The Origins of the Civil War in Tajikistan

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 1 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Contemporary Central Asia: Societies, Politics, and Cultures

Series Editor: Marlene Laruelle, George Washington University

At the crossroads of Russia, China, and the Islamic world, Central Asia remains one of the world's least-understood regions, despite being a significant theater for muscle-flexing by the great powers and regional players. This series, in conjunction with George Washington University's Central Asia Program, offers insight into Central Asia by providing readers unique access to state-of-the-art knowledge on the region. Going beyond the media clichés, the series inscribes the study of Central Asia into the social sciences and hopes to fill the dearth of works on the region for both scholarly knowledge and undergraduate and graduate student education.

Titles in the Series

Kyrgyzstan beyond "Democracy Island" and "Failing State": Social and Political Changes in a Post-Soviet Society, edited by Marlene Laruelle and Johan Engvall

Afghanistan and its Neighbors after the NATO Withdrawal, edited by Amin Saikal and Kirill Nourzhanov

Integration in Energy and Transport: Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Turkey by Alexandros Petersen

Kazakhstan in the Making: Legitimacy, Symbols, and Social Changes, edited by Marlene Laruelle

The Origins of the Civil War in Tajikistan: Nationalism, Islamism, and Violent Conflict in Post-Soviet Space by Tim Epkenhans

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 2 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

The Origins of the Civil War in Tajikistan

Nationalism, Islamism and Violent Conflict in Post-Soviet Space

Tim Epkenhans

LEXINGTON BOOKS
Lanham • Boulder • New York • London

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 3 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Published by Lexington Books
An imprint of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
www.rowman.com

Unit A, Whitacre Mews, 26-34 Stannary Street, London SE11 4AB

Copyright © 2016 by Lexington Books

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016951461
<insert CiP data>

∞™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Acknowledgments		vii
Abbreviations and Glossary		ix
	Introduction	1
1	Prelude: A Post-Colonial Moment in Late Soviet Tajikistan	29
2	Narrating a House Divided: Regionalism Revisited	97
3	"Bloody Bahman"	113
4	Independence	143
5	Islam	181
6	Tensions Rising: The Tale of Two Squares (March and April 1992)	223
7	Men of Disorder: Masculinity, Crime and Violent Conflict	253
8	Civil War	277
9	The 16th Session of the Supreme Soviet	339
Epilogue: The Nation Imagined and the Civil War Remembered		351
Bibliography		369
Index		389
About the Author		401

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 5 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Acknowledgments

This book is the result of a research project which inadvertently commenced in May 2003 in a small village in the Qarotegin Valley. I had been invited by friends to stay over the weekend with their families and here I first encountered local narratives of the civil war that markedly differed from those of government officials, diplomats and scholars and that should haunt me ever since. Back then, I worked as a diplomat and could not pursue a serious research project. Only few years later, in 2006, my work at the OSCE Academy in Bishkek allowed me to return to Tajikistan and collect with colleagues the Oral History Archive of independent Tajikistan. Although this book does not extensively capitalize on the archive, the interviews I listened to profoundly influenced my understanding of the civil war in Tajikistan.

I had the pleasure to work with marvelous colleagues, who inspired, challenged and encouraged me. Furthermore, I had the privilege to work in academic institutions which supported and facilitated my research interests. At the University of Bamberg, Bert Fragner and Lutz Rzehak inspired me with their enthusiasm, deep knowledge and sincere sympathy for Central Asia and Tajikistan. At the University of Freiburg, a generous grant by the Ministry of Science, Research and Arts of the State of Baden-Württemberg and the Faculty of Philosophy supported my research activities. At the University of Bern, the Faculty for Humanities accepted an earlier version of this manuscript as a habilitation treatise.

Teaching classes on contemporary Central Asia in Basel, Bishkek and Freiburg gave me the opportunity to discuss my thoughts and ideas with committed and critical students who challenged my interpretations and invited me to refine my conceptual thinking.

While working on this manuscript, I had the pleasure to discuss my poorly sorted thoughts on the origins of the Civil War in Tajikistan with colleagues

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 7 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

and friends: Dieter von Blarer, Stéphane Dudoignon, Pál Dunay, Olmo Gölz, Michal Hall, Faredun Hodizoda, John Heathershaw, Anke von Kügelgen, Anna Matveeva, Temirlan Moldogaziev, Parviz Mullojonov, Shahnoza Nozimova, Johanna Pink, Mariella Ourghi, Maurus Reinkowski, Sophie Roche, Maxim Ryabkov and Nicola Spakowksi continuously encouraged me with their constructive critique.

Unfortunately, the political situation in Tajikistan has again deteriorated in recent years. In September 2015, the government banned the Islamic Revival Party and imprisoned many of its members. The remaining opposition, independent media and civil society have been silenced since. Hopes and aspirations of a future in an open, pluralistic and democratic society—which many of my Tajik friends and colleagues shared—have been sadly diminished. Considering the political situation, many of my Tajik friends and colleagues with whom I discussed my work, asked me not to mention their names here. With a heavy heart, I comply with their request. Nonetheless, without their support, their readiness to share their knowledge with me, their unwavering friendliness and hospitality, I would have not been able to work on this book.

All of this, however, would be pretty meaningless for me without my family near and far. In particular, my wife Asel and our children Max and Gulbarchyn. Researching violent conflict is a distressing affair and too often it is difficult to disengage from the disturbing narratives, but you were the foothold that kept me grounded. Thank you.

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 8 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Abbreviations and Glossary

Table A.1

Abbreviation/ Term	*Tajik*	*Explanation/Translation*
APC	*Tank* or *BTR/ BMP*	Armoured Personnel Carrier
CC/CPT	*Kumitai markazī*	Central Committee of the Communist Party of the TaSSR, *de jure* the highest body of the CPT.
CSCE		Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (the predecessor of the OSCE).
DOSAAF		Russ.: *Dobrovelnoe Obščestvo Sobeystviya Armii, Aviacii i Floty*, "Volunteer Society for Cooperation with the Army, Aviation, and Fleet," a paramilitary organization in the Soviet Union.
Ešon		*ešon* is a Tajik honorific title for important representatives of a Sufi order (*tariqa*) in parts of Central Asia.
GBAO	*Viloyati Muxtori Kūhistoni Badaxšon*	Russ.: *Gorno-Badakhšanskaya avtonomnaya oblast'*; Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Province created in 1925.
GKČP		Russ.: *Gosudarstvenniy komitet po* črezvyčaynomu *položeniyu*, "State Committee on the State of Emergency"; the August 1991 Coup against Gorbachev.
GNR		Government of National Reconciliation
GRU		Russ.: *Glavnoe razvedyvatel'noe upravlenie*, "Main Intelligence Directorate," the military intelligence service of the Soviet Armed Forces.
IRPT	*Hizbi nahzati Islomii Toğikiston*	Islamic Revival Party of Tajikistan

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 9 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Table A.1

Abbreviation/ Term	*Tajik*	*Explanation/Translation*
Ispolkom	*kumitai iğroiya*	Russ.: *Ispolnitelniy komitet*, "Executive Committee" on the various tiers of the administration (province, city, district).
KGB/NSC	KAM (*Kumitai amniyati millī*)	Russ.: *Gosudarstvennye komitety nacionalʹnoy bezopasnosti*, State Committee for National Security, successor of the KGB.
Komsomol		Russ.: *Kommunističeskii Soyuz Molodyoži*, the youth division of the Communist Party established in 1918.
MRD		Motor Rifle Division; Russ.: *Motostrelkovaya diviziya*, in Tajikistan the 201st MRD.
MRR		Motor Rifle Regiment; Russ.: *Motostrelkovyj polk*.
Maxdum		Honorific title for Sufi authorities (Arabic: *maḫdūm*).
Muhoğir		Tajik for "person living in exile," mostly people from the mountainous areas in Tajikistan who were forcibly resettled since the 1920s.
Murid		Tajik for "student, follower," a term predominately used for those who follow Sufi authorities (the *muršid*); usually the status of a *murid* implies the rendition of services for the *muršid*.
Muršid		Tajik for "teacher, master," usually a Sufi authority who instructs a group (or individual) *murid*.
MVD (see also VKD)		Russ.: *Ministerstvo vnutrennikh del*, Ministry of Internal Affairs.
Nohiyya		Tajik term for district, the lowest administrative tier in Soviet and post-Soviet Tajikistan (Russ.: *rayon*).
Oblast		See *viloyat*.
OMON		Russ.: *Otryad Mobilniy Osobovo Naznačeniya*, "Special Purpose Mobile Unit" of the MVD.
Pir		Tajik for "old," honorific title for a representative of a Sufi order (*tariqa*).
Presidium of the Supreme Soviet	*Presidiumi Šūroi Olī* or *riyosati* Šūroi *Olī*	Permanent body of the Supreme Soviet, elected by the Supreme Soviet and acting on its behalf while not in session.
qoziyot		(Tajik for the office of a judge, from the Arabic *qāḍī*, "judge") Since 1988 the republican quasi-state institution for regulating "Islam" in Tajikistan hived out of the SADUM. Chaired by a *qozikalon* ("Supreme Judge").
Rayon		See *nohiyya*.
RSFSR		Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic.

