

Introduction

In today's Social Sciences and Humanities few, if any, scholars would deny that there is a strong correlation between scientific and scholarly knowledge and the social context within which this knowledge is produced. In Europe, scholarly contemplation of this topic dates back to the end of the nineteenth century – a period which saw the genesis of various social theories and the first attempts at conceptualising the nation-state.¹ Naturally, while these developments shared a number of common features across all the Western states in which they occurred, there were also marked differences and characteristics that were specific to each individual country. In this regard, Russia, which had always been distinct from both Europe and Asia, is a case in point. Thus, emphasising the importance of these distinctions in his substantial work *Science in Russia and the Soviet Union*, Loren Graham wrote in 1993: 'No one will deny that Russian society and culture have in the thousand years of Russian history differed from society and culture in Western Europe, where modern science was born. Russia has followed a different economic path from that of Western Europe, and it has religious political and cultural traditions quite unlike those of its Western neighbors.'² Although these words were said at a time when few could even imagine that Russians would soon be cherishing an authoritarian

¹ See Francine Hirsch, *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005): 25, 26–30, 44. See also Ilya Gerasimov, Jan Kusber and Alexander Semyonov, eds, *Empire Speaks Out: Languages of Rationalization and Self-Description in the Russian Empire* (Boston: Brill, 2009): 3–23, 229–72; Alexander Vucinich, *Science in Russian Culture 1861–1917* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1970): xiv, 5–14, 30–4; Yuri Slezkine, *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994): 388–90; Nikolai Kremmentsov, *Stalinist Science* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997): 13–16.

² Loren Graham, *Science in Russia and the Soviet Union* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993): 1.

state model having had the chance to roll back to the totalitarian state so familiar to them, Putin's present-day Russia with its omnipresent power of intelligence apparatus continues to serve as a partial illustration of the words of this celebrated scholar of Russia.³

However, the issue of distinctions between possible modes of social development directly influencing all other spheres within different nation-states had already been considered by intellectuals at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. A good illustration of this can be found in the words of Bogdan Kistiakovskii (1868–1920), a renowned social philosopher and legal scholar in late Imperial Russia, of Ukrainian origin, who stated as early as 1909: 'No one, single idea of individual freedom, of the rule of law, of the constitutional state, is the same for all nations and all times, just as no social and economic organisation, capitalist or otherwise, is identical in all countries. All legal ideas acquire their own peculiar coloration and inflection in the consciousness of each separate people.'⁴ However, against the backdrop of various kinds of national specificity, there were common, general tendencies and factors, namely at the social, economic and political levels, in all Western societies which were considered by many historians to be major influences on science and scholarly knowledge and their development, and they were clearly apparent in Russia throughout the pre- and post-1917 periods.⁵

³ See Kimberly Marten, "The 'KGB State' and Russian Political and Foreign Policy Culture," *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 30/2 (2017): 131–51; Aaron Bateman, "The KGB and Its Enduring Legacy," *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 29/1 (2016): 23–47; Aaron Bateman, "The Political Influence of the Russian Security Services," *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 27 (2014): 380–403.

⁴ The English translation is given according to Laura Engelstein, "Combined Underdevelopment: Discipline and the Law in Imperial and Soviet Russia," in *Foucault and the Writing of History* ed. Jan Goldstein (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994): 225. The Russian original is 'Нет единых и одних <и> тех же идей свободы личности, правового строя, конституционного государства, одинаковых для всех народов и времен, как нет капитализма или другой хозяйственной или общественной организации, одинаковой во всех странах. Все правовые идеи в сознании каждого отдельного народа получают своеобразную окраску и свой собственный оттенок.' Bogdan Kistiakovskii, "V zashitu prava. Intelligentsiia i pravoznanie," in *Vekhi: Sbornik statei o russkoi intelligentsii* (Moscow, 1909), www.vehi.net/vehi/kistyak.html (accessed 25 September 2013).

