources. According to some data, among the 208 exiled to Siberia there were 136 Kyrgyz, 52 Uzbeks, 13 Kashgarians, 4 Turks, 3 Tajiks.

As a result of the uprising, the innocent population of the Fergana Valley suffered. After the suppression of the uprising, an indemnity of 300 thousand rubles was imposed on the population of the Fergana Valley. Only some volosts (Volost - the lowest unit of the administrative-territorial division of the Russian Empire - A.E., D.Zh.) that were not related to the uprising were exempted from the payment of indemnity.

The uprising was quickly suppressed due to the lack of a clear organization, action plan and unified leadership. However, this event made a tremendous impression on the colonial policy in the province.

The study of this issue and the process of its perception, study, scientific understanding both on the part of the Kyrgyz people proper, as well as representatives of other socio-political systems, scientific directions and schools, allows you to create a general picture of the history and historiography of one of the most important pages of the historical past of the Kyrgyz people.

Despite the fact that the uprising was actively supported by the Ferghana Kyrgyz, little attention was paid to the study of Kyrgyz historiography. At the present time, in the conditions of independence, there are opportunities for a deeper study of some of the issues of this uprising. Until the last moment, this uprising was studied one-sidedly, the results and consequences were not disclosed.

The history of the development of all scientific thought in the studies of historians on this issue in different periods is considered in all the contradictory nature of its expression, in the dialectic of comparative analysis. The work notes the positive and negative aspects of the historiography of the pre-revolutionary and Soviet periods, determines the baggage of historical knowledge that has passed the test of time, and criticizes pseudoscientific conclusions

that served as a breeding ground for the emergence of trends such as “religious fanaticism”, “revolutionary action of the working population”, “ anti-feudal uprising ”and the like.

The practical significance of the work is due to the fact that the historiographic material systematized in the article and the theoretical generalizations made will help to restore the existing gaps in the historiography of the Andijan uprising of 1898 and in the coverage of the history of the liberation movements of the peoples of the Fergana Valley during the reign of Tsarist Russia. The study of the problem of this uprising has a cognitive significance for the history of Kyrgyzstan. The problem under consideration makes a significant contribution to defining the principles, goals of the colonial policy of the tsarist government and the development of the laws of the liberation movement.It is also determined by the urgent need for historians to form an objective idea of the scientific results and prospects of studying the history of the liberation movements of the Turkestan region within the Russian Empire. The materials of this study are of interest in the preparation of general and special courses in historiography and can be used in the preparation of fundamental works on the history of Kyrgyzstan.

The purpose of the study is a systematic historiographic analysis of historical literature aimed at identifying the positions and views of the authors on the problems of the Andijan uprising, its course and consequences, and posing key problems for further research into the history of this uprising. The object of the research is the pre-revolutionary and Soviet historiography of the problem of the history of the Andijan uprising of 1898 in the Fergana Valley of the Turkestan Territory. The subject of the study is a complex and contradictory process of accumulation and development of scientific knowledge, published historical studies reflecting the history of the Andijan uprising, the formation and development of conceptual approaches, their comparative analysis.

Based on this goal, the author defines the following range of tasks:

- to analyze the works of pre-revolutionary authors and determine the features of the assessment of the Andijan uprising by researchers of the colonial period, their conceptual approach;
- to characterize the features of the formation of the Soviet historiography of the history of the Andijan uprising;
- to conduct a comparative analysis of the concepts of the uprising in the historiography of the Soviet period;
- to find out the approach of modern national researchers to the problem of liberation movements during the period of colonialism;
- identify unexplored or poorly covered issues and propose recommendations for organizing future research work.

The chronological framework of the study covers the pre-revolutionary (colonial) and Soviet periods of the study of the topic under consideration from the beginning of the Andijan uprising to the beginning of the historiography of the period of independence.

Within the framework of the implementation of the set goal and the object and subject of research determined by the author, there is no contemporary and foreign historiography of the problem related to them, but requiring separate consideration.