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 10 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Table A.1

Abbreviation/ Term	*Tajik*	*Explanation/Translation*
SADUM		Russ.: *Dukhovnoe upravlenie musulʿman Sredney Azii i Kazakhstana*. The Spiritual Administration of the Muslims of Central Asia and Kazakhstan was the central Soviet institution to regulate Islam in Central Asia.
Supreme Soviet	*Šūroi olī*	Between 1938 and 1995 the highest decision-making body in the TaSSR and Republic of Tajikistan.
Tariqa		Tajik for "path" usually used for Sufi brotherhood such as the Naqšbandiyya or Qaderiyya.
TaSSR		Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic.
UTO	INOT	Russ.: *Obʿedinyonnaya tadžikskaya oppoziciya* (OTO), Taj.: *Ittihodiyai nerūhoi oppozitsioni Toğik*. The "United Tajik Opposition" was established in 1994 by the IRPT, DPT, the Moscow-based Coordination Centre for Opposition Forces and the refugee organization *Umed*. Later Laʿli Badaxšon (1997) joined the UTO.
Viloyat		Tajik term for province (Russ.: *oblast*). A *viloyat* consists of various districts (Taj.: *nohiyya*, Russ.: *rayon*).
VKD (see MVD)	ī	Ministry of Internal Affairs

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 11 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Introduction

On 23 May 2003, the population of a small hamlet in the Nurobod district in the Qarotegin Valley gathered at the northern edge of their village in a small grove to remember the day "the War came" to their community ten years ago. In a solemn ceremony the community commemorated their relatives who were killed that day and buried in the grove. No information board pointed out to the importance of the location for the local population and no government official from the district administration conjured stability (*subot*), peace (*tinǧ*) and national unity (*vahdati millī*) in post-conflict Tajikistan. After the ceremony, the men went to the small teahouse while the women met in one of the larger farmhouses. Over tea and *plov* the men recalled for their foreign guests the tragic events of 23 May 1993, when a group of militiamen from the Popular Front advanced upon their hamlet, dislodged the opposition and occupied the village after heavy fighting that killed several civilians and combatants. The narratives of the men in the teahouse had two interconnected layers: First, they remembered what happened in (and to) their community since the late 1980s, during the tumultuous time of independence 1991, the outbreak of the civil war in May 1992 and eventually the fateful day in May 1993 from a local perspective focused on everyday life of their families, friends and neighbors. The second layer tried to rationalize or make sense of the cruel fate that had befallen the village by integrating the local events into the larger master narrative of the civil war. This second layer operated with assumptions why the conflict broke out hinting to issues such as regionalism, ideology and elite conflicts. Over the years, I listened to similar narratives in Dushanbe, Xuǧand, Qūrġonteppa, Šahrtuz, Kūlob, Xoruġ and other parts of Tajikistan. These memories of local conflict dynamics often deviate from the master narratives rationalizing the civil war in academic papers and political discourses. The many puzzle pieces I collected draw a complex and intricate

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 1 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

picture of the conflict that raised more questions than it answered.[1] The sequence of events is often contested, biographical data on central actors is notoriously inaccurate and important details are omitted. In order to organize the puzzle pieces and reconstruct the historical context of Tajikistan's civil war, I consulted media reports and a hitherto neglected genre: 25 autobiographical accounts by key actors of the turbulent time between Perestroika, independence and the outbreak of violence in May 1992. These texts are the central source for the following analysis of the origins of the civil war in Tajikistan.

OBJECTIVES AND LIMITS

In May 1992 political and social tensions in the former Soviet Republic of Tajikistan escalated to a devastating civil war, which killed approximately 40,000–100,000 people and displaced more than one million.[2] The enormous challenge of the Soviet Union's disintegration compounded by inner-elite conflicts, ideological disputes and state failure triggered a downward spiral to one of the worst violent conflicts in the post-Soviet space. The origins and parameters of the Tajik Civil War have been analyzed in various shorter publications since the early 1990s, but arguably the General Peace Accord 1997 and the subsequent peace building in Tajikistan have attracted more scholarly attention than the origins of the conflict.[3] A detailed monograph on the origins of the civil war has not been published yet and this manuscript has no other ambition than to discuss these origins in greater historical detail. My account focuses on the time period between the Dushanbe riots in February 1990 and November/December 1992, when the 16th Session of the Supreme Soviet and the successive "capture" of Dushanbe on 10 December 1992 by the Popular Front (Taj.: *Fronti xalqī* or Russ.: *Narodniy Front Tadžikistana*) transformed the nature of the conflict.

As with any historical events, the origins of the Tajik Civil War go back in history to pre-Soviet Central Asia, to the enforcement of Soviet rule in the 1920s and to seven decades of Soviet transformation. Although I consider the *longue durée* perspectives and structural causes as important for the analysis of Tajikistan's civil war, my focus lies on the events between 1990 and 1992, the key actors and the many contingencies that shaped the tumultuous time between Perestroika, Glasnost and independence. While the February riots—in Tajikistan known as the "Bloody Month of Bahman" (*Bahmanmohi xunin*)[4] or plainly as the "February Events" (*voqeahoi fevralī*)—mark the outbreak of politically motivated violence in the unfolding disintegration of the Soviet system, the 16th Session of the Supreme Soviet in November 1992 eventually established a new dominant elite and political economy in Tajikistan, thus

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 2 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

deciding the civil war by this time.[5] However, after the militias from Kūlob (a city and region in south-eastern Tajikistan) captured Dushanbe, the conflict was far from over. Instead, the fighting shifted from the densely populated southern lowlands to the "remote" mountainous east, the Qarotegin Valley and its many tributary valleys. The fighting in the east was no less cruel and terrorizing for the local population, but the domestic and international perception gradually changed: The opposition transformed into an "insurgence" sustained by (foreign) Islamist groups in a "traditionally" restive region (referring to earlier Soviet discourses on the Qarotegin Valley). Although peace talks between the government of Rahmonov and the United Tajik Opposition commenced in 1994, it took the two parties until 1997 and significant external pressure by Iran and Russia to agree on the General Peace Accord.

This account does not look for a specific variable; all other variables are subordinated to a master narrative that explains the conflict keeping in mind Stéphane Dudoignon's observation that in the case of the Tajik Civil War one particular variable often conceals other variables.[6] I explain the causes of Tajikistan's civil war with a historical narrative addressing the many contested events, their sequences and how individuals and groups shaped the dynamics of events or responded to them. This historical narrative recognizes long-term structural causes of the conflict originating in the Soviet transformation of Central Asia since the 1920s as well as short-term causes triggered by Perestroika or Glasnost and the rapid dismantling of the Soviet Union. This perspective on the civil war partly grew out of the impression that previous research did not consider the role of individual actors sufficiently. Therefore my analysis is actor oriented and focusses on key individuals who were confronted with sudden changes in the course events, their agency in the unfolding conflict and their adaptation to the changing context of independence, such as Būrī Karim (a reformer and chairman of the State Planning Agency Gosplan), Safaralī Kenǧaev (chairman of the Supreme Soviet), Rahmon Nabiev (president of Tajikistan), Abdullo Nurī (founder of the Islamic Revival Party of Tajikistan, IRPT), "Bobo" ("Grandfather"), Sangak Safarov (an ex-convict and field commander from Kūlob), Asliddin Sohibnazar (a reformer and co-founder of the Democratic Party of Tajikistan, DPT), Hoǧī Akbar Tūraǧonzoda (Tajikistan's *qozikalon*[7]) or Šodmon Yusuf (chairman of the DPT). The attention to individual actors also hints at the many contingencies—personal interests, rivalries and animosities—that have shaped the cause of events. Furthermore, several key actors have composed their memoirs, and these autobiographical texts form the central source corpus of this manuscript. Paired with complementary sources such as the media coverage and interviews, the autobiographical sources provide insights of how Tajik politicians, field commanders and intellectuals perceived and rationalized the outbreak of the civil war within the complex context of post-Soviet

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 3 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

decolonization, Islamic revival and nationalist renaissance. By integrating the origins of Tajikistan's conflict into the historical context of the late Soviet era, the interpretation and analysis of the qualitative empirical data reflects on the wider discussion of "new" and "old" wars by Mary Kaldor, Stathis Kalyvas, John Mueller and others.[8]

DESIGNATING THE CIVIL WAR IN TAJIKISTAN

The civil war in Tajikistan is generally designated in Tajik as internal war (*ğangi doxilī*), civil war (*ğangi šahravandī* or *gražданī*), fratricidal war (*ğangi barodarkuš*), a regional war (*ğangi mintaqavī*) or a suicidal war (*ğangi xudkušī*). Occasionally, the conflict is labeled the "Second Civil War," while the first one was the enforcement of Soviet rule in Central Asia against the resistance by local groups between 1920 and 1931.[9]

In his first New Year's address on 31 December 1992, Emomalī Rahmonov—then since a few weeks Chairman of the Supreme Soviet—called the civil war a "fratricidal and destructive war."[10] While these labels are largely uncontested, more controversial and judgmental designations circulate as well: Prominently, Rahmonov referred in his *The Tajiks in the Mirror of History* to the civil war as a "senseless war (*ğangi bemaʿnī*)."[11] Rahmonov was not the first to label the conflict as senseless, notably Safaralī Kenğaev characterized the civil war as senseless in his memoirs a few years earlier.[12] The notion of a "senseless war" has been decidedly challenged by Būrī Karim who insisted that the civil war was "destructive and not fought without an objective but was related to the soul, blood, homeland and honor (*ğon, xun, Vatan, nomus*)"[13] and insisted that the conflict broke out because of "ideological, kinship (*qavmī*) and national conflicts."[14] The notion of senselessness implies a cruel contingency and chance. It is particularly difficult to understand for the surviving members of a family that their father, brother, sister, mother, son or daughter was killed "by chance" and without any consoling reason. Individuals and societies try to make sense out of horrifying events or they tend to suppress the memory and commemoration.[15] A similar strategy of making sense out of horrifying events, however without recognizing one's own collective or individual responsibility, is the description of the civil war as imposed by others. For instance, Abdullo Nurī, the late chairman of the IRPT, stated in an interview with *Radioi Ozodī* (the Tajik service of Radio Free Europe) that the "war was imposed on us (*boloi mo tahmil šuda bud*)."[16] Hoğī Akbar Tūrağonzoda likewise asserted that the "war was planned outside of Tajikistan and imposed (*tahmil*) on the nation."[17] As one of the few, Ibrohim Usmonov, a former advisor to Rahmonov and member of the National Reconciliation Commission, explicated that the civil war was *not* imposed from outside but triggered by domestic forces.[18]

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 4 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

The question of how to label the civil war in Tajikistan is far more than a philological exercise but indicates how different groups or individuals remember, commemorate and understand the civil war—a highly contentious issue in post-conflict Tajikistan. The contentiousness derives from the fact that there is no official commemoration of the conflict, instead the re-establishment of "order" and "peace" is remembered. No central memorial or commemoration day remembers the victims or the conflict as such. While there is no official commemoration at the national level, local communities, which have suffered from extreme violence between 1992 and 1997, do commemorate the conflict informally as narrated in the introduction: Former kolkhoz and sovkhoz (collective farms) communities in Qūrġonteppa or the Qarotegin Valley remember the day the "war came" to their community. In most reports, the immediate fighting took place within a relatively short time, from a few hours to a few days but transformed in the aftermath into a protracted conflict with random eruptions of violence and a vicious cycle of revenge and counter revenge.

