Conferences and Lecture Series

International Workshop on Xinjiang Historical Sources

Matsuzakaya Honten, Hakone, Japan, December 12-14, 2004

Reported by: **Jun Sugawara**, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo, Japan, sugawara@uighur.jp, **Yasushi Shinmen**, Chuo University, Tokyo, Japan, shinmen@tamacc.chuo-u.ac.jp, and **James A. Millward**, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., USA, millwarj@georgetown.edu

The goals of the International Workshop on Xinjiang Historical Sources, convened for two days in December 2004 at Hakone in Kanagawa Prefecture, Japan, and funded by the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), the Fukutake Science and Culture Foundation, and the Japan Society for Promotion of Science, were to create a basic environment from which to advance Xinjiang historical research through facilitating the sharing of information on the use of historical sources, and to promote discussion of new directions in Xinjiang history.

In a session dedicated to Turkic Historiography, Uyghur specialist Amanbek Djalilov [Jalilov] of Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences and Yasushi Shinmen of Chuo University (Tokyo) presented their research project involving the *Ilawa* [appendix] to Muhammad Sharif's Turkic translation of the *Tarikh-i Rashidi*. Djalilov has studied Xinjiang historical sources based on manuscripts held by the Institute of Oriental Studies, Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, and Shinmen has worked mainly on 19th-20th century Xinjiang history and Central Asian history, and is a responsible party of the Japan Association for Central Asia Studies (http://www.jacas.jp). The *Ilawa* brings the contents of *Tarikh-i Rashidi* up to Muhammad Sharif's own time in the 19th century. It sheds light on the historical circumstances of Kashgaria in the 17th-19th centuries, for which historical sources have been seriously lacking. Djalilov introduced an outline of the supplement as a historical source, and Shinmen discussed the activities of the Begs in the 18th-19th centuries based on this source.

Minoru Sawada of Toyama University, Japan, who is researching the activities of the Makhdumzadas in Eastern and Western "Turkistan," and who has conducted fieldwork in the Ferghana Valley, presented a comparative study of the 22 extant manuscript copies of an important 18th century historical source by Muhammad Sadiq Kashghari, the *Tazkira-i khwajagan*. According to Sawada, by comparing the chapters on Khwaja Afaq, it is possible to determine that six manuscripts held by institutions in London, Paris, and St. Petersburg are the most reliable.

Timur Beisembiev of the Institute of the Oriental Studies in Kazakhstan helped illuminate the history of Central Asia in the 18th-19th centuries through his work on the Persian chronicles of the Khoqand [Kokand, Qo'qon] Khanate and Chaghatay manuscripts, including his research of the *Tarikh-i Shahruhi*. Beisembiev argued that despite their significant value for the study of 19th century Xinjiang, the Khoqand chronicles are seldom used. He then introduced material relevant to Xinjiang history contained in the *Tufhat at-tavarikh-i khani*, a chronicle in Persian by Mulla Awaz Muhammad Attar. This source is rich in information on the incidents of the early to mid-19th century — from the invasion of Kashgaria by the Makhdumzadas to the early activities of Yaqub Beg — a period that has so far lacked historical sources in local languages.

Jun Sugawara from Aoyama Gakuin University of Japan gave a presentation on the qadi documents he has collected in Kashgar. He discussed the sales of old documents, such as Islamic court documents, on today's Xinjiang antiques market, and evaluated their scale, classification, and value as historical sources. Sugawara is involved in the development of the Interactive Database of Xinjiang Historical Sources (Chaghatay manuscripts and publications) within the research activities of the Online Resources for Inner Asian Studies (ORIAS) project, a subproject of

ILCAA and Grammatological Informatics based on Corpora of Asian Scripts (GICAS) in Japan (http://www.gicas.jp/orias/).

Hodong Kim of Seoul National University in Korea, provided detailed explanatory notes on seven 17th century Moghulistan Khanate era edicts. Next was Thierry Zarcone of Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) of Paris, a researcher on Sufism in Central Asia whose methodology combines fieldwork with textual studies. Zarcone drew upon the testimonies of Sufis belonging to extant branches of the Naqshbandiyya, Khafiyya (Thaqibiyya) and Jahriyya (Qadiriyya) in Xinjiang, and introduced the family lineages (*silsilanama*), certificates (*ijazatnama*), and manuals still kept by them to this day, to examine the lineal positions of modern Sufis in Xinjiang. Takahiro Onuma of Tsukuba University, Japan, who conducts research on border regional administrative issues of the 18th-19th century Qing Dynasty, analyzed a set of administrative documents in Chaghatay Turkic and Manchu. The documents, drafted in 1801 by the Kashgar Hakim Beg and addressed to the *Canzan Dachen* [Qing Grand Councilor in charge of Manchu Military Affairs] of the same region, reveal a cross section of administration and the social and economic conditions of contemporary Kashghar.

A session devoted to "Qing Dynasty Documents" began with a presentation by Nicola Di Cosmo of the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies, a researcher in Manchu and Mongol studies. Di Cosmo's paper outlined prior use of the voluminous Manchu sources for Xinjiang studies, and examined the direction that Xinjiang historical studies should take, touching on technical and methodological issues. Li Hua of Osaka University of Economic and Law in Japan, concentrated on the social and economic history of the Chinese northwest in the Qing Dynasty based on Chinese and Manchu sources. Her paper focused on new information regarding Hui migrants in Xinjiang included in the *Manwen Lufu*. These materials include case studies of jade stone smuggling, crime and other problems, and also detailed indication of trends in Islamic *Xinjiao* [new teachings] which rose in popularity from the 18th century.

