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Preface

Trains in these parts went from East to West and from West to East. . . . On either side of the railway lines lay the great wide spaces of the desert – Sary-Ozeki, the Middle lands of the yellow steppes. In these parts any distance was measured in relation to the railway, as if from the Greenwich meridian. . . . And the trains went from East to West and from West to East.

Chingiz Aitmatov, The Day Lasts More than a Hundred Years (1980)

This is Central Asia, remote, exotic, and harsh. These are the words of Chingiz Aitmatov, a native Kyrgyz and father of the “Turkestani” movement in Soviet literature. Aitmatov seeks to capture the barrenness and isolation of Soviet Central Asia, its physical and metaphorical distance from Moscow, even at the close of the 1970s, after six decades of Soviet rule. In his surreal fantasy The Day Lasts More than a Hundred Years, Aitmatov vividly portrays a land and a people whose history, tradition, and identity were the victims of relentless Soviet purges but, paradoxically, the beneficiaries of Soviet development. From collectivization of the nomads’ lands to the elimination of the tribal bai (wealthy), to Stalin’s war on Islam and his 1937 slaughter of the Ferghana intelligentsia, to Khrushchev’s disastrous Virgin Lands program and cotton campaign, Central Asia incessantly felt the heavy and destructive hand of Soviet rule.

And yet by 1980, as the Soviet grip began to relax, Central Asia remained at best only haphazardly penetrated by the Soviet system. Everywhere, modernity clashed with tradition. On the Kazakh steppe, camels still roamed freely on the outskirts of nuclear weapons sites. In the Kyrgyz Republic, Communist Party officials still wore kalpaks (traditional felt hats) and drank kumuz (fermented mare’s milk). Throughout Central Asia, stalwart Soviet “atheists” still laid their dead to rest under the crescent moons of Islam, passed on knowledge of the Qur’an, and even observed the Muslim feast of Ro’za. And yet all the while, the ever-present steel railroad connected
this vast and persistent expanse of Asiatic steppe, desert, and mountain to modernization, to Soviet politics, industry, education, and culture.

If we leap forward two decades to the late 1990s, the so-called post-Soviet era, we find that presidents have replaced the Soviet first secretaries of each Central Asian republic. The Communist Party has been subsumed by various shades and stripes of “democratic” parties. New ideologies, from consumerism to Islamism, have replaced Marxism-Leninism. Capitalist economic theory is taught by those who once propounded only socialism. The Leninist Houses of Friendship now welcome not brother Soviets, but American, German, and Japanese investors. Changes along the scale of Stalinist industrialization are again under way. And yet Aitmatov’s portrayal of Soviet Central Asia is still remarkably fitting. Why is this so? How is this possible? How can so much change so quickly, and yet so much remain the same?

As a political scientist, in this book I look at the transformation of Central Asia in light of such changes and historical processes occurring around the globe. The breakdown of authoritarian regimes, and the democratization that sometimes follows, have been dynamic and ongoing movements for several centuries. In the twentieth century, these issues have often been at the heart of major United States foreign policy efforts. Not surprisingly, these processes are also the focus of much scholarship in the field of political science. Why? Because of the rise of international norms regarding basic human rights, which generally consider freedom from authoritarian rule and a liberal democratic form of government to be integral to human dignity. Although liberal democracy may not, indeed never does, meet the criteria of the classic Aristotelian “best” regime — a regime of participatory rule by the virtuous – liberal democracy has thus far proven to be the closest approximation to the post-Enlightenment Western ideal of a just government. In recent decades, these norms of legitimate government have diffused beyond the West. Thus we have witnessed the courageous deeds that have defined certain cataclysms in world history – East Germans tearing down the Berlin Wall, Hungarians flooding their barbed wire border and heading West, Poles marching behind Solidarity and rallying to the encouragement of their Pope, and Muscovites mounting tanks to defy the 1991 coup against Gorbachev – all this in the name of freedom and democracy.