TAJIKISTAN IN THE 20TH CENTURY: A HISTORY OF VIOLENCE

The experience of violence was no novelty for the Tajik society in 1992. Throughout the 20th century, Tajikistan's population experienced periods of intense physical and permanent structural violence. In the 1920s local armed groups—the *bosmačī*—resisted in the eastern and southern parts of the country the establishment of Soviet rule. Although the Red Army repressed the uprising in central parts of the Tajik Socialist Soviet Republic (TaSSR), the insurgence continued in the remote mountain valleys until 1931.[19] The Stalinist collectivization from 1928 onward compounded the plight of the local population and triggered an exodus of approximately half a million people from southern Tajikistan to Afghanistan. In less than a decade after the revolution, eastern Bukhara lost according to Soviet statistics 42.5% of its population—in some districts such as Kūlob, Qūrġonteppa, Hisor or Qubodiyon more than 60% of the population perished or migrated.[20] With the consolidation of Soviet rule in the TaSSR, the traditional elites, above all religious authorities (*ulamo*[21]) and landowners (*bey* or *beg*), were systematically repressed, expropriated and often arrested. From 1926 on, the Soviet administration initiated the large-scale agricultural transformation of the Vaxš valley (*Vaxšstroy*) for cotton cultivation. A dense irrigation system fundamentally changed the ecosystem of the sparsely populated southern lowlands and since cotton cultivation needs a high input of manual labor, the Soviet authorities resettled large parts of the population from the mountainous parts of the

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 5 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

country, that is, the Qarotegin Valley, Zarafšon, Mastčoh and Badaxšon.[22] The resettlement was insufficiently prepared and many people perished due to the harsh climate, diseases and poor accommodation.[23]

In 1937/1938 Stalin's Great Terror reached also the empire's periphery and killed the first generation of Bolshevik activists in the TaSSR: The 1st Secretary of the CPT, Širinšoh Šohtemur (1899–1937), the former chairman of the revolutionary committee (RevKom), Nusratullo Maxsum (1881–1937), Ūrunboy Ašūrov (1903–1938) and Abdullo Rahimboev (1896–1938) were arrested, tortured, exhibited on show trials and executed. The Great Terror was followed by Nazi Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union. In the Great Patriotic War approximately 300,000 Tajiks were mobilized to serve in the Soviet Armed Forces and some 50,000 Tajik military personnel and 70,000 civilians perished in the war, corresponding with 7.8% of the entire population.[24] Until today "Victory Day" is commemorated in Tajikistan with military parades and an address by the president or minister of defense to the veterans at the central memorial in Dushanbe's spacious Victory Park.

In the 1950s and especially after Stalin's demise in 1953, the TaSSR's urban population experienced decades of reduced physical violence. Dushanbe emerged as a Soviet urban space with a high level of ethnic diversity. For rural communities, especially those of the mountainous Qarotegin Valley, the Badaxšon, Mastčoh and Zarafšon valleys, the 1950s however meant again large-scale resettlement campaigns to the cotton-cultivated areas in southern and northern Tajikistan. The resettlement did not break up communities since the collective farms were often organized according to ethnic or regional origins. Larger resettled communities, such as the Ġarmī population, had their own social "gravity" and maintained only limited interaction (for instance intermarriage) with other groups. Internally resettled communities in the TaSSR adopted the term *muhoğir* (Tajik for emigrant, refugee or evacuee—today used for labor migrants in Russia) and exile strengthened the imagined or real bonds with what was considered and imagined home. *Muhoğir* communities cultivated their specific regional identity sometimes with a nostalgic romanticization of the alleged pristine mountainous environment they had been deported from. The resettlement dramatically changed the regional and ethnic distribution of the population. While in the 1920s two-thirds of the population lived in mountainous areas, the ratio rapidly changed and in 1989 less than a quarter of the population lived in the mountainous regions.[25] In 1926, the region around Qūrġonteppa had according to the Soviet census only 33,000 inhabitants; in the early 1950s the population had increased to 250,000, in 1970 to 650,000 and in 1989 to more than one million people.[26] Migration also changed the political and economic weight of certain regions: Kūlob continuously lost political (representation in the

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 6 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

republican administration) and economic (resource allocation) influence to Qūrġonteppa.

In the late 1960s the economic development lost its pace, investment in the agricultural sector faltered, while the ambitious industrial projects, such as the USSR's second largest Aluminum smelter in Tursunzoda, were prestige projects with operational costs exceeding profits. Simultaneously economic growth did not keep pace with the population growth in particular among Tajikistan's titular ethnic population, which registered the highest population growth rates and the lowest rural out-migration in the entire Soviet Union.[27] Especially in the agricultural areas in southern Tajikistan competition over the limited resources intensified and resulted in local conflicts and tensions. As in other parts of the USSR, youth violence increased in suburban and urban Tajikistan, deeply worrying the Brezhnevite "middle" class (the "Soviet baby boomers"[28]), overwhelmingly cadres in the public administration. Many sources, however, portray the 1960s and 70s as a time of remarkable stability, peace and progress. For many Tajik men born between the late 1950s and the mid-1960s these relatively peaceful years were disrupted by the experience of extreme violence during the Soviet military campaign in Afghanistan. In the nine years of occupation, many Tajiks served as conscripts in the Soviet military intelligence service (GRU) or the civilian administration in Kabul. Many veterans of the Afghan war, the *Afgancy* or in the official Soviet terminology "Internationalist Soldiers" (*voiny internacionalisty*), returned with disturbing memories from Afghanistan and had difficulties reintegrating into the Soviet society. Tajik *Afgancy* played a significant role in the nationalist movements of the late 1980s and many became involved in the fighting during the civil war.[29]

THE ORIGINS OF THE CIVIL WAR: THE STATE OF RESEARCH RECONSIDERED

A set of interpretations on the origins of Tajikistan's Civil War has emerged framing the conflict within the complex context of the USSR's disintegration, which is considered the main catalyst for the outbreak of violence in Tajikistan. Most accounts identify several determinants for the origins of the civil war, namely (1) regionalism and Soviet administrative practice, (2) ideological disputes and the role of Islam in the Tajik society, (3) the catastrophic economic downturn and the intensifying competition over local resources and finally (4) the fragmentation of elites. Most prominently, the civil war is described as a conflict between regional solidarity groups or networks that possess distinct perceptions of regional identities, usually referred to as "regionalism" (Taj.: *mahalgaroī* or *mahalčigī*; Rus.: *mestničestvo*).[30]

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 7 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Not only scholarly works refer to regionalism as one of the central causes of the civil war, also the primary sources and Tajik informants highlight the importance of regionalism. There are variations how regionalism is narrated: as primordial "clans" which "survived" the Soviet transformation of the Tajik society; or as regional-based solidarity networks which emerged within the Soviet administrative system and which were manipulated through political and social exclusion or interference by the center (Moscow).[31] In this book I argue that regional solidarity networks *were* important, both for the outbreak of the conflict and the mobilization. However, in reference to John Mueller, I consider *mahalgaroī* in Tajikistan's civil war as an "ordering device than as an impelling force"[32] and not causative for the conflict. To some extent, the regionalism motive in the Tajik conflict resembles in the form (tropes and narratives) and function (rationalization) the motive of ethnicity in other civil wars.[33] Although ethnicity was addressed in the political confrontations (with an post-colonial twist toward the Russian and an hostile "Othering" of the Uzbek minorities), conflicting ethnic identities were not causative for the outbreak of violence and the key actors in Tajikistan were very well aware that the conflict was first of all an inner Tajik one. Furthermore, regionalist sentiment facilitated the mobilization and dynamics of the conflict, but it should not be understood as a Tajik exotic peculiarity. The extended family ties, provenience from a certain neighborhood or village (*mahalla*, *qišloq*), district (*nohiyya*) or region (*viloyat*), marriage patterns, membership in a professional association or a specific occupation generate symbolic capital and subsequently mutual trust in other societies as well.[34]

In late Soviet Tajikistan, within the context of Glasnost and the nationalist awakening, the urban civil society and emerging independent media discussed next to political reforms the very idea of Tajikistan—its authentic history, religion, language and culture. Both, political reforms and the imagination of Tajikistan were contentious issues and controversially discussed in the media as well as during the political rallies on the streets and squares of Dushanbe.[35] Perhaps, Dov Lynch's statement that the civil war in Tajikistan was not "a conflict over the 'idea' of Tajikistan"[36] should be therefore modified: Although Tajikistan's intelligentsia and political nomenklatura shared similar assumptions on the ethnogenesis of the Tajiks and the emergence of Tajik statehood, they were far from united on the question where to locate national history, culture and language in a larger regional context or on their societal and political vision of a future Tajikistan. The urban intelligentsia was a product of the Soviet social mobilization and local processes which have shaped the political economy of the TaSSR since the 1940s. During Perestroika and Glasnost, intellectuals and political activists started to reconsider their dependencies and engaged in an anti-colonial analysis of the situation which contributed to the increasing polarization of the Tajik society along

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 8 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

several contentious subjects, such as language, regional ownership or history. Especially reformers and the intelligentsia had distanced themselves from the Communist Party's old guard and started to establish civil associations and political clubs discussing the status of the Tajik language, the question of Tajikistan's Iranian and Islamic heritage, center-periphery relations and the regional ownership. The demand for economic reforms, however vague and inconsistent, generated additional tensions between the CPT nomenklatura, the nationalist intelligentsia, urban reformers, rural functionaries in the agro-industrial complex and representatives of the socially and economically marginalized regions.

The 1970s and 1980s saw the emergence of radically alternative concepts of political and social order among young Muslim activists, some of them organized in the *harakat* (movement), the proto Islamic Revival Party of Tajikistan (IRPT). These activists demanded the reintegration of Islam into Tajikistan's public sphere and national narrative and challenged the dominant patterns of resource allocation. The idea of an Islamic political system became a highly contentious issue after the Iranian Revolution 1979 and the Soviet nomenklatura responded with an increasingly belligerent defamation campaign against Islam and Islamic activism. The alleged secular-religious divide eventually shaped the master narrative of Tajikistan's conflict in the early 1990s and the secular government started to conceptualize Islam as external to the authentic Tajik identity othering the opposition.