Laura Newby of Oxford University in England, a scholar researching Xinjiang administrative history and diplomacy towards Khoqand, presented a general introduction to the study of Qing Dynasty Manchu sources and consideration of their value to Xinjiang and Qing studies. Following a detailed overview of the holdings of China's First Historical Archives concerning Xinjiang, she explored the concrete case of negotiations between the Qing and Khoqand. Professor Sunao Hori of Konan University, Japan, has long been at the forefront of Xinjiang social and economic studies in Japan. His paper concerned his lifework on the Yarkand oases under Qing administration, based mainly on the *Ohki Document*. He reviewed the data and theories concerning Yarkand administrative structure, irrigation, local society, and expansion of oases. He had mobilized new resources, including satellite imagery, in this work.

The final session of the Workshop, "Field Research and Xinjiang History," consisted of presentations on Xinjiang historical research using methodologies somewhat different from traditional textually-based studies. These include memoirs, oral history, and ethnographic fieldwork. Ablet Kamalov of the Institute of Oriental Studies in Kazakhstan, an ethnic Uyghur who has studied in Tashkent and St. Petersburg, has been actively conducting research in the US, Central Asia and Europe. He introduced several memoirs by Uyghurs living in former Soviet territories, which were finally made public after the collapse of the USSR. He discussed how these memoirs help resolve historical issues concerning the Eastern Turkistan Republic of 1944-49.

Ildikó Beller-Hann, a Hungarian anthropologist trained in Britain and now working at Martin Luther University in Germany with extensive field experience in Xinjiang, presented a paper that began with a definition of historical anthropology. She subsequently examined the value of such sources that she herself terms "unusual," including ethnographic articles written for a Swedish missionary by an early 20th century Uyghur, travelers' memoirs and fieldwork interviews. As a concrete example of the use of these sources, Beller-Hann examined the status of social welfare in pre-People's Republic of China (PRC) Xinjiang local society and social shifts before and after the onset of PRC rule.

James A. Millward, a specialist in Qing Dynasty border regions from Georgetown University, considered the potential for an environmental history of Xinjiang. Millward sees environmental factors such as long-term climate change, water-use, wind patterns, and deforestation, as a neglected area in Xinjiang historical studies. In addition to suggesting ways to tease environmental

information from existing textual sources, Millward proposes that data from such technical methodologies as mitochrondrial DNA analysis, paleopollen analysis, glaciology and remote sensing of land forms can enhance understanding of the region's history. As a concrete example, he showed how the Han, Tang and Qing epochs of most intense Chinese involvement and *tuntian* [frontier military-agricultural colony] in Xinjiang corresponded to eras that were relatively cool and wet periods in Xinjiang history, when run-off water supplies were more ample than at other times.

This Workshop demonstrated that historical sources for 18th-20th century Xinjiang are remarkably varied, a fact rooted in the unique characteristics of Xinjiang history — although the Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims are the main groups populating the area, they have been administered by the Qing Dynasty, the Republic of China (ROC), and the PRC with continued major influence from adjacent Central Asian states, Russia, and the Soviet Union. As research on Xinjiang continues, scholars must collectively, if not individually, strive to master the rich historical sources now scattered throughout the world. In that sense, this Workshop was an opportunity not only to present individual research, but to consider ways to coordinate research efforts in the future. The Workshop was a significant milestone, given that there has seldom, if ever, been such an opportunity to exchange Xinjiang historical information on such an international level. The organizers, Tatsuo Nakami of ILCAA, James A. Millward, Yasushi Shinmen, and Jun Sugawara, look forward to preparing an English language volume of the revised Workshop papers in the near future.

The International Workshop on Privatization, Liberalization and the Emergence of Private Farms in Former Soviet Countries

Tbilisi, Republic of Georgia, June 21-22, 2005

Reported by: **Ayal Kimhi**, Associate Professor, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel, kimhi@agri.huji.ac.il

The purpose of this US Agency for International Development (USAID)-funded workshop was to promote discussion on the process of land reform and other rural development policies in the Republic of Georgia and its neighboring countries. After the meltdown of the USSR and Georgian independence in 1991, the agricultural sector in nearly all of the former Soviet republics, including Georgia, underwent a severe crisis, which resulted in the destruction of the productive ability of collective and state farms. A process of land individualization (both privatization and leasing) has since then been in effect in the universe of post-communist states. However, the process in Georgia and many of the other southern tier transitional states of the former USSR has been relatively slow, and various institutional factors have imposed considerable limitations on the functioning of the land market.

The first part of the workshop dealt with the results of the particular research project on the topic in Georgia, while the second part included presentations dealing with similar issues in neighboring transitional states. The workshop was well attended by local academics, legislators, and administrators. The first part started with the presentation by Joseph Gogodze of Conjuncture Research Center (CRC) in Tiblisi on the results of a survey conducted in 2003, with the aim of examining the situation of individual farms in Georgia in comparison to results of an earlier survey conducted in 1996. The basic issues investigated were the progress of the land individualization process, and its consequences for the development of the agricultural sector in Georgia, and more generally for the well-being of farm families and rural poverty in that country. The survey found significant changes in the farm sector since 1996. In particular, average landholdings have increased considerably, from 0.9 hectares in 1996 to 1.6 hectares in 2003 (78 percent rise), mainly through leasing of land plots. Gogodze are reported that there has been more specialization, with some farmers not producing at all and others expanding. It was also found that profits and income have deteriorated markedly, and many producers no longer sell their produce on the market. Those producers who leased land were much more likely to sell their produce on the market and they also had higher incomes and relied less on off-farm income and social assistance

payments. Still, fewer than 15% of the farmers lease land. Furthermore, the survey found that while the average age of the rural population has increased, the level of schooling has declined. This indicates a possible "brain drain" process of selective out-migration. Another worrying implication related to lowering incomes, according to Gogodze, is the increase in the incidence of child labor. The presentation concluded by indicating the potential for increased volume of land transactions, and a continued specialization process that should enable successful farmers to acquire more land for improving the economic well-being of their families even in a period of depressed produce prices.

