THE ROLE OF COMPUTERS IN LEARNING ENGLISH VOCABULARY

Toshkent Kimyo international university, Namangan branch

Student: Yusufova Ruxshona Ulug'bek kizi

E-mail: yusufovaruhshona754@gmail.com

ORCID:0009-0007-4129-9386

Jadid Intellectuals and Soviet Repression in Recent Uzbek Scholarship

A narrative review of reform and historical legacy

Abstract

This article examines how five Uzbek-language publications from 2025 present Jadid reform, political repression, and the contemporary interpretation of Jadid heritage. It uses a bounded narrative review rather than a systematic search of the field. The publications were compared by thematic focus, evidence cited, treatment of chronology, and relationship between historical explanation and present-day evaluation. The synthesis identifies three approaches: biographical accounts of reform, organisational explanations of repression, and educational interpretations of heritage. Their perspectives are complementary, but their evidential strengths are uneven. In particular, statements about archival research require scrutiny of the references actually supplied, while broad accounts of persecution can obscure differences between individual lives. An established historical monograph is used as a contextual cross-check rather than as a sixth item in the review corpus. The article argues that a responsible interpretation of Jadid legacy requires distinguishing reformist activity, the changing circumstances of Soviet rule, and contemporary claims about historical continuity. Its contribution is a critical comparison of a small body of recent writing, not a comprehensive reconstruction of repression or a measurement of current public attitudes.

Keywords: Jadidism; Soviet repression; Uzbekistan; narrative review; educational reform; historiography; historical memory

Introduction

Jadid intellectuals used schooling, publishing, literature, and theatre to intervene in debates about knowledge and society in Central Asia. Their importance lies in the institutions and arguments they developed as well as in their later persecution. A history organised exclusively around victimhood risks losing sight of these intellectual projects; a celebratory account of educational progress can leave the mechanisms and chronology of repression insufficiently examined.

Khalid (1998) locates Jadidism within changing practices of cultural production and disputes over authority. His interpretation cautions against treating the Jadids as a homogeneous political group. It also shows that some reformers worked within Soviet institutions during the 1920s before the increasingly centralised political environment became destructive for them. These distinctions complicate a simple narrative of uninterrupted opposition from reform to repression.

Recent Uzbek-language publications approach the subject through different questions. Gulyamov and Xamidova (2025) and Xolmamatova (2025) foreground reform and its representatives; Abdulxayev (2025) addresses political organisations; Ravshanova et al. (2025) and Xaitov (2025) emphasise heritage and contemporary educational values. Such differences make these texts useful for comparison, but they do not make their conclusions interchangeable.

The aim of this review is to assess how these five publications connect reform, persecution, and legacy, and to identify where their evidence supports or limits their interpretations. It asks: How do five selected publications from 2025 represent Jadid reform, Soviet repression, and the contemporary significance of Jadid heritage in Uzbekistan? The contribution is a distinction between accounts of historical activity, explanations of persecution, and present-day uses of the past.

Methodology

Review design and source selection

The study uses a bounded narrative review of five publications identified in advance for their relevance to Jadid intellectuals, repression, and heritage. The corpus is purposive: it was not generated through an exhaustive database search.

Publication in 2025 defines the selected set, rather than a claim that this year represents a distinct historiographical period. The review therefore makes no claim to systematic coverage, statistical representativeness, or saturation.

All five publications address at least one of three connected themes: educational and cultural reform, political organisation and repression, or contemporary interpretations of Jadid legacy. Bibliographic records and available article texts were checked against the cited publication or repository. Khalid's (1998) historical monograph was consulted separately to contextualise chronology and political diversity. It is not counted among the five recent publications. No interviews, surveys, or original archival investigation were undertaken.

Comparative procedure

The comparison considered four questions for each text: What aspect of Jadid history is central? What kinds of evidence are cited? How are individual biographies and historical periods distinguished? What relationship is proposed between the historical movement and contemporary society? The discussion separates what a publication asserts from what its references allow a reader to verify.

The synthesis groups the texts by their dominant emphasis rather than assigning numerical quality scores. Agreement between publications is treated as a shared interpretation, not as independent confirmation of a historical fact. Where accounts conflict, the discrepancy is identified and the conclusion narrowed. This procedure permits critical comparison without claiming that the review independently establishes every event or causal mechanism mentioned in the corpus.