Next to regionalism and ideology, the economic and social development of the TaSSR is widely regarded as an important factor contributing to the increasing tensions in the Tajik society. The TaSSR was the least developed and most externally dependent of the 15 Soviet republics and received significant subsidies from Moscow, according to some calculations up to 46% of the annual budget.[37] Investment in the labor-intensive agricultural sector contracted since the 1970s and did not compensate for the increasing degradation of agricultural areas and the attrition of the irrigation system. Ambitious large-scale industrial projects were economically unsustainable and increased the uneven development between the marginalized eastern parts and central/southern parts of the TaSSR. The overrepresentation of non-Central Asian nationalities (Russians, Byelorussians, Ukrainians and Germans) in industrial employment fueled animosities among the different ethnic groups in the TaSSR. In the agrarian sector, high population growth and limited rural outmigration among the Tajik and Uzbek communities intensified local competition over limited resources and arable land. The economic crisis of the Soviet Union in the late 1980s was aggravated by the erratic economic policies of the TaSSR's nomenklatura and the collapse of the USSR led to a dramatic economic downturn on the macro-economic level with a catastrophic impact on the household level. The economic crisis had a local micro-economic impact

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 9 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

and was understood in terms of a conflict over limited resources between regionally defined groups and therefore contributed to the perception that regionalism triggered the conflict.[38]

In May 1992, Tajikistan spiraled down to complete state failure and many accounts hold Tajikistan's wider nomenklatura responsible for the dynamics of the conflict. In complicity with organized crime, the nomenklatura dismantled state institutions and facilitated the increasing privatization of violence by non-state actors. These violent non-state actors transformed the conflict to an instrumentalist struggle of local elite groups and opportunistic individuals in a weak institutional environment. Markowitz emphasizes the fragmentation and ultimately defection of the security forces on the local and regional tiers.[39] Idil Tunçer-Kılavuz assumes a top-down mobilization in May 1992 in which President Rahmon Nabiev mobilized his networks in the region and therefore intentionally "chose the war option in order to maintain the support of the hardliners."[40] Although the assumption of a top-down mobilization should not be categorically dismissed, the conjecture of an intentional decision by Nabiev to "choose" the war option dramatically overestimates his situative capacity and influence in May 1992 and underestimates the many contingencies and the local deviances as well as the agency of local actors. We have relatively little understanding of local processes and cleavages—the "disjunction between center and periphery"[41]—in the Tajik conflict. The journalistic and academic accounts provide rather unsystematic insights into the local dynamics and underline the complex nature of the conflict. In civil conflicts, local cleavages are often articulated in terms of the master narrative, but a closer analysis and a more systematic evaluation of available sources may reveal important deviations from the established conceptualizations as Kalyvas assumes: "Because the meaning of rebellions is often articulated by elites in the language of national cleavages, many observers erroneously code them as actually mobilizing popular support along those cleavages."[42] Violent non-state actors in complicity with the former nomenklatura were arguably the main drivers of violence in the early stage of the conflict, but as I try to show here, they were not merely 'activated' but had agency and even enunciated their own narratives of legitimacy. The empirical qualitative data presented and analyzed here might provide insights into how local actors (the micro level) refer to "master narratives" or adopt the particular parameters of the conflict.

In most memoirs and official narratives of the Tajik Civil War, the Tajiks are presented as a peaceful, sedentary, cultured and diligent people and the civil war as "imposed" by foreign forces. Notably both, the government of Emomalī Rahmonov and the United Tajik Opposition (UTO) under the leadership of Abdullo Nurī, agreed on the hidden foreign hand, which imposed the civil war on the Tajik people. Undoubtedly, Uzbekistan and

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 10 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Russia provided military and financial assistance to the Popular Front and individual field commanders. Russian and Uzbek authorities carefully prepared the convention of the 16th Session of the Supreme Soviet in Xuğand and orchestrated Rahmonov's election to its chairman. In 1993 the Uzbek Air Force supported the Rahmonov government with airstrikes against the opposition positions in the Qarotegin Valley. Vice versa, the opposition received weapons and training from Gulbuddin Hekmatyar's *Ḥezb-e Islāmī* or the Northern Alliance under Ahmad Shah Massoud and financial support from Iran. The influence of external actors in the conflict is undisputable and Russia, Iran and Uzbekistan had an impact on the course of the conflict from 1993 on.[43] However, the immediate *outbreak* of the civil war in May 1992 was neither a "plot" nor a "conspiracy" by foreign powers designed to deprive the Tajiks of their statehood and independence, but triggered by local actors. In 1992, there were no external sources of legitimation or funding for the conflicting groups. Instead, Uzbekistan and Russia got gradually involved in Tajikistan's civil war in the autumn months of 1992, but their early engagement was improvised. Russian special forces and officers of the 201st Motor Rifle Division deployed in Tajikistan took matters into their own hands and did not act on directives by Moscow. Therefore, the involvement of foreign powers will be less addressed here.

Instead, the following account offers a detailed historical narrative with a particular focus on individual actors, their motivation, legitimation strategies and response to the rapid transformation. While reading through the sources and the secondary literature, three subjects recur repeatedly which have not been sufficiently addressed in the relevant literature: A post-colonial perspective on the Glasnost discussions among the Tajik intelligentsia, concepts of masculinity in the legitimation of violent non-state actors in the civil war and eventually the contingencies in the outbreak of the civil war.

Contingency is a contested category in history and Reinhart Koselleck calls contingency "ahistorical," indicating inconsistencies both in its determining factors as well as in the incommensurability of its consequences. Koselleck concedes that the notion of contingency eventually contains a specific historical aspect and postulates that in modern historiography, contingency indicates the absence of moral or rational public policy. I do not understand the concept of contingency as contrary to theoretical models reflecting on mobilization and macro-political results behind the course of events. Instead, I consider contingency as a useful category to bridge the micro and macro levels of contemplation and to emphasize the importance of individual actors and catalysts.[44] The discussion about the controversial designation of the Tajik Civil War as "senseless" highlights the problem of contingency and structural (i.e., rational) causes of the conflict. Various authors are well aware of the contingencies but make circuitous efforts to refute chance in the events.

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 11 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Būrī Karim, for instance, maintains in an ambivalent narrative that the events were *not* contingent (*tasadufī*) but a manifestation of the people's hopes and aspirations: "The Tajik people have entered the political stage, the first time deliberately and consciously, with the complete awareness of the anomaly, the deception and indifference of the rulers."[45] The reference to contingency does neither intend to view violence in the Tajik Civil War as fundamentally "irrational" nor suspend the search for structural causes such as Soviet administrative practice, uneven economic development, elite fragmentation or identity politics, but should remind us of the complexity of the civil war and the often cruel contingencies that shape violent conflicts.[46]

Field commanders and warlords in the Tajik Civil War were exclusively male. Women participated in the emerging civil associations and were involved in the political confrontation, such as the poet Gulruxsor Safieva, the lawyer Oynihol Bobonazarova or the Communist Party deputy Adolat Rahmonova, but not a single source reports about the active involvement of women as combatants in the civil war (but sadly numerous accounts report about violence *against* women).[47] Many male politicians and field commanders refer in their legitimation narratives explicitly to "concepts of masculinity,"[48] in particular to the idea of *ǧavonmardī* (Tajik for "manliness"). Chapter 7 deals in greater detail with the issue of violence and masculinity in the Tajik Civil War.

Last but not least, my account on the origins of the civil war in Tajikistan adopts a post-colonial perspective to the discussion among the Tajik intelligentsia locating a brief post-colonial moment during the final years of the Soviet Union. A younger generation of Tajik intellectuals and political activists suddenly scrutinized the intellectual dependencies on the center (Moscow) and reformulated the Soviet paradigms on history, culture, language and religion. The post-colonial moment never fully blossomed in Tajikistan and the outbreak of violence in May 1992 suspended this period.[49]

THE SOURCES: AUTOBIOGRAPHIES

In general, archival sources covering the events in Tajikistan between 1990 and 1993 are not accessible yet and considering the destruction of the Tajik KGB/Communist Party archive in May 1992, the amount of archival sources for the administrative and political history of Tajikistan might be limited anyway. Instead, the main source corpus for this study are 25 autobiographical texts published by key actors since 1992. These accounts have been randomly used for mining information on the events, but often without a proper contextualization addressing validity, narrative strategies or the authors' agenda.[50] The texts consulted here have been published predominately in

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 12 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Tajik, sometimes with Russian text fragments, due to the political situation often outside Tajikistan with a low print run. Only a few titles are available in Tajikistan but scattered in libraries throughout Central Asia, Europe and North America. Moreover the Tajik government and its academic institutions have started to sort out "disagreeable" literature in order to manipulate the commemoration of the recent history and the discourse on the civil war.[51]

The accounts under consideration here significantly differ from the established literary genre of autobiography and life writing popular in the wider Persianate context, represented in Tajikistan for instance by Sadriddin Aynī's *Yoddoštho* (*Memoirs*) or Ǧalol Ikromī's *Onči az sar guzašt* (*Those things which have happened*).[52] Although Būrī Karim, Safaralī Kenǧaev and Asliddin Sohibnazar have literary ambitions, their texts provide predominately a digest of the events, highly polemic and hastily composed with little editing competing for the interpretative predominance of the events covered. Although the authors, who were at the same time key actors in the unfolding events, claim that their analyses reflect the "objective truth," they reproduce an individual, biased and partial interpretation of the events legitimizing their personal decisions and actions.

Most of the memoirs expect from the reader extensive background knowledge on the political, social and historical developments in the TaSSR. The information provided—numbers, dates, places and personal names—are notoriously inaccurate and often exaggerated indicating the partisan interpretation. Although the narratives usually follow a chronological sequence, there are sudden fissures and unrelated digressions and flashbacks.