The next three presentations dealt with empirical analyses of the potential impact of land reform on farm and on off-farm incomes. Ayal Kimhi of The Hebrew University presented an analysis of cropland allocation decisions, input allocation decisions and crop yields. The results implied that changes in Georgian agriculture, and in particular land reform, have potential implications to both cropland allocation and crop yields. For example, a farm that increases its cropland will likely increase the fraction allocated to wheat, hence wheat cultivation will likely increase. However, the increased cultivation of wheat will lead to a lower yield due to an inverse relationship between size and productivity in its cultivation. Given that average cropland (in the sample population of the study) did not change between 1996 and 2003 (roughly 0.7 hectares), the reason for the emergence of the inverse relationship could be due to other factors that became unfavorable to agriculture over the years. This indicates that, as has been found elsewhere, land reform is a necessary but definitely not a sufficient condition for agricultural development. These results, according Kimhi, point to several potential avenues for further investigation. One is the increase in land fragmentation. Another is the aging of the farm population. Third, the availability of infrastructure services such as water, electricity and roads could be increasingly critical factors of agricultural productivity. Finally, in the long run, farmers' education could be a key factor for agricultural development in Georgia.

Next, Ofir Hoyman of Hebrew University of Jerusalem presented an analysis of the labor allocation decisions of farmers in Georgia and their sensitivity to the progress of land reform. The results indicated that the off-farm labor market is not functioning optimally. Physical strength seems to be more rewarding than human capital, wages in part-time off-farm work surpass the wages in full-time jobs, and the opportunities for female members of the farm-household are much lower than those for males. The results also indicate that the off-farm labor decisions are sensitive to the situation in the land market. Possession of a land document decreases off-farm labor participation, indicating that a land document increases farmers' confidence in their ability to make a living through farming and therefore reduces their tendency to seek alternative income sources. The quality of land also has a negative effect on the probability of working off the farm, and the same is true for the index of farming efficiency. Another of Hoyman's findings was that off-farm income serves as a self-insurance mechanism against farm income risk.

Later, Giorgi Kalakashvili of CRC Ltd., dealt with the effect of off-farm income on rural income inequality in Georgia. Kalakashvili found that off-farm income is inequality-decreasing and adding it to farm income makes total income more equal across households. Less than half of farm families in Georgia have off-farm income. It is likely that an increase in off-farm income will decrease overall household income inequality. In the second part of the workshop, Astghik Mirzakhanyan of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP-Armenia) talked about rural poverty in Armenia. The rural population according to Mirzakhanyan fared better than the urban population in the first years after liberalization. Since then, urban poverty gradually has decreased while rural poverty has remained roughly the same. Economic growth simply has slipped by Armenia's rural families. As a response, the Armenian government has announced a new five-year program to support the agricultural sector. The program aims to address two important obstacles for agricultural development: irrigation and rural roads.

Next, Victor Moroz (UNDP-Moldova) spoke about the grim situation in Moldova's agriculture, which has suffered significant drops in productivity and yields since the early 1990s. This is in part a result of the restructuring of agriculture that is still underway. Rural poverty has become a serious problem. To remedy the situation, Moroz advocated a combination of continued development of the agri-food sector, strengthening rural institutions, and creating off-farm employment opportunities. In the longer run, attention should also be given to increased competitiveness of Moldovan farmers in international markets. This requires investments in information systems and in human resources, and

improvements of institutional conditions. On a similar note, Alexandru Stratan of the State Agricultural University in Moldova presented a perspective on the situation of Moldovan agriculture following land reform. He emphasized the lack of financial resources that are necessary for the catching up of farmers under the new configuration agricultural sector in Moldova.

Finally, Andrey Nedoborovskyy of the Institute of Agricultural Development in Central and Eastern Europe (IAMO, Halle, Germany) talked about the challenges facing individual household agricultural plots in the Ukraine. Occupying just 13 percent of Ukraine's agricultural land, household plots produced almost 60 percent of the country's gross agricultural output in 2003. This seems to have been due to their ability to obtain inputs from neighboring large enterprises at no cost or at very low prices. The ability of household agricultural plots to function independently and grow, according to Nedoborovskyy, will depend on the development of infrastructure such as markets for inputs, output and credit.

Overall, the workshop served its goal of discussing issues of mutual concern to many transitional states. If anything, it confirmed that despite the slow pace of land reform, the experience of progress in land reform, that has yet to be fully accompanied by necessary market and infrastructure developments, seems to be fairly universal among the states of the former Soviet Union. Both organizers and participants of the Workshop have hoped that this academic gathering will help to put these issues high on the agenda of local policy makers and international organizations.

2005 Middle East and Central Asia Politics, Economics, and Society Conference

University of Utah, Salt Lake City, USA, September 8-10, 2005

Reported by: **Jennifer Taynen**, Asian Institute, Munk Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, jennifer.taynen@utoronto.ca

Academics, government employees, NGO workers, and interested members of the public, converged on the University of Utah in Salt Lake City during September 8-10 for the "2005 Middle East and Central Asia (MECA) Politics Society and Economics Conference." For the three years that it has run, the mandate of this event has been to promote research and dialogue on a wide array of topics related to the two great regions of the Middle East and Central Asia. The theme for this year's proceedings was "Authoritarianism and Democracy in the Age of Globalization," which, as was demonstrated by the diversity of the scheduled program, proved an applicable jumping-off point for a plethora of subjects related to regional studies in the respective areas. The breadth of topics covered in the 35 panels and as many as 120 individual presentations echoed the diversity of the participants themselves, who came from a dozen countries, as well as institutions across the United States.

Concurrent with the MECA Conference was the "US-Iran Relations Conference: Regional and Global Dynamics," originally slated for Ankara, Turkey, in May 2005, but which was merged with the MECA Conference. A noteworthy event was the 13th Annual Reza Ali Khazeni Memorial Lecture in Iranian Studies (held annually at the University of Utah), which was delivered by Prof. Ehsan Yarshater, director of the Center for Iranian Studies at Columbia University and editor of the *Encyclopedia Iranica*. Yarshater, considered an intellectual icon in Iranian studies, gave a succinct and moving lecture on the "Persian Phase of Islamic Civilization."