⁵ See Graham, *Science in Russia*, 1. See also Vera Tolz, *Russia's Own Orient: The Politics of Identity and Oriental Studies in the Late Imperial and Early Soviet Periods* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011): 6; Hirsch, *Empire of Nations*, 7, 25–30; Daniel Beer, *Renovating Russia: The Human Sciences and*

Twentieth-century European thought engaged with major international debates on the philosophy and social history of scientific and scholarly knowledge. Since the beginning of the century, humanities scholars studying the history and present of science, and scientists themselves, particularly in those countries which were in the vanguard of the rapid development of science, had been paying further attention to questions such as the social effects of this process on societies, the role that science and scholarly knowledge play in a particular country or society and for mankind in general. In the second half of the twentieth century, the issue of the relationship between scientific and scholarly inquiry and their social context and, especially, the role of state power in this relationship became subject to the scrutiny of social philosophers and historians. They also pondered the question of the place of scientists and scholars in the complex and entangled grid of multi-branch, reciprocal influence between individuals and various forms of knowledge, social institutions and state power.⁶

Among them, Michel Foucault's (1926–84) work is of particular interest. His ideas on power relations within the power/knowledge nexus, the notion of discourse deeply influencing the process of scientific/scholarly knowledge production and the perception of various truths by society, the role of intellectuals and the phenomenon of resistance are the most pertinent to the subject of this study.⁷ Foucault's work is characterised by a high level of inherent inconsistency and a lack of theoretical totality and cohesion, but especially by its iconoclastic and challenging nature. However, what goes without saying is that 'his influence is clear in a great deal of post-structuralist, post-modernist, feminist, post-Marxist and post-colonial theorizing. The

the Fate of Liberal Modernity, 1880–1930 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008): 3–8; Slezkine, *Arctic Mirrors*, 388–90; Krementsov, *Stalinist Science*, 13–16; Stephen Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995): 14, 21–3.

⁶ In this context, the names of the prominent intellectuals who in this or that way touched upon these issues such as Pierre Bourdieu (1930–2002), Gilles Deleuze (1925–95), Jacques Lacan (1901–81), Louis Althusser (1918–90), Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–80), Simone de Beauvoir (1908–86) and Martin Heidegger (1889–1976) are worth mentioning.

⁷ See the works by Michel Foucault, such as: *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences* (London: Routledge, 1989), *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (New York: Pantheon, 1972), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977* (Brighton: Harvester, 1980).

impact of his work has also been felt across a wide range of disciplinary fields, from sociology and anthropology to English studies and history'.⁸

Indeed, the Foucauldian theoretical legacy contains a much vaster spectrum of historically and philosophically important ideas; however, many of them, including those concerning the history of sexuality and Western societies' perception of madness, are mostly irrelevant to my topic and will not be touched upon here. Those of Foucault's ideas on which I am going to rely can be used separately as basic theoretical tools for studying societies such as late Imperial and early Soviet Russia – societies which, at first glance, may not fully correspond to Foucault's focus on late European juridical monarchies and liberal states but which, on the contrary, being different, prove the wider international universality of the Foucauldian ideas on power relations.

Equally, it must be noted that the applicability of these theoretical notions to the analysis of late Imperial and early Soviet Russia has been questioned, since Foucault arrived at his conclusions through the study of the late European juridical monarchies and liberal states, a grouping to which Russia arguably did not belong.⁹ However, more recently, scholars have argued convincingly in favour of the Foucauldian approach to the study of Russian history, emphasising the universality of Foucault's thoughts on power relations.¹⁰ Drawing on the insights provided by these scholars, the theoretical framework of my research will be informed by the above-mentioned Foucauldian notions.

The research presented in this book is situated within the above-mentioned two periods as they are the most crucial phases in the modern history of both Russia and Iran. In addition to their above-mentioned historiographical importance, explained by the character of large-scale developments in both countries and Russia's intense

⁸ Sara Mills, *Michel Foucault* (London: Routledge, 2005): 1.

⁹ For the debates on the feasibility of applying Foucauldian ideas and notions to the Russian case, see Engelstein, "Combined Underdevelopment." See also Beer, *Renovating Russia*, 3–8, 16–26, 202–8; Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain*, 21–3. This will also be touched upon further in this chapter.