While the historical value of autobiographical texts is undisputed, their interpretation (fiction/nonfiction), verification, contextualization in collective reproducible horizon of experience (the "social imaginaries") or representation of the "Self" (or "Selfhood") is discussed extensively in the relevant literature.[53] In reference to Charles Taylor's concept of social imaginaries, autobiographies reflect the forms of social constraint individuals are exposed to and show in their narratives acquired dispositions (beyond questions of credibility or validity). Self-construction is guided by larger sociological structures determining the individuals' sense of the possibilities of their intended actions.[54] In these terms, autobiographical writing is not primarily the retrospective reconstruction of the author's life or the events covered, but the self-perception, self-reflection and construction of an identity and social role model, which also reflects flexible and shifting attitudes of personal identities, influenced by the rules and dynamics of the social fields.[55] Greyerz points out that personal/autobiographical narratives reproduce and create discourses which are embedded in a collective context and that the reconstruction in self-narratives allows us to analyze the "specific cultural, linguistic, material and, last but not least, social embeddedness. Ultimately a majority

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 13 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

of these texts […] probably tell us more about groups than they do about individuals."[56] Similarly, Fulbrook and Rublack conclude that

> [o]ne does not have to follow down a post-modernist route to realize the significance of the fact that no account of the self can be produced which is not constructed in terms of social discourses: that the very concepts people use to describe themselves, the ways in which they choose to structure and to account for their past lives, the values, norms, and common-sense explanations to which they appeal in providing meaning to their narratives, are intrinsically products of the times through which they have lived.[57]

Thus, the narratives refer to the social and cultural embeddedness of their authors and help us to understand the social and political transformation of Tajikistan since the 1980s. Importantly, the authors' accounts represent a *retrospective* interpretation and rationalization of the events and a legitimation of their actions. This raises the question of accuracy of the memories and the authenticity of the motivations and intentions depicted in the accounts. Complementary sources (media reports or interviews) either support or disprove the representation of the events in the autobiographical accounts, but arguably more important for the analysis of the origins of Tajikistan's civil war is the interpretation of the particular tropes and rhetorical figures in these narratives. Some of the autobiographical texts need to be singled out, either for their particular relevance as source material or their aggressive polemic.

Būrī Karim′s Faryodi solho

Būrī Karim[ov], born in 1957 in the Leninsky district close to Dushanbe, was a career functionary in Gosplan (*Gosudarstvenniy Komitet po Planirovaniyu*, the republican State Planning Committee) and between 1988 and 1990 minister for transport as well as deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers (which today corresponds with the office of a vice prime minister). Karim belonged to a relatively small group of CPT officials, which demanded more substantial (or radical) reforms in the TaSSR since the late 1980s. During the February 1990 Events, Karim emerged briefly as one of the popular leaders of the opposition. However, with the subsequent suppression of the protests and the nomenklatura's prevalence, Karim was politically sidelined. His voluminous *Faryodi solho* (*The Cry of Years*), published in Moscow 1997, is a biographical account organized as collage of diary entries, copies of official documents, newspaper articles, photos and comments by Karim covering the period between the mid-1980s and 1997.[58] His intention was to offer advice (*pand*) for the future generation, to remind them of the historical greatness of the Tajik people but also their bitter (*talx*) moments such as the conquest of

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 14 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

Alexander the Great, the invasion of the Arabs, the destruction under the Mongols and finally the Russian conquest in the 19th century.[59] One of Karim's central concerns was to refute the nomenklatura's version of the events and to show the truth (*haqiqat*), but notably he conceded that he has difficulties to be objective in his account.[60] Due to the diary character and the frequent incorporation of newspaper/magazine articles, Karim's account is relatively reliable with dates and the sequence of events and less polemic in its tone (compared to the other texts). Already marginalized in 1990, Karim played a minor political role in the political developments after 1991 but remained a mindful observant of Tajikistan's trials and tribulations until today.

Hikmatullo Nasriddinov's Tarkiš

Tarkiš (*Explosion*) depicts the events between the late 1980s and 1992 from the perspective of Hikmatullo Nasriddinov, an ambitious politician and CPT Deputy from Kūlob. Born 1939 in Mūʿminonbod, Nasriddinov had been minister for agricultural water management between 1986 and 1992 and was one of the presidential candidates in the 1991 elections. He published *Tarkiš* in 1995 and many of my Tajik colleagues and informants consider his account as fairly accurate and balanced. Although Nasriddinov maintained that he wrote *Tarkiš* in order to expose the prevalent regionalism in the TaSSR/Tajikistan, his account ventures far beyond the issue of regionalism and provides thoughtful insights to the political field and center-periphery relations in the TaSSR.[61] Nasriddinov lost his political influence with the outbreak of the civil war but remained a politician with modest fortune in the post-conflict Tajikistan.[62]

Asliddin Sohibnazar's Subhi Sitorakuš

Arguably, Sohibnazar's two-volume *Subhi sitorakuš* (*The Morning the Star Is Killed*) is the most elaborated, ambitious and personal narrative on the origins of Tajikistan's civil war. Sohibnazar, born 1939 in Kūhdara in the Rohatī district east of Dushanbe, had been a senior planning official in the agro-industrial complex and deputy of the Supreme Soviet. As a radical reformer, he left the Communist Party and established with like-minded intellectuals the Democratic Party of Tajikistan (DPT). As one of the few democratic deputies in the Supreme Soviet and member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Sohibnazar was one of the key political actors in Tajikistan until December 1992. His autobiographical account covers the time period from the late 1980s to the mid-1990s, however, with frequent retrospect excursions discussing his career in the later TaSSR.[63] Sohibnazar employs a range of remarkable narrative strategies to increase the impression of his memoir's

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 15 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

credibility and authenticity. For instance, he introduces several authoritative witnesses for the events, such as the omniscient Russian KGB operative "Andrey," who predicts in detail the developments in Tajikistan, or the Tajik racketeer "Mūso," who is involved in the early violence and "knows" the masterminds behind the outbreak of the civil war.[64] Although Sohibnazar's account is not free from polemics, his dense narrative on the political trials and tribulations between 1989 and 1992 is a highly relevant source for the reconstruction of the conflict's origins.

Ibrohim Usmonov's Soli Nabiev

Ibrohim Usmonov, born 1948 in the Ašt *nohiyya* in Leninobod, has been a professor for journalism, former minister of communication (1992–1993), chairman of Tajikistan's Radio and TV Committee (1994), advisor to President Rahmon (until 2004) as well as a central figure in the peace negotiations between 1994 and 1997. He published his first account on the developments between 1991 and 1992 under the title *Soli Nabiev* (*The Year of Nabiev*) already in 1995. Although Usmonov refers in *Soli Nabiev* to his personal perception of the evolving political crisis in Tajikistan, his account is more of a political analysis than memoirs in a strict sense. Albeit he does not conceal his sympathies with the Communist Party, his judgement and evaluation is in general balanced and consistent considering the polarization of the society during these years. Usmonov continued to publish extensively on Tajikistan's recent history and was one of Rahmonov's key advisors in the peace negotiations with the UTO and member of the Peace and Reconciliation Commission after 1997. In 2013, Usmonov established the *Dialogue of Civilizations* format in Dushanbe in which prominent key actors, such as Davlat Usmon, Būrī Karim and others, have talked about their memories of the conflict.

Hoǧī Akbar Tūrağonzoda's Miyoni obu ateš. . .

Hoǧī Akbar Tūrağonzoda (born 1954 in Vahdatobod) was between 1988 and 1993 the *qozikalon*, formally the highest religious authority in the administration of Islam in Tajikistan. In many respects, Tūrağonzoda epitomized the political and social transformation of Perestroika in the religious field: As young, versatile and charismatic descendant from a prominent religious family, he represented a new generation of religious specialists in Central Asia. Tūrağonzoda ably blended his appeals for a "return" to a normative understanding of the Hanafi Sunni tradition with nationalist imaginaries and a Perestroika/Glasnost discourse on economic and political change. Initially, he tried to remain independent in the unfolding political struggle, however in the increasing polarization of the Tajik society, he finally joined the

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 16 10/5/2016 11:02:34 AM

opposition in spring 1992. As for today, Tūrağonzoda composed only a short account of the events between 1991 and 1992 under the title *Miyoni obu ateš* (*Between Water and Fire*) during his exile in Tehran.[65] Despite its brevity, the account offers valuable insights into Tūrağonzoda's conceptual thinking and his relationship with other important actors (such as Rahmon Nabiev and Safaralī Kenğaev). Since he has remained a public and controversial figure in Tajikistan, his frequent interventions—interviews and writings—are an important complementary source as well.

Three autobiographical accounts have to be singled out in this brief introduction for their aggressive polemics, exaggerations and limited factual validity: Šodmon Yusuf's *Tajikistan: The Price of Freedom*, Safaralī Kenğaev's three-volume *Coup d'état in Tajikistan* and Narzullo Dūstov's *A Wound in the Body of the Homeland*. While Yusuf is a representative of the reformist opposition, Kenğaev and Dūstov operated within the Popular Front. The three accounts share similar strategies of defamation and fraudulent misrepresentation, which deeply undermine the authenticity and validity of these sources but provide interesting insights into the political conflicts and the polarization.

Šodmon Yusuf's Tāğīkestān: Bahā-ye āzādī

Šodmon Yusuf, a former research fellow in the Philosophy Department of the Tajik Academy of Science and Communist Party organizer, was born in 1949 into a *muhoğir*-family (originally from Darband in the Qarotegin Valley) in a small village close to Šahrituz in southern Tajikistan. After post-graduate studies in Moscow, he returned to the TaSSR in 1987 but soon disassociated himself from the CPT. He sympathized with the Rastoxez movement and eventually became one of the co-founders the DPT in 1990. Yusuf published his autobiographical account *Tāğīkestān. Bahā-ye āzādī* (*Tajikistan: The Price of Freedom*) during his exile in Iran and apparently exile shaped his narrative. His coverage of the events between 1989 and 1992 comes in form of an embittered pamphlet against Russian/Soviet rule in the TaSSR "exposing" numerous conspiracies (mostly set in motion by the Uzbeks), genocides and atrocities against the Tajik people undermining some of the original concerns of his report, namely the plight of the civilian population in the Qūrġonteppa area during the first months of the civil war. Yusuf's *Tāğīkestān* is one of the most partisan accounts with gross exaggerations, countless inaccuracies and many false reports villainizing opponents and even de-humanizing them.