Prof. Stephen Zunes of the University of San Francisco and Middle East editor for *Foreign Policy in Focus* (http://www.fpif.org) was the speaker for a plenary session. Using the specific example of the ongoing Iranian case, Zunes dissected the goals and current state of US foreign policy related to nuclear non-proliferation. Zunes, who is the author of *Tinderbox: US Middle East Policy and the Roots of Terrorism*, criticized the "alarmist rhetoric" of the US on Iran's nuclear program, calling such communications "one-sided" and misleading to the American public. He noted, among other things, that

despite Iran's attempt to build a nuclear program, it has, along with Syria, Jordan and Egypt, for years called for a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. Zunes advocated "a law-based, region-wide program of [nuclear] disarmament."

Another plenary speaker was Prof. William O. Beeman of Brown University, author of *The "Great Satan" and the "Mad Mullahs": How the US and Iran Demonize Each Other.* Beeman laid out an impressive anthropological analysis — an often overlooked perspective on political conflict — of the roots of US-Iran relations. Among other noteworthy points, Beeman expressed his belief that the conflict between US and Iran cannot be understood without delving into the Persian cultural nuances of *qahr* [enmity and disengagement] and *aashti* [reconciliation], of which success in the latter (in Iranian and most Middle Eastern cultures) often requires mediation by a third party.

A third plenary event was a panel discussion on "Authoritarianism and Democracy in the Middle East and Central Asia," with panelists Profs. Zunes and Beeman, in addition to Dr. Shireen Hunter of Georgetown's Center of Muslim-Christian Understanding. This panel was chaired by Prof. Mohiaddin Mesbahi of Florida International University. Discussion by the panelists on the theme was rather broad, with nearly all choosing to delve into the various causes and effects of US foreign policy on the two respective regions. Mesbahi, for example, emphasized that Washington's foreign policy towards the two regions has been multidimensional with a variety of overarching approaches (Hobbesian, Kantian and Lockean) coming into play depending on the issue, time, and crisis at hand.

Among the noteworthy panel presentations was one by Mrinalini Menon of the University of British Columbia who presented a paper titled "Problems and Prospects for Chinese Perceptions of Security Multilateralism in Central Asia: The Role of the SCO (Shanghai Cooperation Organization) in the New 'Great Game.'" This paper, part of Menon's graduate thesis, proved an original examination of the SCO's significance, both to China's international security objectives, and as a gauge by which the international community can assess Beijing's perceptions of internal and external threats. Menon was particularly interested in China's choosing to pursue multilateral agreements like the SCO over a series of bilateral agreements. She examined the multilateral dynamics of the SCO, but also stressed the political, economic and military dominance of China within this group. Finally, she put forward some possible reasons for China's choosing this strategy for regional hegemony, and what some of the regional and global implications of this choice might be.

Payam Foroughi of the University the Utah presented a paper titled "'White Gold' or Women's Grief? Gendered Cotton and Disparity in Central Asia: Solutions for Tajikistan." This paper was the result of short-term field work for an international NGO (Oxfam Great Britain) with projects in rural Tajikistan. Foroughi examined the way in which agriculture (and more specifically, cotton production) has become the domain of women, as the majority of working-age men have left rural areas of Tajikistan in search of better employment opportunities in other CIS countries, mostly Russia. The paper looked at the social, economic and political implications that this demographic shift, along with monopolistic policies and forced cotton production, has on Tajik agrarian society. Through focus groups and interviews with local women, Foroughi identified concrete ways in which this vulnerable group could be empowered. Despite the poignant nature of the subject matter, Foroughi ended his presentation on a positive note, by listing a series of concrete suggestions for improving the conditions of the mostly rural female cotton workers of Tajikistan and their households.

Prof. Elizabeth S. Hurd of Northwestern University gave an informative presentation titled "The United States, Iran and the Politics of Secularism in International Relations." Hurd suggested that traditional Western government and academia emphasize the significance of religion in states where political and religious institutions are intertwined, but fail to give due consideration to the impact of secularism on democratic Western societies. She argued that secularism, far from being a point of neutrality from which to assess religious states, is powerfully ingrained in the Western psyche and creates as binding a frame of reference as that found in religious states. To illustrate her argument, Hurd used the case of relations between the US and Iran, challenging the idea that secularism is without a proselytizing agenda, and cited the US and the Western world's assumption of its own neutrality as having been a fundamental component in exacerbating political tension between the US and Iran.

Those interested in learning more about this year's conference program, or who have inquiries concerning the 2006 conference, are encouraged to refer to the conference website at http://www.utah.edu/meca.

References

Beeman, William O.
2005 *The "Great Satan" and the "Mad Mullahs": How the US and Iran Demonize Each Other.* Westport, Conn.: Praeger.

Zunes, Stephen
2003 *Tinderbox: US Middle East Policy and the Roots of Terrorism.* Monroe, Me.: Common Courage Press.

Post-Soviet Islam: An Anthropological Perspective

Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle, Germany, June 29 - 30, 2005

Reported by: **Krisztina Kehl-Bodrogi**, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle, Germany, kehl@eth.mpg.de

The goal of this conference was to bring together local and foreign anthropologists and other social scientists working on issues relating to Islam in the former Soviet Union. The organisers, Krisztina Kehl-Bodrogi and Johan Rasanayagam, both of Max Planck Institute (MPI) for Social Anthropology, are themselves conducting research on Islam in contemporary Uzbekistan within the framework of the group "Religion and Civil Society in post-Soviet Eurasia," which was established at the Institute in 2001. The aim of the event was to discuss questions frequently addressed in internal seminars in the wider framework of a conference in order to compare differing experiences as well as to explore possible commonalities of post-Soviet context. Fourteen scholars working in Denmark, England, Germany, Poland, Russia, USA, and Uzbekistan were invited to participate in the conference, which was funded by the Max Planck Institute. To facilitate discussions, papers were circulated in advance to the participants.