¹⁰ In the first instance, such scholars can be named as including Nikolai Kremontsov, Loren Graham, Alexander Vucinich, Vera Tolz, Michael Kemper, Daniel Beer, Peter Kneen, Nathaniel Knight, Stephen Kotkin, Jeffrey Roberg, Stephen Fortescue, Francine Hirsch, Ilya Gerasimov, Vadim Birstein and Yurii Slezkine.

activities in Persia/Iran, it is precisely during these periods that Russia's Persian policy was seriously affected by the perceptions which circulated within the prevailing field of Russia's Orientalological knowledge of the time, namely Persianate studies. The scholars and experts engaged in this field constituted the core of late Imperial and early Soviet Russia's Oriental studies – the field that exerted its intellectual influence far beyond its professional precincts in Russia.¹¹ This, of course, is also explained by the protracted, crucial importance of the multifaceted perceptions of the East and the West and their correlation within the context of various interpretations of Russia's national identity during the two periods in question.

Though the depth of academic and practical training varied in different domains, late Imperial Russia's Orientalologists,¹² as well as scholars within Persian studies, in its narrow sense, were expected to study the history, culture and languages of a broader region embracing the territories of modern Turkey, Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, the Central Asian states and further to the borders of China – the region which is now subsumed under the classification of the Persianate world.¹³ The scholarly interests of late Imperial Russia's mature academics, and the practical assignments received by the military officers, diplomats and missionary clergymen lay within the same broad geography. For example, Vasilii Barthold can equally be regarded as an Iranist, a Turcologist and an expert on the interaction of Central Asia with Chinese culture.¹⁴ The future acting Head of the Russian Legation in Persia, later Professor of Persian studies in SOAS, Vladimir Minorsky served and gathered scholarly material in Turkey and Central Asia, in addition to his substantial Persian record

¹¹ See Chapters 2 and 4 for analysis of Tolz's *Russia's Own Orient*. On the term Persianate, see Marshall Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam: The Expansion of Islam in the Middle Periods* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1974): 293–4.

¹² In order to avoid the unnecessary Saidian connotation and to preserve the neutral epistemological denotation of the term, I henceforth am using the noun Orientalologist and the adjective Orientalological throughout the manuscript, thus imitating Tolz and Schimmelpenninck van der Oye. Whenever the term is used with the Saidian connotation or in the context of the debates related to Said's concept, the words Orientalism and Orientalist are used, except for direct quotations.

¹³ See RGVIA, f. 400, op. 1 'The Asiatic Section of the General Staff', d. 3522 (1907), l. 38–41 (Colonel Iagello's report on teaching Oriental languages); l. 50–2 (Head of the General Staff's instructions on Orientalological training).

¹⁴ See Appendix (Barthold).

of service and scholarly activities.¹⁵ The future Lieutenant-General of the Russian Imperial Army, later founder of the Military Academy of the RKKK, Andrei Snesev also spoke Hindi and Chinese and studied these regions, in addition to Iran and Afghanistan.¹⁶ Such an approach was underpinned by the Russian scholars' thesis regarding the role of Iranian culture as a binding agent for a region spreading 'far beyond the linguistic Iran – from Constantinople to Calcutta and the towns of Chinese Turkestan'.¹⁷ Moreover, this approach was also demanded by the political situation in the region, which was profoundly influenced by the underlying unity of historical and cultural commonalities of the peoples inhabiting those areas. Therefore, all the individuals studied in this research can also be subsumed under a broader definition of Persian studies, namely Persianate studies.

This research also proves that Russia's Persianate studies, as well as Persian studies therein – a field that became more narrowly defined as the study of Iran and Afghanistan along with the further development and specialisation of Oriental studies in Russia – consisted of four main domains for the production of scholarly knowledge during the late Imperial period, namely academic scholarship, the military, the diplomatic service and the Russian Orthodox Church's missionary institutions, whereas the early Soviet period can be characterised by the presence of three main domains capable of contributing to Orientological knowledge, namely academic scholarship, and the military and diplomatic domains. The analysis of the activities undertaken within the above-mentioned Orientological domains during the two periods which is carried out in this research at institutional and individual levels clearly reveals the interplay of diverse multi-vector power/knowledge relations between the equipotent players, namely institutions, individuals, state, discourses and knowledge. This research, hence, also questions the Saidian Orientalist concept of two-vector relations between state power and scholarly knowledge, as well as any kind of argument on the inapplicability of the Foucauldian concept to the Russian case.

¹⁵ See Appendix (Minorsky).

¹⁶ See Appendix (Snesev); RGVIA, f. 409, op. 2, p/s 338–604 (Snesev's Record of Service), l. 3 (2 June 1899).

