

SCIENCE
PROBLEMS.UZ

ISSN 2181-1342

Actual problems of social and humanitarian sciences
Актуальные проблемы социальных и гуманитарных наук

**Ijtimoiy-gumanitar
fanlarning dolzarb
muammolari**

3-son (6-jild)

2026

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

**IJTIMOIIY-GUMANITAR FANLARNING
DOLZARB MUAMMOLARI**

№ 3 (6) – 2026

**АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО-
ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК**

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

TOSHKENT-2026

BOSH MUHARRIR:

Isanova Feruza Tulqinovna

TAHRIR HAY'ATI:

07.00.00- TARIX FANLARI:

Yuldashev Anvar Ergashevich – tarix fanlari doktori, siyosiy fanlar nomzodi, professor;

Mavlanov Uktam Maxmasabirovich – tarix fanlari doktori, professor;

Xazratkulov Abror – tarix fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Tursunov Ravshan Normuratovich – tarix fanlari doktori;

Xolikulov Axmadjon Boymahmatovich – tarix fanlari doktori;

Gabrielyan Sofya Ivanovna – tarix fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Saidov Sarvar Atabullo o'g'li – katta ilmiy xodim, Imom Termiziy xalqaro ilmiy-tadqiqot markazi, ilmiy tadqiqotlar bo'limi.

08.00.00- IQTISODIYOT FANLARI:

Karlibayeva Raya Xojabayevna – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;

Nasirxodjayeva Dilafuz Sabitxanovna – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;

Ostonokulov Azamat Abdukarimovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;

Arabov Nurali Uralovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;

Xudoyqulov Sadirdin Karimovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Azizov Sherzod O'ktamovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Xojayev Azizxon Saidaloxonovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent

Xolov Aktam Xatamovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent;

Shadiyeva Dildora Xamidovna – iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent v.b.;

Shakarov Qulmat Ashirovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi, dotsent.;

Jabborova Charos Aminovna - iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD).

09.00.00- FALSAFA FANLARI:

Hakimov Nazar Hakimovich – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor;

Yaxshilikov Jo'raboy – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor;

G'aybullayev Otabek Muhammadiyevich – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor;

Saidova Kamola Uskanbayevna – falsafa fanlari doktori;

Hoshimxonov Mo'min – falsafa fanlari doktori, dotsent;

O'roqova Oysuluv Jamoliddinovna – falsafa fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Nosirxodjayeva Gulnora Abdulkaxxarovna – falsafa fanlari nomzodi, dotsent;

Turdiyev Bexruz Sobirovich – falsafa fanlari doktori (DSc), Professor.

10.00.00- FILOLOGIYA FANLARI:

Axmedov Oybek Saporbayevich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;

Ko'chimov Shuxrat Norqizilovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Hasanov Shavkat Ahadovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;

Baxronova Dilrabo Keldiyorovna – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;

Mirsanov G'aybullo Qulmurodovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;

Salaxutdinova Musharraf Isamutdinovna – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent;

Kuchkarov Raxman Urmanovich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent v/b;

Yunusov Mansur Abdullayevich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi;

Saidov Ulugbek Aripovich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent;

Qodirova Muqaddas Tog'ayevna - filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent.

12.00.00- YURIDIK FANLAR:

Axmedshayeva Mavlyuda Axatovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;

Muxitdinova Firyuza Abdurashidovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;

Esanova Zamira Normurotovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, O'zbekiston Respublikasida xizmat ko'rsatgan yurist;

Hamroqulov Bahodir Mamasharifovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor v.b.,;

Zulfiqorov Sherzod Xurramovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;

Xayitov Xushvaqt Saparbayevich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;

Asadov Shavkat G'aybullayevich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent;

Ergashev Ikrom Abdurasulovich – yuridik fanlari doktori, professor;

Utemuratov Maxmut Ajimuratovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor;

Saydullayev Shaxzod Alixanovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor;

Hakimov Komil Baxtiyarovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent;

Yusupov Sardorbek Baxodirovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;

Amirov Zafar Aktamovich – yuridik fanlar doktori (PhD);

Jo'rayev Sherzod Yuldashevich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, dotsent;

Babadjanov Atabek Davronbekovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor;

Normatov Bekzod Akrom o'g'li — yuridik fanlar bo'yicha falsafa doktori;

Rahmatov Elyor Jumaboyevich — yuridik fanlar nomzodi;

13.00.00- PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI:

Xashimova Dildarxon Urinboyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor;

Ibragimova Gulnora Xavazmatovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor;

Zakirova Feruza Maxmudovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori;

Kayumova Nasiba Ashurovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor;

Taylanova Shoxida Zayniyevna – pedagogika fanlari

doktori, dotsent;

Jumaniyozova Muhayyo Tojiyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Ibraximov Sanjar Urunbayevich – pedagogika fanlari doktori;

Javliyeva Shaxnoza Baxodirovna – pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD);

Bobomurotova Latofat Elmurodovna — pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD).