Results. The scientific novelty of the article lies in the fact that it is a generalizing study in Russian historical science, specially devoted to the analysis of the entire complex of works in conjunction with historiographic materials on the history of the Andijan uprising from the beginning of its study to the present. The article provides a detailed description of the stages of the historiography of the problem, the change in the direction, and the content of its study, identifies the leading trends, results and defines the prospects for the further development of the historiography of the history of the Andijan uprising of 1898. An essential sign of the scientific novelty of the article is the rethinking and disclosure of poorly illuminated aspects in the historiography of the Andijan uprising of 1898, for example, the presence of religious fanaticism and the use of the Islamic factor.

Literature Review. Three sets of sources were used in this historiographic work. The first, main group of sources is scientific historical literature. It includes the published works of researchers of the pre-revolutionary period, which left information about the course and results of the Andijan uprising; research by Soviet scientists who made a great contribution to the development of many aspects, but not free from ideological attitudes; works of Kyrgyz, Uzbek and other historians reflecting this problem from the standpoint of today.

Materials and methods. The general theoretical basis of this research is the so-called civilizational approach to understanding historical processes. Historical-genetic and comparative methods are used as scientific research tools.

The historical and genetic method makes it possible to trace the origin and dynamics of the development of the people’s liberation struggle of the population of the Fergana Valley. It is also suitable for studying the continuity and change in the policy of the authorities of the Empire and the Turkestan administration in relation to the colonization of this region.

The comparative method makes it possible to compare historical thought in the historiography of the colonial and Soviet periods, revealing the influence of the ideology of the authorities.

Discussions. The first official report on the Andijan uprising of 1898 was published on the pages of the newspaper “Turkestanskie vedomosti” under the title “Riots in Fergana”. Factual data were reported about the protest and which took place in the midst of general tranquility and local welfare, the population of the region in which there were no destructive diseases, no food difficulties, no events that could cause popular unrest. The reasons for the uprising were explained by the revival of Muslim ideas [1] . Subsequent issues of the newspaper reported on the administrative measures taken by the government to pacify and investigate the riots, as well as other details of the uprising. Representatives of the Turkestan military district also viewed the uprising from the point of view of the gazavat. Lieutenant General N.I. Korolkov in his report reduced the uprising to the religious slogan “ghazavat”, “fanatical excitement of the native population” and the actions of Madali Ishan. Head of the Margelansky district A.I. Bryanov also wrote in his report that the basis of the uprising was religious fanaticism, which undoubtedly infected the entire population. The Andijan events have cast doubt on the policy of “ignoring” Islam, which the Russian government has been pursuing in Turkestan since 1867, since the appointment of Konstantin Petrovich von Kaufman as the first general governor of the district. As a result, S. M. Dukhovskoy, who served as governor-general at the time of the uprising, called for a more active policy towards Islam and spoke in favor of taking tough administrative measures against the Sufis, introducing administrative control over the Muslim clergy and carefully monitoring the mood among the adherents. Islam, which ran counter to the previous course. Similar characteristics were given to the uprising in the periodicals of that time. By this, the authorities sought to obscure the true reasons for the uprising directed against the colonial policy of tsarism.

Initial studies of the colonial period were dominated by the view that the revolt was based on religious fanaticism. Such versions can be assessed as an official opinion. Among the supporters of the official version were I.P. Yuvachev, N.S. Lykoshin, M.A. Terentyev, N.P. Ostroumov and others. In the versions that

appeared under conditions of strict censorship, the researchers of the colonial period are showing homogeneity. The main emphasis in the presentation of the anti-colonial struggle in the works of this period was from the point of view of the interests of the Russian Empire.

For example I.P. Yuvachev, in his essay "Kurban-Dzhan-Datkha, the Kara-Kyrgyz queen of Alai," written in 1907, mentions the Andijan event and adheres to the official version. He writes: "In 1898 a new great uprising was prepared and a gazavat was declared against the Russians. I will have to dwell on this uprising a little longer, in view of the false popular opinion that the military administration of Turkestan, fearing of losing their homes, with the alleged transfer of the region to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, as if deliberately provoked the Andijan massacre in order to show the need for military power here. In fact, the announcement of gazavat can only be explained by the religious fanaticism of the country's population "[2, p. 972-973] .