¹⁷ Vasilii Bartol'd, "Iran: Istoricheskii obzor," in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 7 (Moscow: Nauka, 1977): 232. On the place and influence of Iranian culture on neighbouring regions, see *ibid.*, 237.

In addition, regarding the activities of the institutions and individuals involved in Persian studies during the two periods, this book presents ample historiographical information on the technicalities of Russia's dealings with Persia/Iran and illuminates some developments in the modern history of Russo-Iranian interaction from an entirely new angle. In doing so, and given the manifold interactions between Russia and Iran during the two periods in question, the undertaken research necessitated applying to a range of archives and, as a result, draws on documents from the eleven main political, socio-historical, academic and military archives of Russia and Georgia,¹⁸ hence putting into scholarly circulation recently declassified and unpublished documents on Russo-Iranian relations. The book also engages with the most recent and relevant Russian-language literature, still unused in English-language scholarship. In Western scholarship, there are few works on the Russo-Iranian nexus¹⁹ and no book-length works whatsoever with specific focus on Russia's Persian studies, or Iranology, and its involvement in Russia's foreign policy towards Persia/Iran. Therefore, the study also aims at filling this lacuna by means of shedding new light on Russian Orientalology through the prism of Foucauldian power/knowledge relations.

Statement of Method

By means of the analysis of institutional and individual activities within the domains in question, the research aims to trace the manifestations of the mutual influences of the main above-mentioned components of power/knowledge relations. This is done by drawing on Foucault's

¹⁸ During the two periods, Tiflis played a strategic role in both political and military terms in the context of Russia's Persian policy. Georgian archives contain a significant number of valuable documents on the issue, including the safekeeping of Konstantin Smirnov's collection at GNCM.

¹⁹ In this respect, the most recent significant work that can be named is Stephanie Cronin, ed., *Iranian–Russian Encounters: Empires and Revolutions since 1800* (London: Routledge, 2013), which contains insightful articles on the history of Russo-Iranian relations in multiple dimensions, namely from the political, military and economic to the two countries' mutual cultural perceptions of each other. Another is Elena Andreeva, *Russia and Iran in the Great Game: Travelogues and Orientalism* (New York: Routledge, 2007), which presents analysis of the travelogues, authored by all sorts of Russians who travelled to Persia during the nineteenth century, from the angle of Said's Orientalism.

theoretical postulations regarding notions such as society, truth, knowledge, the intellectual, discourse and others which are rather general in their essence. In order to receive more detailed answers on the technicalities of the interactions of the Foucauldian agents of power and among them, particularly, of intellectuals with state power, it is necessary to additionally employ the following more specific approach.

It is difficult to evaluate, let alone measure, the influence of intellectuals on actions of state power, in general, and on foreign policy, in particular. There is an abundance of works concerned with state control over scholarship and, especially, with the influence of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on scholarly knowledge and intellectuals.²⁰ Though it is hardly possible to overestimate this influence, more recently some researchers, such as Robert Dahl, Dean Schooler, William Gamson and Jeffrey Roberg, have argued that most of the older scholarship tended to view this influence as being unidirectional, whereas according to them it should be viewed as, at least, bi-directional or indeed multi-directional, involving not only the relationship between scientific/scholarly knowledge and state power but also between intellectuals themselves, knowledge, social institutions and the society in which all of them operate.²¹ Examining and questioning two earlier attempts that had been made at identifying and measuring this influence,²² Jeffrey Roberg proposed his own approach.²³ He advocates a synthesis of these earlier approaches, concluding:

influence can be gauged by distinguishing among presence, attempt, and outcome. By dividing influence in this manner, we must seek to answer three questions: First, does the potential influencer have access to the

²⁰ In this sense, the following work, for instance, could be pointed out as the most representative: Stephen F. Cohen, *Rethinking the Soviet Experience: Politics and History since 1917* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

²¹ Jeffrey L. Roberg, *Soviet Science under Control: The Struggle for Influence* (London: Macmillan, 1998): ix, 1–17. See also Krementsov, *Stalinist Science*, 3–4; Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain*, 2–9, 14, 21–3; Slezkine, *Arctic Mirrors*, 388–95, 221–64.

²² As Roberg classifies them, the first is *outcome-dependent* and is associated with Robert Dahl's work, while the second is *process-oriented* and was initially offered by Dean Schooler.