One section of the presentations dealt with the relationship between state and religion from an anthropological point of view. Among other noteworthy presentations, Johan Rasanayagam of MPI drew on recent fieldwork to discuss the effects of state power on every-day religious practice and the processes of defining Muslim orthodoxy in independent Uzbekistan. His paper was complemented well by the presentation of Nazif Shahrani of Indiana University who focused on the efforts of a group of reformist *ulama* to reclaim Islamic beliefs and practices, and the Uzbek government's violent reactions to the group's activities. Both papers pointed to continuities between the Soviet and the new Uzbek state's policy towards Islam and Islamism. Paying particular attention to the ongoing conflict with Russia, Anna Zelkina of the School of African and Oriential Studies (SOAS), University of London, discussed the role of Islam in the social and political life in Chechnya.

Edmund Waite of the Institute of Education, University of London, addressed the challenge posed to local religious practices such as shrine visitations, memorial festivals and the like, by the rise of reformist Islamic ideologies among Uyghurs in Xinjiang, China. Addressing the question of orthodoxy, Waite's paper offered a good basis for comparison with Rasanayagam's findings in Uzbekistan and contrasted well with the research of Saulesh Yessenova of the University of British Columbia, Canada, who discussed burial practices and shrine visitations as part of the ethnic and Islamic identities among the Kazakhs. Two further presentations addressed shrines and shrine pilgrimage in Uzbekistan from different points of view. Focusing on a particular shrine in the province of Khorezm (Xorazm), for example, Krisztina Kehl-Bodrogi (MPI) showed how a holy site reflects overall social, political, and religious factors characteristic of the greater society. And on the basis of field data from Samarqand, Maria Louw of the Aarhus University, Denmark, investigated the meaning of sacred places from the viewpoint of the individuals engaged in them.

Focusing on post-Soviet changes in wedding rituals, particularly the institution of the "wedding speaker" as a religious figure, Julie McBrien (MPI) addressed processes of reinterpretations of religion and identity among Uzbeks in Kyrgyzstan. Her paper contrasted well with the presentation of Pawel Jessa of Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland, which dealt with a new religious movement in Kazakhstan, aiming at the "spiritual purification" of Kazakh society. Gusel Sabirova of the Institute of Sociology, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, analysed biographical narratives as a means of identity construction for Tatar women visiting Quranic courses in Moscow. Her paper was a good supplement to the presentation by Deniz Kandiyoti (SOAS) who, on the basis of field data from Uzbekistan and Afghanistan, gave a more macro-level analysis of Islam and the politics of gender. Focusing on female religious authorities (*bibi-khalife, otin-oyi*), Habiba Fathi of the French Institute for Central Asia Studies (IFEAC) in Tashkent discussed the religious life of Muslim women in several Central Asian societies. Also, Amir Navruzov of the Institute of History and Ethnography in Daghestan discussed the influence of transnational Islamic networks on institutions of higher Islamic education in Daghestan. And Shamil Shikhaliev also of the Institute of History and Ethnography, Daghestan, explored the peculiarities of Sufi rituals in the northeastern Caucasus and argued that Sufism plays an important role in shaping Muslim identity in contemporary Daghestan.

The conference proved a highly favourable environment for bringing together anthropologists and social scientists who specialize in Islamic issues in contemporary Central Asia and the Caucasus. Discussing a wide range of topics in the course of two days, the participants were able to elaborate many similarities in the current developments in the field of post-communist Islamic studies. While many developments are clearly a heritage of the common Soviet past, Islam in the successor states of the former Soviet Union is exposed to global influences as well. As Richard Tapper of SOAS pointed out in his concluding remarks, it will be promising for future projects to relate Islam in this part of the world with processes going on elsewhere in Muslim societies.

The VIIth Congress of the International Council for Central and East European Studies

Berlin, Germany, July 25-30, 2005

Reported by: **Sebastian Peyrouse**, French Institute for Central Asia Studies (IFEAC), Tashkent, Uzbekistan, sebpeyrouse@yahoo.com

On July 25-30, 2005 in Berlin the VIIth Congress of the International Council for Central and East European Studies (ICCEES) was held. This international scholarly association was founded in 1974 as the first international and multidisciplinary conference of scholars working in this field, which covers the areas from Eastern Europe to Russia and Central Asia. The VIIth Congress was organized by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Osteuropakunde under the direction of Professor Thomas Bremer (Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität in Münster). The congress of this association, which is held every five years, included about twenty papers on Central Asia. Among the researchers presenting on Central Asia, most were from Europe and the former Soviet Union, and some were from the United States.

Three panels were organized on the history of Central Asia. The first one was dedicated to N. Il'minskii. Two papers were presented, one by Isabelle Kreindler (University of Haifa, Israel) about Il'minskii's system and its impact on the Kriashen, the Chuvash and the Kazakhs, and the second one by Robert Geraci (University of Virginia, USA) about Il'minskii's influence on Russian-Muslim relations. The second panel on history grouped Adeeb Khalid (Carleton College, USA), with a paper entitled "The Territorialization of Bukhara, from the Origins to Uzbekistan," Stephane Dudoignon (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, France) on the dialectics of "Watan" among the Muslims of Russia at the eve of the WWI, and Christian Noack (Universität Bielefeld, Germany), working on the

spatial dimension of Muslim identity in late imperial Russia.

The third panel was about relations between Russia and Kazakhstan in the 19th century, with Steven Sabol (University of North Carolina, USA) on the Kenysary Kasymov revolt and Russian expansion into the Kazakh Steppe (1837-1847), Beate Eschment (Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Germany) about the Russian image of the Kazakhs in the 18th-19th century, and Sebastien Peyrouse (French Institute for Central Asia Studies, Tashkent, Uzbekistan) about the Orthodox Church mission in the Kazakh Steppe (1881-1917). Alexander Morrison (All Souls College, Oxford University) dealt with the central question of imperial history, the search for narrative collaborators by the conquering power, and the consequent re-creation of local elites. Nikolay Goroshkov (Voronezh State University, Russia) presented a paper on Jadidism and the influence of Ismail Gasprinskii's thinking on the Tatars during the 20th century.