Another author, N.S. Lykoshin believed that gazavat was only one of the reasons for the uprising, and far from the most important one. In his opinion, the most important reasons are: "1. The savagery of the Fergana Kyrgyz. 2. Muslim fanaticism. 3. The bad influence of native officials opposed to the interests of Russia, some of whom attached their seals to the proclamation of Dukchi Ishan. 4. "Stone wall" of the native administration, which closed the Turkestan native population access to the true benefits of Russian civilization "[3, p.58] .

In the three-volume work of Lieutenant General M.A. Terentyev "History of the Conquest of Central Asia", created at the beginning of the 20th century, the Andijan uprising was described in the ranks of the events of the 18th-19th centuries. The author, who served in Turkestan for 40 years, found the reasons for the events in the weakening of the role of the military in governing the region, weak control of the activities of the Muslim society and insufficient attention to the election of elders and qazis (give explanation), the lack of knowledge of the Russian administration of local customs and languages.

The author of the book is M.A. Terentyev outlined his conclusions in 27 points on the Andijan uprising. Among them, the author emphasized the following reasons: "The habits of the population of Fergana to unrest and unrest associated with robberies, lack of supervision over the Muslim clergy and schools, freedom of public preaching by Muslim missionaries" [4, p. 487]. Most of the supporters of such opinions could not indicate the true reasons for the uprising, since they were representatives of the colonial administration. There were, however, albeit a few authors who sought to soberly assess the reasons for the uprising. Different opinions from the official version are found, in particular, in the works of V. Salkov and the anonymous author S. T-ov. In his research, V. Salkov noted that popular unrest is rarely the result of one cause, and unwittingly admitted that the purpose of the uprising was the desire to put an end to the source of the people's torment, and not because of religious fanaticism. "Popular uprisings are rarely the result of one reason," he wrote, they reflect on themselves partly conscious, partly unconscious, the desire to put an immediate end to everything that in the eyes of the rebels seems to be a flagrant untruth and the closest source of their misery. The press tried to shed some light on the reasons for the Andijan uprising, "but in general, it seems, everything was explained by Muslim fanaticism, which is always used to explain incomprehensible phenomena in the social life of Muslim peoples. Although this is partly true, the main reason is the low level of mental development of the madmen who decided to threaten our vast Empire with sticks, sickles and clubs. The Andijan affair once again proved that the uneducated people and the dark masses, easily fanaticized by outside influences, are a constant threat to the existing order "[5, p.124].

In 1908, in connection with the 10th anniversary of the uprising, an article by the anonymous author S. T-ov was published on the pages of the "Historical Bulletin" magazine. The author of the article denies the dominant position of Muslim fanaticism in the uprising. The author posed a specific question: "Was it (the uprising - AE) as a result of fanaticism of fanatics or other reasons." "The official investigation carried out with the aim of revealing the true cause of the 1898 uprising," he wrote, "found that the reason was almost exclusively in the fanaticism of Muslims, which was based on religious intolerance towards their kafir (give explanation) rulers" [6, p. 664] . He saw the main reason in the acceleration of the Russification of the region, which infringed upon the religious interests of Muslims.

Another author, V. Nalivkin, drew attention to the reasons for the uprising. He considered the shortcomings in the activities of the colonial administration as the main reason for the uprising. The author was the first and, perhaps, the only one of the pre-revolutionary researchers, directly declared his irreconcilable position in relation to the regime of government that existed in the Turkestan region, considering it excessively tough and prone to corruption.He considered the shortcomings in the activities of the colonial administration as the main reason for the uprising. "We talked and wrote a lot about the uprising, but we didn't say a single word about the most important, most significant reason for this uprising (that is, the "uprising" of Dukchi Ishan), about those grave, chronic ailments of our official life (service and public), which, being undesirable and harmful in general, seem to be especially harmful and dangerous on the Muslim outskirts"[7, p136]. - he writes. It should be noted here that after a few years Nalivkin shared the views of N.S. Lykoshin. He repeated and expounded at greater length the shortcomings in the activities of the colonial administration.