Deep in the Soviet Union, however, the wave of democratization was slower in coming. Leninism and Stalinism had gripped the Soviet peoples much longer and much more harshly than most authoritarian dictators or ideologies throughout history had been able to do. Yet there was never a lack of dissidents demanding truth and justice. Pasternak’s poetry sought space for the personal life. Mandelstam and Akhmatova died in a quest for freedom of self-expression. Solzhenitsyn mocked Stalinism’s cowardly attempts to control the human mind and soul. Sakharov survived exile in Gorky and multiple hunger strikes in order to expose communism’s brutal disregard for human rights. Writing from Central Asia, Aitmatov and Suleimanov...
published fantastic tales to call their ethnic peoples to remember who they are, to value their cultural identity, and to keep sacred those very memories Soviet ideology had sought to destroy. By the late 1980s, atomized dissidence in the Soviet Union had surged into mass movements. What had begun with scientists and intellectuals in Leningrad and Moscow soon rippled outward to inspire the popular fronts and civil protests of the Balts and Ukrainians and, eventually, even of the Central Asians. The grip of repressive and corrupt regimes has been strong, but now, after a decade and a half of failed post-Soviet democratization, Kyrgyz and other Central Asians are again renewing the call for democracy.

The post-Soviet political transition of Central Asia is the main concern of this book. Not only theoretically, but normatively, the Central Asian transition is imbued with importance and meaning – for those analytically studying that transition, for those shouldering the responsibility of shaping and directing that transition, and most of all, for the many people who are living that transition. In this book, I hope to contribute to our understanding and remembering of that process.
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In this book, I use a modified Library of Congress system of transliteration from the Cyrillic, especially for Russian words and names. There is no standard system for the transliteration of the Central Asian languages. There is even further confusion in transliteration, given that some languages (especially Uzbek and Turkmen) have started to use a modified Latin alphabet in recent years. There is also disagreement among Central Asians themselves over the proper new Latin spelling of some words. Throughout the text, I adopt the Central Asian form based on the Cyrillic script, since the most comprehensive Central Asian dictionaries are still in Cyrillic. A few exceptions are included in the glossary.

I have adopted some changes for the ease of the reader who is not fluent in Russian or the Central Asian languages. I have typically not used accent marks above the letters, though I have retained the Russian soft sign (e.g., obl’ast’). For words commonly used, such as glasnost, I drop the sign.

For the ease of the reader as well as for the sake of consistency throughout the text, I use one form (the Uzbek form) of any Central Asian word that has very similar variants and the same meaning across the languages (for example, qishloq, oqsoqol, mahalla). See the Appendix for other forms of these words in Kyrgyz, Tajik, Turkmen, and Kazakh. When using a plural form of a Central Asian or Russian word (such as qishloq, kolkhoz), I simply add the English plural form, “s” (qishloqs, kolkhozes), rather than use the Central Asian plural, which might be confusing to the reader.

I attempt to use the most common and most readable spellings of Central Asian persons’ names (such as Niyazov, not Niiazov). If they retain the Russian spelling, I adopt that. If they have changed to a more traditional Uzbek or Tajik spelling, I use that form. Some names are written in multiple ways in the local press, so it can be difficult to know which is the preferred form for each person. It is important to note that in some cases, individuals and/or families since independence and in some cases since perestroika have
opted to drop the Russian endings from their names (e.g., the Pulatov/Pulat brothers).

When using Central Asian place names, I generally adopt the transliteration from the Russian/Cyrillic spelling, except when a particular spelling is common in the Western literature, or when the Russian form is less readable than other forms. For example, I use the Uzbek spelling Jizzak (rather than the Russian Dzhizak) for the Uzbek province. I use Samarkand, the common English spelling, for the city and province of Samarkand. I use the common transliteration of the Russian form of Uzbekistan (not the Uzbek form, Ozbekistan). In discussing the post-1991 period, I use the common form, Kyrgyzstan, rather than the official form, the Kyrgyz Republic, throughout text for the sake of simplicity and to conserve space. Transliteration does not reflect any bias toward one of the many languages used in the region, but only my concern for some consistency and the ease of the general reader.