The second main topic concerning Central Asia was the geopolitical situation, the Russian and international presence in the area. Viatcheslav Amirov (Academy of Sciences, Moscow) presented a paper about the new Russian economic and energy policy in Central Asia. Russian energy issues in Central Asia were also treated by Pavel K. Baev (International Peace Research Institute, Oslo, Norway), focusing on the two energy resources republics, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan. A third paper, presented by Lena Jonson (Swedish Institute of International Affairs, Stockholm, Sweden) analyzed recent shifts in Russia's policy towards Tajikistan and the implications for Russia's relations with Afghanistan. Roger E. Kanet (University of Miami, Coral Gables, USA) discussed the US challenge to Russian influence in Central Asia and the Caucasus and Neil MacFarlane (Oxford University, United Kingdom) focused on the interaction between international community objectives and Russian interests in Central Asia.

A third topic was linked to the issue of the Central Asian state development. Irina Morozova (International Institute for Asian Studies, Leiden, Netherlands), dealt with the current concern of reevaluating Central Asia's development for the last fifteen years. Regine Spector (University of California, Berkeley) investigated the rise of informal trade networks in post-Soviet transition economies. Manuela Troschke and Andreas Zeitler (Institute of Eastern Europe, Munich, Germany) studied privatization and corporate governance in Central Asia through two cases, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan.

Issues of nation-building, especially in Kazakhstan, were the focus of a number of papers. Assel Rustemova (Kazakhstan Institute of Management, Economics and Strategic Research, Almaty, Kazakhstan) addressed the impact of the Kazakh polyarchic state building on the evolution of the national idea. Steven Sabol (University of North Carolina, USA) dealt with the ethnic issue in Kazakhstan and the Kazakhification of public life in the country. Gulnara Dadabaeva (Al Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan) studied the problems of formation of cultural identity in modern Kazakhstan and nationalism as a possible vehicle of resistance to global cultural trends. Natalia Poyasok (Marc Bloch University, Strasbourg, France) clarified how external political life influences Kyrgyz state policies regarding such issues as nationhood.

Finally, a group of papers addressed Central Asian societies. Swietlana Czervonnaja (Nicolaus Copernicus University, Torun, Poland) focused on the ethnic minorities issue and especially on Crimeans Tatars in Ukraine. Gulnara Kuzibaeva (Tashkent National University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan) dealt with the demographical changes in the post-Soviet Central Asia and their policy implications. Dina Wilkovsky (Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany) studied some aspects of the revival of Islam in Kazakhstan and their internal and external factors. Cynthia Werner (Texas A&M University, USA) proposed a very original analysis of memories and experiences of Kazakh villagers living near the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site.

The ICCEES Congress is a rare opportunity for scholars from Europe, the United States and the former Soviet Union, who specialize in Central Asia, to gather. The next Congress will be held in Stockholm in 2010.

Energy Program Asia Conferences: Challenges of Post-Soviet Transition in Kazakhstan; Security of Energy Supply in China, India, Japan, South Korea and the European Union: Possibilities and Impediments

International Institute for Asian Studies, Leiden, Netherlands (April 8, 2005); Clindendael Institute, Hague, Netherlands (May 20, 2005), and Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands (May 21, 2005)

Reported by: **Lisa Daniels**, Energy Program Asia, Leiden, Netherlands, lisa.daniels@gmail.com

Energy Program Asia (EPA) was initiated by its director, Mehdi Parvizi Amineh, in late 2004 at the International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS) in Leiden, Netherlands, in cooperation with the Clingendael International Energy Program (CIEP) of The Hague, Waseda University in Tokyo and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. EPA's research agenda is to study the effects of the global geopolitics of energy supply on the main energy consuming countries of East and Southeast Asia (China, India, Japan, and South Korea), examining regional and national strategies for securing energy supplies from the Persian Gulf (Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, United Arab Emirates and Kuwait) and the Caspian region (Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Iran and Russia). As part of a number of EPA conferences to be held in Europe and Asia, the Second and Third International Conferences of Energy Program Asia evaluated East and Southeast Asian energy supply security relative to the Caspian and Persian Gulf regions in the 21st century.

The Second International Conference of EPA, in cooperation with the Embassy of the Republic of Kazakhstan in Brussels, brought together policy-makers, journalists, academics and diplomats to address Kazakhstan's state of affairs, particularly in relation to its oil resources. Kazakhstan, one of Caspian's five littoral states, is the second largest state in the former Soviet Union and the largest among the newly formed Central Asian republics, in terms of land mass, and oil production and reserves. The conference focused on the following questions: What are the links between economic and political reform in Kazakhstan? How is it that in theory there is a direct connection between market economy and democratization, while empirically this connection is much more tenuous, varied and complex?

The first panel, chaired by CIEP Director, Coby van der Linde, began with Kazakhstan's Director of the Department of Nuclear Energy and External Relations of the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, Almaz Tulebayev, who addressed priorities and basic perspectives of Kazakhstan's energy complex. Then, Xiaoning Wang of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) debated issues of energy supply security in China and Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan's Deputy Minister of Industry and Trade, Zhanar Aitzhanova, discussed the competitiveness of Kazakhstan's economy and its relation to the global market. The theoretical issues dealt with by this panel related to the correlation between successful development and political and economic reforms in Kazakhstan in a world of interconnected global markets, with a primary focus on the role of Kazakhstan's oil and gas resources.