²³ See Roberg, *Soviet Science*, 5–9.

decision-making arena, that is, can he/she be present to put forward policy options? Second, if the influencer gained access, what did he/she do while in the decision-making arena? And third, what was the actual outcome, that is, did the actor achieve the outcome that he/she wanted, or at least modify the outcome?²⁴

Thus, according to Roberg, the response to all these questions will give a complex vision of how this influence has emerged. At this stage, the analysis should be completed by exploring the personal characteristics required by an actor in acquiring this influence.²⁵

While I intend to partly draw on this approach too, it must be pointed out that it pays attention mainly to the practical or even physical access of the actors to the decision-making arena. It underestimates the intentional and unintentional, indirect influence of intellectuals and their communities whose scholarly and professional activities influenced decision-makers and those very actors, through both generating the relative discourses (in the case of academic scholars) and through operating at a level that affected the very execution of policies (in the case of experts). Therefore, in order to make up for that, the above-mentioned approach will be enriched by studying various manifestations of the influence being exerted by scholars and state experts in the field of the foreign policy of late Imperial and early Soviet Russia towards Iran. This, of course, should be done cautiously since it is important to recognise that these kinds of influence have often tended to be exaggerated by other intellectuals.

In so doing, the research will draw on the personal archival files of scholars and experts, as well as on their public (published) or official written record, i.e. books, articles, reports, memos, notes, etc. This will be supplemented by analysis of the institutional activities of the Orientalological structures in which they were involved. The necessary data will be obtained from the relevant Russian- and English-language secondary sources but mostly from archival documents and the writings authored by the individuals in question. In addition, the study of inner Russian discourses which existed at the time and influenced contemporary activities within Persian studies will help identify whether this or that action was undertaken by an individual because of his

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 6–7.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 7.

susceptibility to a particular discourse or whether he was motivated mainly by personal/institutional interests, or by a combination of these influences. The analysis of the archival sources containing private diaries and correspondence, combined with the available scholarship on the issue, will secure the retrieval of the necessary answers.

At the same time, in order to provide an answer to my overarching question, namely to gauge the influence of academic Orientologists, as well as of scholarly trained experts, being practitioners working for political or military organs of the state, in the field of the Russian state's foreign policy towards Iran, my book will address the following eight sub-questions.

- 1 What were the institutional structures for the involvement (to differing degrees) of academically trained and scholarly active Iran experts, both ("pure") academics and experts directly employed by state organs (ministries, military, party apparatus, commercial entities), in the process of policy formulation, decision-making and conducting Russia's/the USSR's policy towards Iran?

The answer to the above-mentioned question will mainly be given in Chapters 2 and 3, which will deal with the history of the institutional organisation of Russian/Soviet Oriental studies, in particular Persian studies, or, as it was later called, Iranology. Besides an examination of the scholarly activities in this field, there will be a brief analysis of the historical context of Russo/Soviet–Iranian relations. The answer will also be supplemented by information retrieved from the biographies of the scholars and experts under study.

- 2 What was the nature of this involvement, e.g. written and/or verbal advice and consultancy (scholarly publications, memoranda, membership in committees, hearings, formal consultations, informal involvement through personal acquaintance with decision-makers, etc.), teaching/training/instructing of personnel, (secret) missions and expeditions, official postings as working on Iran for various state entities inside/outside Russia?

According to Roberg, asking these questions provides valuable data for defining the influence of scholars and experts on state policy and is very important for identifying the internal mechanisms of their interaction during both general periods under study.²⁶ The archival

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 15.

record will enable me to analyse the technicalities of the cooperation imposed by the state on these scholars and experts or chosen by them consciously or unwittingly. From there I will be able to deduce the patterns that were characteristic of each particular state power of the time (late Imperial Russia, the early Soviet state). This question will be dealt with mainly in Chapters 4 and 5.

- 3 In the case of policy advice on specific issues in Russo/Soviet–Iranian relations, what exactly was suggested by the experts and based on what grounds? What kind of personal impact, expressed in what forms (endorsement or criticism of past/current government policies, other forms), was there?

The personal archival files and the written works by the scholars and experts being studied will be examined in order to find the answer to this question. It is in this context that I will explore their participation in creating and developing professional discourses, as well as their personal views and the correspondence of these views with actual actions.