Results

Reform as a biographical and institutional project

Gulyamov and Xamidova (2025) present reform through leading intellectuals, schooling, and the press. Their discussion includes Munavvarqori's educational activity and subsequent persecution. The article provides biographical context for understanding what was threatened by repression. However, its extensive bibliography should not itself be taken as evidence that every historical claim is

closely documented: relevance and the link between a reference and a specific assertion must be assessed individually.

Xolmamatova (2025) frames Jadid activity within the historical, social, and cultural development of Turkestan, connecting education, publishing, literature, and national awakening. This contextual emphasis broadens the discussion beyond an isolated list of victims. Its role in the synthesis is principally to establish the range of reformist activity, rather than to supply a detailed account of investigation, prosecution, or punishment.

Read comparatively, these approaches make the objects of repression more visible: teaching, publication, and organised intellectual work. Nevertheless, showing that such activities existed does not establish why a particular individual was arrested or how a specific institution was dismantled. Those questions require a different level of documentation.

Organisations and the evidential limits of repression narratives

Abdulxayev (2025) shifts the unit of analysis towards political organisations, including Milliy Ittihod and Milliy Istiqlol. This helps connect individual persecution with collective political activity. Yet the article's abstract invokes archival materials while the reference list supplies no identifiable archival collection, inventory, or file number. Its archival basis consequently cannot be reconstructed from those references alone.

A further difficulty concerns biography. The article groups Hamza with intellectuals destroyed through Stalinist repression, whereas Khalid (1998, p. 300) describes his killing by a mob in 1929 during an unveiling campaign. The discrepancy demonstrates why a general category of persecution cannot substitute for identifying the agent and circumstances of death. It does not invalidate every organisational claim, but it limits confidence in an undifferentiated account (Abdulxayev, 2025).

The review thus identifies an imbalance: organisational history offers the most direct route to the article's repression theme, but the selected material does not

support a complete reconstruction of the legal and administrative processes involved. That gap should remain visible in the conclusions.

Heritage as a contemporary educational argument

Ravshanova et al. (2025) connect Jadid heritage with education, women's participation, identity, and contemporary development. Their text is useful as evidence of how Jadidism is interpreted in recent writing. Its claims of continuity do not, however, establish a documented chain of influence between a particular Jadid text and a present-day institution or policy.

Xaitov (2025) gives greater attention to moral education, teachers' responsibilities, and the upbringing of young people. Historical discussion is combined with contemporary educational recommendations and references to public policy. This makes the article valuable for analysing the present use of Jadid heritage, while its normative recommendations should be distinguished from findings about historical causation.

The distinction is consequential. An author can reasonably argue that an earlier educational ideal remains valuable without demonstrating that it directly produced a current practice. Conversely, the existence of a contemporary commemorative or educational discussion does not show how widely the public understands or accepts that interpretation. Neither heritage-focused article supplies the kind of reception study needed to answer that question.

Discussion

Chronology and individual trajectories

Khalid (1998, pp. 299–300) distinguishes participation in Soviet cultural life from the later destruction of the reformist generation. His account also places Behbudiy's death in 1919 at the hands of the Bukhara amir's functionaries, outside the chronology of the Stalinist purges, and records Fitrat's execution in 1938. These cases require separate chronological and political treatment.

This comparison changes the question that can be asked of the recent literature. Instead of asking only whether an intellectual suffered, a historical review

should ask when the event occurred, which authority or group was responsible, what accusation or conflict was involved, and what evidence survives. A shared commitment to reform cannot answer those questions on behalf of every individual.

The distinction also prevents retrospective reasoning. Later victimisation cannot, by itself, establish an intellectual's earlier political position. Membership in a reformist milieu, work in a Soviet educational institution, and later prosecution are different historical relationships. Their connections need to be demonstrated through the sequence of a particular life rather than assumed from the label Jadid.

Repression and the transmission of intellectual work

The selected literature supports examining repression at more than the level of personal tragedy, but it does not measure its institutional consequences. A useful analytical distinction is between the removal of a person, restrictions on the circulation of texts, and interruptions to the reproduction of professional knowledge. Each requires different evidence: biographical and legal records for the first, publication and censorship records for the second, and institutional records for the third.