Safaralī Kenğaev's Tabadduloti Toğikiston

Kenğaev published several autobiographical accounts between the late 1980s and the mid-1990s. *Sūzi dil* (*Burning Heart*) covers the Perestroika

time and the three-volume *Tabadduloti Toǧikiston* (*Revolution/Coup d'état in Tajikistan*)[66] is the most detailed accounts of the civil war by one of the leading political actors. Kenǧaev (1942–1999) was born into a Yaġnobī family in Čoryakkoron, a suburb in western Dushanbe and presented himself as a staunch *homo sovieticus* rooted in the Soviet system. He graduated as 1965 with a law degree from the Tajik State University and started to work in the Public Persecutor's Office in Dushanbe. He quickly made a career and was promoted as district prosecutor and eventually to the republican transport sector prosecutor, when he was elected to the Supreme Soviet in 1990. Energetic, self-conscious and unscrupulous, he emerged as a central actor in the tumultuous time and organized the successful election campaign of Rahmon Nabiev for the presidential elections in November 1991 who in turn awarded him with the position of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. In this position he significantly contributed to the increasing polarization of the political factions and his public assault on the minister of interior in April 1992 is considered a catalyst and provocation that contributed to the outbreak of violence. Kenǧaev, as his memoirs demonstrate, was a complex character, who referred to a mixture of strategies and methods originating in the Soviet political economy, to some extent an outsider to the system, a political adventurer with little ideological baggage. Kenǧaev's memoirs are—similar to Yusuf's account—partisan, biased, manipulative and highly unreliable. Kenǧaev maliciously defamed the entire political nomenklatura of the later TaSSR and independent Tajikistan including some of his political allies and his memoirs reflect the uncompromising polarization and confrontation dominating Tajikistan's politics.

Narzullo Dūstov's Zahm bar ǧismi vatan

Narzullo Dūstov, a confidant of Kenǧaev and Nabiev's vice president between December 1991 and May 1992, was born in 1940 in Qalʿai Xumb (Darvoz). Dūstov made a career in the TaSSR's transport sector and was director of the *avtobaza* No. 2 when he was elected to the Supreme Soviet in 1990. In September 1991, Nabiev selected him as running mate in the election campaign for the presidential office. Dūstov was appointed minister of transportation in 1993, but joined Mahmud Xudoyberdiev in his ill-fated attempted to seize Xuǧand in 1998.[67] His 1995 account *Zahm bar ǧismi vatan* (*A Wound in the Body of the Homeland*) is by far the most biased and erratic account on the Tajik Civil War and Dūstov's agitation against the Islamist opposition as *vahhobī* (Wahhabis) extremists exceeds even Kenǧaev's rancor and defamation. His account provides little reliable information and his narrative is saturated with conspiracy theories and untenable defamations.

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 18 10/5/2016 11:02:35 AM

The IRPT's Counter Discourse

Memoirs of the late Muhammadšarif Himmatzoda and Abdullo Nurī have not been published yet. Davlat Usmon reportedly finished his memoirs, but it will be difficult to publish them in the current political situation. Despite being politically marginalized and finally banned in 2015, the IRPT nonetheless published a counter-discourse on the Tajik Civil War. The IRPT's weekly *Nağot* had frequently featured articles on the events between 1990 and 1993 and the IRPT's Presidium had composed its standardized history, political legend and counter narrative on the origins of the party and its role in the conflict.[68] With the death of the IRPT's founder, Abdullo Nurī, in 2006, the IRPT had stepped up the publication of its history with a clear focus on Nurī's contribution to the peace process culminating in the General Peace Accord in 1997. In 2013 representatives of the IRPT published several memoirs and shorter biographical works on the occasion of the IRPT's 40th anniversary.[69] The continuous political pressure by the Tajik government—physical attacks on IRPT representatives, defamation campaigns in the state media, law suits and so forth—had certainly contributed to the intensified but often destitute effort by the IRPT to formulate a counter narrative on the events. Most of the memoirs published so far offer a rather docile reading of the *harakat* and IRPT's role in the final years of the USSR. Although controversial issues—such as the *domullo* Hindustonī's opposition toward Islamic activism—are addressed in the memoirs, the *harakat*/IRPT is mostly portrayed as a dissident cultural association and not as an Islamist political party, which maintained its armed militia during the conflict.[70]

Complementary Sources

The most important complementary sources are the media coverage on the events and the many interviews with key actors and eyewitnesses. For more than a decade after the General Peace Accord of 1997, neither the government nor the civil society encouraged the public commemoration of the events leading to the civil war, instead peace, stability and order were celebrated. Since 2009, however, one can observe a significant change in Tajikistan's otherwise timid public: On the eve of the 20th anniversary of the February 1990 events the independent Tajik media began to publish interviews with eyewitnesses and articles on the dramatic events. The Tajik branch of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, *Radioi Ozodī*, was particularly active in the initial coverage on Tajikistan's recent history, but also the domestic media (except for the government-controlled outlets such as *Minbari xalq* and *Ğumhuriyat*) joined the commemoration: *Ozodagon*, *Millat*, *Farağ*, *Nigoh*, *SSSR*, *Toğikiston*, the Asia Plus Agency (with the radio station and newspaper *Asia Plus*) and the

IRPT newspaper *Nağot* frequently publish extensive articles and interviews on the civil war in the past years. In case dates and the sequence of events are contested, I usually refer to Davlat Nazriev and Igor Sattarov's voluminous and meticulously collected chronicle of the years 1991–1993.[71]

STRUCTURE

This book follows a chronological order, but overlapping topics, such as "regionalism," "Islam" or biographies of key actors are presented outside the chronological order in separate (sub-)chapters. The first chapter offers a historical introduction to Perestroika and Glasnost in the TaSSR. The chapter does not claim to offer an exhaustive and detailed history of the final decade of Soviet Tajikistan, but highlights developments I consider important for the understanding of the cleavages and tensions in the Tajik society. Shifting debates on national history, language and dependencies to the Soviet system condensed during the late 1980s to a short but pronounced post-colonial moment in the later TaSSR. The political tensions, the inability of the Tajik intelligentsia to negotiate an inclusive idea of Tajik nationalism and finally the outbreak of violence in May 1992 suspended this short post-colonial moment. The second chapter reviews regionalism in the TaSSR and how regionalism is narrated in the relevant sources. I argue that regionalist solidarity groups and networks *were* important in Tajikistan, but they did not generate categorical solidarity or loyalty. Moreover, the frequent reference to "regionalism" as the central catalyst for the civil war is often an attempt to rationalize the outbreak of the conflict and relativize the many contingencies. The third chapter revisits the February 1990 events in detail and covers the time period until spring 1991. Since conspiracy theories are ubiquitous in the autobiographical accounts, I will briefly introduce some of the pervasive conspiracy theories in this chapter as well. The fourth chapter covers the time period between independence in September 1991 and March 1992: President Mahkamov had to resign after the failed August coup in Moscow and continuous protests on the streets of Dushanbe changed the political landscape in Tajikistan. Instead of a reformist Glasnost supporter, a Brezhnevite cadre, Rahmon Nabiev, was elected president in November. The fifth chapter considers how Soviet institutions regulated Islam and how religious specialists (the *ulamo*) responded to the appropriation and manipulation by the state in the TaSSR. While the religious field experienced since the 1950s significant changes and "revivals," the 1970s saw the emergence of a younger generation of political activists who expressed their societal vision in religious terms. The political nomenklatura and established *ulamo* soon stigmatized these Islamic activists as religious extremists. The sixth chapter returns to the chronological order and looks at

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 20 10/5/2016 11:02:35 AM

the increasing polarization of the Tajik society during the protests on Ozodī Square and Šahidon Square between March and May. The seventh chapter analyses concepts of masculinity in Tajikistan and how male violent non-state actors shaped the dynamics of the civil war. The eighth chapter narrates the outbreak and initial stages of the civil war between May and November 1992. The chapter particularly focusses on the many divisions in the two major factions. The ninth chapter presents the 16th Session of the Supreme Soviet in Xuğand, which (at least from the narrative of the Rahmonov government) re-established legitimate order in Tajikistan. The conclusive Epilogue eventually deals with the commemoration of the civil war in post-conflict Tajikistan.

TERMINOLOGY

The official terminology of the political, social and cultural spheres of the TaSSR is a complex and at times intricate affair due to the inflationary use of acronyms and sesquipedalian titles. Tajikistan's official designation as a Soviet Republic was Soviet Socialist Republic of Tajikistan (Tajik: *Respublikai Sovetii Socialistii Toğikiston*) and the most powerful office was the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Tajikistan. To keep the balance between accuracy and redundancy, I decided to abbreviate most of the recurring terms, for instance TaSSR for the Soviet Socialist Republic of Tajikistan or CC/CPT for Central Committee of the Communist Party of the TaSSR.

I frequently use the term "nomenklatura" for those individuals who occupied leading positions in the various tiers—union, republican, provincial and district level—of the Soviet administration covering different portfolios such as government, security, industry, agriculture, health, education or culture.[72] The term nomenklatura implies that these individuals were members of a distinct social group, usually appointed by the Communist Party and part of larger patron-client networks.[73] Likewise, the terms "intellectuals" and "intelligentsia" appear frequently. Intelligentsia (Taj./Russ.: *intelligenciya*[74]) is related to the nomenklatura since the USSR's constitution of 1977 and the TaSSR's constitution of 1978 stipulate that the socialist society consists of three distinct social groups: the workers, peasants and the intelligentsia.[75] As for the TaSSR, the emergence of the intelligentsia as a cognizable but heterogenous social group is embedded in the societal transformation since the 1960s. Prerequisite for being a member of the intelligentsia was usually the formal nomination to a position in the academic-scientific and cultural institutions.

Soviet Tajikistan was a multi-ethnic society: In 1989, only 62.3% of the population were ethnic Tajik, 23.5% were Uzbeks and some 10% non-Central

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 21 10/5/2016 11:02:35 AM

Asian nationalities, such as Russians (7.6%), Tatars, Germans, Ukrainians, Koreans and so forth. Since independence, the ethnic diversity has continuously receded due to emigration. In 2000, 80% of the population were considered ethnic Tajik and in 2010 84.3%. The percentage of the ethnic Russian population declined from 1.1% (in 2000) to 0.5% in 2010.[76] The term "Tajik" refers here in general to the citizens of Tajikistan regardless of their ethnicity. In case ethnicity seems to be relevant, I will refer to it explicitly.