Thus, in the colonial period, in many studiesthe Andijan uprising was assessed according to the authorities' view of the natural "fanaticism" inherent in the Ferghana Muslims and the resulting threat of Islamic rebellion and ghazavat. Therefore, many authorities and researchers also argued that this uprising testified to a new, pan-Islamic threat, referring to the head of the uprising of the spiritual leader Dukchi Ishan on the possibility of his intercourse with the Ottoman sultan Abdul-Hamid II. As a result, the "Andijan events cast doubt on the policy of"ignoring "Islam, which the Russian government pursued in Turkestan since 1867, since the appointment of Konstantin Petrovich von Kaufman as the first governor-general of the district. As a result, S.M. Dukhovskoy, who served as governor-general at the time of the uprising, called for a more active policy towards Islam, which in the long term had serious consequences for the colonial rule in Turkestan "[8, p.48].

Modern historiographers pay much attention to the development of historical science during the Soviet period. In Soviet times, the stage of pre-revolutionary historiography was characterized as a "crisis of bourgeois-noble historiography in the period of imperialism" due to the reluctance of most bourgeois historians to view the materialist understanding of history as the highest achievement of historical thought and as a qualitatively new stage in the development of Russian

historiography. The manifestation of this crisis was seen in the refusal to recognize the progressive and natural course of history, from historical monism, in ignoring the role of the masses, the class struggle and the revolutionary movement. This was an extreme point of view that ignored the objective social situation. In the Soviet period, many historians did not actually try to establish the deep motives and causes of the Andijan uprising, preferring interpretations in the spirit of the historiographic ideology prevailing at that time. Until the end of the 1930s, Soviet historians could still regard it as a "truly revolutionary" movement of the oppressed working class of the Fergana Valley, despite its "religious coloring."

Historiographic analysis of the period of formation of Soviet historiography shows that at this time, along with the formation of a centralized administrative-command system, the Marxist-Leninist methodology of historical research was established in it. For the first time in Soviet historiography, the Andijan uprising was considered partially within the framework of national liberation movements in the work of E. Fedorov. One of the reasons for the uprising, the author noted the impoverishment of the masses [9, p.81].

At the end of the 20s of the last century, P. Galuso addressed this problem. He was one of the first to give a historical assessment of the reasons, significance and consequences of the Andijan uprising. The author emphasized the participation in the Andijan uprising of various social groups pursuing their own class interests, where the results of the uprising led to increased repression by the tsarist government and the arming of immigrants. His view is typical of early Soviet historiography, which criticized tsarist colonial policies as brutal and exploitative. P. Galuzo, who dealt with these issues back in the twenties, outlined the following stages in the development of the liberation movement of the period under consideration:

1. The liberation movement of the era of the conquest of Central Asia by Russia;

2. The liberation movement of the late 19th century (the last two decades);

3. The liberation movement of the early twentieth century. [10, p.41] .

A characteristic feature of the first and second stages, according to P.G. Galuzo was the religious orientation of speeches under the slogan "ghazavat".

One of the first Soviet researchers, Seng-Zade, drawing attention to the history of the uprising in his comprehensive work, believed that "the uprising of 1898, which was an attempt by dying feudalism to strangle capitalism that was nascent in Turkestan, trying to turn the history of Turkestan back to the times of the Kokand Khanate, should be considered an exclusively reactionary movement." [11, p.57] .

In the 30s, archival materials related to the above event were published on the pages of the Red Archive magazine. The expansion of the source study base for studying this problem had a significant impact on the development of research on uprisings. Analyzing the history of the uprising, E. Steinberg [12, p.123] saw the great importance of the Andijan uprising in the fact that it was an open attack by an organized rebel group on the colonialists, and not on peaceful officials or migrant peasants, but on the tsar's garrison and a military unit and denied the opinion of Seng-Zade, who considered the uprising reactionary.