The second panel, chaired by Amineh, opened with Alexey Volkov, Kazakhstan's Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, who discussed modern foreign policy challenges facing Kazakhstan and strategic partnerships. He spoke of macroeconomic reforms and moves toward political and economic liberalization, as well as the importance for Kazakhstan to meet European Union (EU) development standards to achieve its goal of integration into EU markets and association with the wider EU project. Anthony van der Togt of Netherland's Ministry of Foreign Affairs then addressed Dutch and EU policy priorities regarding Kazakhstan, including support for its political and economic transition, WTO (World Trade Organization) membership and dialogues regarding equitable distribution of income generated by energy resources. Gideon Shimshon of Webster University closed the panel with a discussion of political impediments to democratization in Kazakhstan, including governmental corruption, and lack of accountability and systemic trust. The conference concluded with a round table discussion of the challenges of economic reform and political democratization in contemporary Kazakhstan, chaired by Gerd Junne of the University of Amsterdam. This discussion connected many of the

preceding issues, beginning with the "consecutive realization of democratic reforms" presented by Yermukhamet Yertysbayev, Political Advisor to the President of Kazakhstan. Yertysbayev spoke to many transitional issues facing Kazakhstan such as pluralism, civil society, and threats to democratization. Finally, Mirzohid Rahimov, IIAS Visiting Research Fellow, presented similarities and differences among transition challenges in Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan.

One month later, the Third International Conference of the EPA, in cooperation with CIEP, assembled academics and diplomats to debate potential development of a shared perspective on geopolitical, economic and energy related issues in East and Southeast Asia. The conference primarily addressed the following questions: will rivalry between the main Asian energy consumer countries — China, Japan, India and South Korea — as well as the EU and US, over Persian Gulf and Caspian energy production become an obstacle to energy supply security? What are the strategic scenarios of these countries to secure projected energy supplies? How can producer-consumer dialogues and regional cooperation mitigate internal security risks?

Following an introduction by Wilbur Perlot, CIEP, the first day of the conference examined the central themes from a global and Asian outlook. The first session, chaired by EPA Director Amineh, commenced with Reinaldo Figueredo, Director of the United Nations Global Programme on Globalization, Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development. Figueredo's discussion focused on international developments regarding globalization and geopolitics. Of particular importance was his assertion that energy security is not simply an issue of efficient and uninterrupted supply sources, but also how energy is encompassed as an engine of growth through energy services. CIEP Director van der Linde then extended the geopolitical discussion into the realm of energy supply security, expanded upon by Henk Houweling of the University of Amsterdam, who spoke to post-Cold War geopolitics and security. The second session, chaired by Stanislav Zhiznin of Russia's Department of Economic Cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, included a discussion of market-oriented reforms in China's energy industry, as well as a discussion of Japan's energy supply security in the geopolitical context — respectively presented by Shi Dan, Director of Beijing's Energy Economic Research Center, and Yu Shibutani, Director of Energy Geopolitics, Ltd., Japan. The main arguments of these sessions focused on various ways in which energy policies and industries in primary Asian consumer countries, given current geopolitical realities, can be adapted in favor of supply security.

Day two of the conference further examined Asian energy supply security and geopolitics. The opening session, chaired by Energy Geopolitics Director Shibutani, began with Kurt Radtke of Waseda University's Institute for Asia and Pacific Studies (IAPS) who spoke of East Asian "dreams of great power" and energy security. Frank Umbach of the German Council on Foreign Relations then presented several geopolitical challenges and implications of Chinese, Indian, Japanese and South Korean energy dependence on the Caspian and Persian Gulf regions. Jung-Hoon Lee of IAPS discussed Korea's energy supply security, followed by analysis of China's growing economy and energy consumption, presented by OPCW Director Wang. The session's final speaker, Wang Limao of Beijing's Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, further debated considerations for China's long-term oil security. Overall, the speakers in this session dealt primarily with the development and implementation of global strategies when facing non-traditional security issues, such as energy supply. In general, the session concluded that more open and diversified supply systems provide greater security and increased cooperation in the region will greatly contribute to its stabilization and common prosperity.

The second session, chaired by Figueredo, addressed consumer relations with producing countries. Michal Meidan of the French Institute of International Relations opened with a discussion of China's energy supply security relative to Middle Eastern resources, followed by Hama Katsuhiko of Tokyo's Soka University who analyzed China's economic and energy policies toward Central Asia and Russia. Katsuhiko discussed the internationalization of China's energy strategy which began in 1994 through the 2004 construction of oil and gas pipelines from Kazakhstan. CIEP's Femke Hoogeveen then discussed the EU's relations with Middle Eastern producer countries. The final session, chaired by Radtke of IAPS, brought together each of the conference's main themes. Fraser Cameron of the European Policy Centre spoke of Asian geopolitics and the place of Europe, followed by questions and answers led by CIEP's Perlot and closing remarks by Amineh. To conclude, in an environment of serious geopolitical

competition for energy resources, the two primary producer regions — Persian Gulf and Caspian — could easily become further destabilized with increasing external pressures and intensification of conflicts over control of global oil and gas; the likelihood of which must be factored into energy supply security strategies of the major consumer countries of East and Southeast Asia.

The Second and Third International Conferences of Energy Program Asia were conducted as part of its overall and ongoing research project. In addition to the specific substantive input obtained from the conference contributors, these conferences also helped identify main points of interest and implications for the future direction of EPA's research. EPA currently has four more conferences planned and scheduled for the next two years: In January 2006, it will organize a conference in cooperation with CIEP in the Hague with the tentative title "Energy Security in the European Union and Central Eurasia," followed in June with a conference in cooperation with the Energy Economic Research Centre of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences to be held in Beijing: "The Global Cooperation on Energy Efficiency and its Impediments." EPA will also organize a November 2006 conference to be held in Almaty, Kazakhstan, in cooperation with the Kazakh Embassy in Brussels, provisionally titled: "Asian Energy Consumption and the Caspian Region: Implications for the European Union Energy Use." In 2007, a conference is planned with a venue of Tokyo in cooperation with the Institute for Asia and Pacific Studies of Waseda University and Energy Geopolitics, Ltd. The results of the said conferences as well as EPA's additional research activities will be published in a series of three books in 2007: *Energy Supply Security and Geopolitics in China, India, Japan and South Korea*; *The Implementations of Geopolitics of Energy Supply Security: Possibilities and Impediments for Conflict and Cooperation (US, EU, China, India, Japan, South Korea)* and *Towards the Global Cooperation on Energy Efficiency*.