Islam, Muslim religious elites and Islamic activists or Islamists recur frequently in this text. Instead of using terms such as "clergy" borrowed from the Greek-Latin Christian tradition, I apply either the original Tajik/Arabic terms for Islamic religious specialists (*mullo*, *domullo*, *imom-xatib*, *ešon* and so forth) or collectively the plural term *ulamo* (from the Arabic "*ulamā"*) for scholars of the Islamic sciences. There has been an on-going debate about the correct terminology to describe political interpretations of Islam, for instance as fundamentalism, political Islam, radical Islam or Islamism. I prefer here the term Islamism as "fundamentalism" too strongly stresses the aspect of a scripturalist interpretation of Islam and "political Islam" gives a too exclusive weight to the question of political agenda. "Islamism" is to be understood as a trend of thought in the Islamic world from the late 19th century onwards that, by implicitly struggling with the challenges of the "West" and "modernity", seeks for a return to the intellectual and religious fundamentals of Islam, intends to form the entire society according to these insights and gives (limited or unlimited) precedence to the necessity of enforcing this new-old order.[77] For those individuals, who have appropriated this Islamist thought, I use for the Tajik context the term Islamic activist or Islamist. Finally, I borrow the term Islamicate from Marshall Hodgson's seminal study *The Venture of Islam* for phenomena, which originated in regions dominated by Muslims but which were not necessarily religious as such.[78]

TRANSLITERATION AND TECHNICAL REMARKS

This thesis is predominately based on Tajik sources written in the Tajik-Cyrillic alphabet. For the reproduction of Tajik, I apply a simplified transliteration with six special characters for terms and proper names according to their Tajik-Cyrillic and not Russian-Cyrillic spelling, for instance Rahmonov and not Rakhmonov.[79] Since the late 1980s many Tajiks have changed their surnames out of nationalist sentiment. Intellectuals and politicians demonstratively omit the Slavic suffix *–ov* or replace it with the Persian/Tajik suffix *–zoda.*[80] The incumbent president of Tajikistan, Emomalī Rahmonov, decreed in 2007 that his surname shall be Rahmon from then on and several members of his retinue followed suit. At times, the Soviet/Russian, Soviet/Tajik or

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 22 10/5/2016 11:02:35 AM

post-Soviet variations of proper names are used simultaneously in the literature creating some confusion. Besides, the TaSSR/Tajikistan has experienced a continuous naming and renaming of toponyms: First the Bolshevists introduced ideologically adequate names, and then Stalinism had its day—even the TaSSR's capital, Dushanbe was "elevated" to Stalinobod between 1923 and 1961. In the 1960s the memory of Stalinism was erased and in the late 1980s nationalist sentiment and independence initiated again a reconsideration of toponyms. Since the 2000s, President Rahmonov is again changing names conjuring his imagination of the Tajik nation. As a rule, I cite all proper names and toponyms in Tajik as given in the sources but usually provide their current (2016) variation in Tajik as well.[81]

NOTES

1. The Oral History Archive of independent Tajikistan is accessible for researchers at the OSCE Academy in Bishkek and at the University of Freiburg.

2. There is no reliable data on the casualties of the conflict. Many accounts operate with 50,000 dead. Jesse Driscoll uses the conservative figure 41,300 in his study *Warlords and coalition politics in post-Soviet states* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 70. During a round table discussion in Dushanbe in December 2013, discussants gave 27,000 to 150,000 casualties (see www.ozodi.org/content/article/25208268.html. Accessed December 21, 2013).

3. On the Civil War see: Muriel Atkin, "The Politics of Polarization in Tajikistan," In *Central Asia: Its strategic importance and future prospects*. Edited by Hafeez Malik (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994); Valentin Buškov and D. Mikul'skiy, *Anatimiya graždanskoy voyny v Tadžikistane: etno-social'niye processy i političeskaya bor'ba: 1992–1996* (Moskva, 1996); Driscoll, *Warlords*; Stéphane Dudoignon, *Communal solidarity and social conflicts in late 20th century Central Asia: The case of the Tajik civil war* (Tokyo, 1998); Dov Lynch, "The Tajik Civil War and Peace Process," *Civil Wars* 4, no. 4 (2001); Lawrence Markowitz, *State erosion: Unlootable resources and unruly elites in Central Asia* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press 2013); Olivier Roy, *The new Central Asia: Geopolitics and the birth of nations* (London: Tauris, 2007); Barnett Rubin, "The Fragmentation of Tajikistan," *Survival* 35, no. 4 (1993): 71–91; İdil Tunçer-Kılavuz, *Power, networks and violent conflict in Central Asia: comparison of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan* (London: Routledge, 2014). For the politics of peacebuilding see John Heathershaw, *Post-conflict Tajikistan: The politics of peacebuilding and the emergence of legitimate order* (London: Routledge, 2009).

4. *Bahman* is the 11th month (*moh*) of the Iranian calendar (21 January to 19 February).

5. See Barnett Rubin, "Russian Hegemony and State Breakdown in the Periphery: Causes and consequences of the Civil War in Tajikistan," In *Post-Soviet political order: Conflict and state building*. Edited by Barnett R. Rubin and Jack L. Snyder (London: Routledge, 1998).

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 23 10/5/2016 11:02:35 AM

6. Cf. Stéphane Dudoignon, "Une Segmentation peut en Cacher une Autre: Regionalismes et Clivages politico-economiques au Tadjikistan," *Cahiers d'étues sur la Méditerranée orientale et le monde turco-iranien*, no. 18 (1994): 73–129.

7. *Qozikalon*, Tajik for "supreme judge," was until 1993 the highest office among the registered *ulamo* (Islamic scholars) in Tajikistan.

8. See Mary Kaldor, *New and old wars. Organized violence in a global era* (Stanford: Standford University Press, 2012); Stathis Kalyvas, "'New' and 'Old' Civil Wars. A Valid Distinction?" *World Politics* 54 (2001): 99–188.

9. For the first civil war, see Mullo I. Irkaev, *Istoriya Graždanskoy Voyny v Tadžikistane* (Dušanbe: Irfon, 1971).

10. Emomalī Rahmonov, *Istiqloliyati Toǧikiston va Ehyoi millat*. Vol. 1 (Dušanbe: Irfon, 2002), 18.

11. Emomalī Rahmonov, *Toǧikon dar oinai ta'rix: Az Oriyon to Somoniyon*. Vol. 1 (Dušanbe: Irfon, 1999), 8.

12. Safaralī Kenǧaev, *Tabadduloti Toǧikiston 2* (Toškand: Fondi Kenǧaev, 1994), 102 & 337.

13. Būrī Karim, *Faryodi solho* (Moskva: Transdornauka, 1997), 23.

14. Karim, *Faryodi*, 456.

15. See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (London: Verso, 2006), 191–210; Christian Meier, *Das Gebot zu vergessen und die Unabweisbarkeit des Erinnerns: Vom öffentlichen Umgang mit schlimmer Vergangenheit* (München: Siedler, 2010).

16. A. Qayumzod, *40 soli muboriza, muqovimat va talošho* (Dušanbe: Muattar, 2013), 37.

17. Hoǧī Akbar Tūraǧonzoda, "Ivazšavii hokim naboyad nišonai noamnī bošad," *Nigoh*, July 10, 2013, 16. For a similar perception see Šādmān Yūsuf, *Tāǧīkistān. Bahā-ye āzādī* (Tehrān: Daftar-e našr-e farhang-e Eslāmī, 1994/1995), 9–10.

18 See www.bbc.co.uk/tajik/news/2013/05/130517_mm_usmanov_civil_war.shtml. Accessed May 17, 2013.

19. Cf. Glenda Frazer, "Basmachi (Part I)" *Central Asian Survey* 6, no. 1 (1987): 1–73 and "Basmachi (Part II)" *Central Asian Survey* 6, no. 2 (1987): 7–42.. *Bosmačī* (Russ.: *basmačestvo*) is originally a Turkish word with the meaning "bandit, marauder," *bosmačigī* is usually used for the heterogeneous resistance movement in parts of Central Asia in the 1920s.

20. Cf. K. Abdullaev, *Ot Sinʿczyanya do Xorasana. Iz istorii sredneaziatskoy emigracii XX veka* (Dushanbe: Irfon, 2009); Beatrice Penati. "The Reconquest of East Bukhara: The Struggle Against the Basmachi as a Prelude to Sovietization," *Central Asian Survey* 26, no. 4 (2007): 521–538.

21. The Arabic plural term "*ulama"* (Tajik: *ulamo*) means generally "scholars" but is used almost exclusively for the Islamic sciences.

22. The Qarotegin (or Rašt/Ġarm) Valley is a mountainous area east of Dushanbe dominated by the Surxob/Vaxš River basin. The Zarafšon River (in its upper reach: Mastčoh) rises in the fringes of the Pamir and flows west in the direction of Panǧakent through Aynī and the Zarafšon/Turkestan Mountains. Badaxšon is in the eastern Pamir, today the Autonomous Province of Mountain Badaxšon (Russ.: *Gorno-Badakhšanskaya avtonomnaya oblast'*, GBAO).

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 24 10/5/2016 11:02:35 AM

23. Š. I. Kurbanova, *Pereselenie. Kak eto bylo* (Dušanbe: Irfon, 1993); Botakoz Kassymbekova, "Humans as Territory: Forced Resettlement and the Making of Soviet Tajikistan, 1920–38," *Central Asian Survey* 30, no. 3–4 (2011): 349–70.

24. See Vadim Erlikhman, *Poteri narodonaseleniia v XX veke: Spravochnik* (Moskva: Russkaia panorama, 2004), 22–35.

25. Aziz Niyazi, "Migration, Demography and Socio-Ecological Processes in Tajikistan," In *migration in Central Asia: Its history and current problems*. Edited by H. Komatsu et al., (Tokyo: Japan Center for Area Studies, 2000), 169–171.

26. Cf. Muhammad Osimī, ed., *Enziklopediyai sovetii Toğik*. Vol. 8 (Dušanbe: SIEST, 1988); TAJSTAT, ed., *Demografiyai solonai ğumhurii Toğikiston* (Dušanbe: RMT MKH, 2013), 26.

27. Ajay Patnaik, "Agriculture and Rural Out-Migration in Central Asia, 1960–91," *Europe-Asia Studies* 47, no. 1 (1995): 147–69.

28. Donald Raleigh, *Soviet baby boomers: An oral history of Russia's Cold War generation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 220–267.