According to the sources, in the studies carried out in the early years of the formation of Soviet historical science, pressure was made on socio-economic factors and on the excessive strengthening of colonial and social oppression. At the initial stage of its formation, Soviet historiography was characterized by a sharp negative assessment of the activities of the tsarist administration of the Turkestan Territory. In addition to the economic exploitation of the region, the emphasis was placed on the punitive policy of the authorities aimed at suppressing the national liberation movement of the peoples of Central Asia.

In 1937, with the beginning of the Stalinist repressions, research work on the history of national liberation movements was practically curtailed. In 1947, a work was published under the editorship of S.V. Bakhrushin "History of the peoples of Uzbekistan". The sections about the uprising itself in the main centers, about its driving forces are covered quite fully, a new interpretation of the name of the uprising is proposed. "This name, generally accepted in the literature, is somewhat arbitrary. In fact, Andijan was not so much the center of the movement as the place where the rebels attacked the tsarist garrison. The area of the uprising was much wider - it covered the area around Andijan, Osh and Namangan. The uprising was supposed to start also in these last two cities, and not only in Andijan itself; therefore, it would be more accurate to call the Andijan uprising of 1898 as Fergana or East Fergana "[13, p.362]. According to the author, as a popular movement, the Andijan uprising had great revolutionary significance. "The uprising thus contributed to the accumulation of the experience of political struggle among the broad working masses. In general, the Andijan uprising of 1898 was a progressive historical phenomenon, a force that pushed forward the historical development of Uzbekistan and prepared, to a certain extent, subsequent popular movements, in particular, the uprising of 1916"[13, p.365], - he believed. In some fundamental works written before the 50s, opinions appeared that assessed the nature of the Andijan uprising as a national liberation movement. However, starting in the 1950s, such views began to change. This was due to the fact that the situation was especially aggravated after the publication of a noisy article by the secretary of the Central Committee of the Azerbaijan Communist Party, M.D.Bagirov [14, p.22-31] about the uprising of Shamil. This article played a huge role in assessing the liberation movements in the national outskirts during the period of Russian colonization. Later, Bagirov's article came to be seen as a provision giving direction to all social sciences. In this regard, scientists who studied the Andijan uprising were forced to change their views.

At a conference held in 1950 at the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan, dedicated to the nature of the Andijan uprising, all participants, with the exception of K. Dodonov, came to the conclusion that the uprising was reactionary in nature. Some researchers overestimated it as "reactionary", and there were even hints of the intervention of British agents. Almost all researchers who wrote about the Andijan uprising of 1898 turned to the most obscure side of these events. In this regard, the most revealing article is B. Gafurov's article "The Andijan" uprising "of 1898" [15. pp. 50-61].

Later, from the moment of the "thaw of Khrushchev's democracy," both in all branches of public life and in the social sciences began a new assessment of controversial issues. But not all scientists immediately changed their views on the reactionary nature of the uprising. In 1966, a meeting of historians was held at the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan to discuss the nature of the Andijan uprising. The participants in the meeting, noting that the wrong opinion, formed under the influence of the article by

M.D. Bagirov, in the 50s, came to the conclusion about the progressive significance of the uprising. The shadow side of the movement was the participation of feudal - clerical elements who sought to use the uprising of the people in order to restore their lost rights and privileges.

In the mid-70s, K.F. Kasymbekov was engaged in the development of the history of the liberation movement in the Fergana Valley. The author, in contrast to previous researchers, noted that the liberation movement was spread throughout the territory of the Turkestan region, and that the participants in the uprising were farmers, the poorest nomads, the urban poor and representatives of the new bourgeoisie. K. Kasymbekov, noting the spread of the movement over wide territories, showed that to limit the movement of 1898 to one attack on the Andijan garrison, calling it the "Andijan uprising" is clearly erroneous and historically incorrect, and along with this suggested to call the uprising the uprising of the working people of the Fergana Valley [16, pp. 43-65] . The author also showed the progressive nature of the uprising.