These categories are proposed as an agenda for further investigation, not as independently verified findings about every Jadid institution. They explain why a statement that repression damaged intellectual life needs more than a list of deaths. A stronger account would trace a publication, school, or professional network across time and identify the specific changes associated with coercion.

Historical legacy and claims of continuity

The heritage literature raises a different evidential problem. Similarity between an earlier aspiration and a contemporary goal is insufficient to demonstrate transmission. A claim of direct influence becomes stronger when it identifies the historical text, the later reader or institution, and the mechanism through which the idea was received. Without that connection, educational relevance is better described as interpretation or adaptation.

This does not reduce the value of studying Jadid thought. It makes the educational use of that thought more precise. Learners can compare historical arguments with current questions while also asking which terms, institutions, and social assumptions have changed. Critical reading preserves the distinction between understanding a writer in context and using that writer's work for present purposes.

Contribution of the synthesis

The comparison identifies a mismatch between thematic coverage and evidential depth. The corpus covers reform, repression, and heritage, but breadth across those themes does not amount to a fully documented explanation of their relationship. The central contribution is therefore methodological: biography establishes trajectories, organisational history addresses collective structures, and heritage writing reveals contemporary interpretation. Conclusions become more defensible when each kind of writing is used for the question it can actually answer.

Limitations

The corpus contains only five purposively selected publications from one year. It cannot represent the full Uzbek or international scholarship on Jadidism. No formal bibliometric analysis, independent archival verification, or assessment of public reception was conducted. The contextual monograph helps identify chronology and interpretive complexity, but it cannot resolve all uncertainties in the recent publications. The review's findings concern the emphases and evidential limitations of the selected texts; they do not establish the prevalence of those features across an entire field.

Conclusion

The five publications present Jadid intellectuals through connected but distinct accounts of reform, political organisation, and contemporary educational heritage. Their combined value is to show the range of questions the movement continues to raise. Their combined limitation is that agreement about historical importance can coexist with insufficient documentation of chronology, mechanisms of persecution, and the transmission of ideas.

A responsible account should distinguish individual fates, examine the evidential basis of organisational claims, and identify present-day interpretations as interpretations. Future research can strengthen these connections through traceable archival references, institutional histories, and documented studies of reception. Jadid legacy is most productively studied through this combination of historical specificity and critical engagement with its contemporary uses.

References

Abdulxayev, E. K. (2025). *Qatag'on siyosati qurboni bo'lgan jadidlar tomonidan tuzilgan asosiy muxolif tashkilotlar tarixi va ularing faoliyati* [History and activities of the main opposition organisations established by Jadids who became victims of repression]. O'zbekiston Milliy axborot agentligi. https://cdn.uza.uz/2025/05/20/16/36/ME6L91AQ6vsUIVpnOGgd6wamXHe2cRlV.pdf

Gulyamov, A. A., & Xamidova, R. X. (2025). *Jadidchilik harakati namoyondalari va ularning faoliyati* [Representatives of the Jadid movement and their activities]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15511482

Khalid, A. (1998). *The politics of Muslim cultural reform: Jadidism in Central Asia*. University of California Press. https://publishing.cdlib.org/ucpressebooks/public/book/the-politics-of-muslim-cultural-reform-jadidism-in-central-asia.html

Ravshanova, G. X., Ne'matova, J. N., Eshquvvatova, M. J., & Shodmonova, L. F. (2025). Jadidchilik merosi va bugungi kundagi o'rni [Jadid heritage and its place today]. *Modern Science and Research, 4*(5), 1177–1179. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15486632

Xaitov, B. T. (2025). Jadid ma'rifatparvarlarining ma'naviy merosining bugungi kundagi ahamiyati [The contemporary significance of the spiritual heritage of Jadid enlighteners]. *Tadqiqotlar, 58*(1), 263–268. https://scientific-jl.com/tad/article/view/5223

Xolmamatova, R. (2025). Turkistonda jadidchilik harakati va ularning faoliyati [The Jadid movement in Turkestan and its activities]. *Research and Implementation, 3*(1), 139–142. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14713393