The 11th Annual Central and Inner Asian Seminar (CIAS)

University of Toronto, Canada, May 13-15, 2005

Reported by: **Duishon Shamatov** and **Bolor Legjeem**, Central and Inner Asian Studies, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, duishon@yahoo.com

The University of Toronto's annual *Central and Inner Asian Seminar* has become a favorite forum for many scholars who specialize or have interests in Central and Inner Asia. This year's theme was "Traders and Trade Routes of Central and Inner Asia: The 'Silk Road,' Then and Now."

The conference brought together more than 30 speakers from 15 countries and blended a wide range of interests. Historical discussions were closely connected to the illustrious Silk Road past, including theories about the its origins and growth, and the role of traders during the Russia-Britain rivalry in the region known, a competition of hegemonies known as the "Great Game." Discussions of contemporary situations sometimes caused some heated controversy due to the political and economic interests involved.

Four fascinating papers focused on current economic and trade issues that have the potential to affect the future of the Central Asian republics. Levent Hekimoglu of York University's Centre for International and Security Studies downplayed the often-touted oil and gas reserves of these republics, suggesting that they contained a very small percentage of the world's future energy needs, and were not therefore offering the potential economic salvation that many have hoped for. Martin Spechler of Indiana University agreed, while Faridun Odilov of Samarqand Regional Chamber of Commerce (Uzbekistan) disagreed, and argued that these energy reserves would be significant for the foreseeable future. Spechler argued for a gradual reform of the Uzbek economy, while Rokhat Usmanova-Kerns, an independent scholar from Virginia offered an overview of attempts being made by some Central Asian governments to achieve economic reform by assisting in the development of small and medium businesses.

Craig Benjamin of Grand Valley State University (Michigan) traced the origins of the Silk Road back to as early as 138 BCE with the Han

envoy Zhang Qian's journey to Central Asia and his report to the Emperor of China on political and mercantile opportunities to be had in the region. Benjamin stressed the historical significance of the classical adventure of Zhang Qian and argued that through his work, Zhang Qian brought China out of millennia of relative isolation into its subsequent position of centrality in Silk Road exchanges. Domenico Catania and Claudio Rubini, archaeology scholars from Bari University, Italy, explained how the Silk Road trade routes changed settlements in Central Asia. They gave an example of Samarqand as a process of urban morphogenesis, tracing the history of its development over a long period of time, and explaining the effects of trade opportunities on the city.

Sessions about anthropology and religion in the countries situated on the Silk Road, included a presentation by Cathy Kmita of York University about the shamanic dance "Andai" in Inner Mongolia. She discussed the healing effects of the dance as well as its role in shaping Mongolian identity, and even demonstrated the "Andai," encouraging the audience to join in the performance. Patrick Hatcher of University of Chicago talked about religion as one of the most important commodities carried along the Silk Road. He argued that the Islam-bearing traders were not merely tradesmen but also played authoritative roles as scholars or princes, creating an amalgamated religious "ideal type."

The sessions about current trade issues, in particular related to energy and politics, drew great attention and sometimes controversy. Issues of regional cooperation, security, and international integration were raised along with views about the struggle for political and economic power. Mostafa Abtahi, a professor from Iran, gave an assessment of transportation of natural resources to the market via the closest ports, considering the land-locked situation of the region. Pinar İpek from Ankara's Bilkent University gave a critical account of how the new trade routes of Central Asia via the pipelines crossing vast and mountainous regions to access energy markets have become both sources of cooperation and rivalry between and among the local and regional as well as global actors. She argued that the "myth" of the "Great Game" is often misleading in understanding the realities of the strategic interaction process that is taking place among the new traders of energy resources in the region.

Maryna Kravets of University of Toronto spoke about the less documented trafficking of eastern European slaves to the Ottoman Empire through the Crimean Khanate. She examined some previously unused Crimean and Ottoman sources to reconstruct the slave traffic from the Crimean Khanate to Istanbul and analyzed the nature of the slave trade, including numbers of slaves exported, their gender, age, ethnic composition, and prices. An independent ethnic Kazakh scholar, Jazira Asanova from Toronto, discussed the role of education as a vital means of bringing knowledge of free trade and market ideas to the transitional and newly democratizing countries of the region. Her paper contributed a solid empirical case to a growing theoretical literature on how international assistance shapes local contexts, and pointed out the dangers of lack of understanding and dialogue between foreign and local actors. Asanova raised issues of ownership, sustainability and setbacks. She focused on general tendencies among development agencies to pay little heed to recipients' priorities, to devalue local knowledge, and to fail to learn from past mistakes, thus leading to a lack of recipient ownership and control of development projects. She called for more dialogue and cross-cultural understanding to create effective partnership between development agencies and local actors.

Duishon Shamatov and Sarfaroz Niyozov of the University of Toronto explored the hardships caused by the collapse of the Soviet system, internal conflicts, and the economic transition period with a focus on teachers turned traders in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. They argued that because of the miserable wages and worsening living conditions, shortly after the break-up of the Soviet Union many teachers in Central Asia were forced to leave behind their teaching occupation and move to market trading and commerce, or emigrate to Russia in seek of employment. The conference sessions ended with a colourful presentation by Daniel Waugh, who accounted for the continuity and change in the trade of Xinjiang into the early 1920s. He argued that despite the disruptions of the traditional trade patterns caused by the newly established Soviet power in Central Asia, there is interesting evidence about the ways in which the historic networks continued to operate.

The papers presented at the 2005 CIAS will be published in the forthcoming volume of *Toronto Studies in Central and Inner Asia*. Should CESR readers wish to find out more about either this annual event or the Seminar's publications, they may

consult the CIAS website at http://www.utoronto.ca/cias, which also includes photos of the conference. Alternatively, readers can contact Gillian Long at gillian.long@utoronto.ca.