In Kyrgyzstan, the first historiographic review of literature on the history of the Andijan uprising was made by A. Khasanov. He specifically focused on the history of the study of the uprising and gave an assessment of the stages, conditions for the emergence of dominant concepts [17, p.5-6] . Anvarbek Khasanov was one of those scholars who argued that this uprising was a progressive phenomenon. But the periodization proposed by A. Khasanov cannot be considered completely correct and final. Supporters of one version or another were and are in all the stages noted.

With a historiographic review of the Andijan uprising, it can be noted that the researchers of this problem in the mid-60s and early 80s. agreed that the uprising was progressive. Such views were reflected in the works, scientific collections, and textbooks of Uzbek historians and Kyrgyz scientists who have partially addressed this problem. On the whole, the progressive nature of the Andijan uprising of 1898 was noted in all publications published since the second half of the 60s, and it seemed that there was a common opinion on this issue in historical science.

From the second half of the 80s.in the XX century in connection with the beginning of the "perestroika processes", the opinion was established among historians that the way out of the crisis of historical science lies in the study of pre-revolutionary historiography and criticism of historiography before perestroika. The calm that remained in the scientific community was broken by an article by the Uzbek historian M.G. Vakhabov [18, p.43-57] . In his article, the author argued that a positive assessment of the 1898 uprising was made "in spite of historical facts ... at the behest of some scholars, endowed with the unquestioning right to evaluate certain historical events," and considered the uprising an adventurous performance by Madali Ishan. This article was followed by a heated discussion among Uzbek scientists E.Yu. Yusupova, B.V. Lunin [19, p.18-31] , Kh.Z. Ziyaeva [20, p.63] . The Uzbek historian Kh. Ziyaev emphasized that despite the religious coloring, the uprising of 1898 was popular, shaking the foundations of the colonial-feudal order in pre-revolutionary Uzbekistan.

As a result of the discussion among historians on December 23, 1987, a conference on the problems of the national liberation movement in Central Asia and Kazakhstan at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries was held in Tashkent. The participants in the conference viewed the uprising as an open anti-colonial action of the masses, it was concluded that the uprising undermined the foundations of the colonial regime of tsarism in Central Asia. The well-known Kyrgyz historian who participated in the conference K. Usenbaev raised the issue of participation in the uprising of the Kyrgyz. The invaluable importance of the works of K. Usenbaev in the study of the uprising of 1898. Back in Soviet times, he argued that it was a national liberation uprising [21].

The issue of the historiography of the Andijan uprising of 1898 was also considered in the dissertation of the Kyrgyz researcher Zh. Zhakypbekov. The main conclusions of the author, set out in the author's abstract of the dissertation, indicate that when covering this issue, more attention was paid to the work of Kyrgyz historians, devoted mainly to participation in the uprising of the Kyrgyz people [22].

A change in landmarks took place at the turn of the 1990s, which was due to the formation of the national historiography of the independent states of Central Asia. The problem of the struggle against colonialism and for independence is brought to the fore.

Conclusions. Studying the experience and opinions of pre-revolutionary and Soviet authors, relying on the achievements of modern historiography, in the conclusion the following conclusions were offered:

- The Andijan uprising refers to the second stage of the implementation of the colonial policy of tsarism in the Fergana Valley – the stage of transition to a full-fledged colonial policy. It is incorrect to assess the uprising as a random event. The genesis of the uprising lies in the nature of colonial policy and in its principles of phasing, gradualness and Russification.
- Despite the fact that the uprising was led by a representative of the Naqshbandi Sufi order, the spiritual leader Madali Ishan, and had an appeal to the holy war – ghazavat, the religious factor cannot be considered the main reason for the uprising. At the same time, one cannot deny the religious goals of the representatives of the clergy who took part in the uprising. The appeal to ghazavat also took place in the events before the Andijan uprising.
- The Andijan uprising is a multinational struggle during the colonial period. Before that, if we do not take into account the popular uprising of 1876, there was no such unification of the insurgent people into a single whole of multinational Fergana. Therefore, the uprising cannot be attributed to any one people. At the same time, we are far from the opinion that all peoples took an equal part. Uzbeks, Tajiks, Turks, and others took part in the uprising to varying degrees.
- Modern Kyrgyz historiography of the issue should provide continuity in the development of historical thought, determine its prospects in each specific direction and prevent the dominance of some tendencies of folk history, which are manifested to varying degrees in the process of the formation of national history.