29. See Mullonazar Xolnazar, *Dar čašmoni xotiraho* (Dušanbe: Kayhon, 2011).

30. See Kirill Nourzhanov and Christian Bleuer, *Tajikistan: A political and social history* (Canberra: ANU Press, 2013); Shirin Akiner, *Tajikistan: Disintegration or reconciliation?* (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 2001); Kathleen Collins, *Clan politics and regime transition in Central Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

31. The Tajik sources often use the term *markaz* ("center") for the USSR's political leadership in Moscow.

32. John Mueller, "The Banality of 'Ethnic War,'" *International Security* 25, no. 1 (2000): 62.

33. See Rogers Brubaker and David Laitin, "Ethnic and Nationalist Violence," *Annual Review of Sociology* 24 (1998): 423–452.

34. Cf. Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

35. See Nassim Jawad and Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh, *Tajikistan: A forgotten civil war* (London: Minority Rights Group, 1995).

36. Lynch, "Tajik Civil War," 49.

37. Cf. World Bank Group, ed., *Statističeskiy sbornik, 1993 god* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 1992).

38. Lynch, "Tajik Civil War," 55.

39. Cf. Markowitz, *State*, passim and Driscoll, *Warlords*, passim. For a definition of violent non-state actors see Ulrich Schneckener, "Fragile Statehood, Armed Non-State Actors and Security Governance," In *Private actors and security governance*. Edited by Alan Bryden and Marina Caparini (Wien: Lit, 2006), 25; "[…] armed (or violent) non-state actors are (1) willing and able to use violence for pursuing their objectives; and (2) not integrated into formalised state institutions such as regular armies, presidential guards, police or special forces. They may, however, be supported by state actors whether in an official or informal manner. There may also be state officials who are directly or indirectly involved in the activities of armed non-state actors —sometimes for political purposes, but often for personal interests (i.e., corruption, clientelism)."

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 25 10/5/2016 11:02:35 AM

40. İdil Tunçer-Kılavuz, "Understanding Civil War: A Comparison of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan," *Europe-Asia Studies* 63, no. 2 (2011): 280.

41. Stathis Kalyvas, "The Ontology of 'Political Violence': Action and Identity in Civil Wars," *Perspectives on Politics* 1, no. 3 (2003): 476.

42. Kalyvas, "Civil Wars," 111.

43. Cf. Tetsuro Iji, "Cooperation, Coordination and Complementarity in International Peacemaking: The Tajikistan Experience," *International Peacekeeping* 12, no. 2 (2005): 189–204.

44. Reinhart Koselleck, *Futures past: On the semantics of historical time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 127. See also Richard Lebow, "Contingency, Catalysts, and International System Change," *Political Science Quarterly* 115, no. 4 (2000): 591–616; David Mandel, "Simulating History: The Problem of Contingency," *Analyses of Social Issues & Public Policy* 3, no. 1 (2003): 177–80. For contingency in the Iranian Revolution 1979 see Charles Kurzman, *The unthinkable revolution in Iran* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 163–172; In Egyptian uprising 2011 see Killian Clarke, "Unexpected Brokers of Mobilization: Contingency and Networks in the 2011 Egyptian Uprising," *Comparative Politics* 46, no. 4 (2014): 379–97; In the Ukrainian Revolution 2005 see Mark Beissinger, "Mechanisms of Maidan: The Structure of Contingency in the Making of the Orange Revolution," *Mobilization* 16, no. 1 (2011): 25–43.

45. Karim, *Faryodi*, 242.

46. Stathis Kalyvas, *The logic of violence in civil war* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

47. Cf. Karim, *Faryodi*; Asliddin Sohibnazar, *Subhi sitorakuš.* 2 vols. (Dušanbe: Doniš, 1997 and 2000); Yūsuf, *Tāğīkistān*.

48. Raewyn Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

49. Cf. Laura Adams, "Can We Apply Postcolonial Theory to Central Eurasia?" *Central Eurasian Studies Review* 7, no. 1 (2008): 2–7 and John Heathershaw, "Central Asian Statehood in Post-Colonial Perspective," In *Stable outside, fragile inside? Post-Soviet statehood in central Asia*. Edited by Emilian Kavalski (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

50. For a comment on the value of autobiographical accounts see Stéphane Dudoignon and Sayyid A. Qalandar, "They Were All from the Country: The Revival and Politicisation of Islam in the Lower Wakhsh River Valley of the Tajik SSR (1947–1997)," In *Allah's Kolkhozes: Migration, de-stalinisation, privatisation, and the new muslim congregations in the soviet realm (1950s–2000s)*. Edited by Stephane A. Dudoignon and Christian Noack (Berlin: Klaus-Schwarz, 2013).

51. The administration of the National Library of Tajikistan, which moved in 2012 to newly constructed premises, has used the relocation to "sort" out "objectionable" material and sources (for instance periodicals from 1991 or 1992).

52. Sadriddin Aynī, *Yoddoštho*, 2 vols. (Dušanbe: Irfon, 1954/55) and Ğalol Ikromī, *Onči az sar guzašt* (Dušanbe: Irfon, 2009).

53. See Margaretta Jolly, ed., *Encyclopedia of life writing: Autobiographical and biographical forms*. 2 vols. (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2001); Winfried Schulze, ed.,

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 26 10/5/2016 11:02:35 AM

Ego-Dokumente: Annäherung an den Menschen in der Geschichte (Berlin: Akad. Verlag, 1996); James Olney, ed., *Studies in autobiography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

54. Cf. Charles Taylor, *Modern social imaginaries* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).

55. Cf. Pierre Bourdieu, "The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups," *Theory and Society* 14, no. 6 (1985): 723–44.

56. K. von Greyerz, "Ego-Documents: The Last Word?" *German History* 28, no. 3 (2010): 281.

57. M. Fulbrook and U. Rublack. "In Relation: The 'Social Self' and Ego-Documents," *German History* 28, no. 3 (2010): 267.

58. See also Būrī Karim, *Dar girdobi zindagī. Yoddošt, maqolaho, musohibaho* (Možaysk: Terra, 1995).

59. Karim, *Faryodi*, 13–27. Karim referred to the historian Boboğon Ġafurov by declaring that history writing should not be entertaining but above all consultative (*pandomūz*).

60. Karim, *Faryodi*, 26–27.

61. Hikmatulloh Nasriddinov, *Tarkiš* (Dušanbe: Afsona, 1995), 8.

62. In 1998, Nasriddinov established the Agrarian Party of Tajikistan with little success (the party was suspended in 1999).

63. Sohibnazar, *Subhi 1*, 5.

64. For instance Sohibnazar, *Subhi 2*, 52–55.

65. Hoğī Akbar Tūrağonzoda, *Miyoni obu otaš. Tarhi sulh andoxtam, ammo…* (Dušanbe, 1998).

66. Whilst the first volume of Kenğaev's *Tabadduloti Toğikiston* was published in Dushanbe 1993, the other two volumes were published in Uzbekistan (Tashkent) in 1994 and 1995.

67. Dūstov's whereabouts are unknown and he is on the Interpol Warrant list for banditry and abuse of power.

68. Qiyomiddin Sattorī, ed., *HNIT—Zodai ormoni mardum* (Dušanbe: ŠKOS HNIT, 2003).

69. See Saidumar Husaynī, *Xotiraho az naxust ošnoiyam ba Harakati Islomii Toğikiston to rasmiyati on* (Dušanbe: Muattar, 2013); Zubaydulloh Roziq, *HNIT dar masiri taʿrix* (Dušanbe: Muattar, 2013). Additionally, the IRPT's weekly *Nağot* published between 2009 and 2013 numerous shorter memories and articles on the civil war.

70. Tim Epkenhans, "The Islamic Revival Party of Tajikistan: Episodes of Islamic Activism, Postconflict Accommodation, and Political Marginalization," *Central Asian Affairs*, no. 2 (2015), 321–346.

71. Davlat Nazriev and Igor Sattarov, *Respublika Tadžikistan: Istoriya nezavisimosti god 1991-y (Tom I)* (Dušanbe: AK-94, 2002); id., *Respublika Tadžikistan: Istoriya nezavisimosti god 1993-y (Tom III)* (Dušanbe: Irfon, 2006) and id., *Respublika Tadžikistan: Istoriya nezavisimosti god 1992-y (Tom II)* (Dušanbe: Nur, 2005).

72. The term "nomenklatura" was popularized by Mikhail Voslensky, *Nomenklatura. The Soviet ruling class* (New York: Doubleday, 1984).

73. Cf. Teresa Rakowska-Harmstone, *Russia and nationalism in Central Asia: The case of Tadzhikistan* (Baltimore: Hopkins Press, 1970); John Schoeberlein-Engel, "Conflict in Tajikistan and Central Asia: The Myth of Ethnic Animosity," *Harvard Middle Eastern and Islamic Review* 1, no. 2 (1994): 1–55.

74. The Russian term *intelligenciya* is also used in Tajik. In the 1980s the Tajik term *ziyoī* became more frequent.

75. Cf. F. J. M. Feldbrugge, ed., *The Constitutions of the USSR and the union republics: Analysis, texts, reports* (Alphen aan den Rijn: M. Nijhoff Publisher, 1979).

76. TAJSTAT, ed., *Hayati millī, donistani zabonho va šahrvandii aholii ǧumhurii Toǧikiston*. Dušanbe: RMT MKH, 2010), 7.

77. Cf. Peter G. Mandaville, *Islam and politics* (New York: Routledge, 2014).

78. Marshall G. Hodgson, *The venture of Islam: Conscience and history in a world civilization*, 3 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).

79. Please note the following special characters: ҡ/Ҡ = q/Q; ғ/Ғ = ġ/Ġ; ҷ/Ҷ = ǧ/Ǧ; ъ = ʿ; ӣ = ī and ӯ/Ӯ = ū/Ū.

80. The suffix *–zoda* is the past participle of the Tajik verb *zodan* ("to be born").

81. For toponyms see Nurmuhammad Amiršohī, *Fehristi nomi mahalhoi Toǧikiston* (Dušanbe: Ensiklopediyai Millii Toǧik, 2013) and Soviet military 1:100,000 maps of the USSR (sheets 10:42: 10–128; 11:42: 105–142; 10:42: 13–110).

Epkenhans_9781498532785.indb 28 10/5/2016 11:02:35 AM