- 4 Is there congruence between the expert advice provided and the policies that were actually pursued in the end?
- 5 Is it possible to trace instances of direct impact of individual scholars and experts on the course of shaping and/or execution of policies? If so, how significant was it?

For its part, the received answer will logically lead us to the following question, namely:

- 6 How effectively did the state bring into play scholarly and expert knowledge, as a whole, and the expertise of individuals, in particular?
- 7 What motivated scholars and experts in their cooperation with the state? What was the character of their relationship with the state (smooth or conflict-ridden, etc.)?

The last five questions will be tackled throughout the whole book.

- 8 In relation to the above seven questions, what are the common features and specific differences of the three periods under consideration (1863–1917, 1917–21 and 1921–41)?

The answer to this question will comprise the statement of the distinctions and the common features of the two general periods under

study, late Imperial and early Soviet Russia – in other words, from the second half of the nineteenth century to 1941. This will be addressed in General Conclusions.

The above-mentioned time frame is mainly based upon events in the two countries' political history and Russia's activity in Iran. The first period comprises the establishment of the Asiatic Section of the General Staff in Russia and the Persian Cossack Brigade in Persia, the peak events of the Great Game and the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907, Russia's participation in cracking down on the Persian Constitutional movement, and Russia's assistance to the Persian central government to quell tribal separatist activities, fighting the German and Turkish influence and securing the Persian front during World War I. Then, in the course of and after the 1917 developments in Russia, comes a period of considerable unilateral changes in Russia's policy towards Persia, including "exporting revolution" and urging Persia to fully recognise the new Soviet state. The years after the conclusion of the 1921 Soviet–Iranian treaty can be characterised as a time of relatively mutually beneficial cooperation of the two states when Soviet Russia was trying to conduct its interests on the basis of the outward respect of Iran's territorial integrity and using mainly conventional diplomatic methods – a period that lasted until 1941, the year of the second Soviet military invasion of Iran. In further substantiation of the time frame, it should be noted that by the late 1930s all the individuals who were the main representatives of Persian studies within their domains, and are thus studied in this research, had died or, rather, predominantly had been executed by the state.

The book studies the involvement of scholars who were mostly engaged in professional academic activities on the one hand (including such prominent figures as Vasilii Barthold, Valentin Zhukovskii and Vladimir Gurko-Kriazhin), as well as that of experts who had received the relevant Orientological training but pursued careers in the state (or party) bureaucracy or in the military/intelligence on the other hand (including such individuals as Vladimir Kosagovskii, Konstantin Smirnov, Vladimir Minorsky, Andrei Snesev, Nikolai Bravin, Pavel Vvedenskii, Vladimir Osetrov (pseudonym Irandust), Sergei Pastukhov (pseudonym S. Iranskii) and Konstantin Chaikin). Documents on the activities of the above-mentioned individuals and of the institutions with which they had been involved were consulted from the eleven main Russian and Georgian archives.

This book consists of seven main parts, namely the Introduction, five chapters and Conclusions. The current section highlights the context in which the subject of the research is problematised, and the research rationale. It also presents the outline of the book and its research methodology. It does not include a conventional literature review since the secondary sources relevant to a particular chapter are analysed in that chapter. Some short sections of this book, in one way or another, were used by the author for articles published in peer-reviewed journals and edited volumes. Chapter 1 contains the theoretical framework and substantiates the employment of this framework for the study of the power/knowledge nexus in the Russian case and for Oriental studies therein. It draws on English-, Russian- and French-language scholarship on the issue. Chapter 2 explains why this monograph mainly deals with Persian studies, or Iranology, and contains analysis of its organisational set-up during the late Imperial period in the context of contemporary discourses. It also touches upon the activities of a broader number of the representatives of late Imperial Russia's Oriental studies than those earmarked for detailed case study in Chapters 4 and 5. Work similar to Chapter 2 is conducted in Chapter 3, but for the early Soviet period. It also analyses the continuities and shifts which took place over the 1917 watershed. Chapters 4 and 5 contain case studies of the individuals most representative of their Orientological domains during the late Imperial and early Soviet periods, respectively. Chapters 2, 3 and, particularly, 4 and 5, predominantly draw on archival sources, in addition to the relevant literature.