Acknowledgments: We express our deep gratitude to the scientific consultants, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor T. Kenensariyev, Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor K.S. Moldokasymov for useful advice when writing the article, as well as to colleagues of the Department of History of the Jalal-Abad State University. B. Osmonov, Department of Philosophy, International University named after K.Sh. Toktomamatov who contributed to the discussion of the manuscript in the process of its preparation.

References

1. Riots in Fergana (1898), Turkestanskie vedomosti. No. 37 (1665).
2. Yuvachev, IP (1907) "Kurban-dzhan datka Kara kirgiz queen of

Alai", Historical Bulletin. No. 12.p.954-980.
3. Lykoshin, NS (1908), "To the tenth anniversary of the Andijan massacre", Historical bulletin, no. 5 p. 52-59.
4. Terentyev, M. (1906), History of the conquest of Central Asia, SPb.T.3. 499 s.
5. Salkov, V. (1901), Andijan uprising of 1898, Kazan, 130 p.
6. Tov, S. (1908), "Andijan uprising and its reasons" Historical Bulletin. №5.p.659-670
7. Nalivkin, V. (1913), Natives before and now, Tashkent: A.L. Kirsner, 1913.144 p.
8. Morisson A. (2013) "Sufism, Pan-Islamism and Information Panic: Nil SergeevichLykoshin and the Consequences of the Andijan Uprising", Tartaria Magna. No. 2.s.48
9. Feodorov, E. (1925), Essays on the national liberation movement in Central Asia, Tashkent, 237 p.
10. Galuzo, P.G. (1929), Turkestan colony. M.: Communist University of the Working East named after I.V. Stalin, 1929 .-- 162 p.
11. Seng-Zade (1929), "To the 30th anniversary of the Andijan uprising of 1898" Revolution in Wed. Asia, Book. 1.Tashkent, p.41-59.
12. Steinberg E. (1938), "Andijan uprising of 1898" Red archive. Historical magazine. State Socio-Economic Publishing House,. M, T.3 (88), pp. 123-128.
13. Bakhrushin, S. V. (1947) History of the peoples of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, 459 p.
14. Bagirov, MD (1950), "On the question of the nature of the movement of Muridism and Shamil", Bolshevik, No. 13. P. 22-31.
15. Gafurov, B. (1953), "Andijan uprising of 1898" Questions of history, no. 2, p. 50-61.
16. Kasymbekov, Қ. F., (1976), From the history of popular movements in Fergana in the late XIX - early XX centuries. ed. H. T. Tursunov. Tashkent, s. 43-65.
17. Khasanov, A. (1972) "Historiography of the Andijan uprising of 1898" Proceedings of KSU, Frunze, Issue 12. from. 5-6.
18. Vakhabov, MG (1987) "Once again about the Andijan uprising of 1898" Social sciences in Uzbekistan, no. p.43-57
19. Yusupov, E. Yu., Lunin, BV (1987), "The Andijan uprising of 1898 in Soviet historical literature", Public sciences in Uzbekistan, No. 1, pp. 18-31.
20. Ziyaev, Kh. Z. (1988), "On the social essence of the Andijan uprising of 1898" Social sciences in Uzbekistan, no. 7. pp. 57-63
21. Usenbaev, K.U. (1998), "On the participation of the Kyrgyz in the Andijan uprising of 1898" Popular movements in Central Asia in the 19th century (Based on materials from Kyrgyzstan) Bishkek-Osh, 1998. 154 p.
22. Zhakypbekov, J. (1986) Soviet historiography of the revolutionary and national liberation movement in Central Asia. In the second half of the XIX - early XX century.in .: author. dis…. Cand.ist. nauk, Moscow, 26 p.