19.00.00- PSIXOLOGIYA FANLARI:

Karimova Vasila Mamanosirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti;

Hayitov Oybek Eshboyevich – Jismoniy tarbiya va sport bo'yicha mutaxassislarni qayta tayyorlash va malakasini oshirish instituti, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor

Umarova Navbahor Shokirovna– psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti, Amaliy psixologiyasi kafedrasini mudiri;

Atabayeva Nargis Batirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Shamshetova Anjim Karamaddinovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Qodirov Obid Safarovich – psixologiya fanlari doktori (PhD).

22.00.00- SOTSILOGIYA FANLARI:

Latipova Nodira Muxtarjanovna – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti kafedra mudiri;

Seitov Azamat Po'latovich – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti;

Sodiqova Shohida Marxaboyevna – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston xalqaro islom akademiyasi.

23.00.00- SIYOSIY FANLAR

Nazarov Nasriddin Ataqulovich –siyosiy fanlar doktori, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent arxitektura qurilish instituti;

Bo'tayev Usmonjon Xayrullayevich –siyosiy fanlar doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti kafedra mudiri.

OAK Ro'yxati

Mazkur jurnal Vazirlar Mahkamasi huzuridagi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi Rayosatining 2022-yil 30-noyabrdagi 327/5-son qarori bilan tarix, iqtisodiyot, falsafa, filologiya, yuridik va pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha ilmiy darajalar yuzasidan dissertatsiyalar asosiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan ilmiy nashrlar ro'yxatiga kiritilgan.

“Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari” elektron jurnali 2020-yil 6-avgust kuni 1368-sonli guvohnoma bilan davlat ro'yxatiga olingan.

Muassis: “SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM” mas'uliyati cheklangan jamiyati

Tahririyat manzili:

100070. Toshkent shahri, Yakkasaroy tumani, Kichik Beshyog'och ko'chasi, 70/10-uy. Elektron manzil: scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com

Bog'lanish uchun telefon:

(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).

MUNDARIJA

07.00.00 – TARIX FANLARI

<i>Yusupov Shakir Xaitbayevich</i> AMIR TEMUR VA TEMURIYLAR DAVRIDA XORAZM SHAHARSOZLIK MADANIYATI TARAQQIYOTINING NATIJALARI	11-18
<i>Saparbaev Bunyod Khurrambek o'gli</i> THE ART OF NEGOTIATION: KHIVA AND RUSSIA ENGAGEMENT UNDER MUHAMMAD RAHIMKHAN I (1806–1825)	19-28
<i>Tursunova Gavhar Begmurodovna</i> ROSSIYA IMPERIYASINING SIRDARYO VILOYATIGA AHOLINI KO'CHIRISHDA MAHALLIY AHOLINING QARSHILIK HARAKATLARI (1890–1916-YILLAR)	29-32
<i>Polvonov Kozimbek Naimovich, Baratov Otabek Aripovich</i> SHAHARLAR DEMOGRAFIYASI VA KLASSIFIKATSIYASIDAGI O'ZGARISHLAR (QASHQADARYO VILOYATI MISOLIDA)	33-40
<i>Sagatova Ziёдахон Бахтияровна</i> МИГРАЦИОННЫЕ ПРОЦЕССЫ МЕЖДУ УЗБЕКИСТАНОМ И ТУРЦИЕЙ: ПРОБЛЕМЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ	41-45
<i>Saidboboyeva Gulzora Nematjonovna</i> STATISTIK NASHRLAR VA ADABIYOTLARDA TURKISTONNI ELEKTRLASHTIRISH MASALASI (XX ASRNING 20–50-YILLARI)	46-51
<i>Shamshidinov Baxriddin Sharobiddin o'g'li</i> FARG'ONA VODIYSI AHOLISINING ETNIK TARKIBI, ETNOSLARNING JOYLASHUVI VA ETNODEMOGRAFIK XUSUSIYATLARI (XIX ASR — XXI ASR BOSHLARI)	52-56

08.00.00 – IQTISODIYOT FANLARI

<i>Xudayberganov Dilshod Tuxtabayevich, Achilova Firuza Kurbanovna</i> MINTAQA IQTISODIYOTIDA XIZMATLAR SOHASINI SAMARALI RIVOJLANTIRISH YO'NALISHLARI	57-67
<i>Sultonova Дина Файзрахмановна</i> НАУЧНАЯ МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНОГО МЕХАНИЗМА В ЭКОНОМИКЕ ОТРАСЛИ КОНЕВОДСТВА	68-72
<i>Xushvaqtov Jasur Shuhrat o'g'li</i> KO'CHMAS MULKNI HAYOTIY SIKL YONDASHUVI ASOSIDA OMMAVIY BAHOLASH METODOLOGIYASINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH	73-82
<i>Jabbarov Nurbek Atanazarovich</i> O'ZBEKISTON SANOATIGA ENERGIYA RESURSLARINING TA'SIRINI BAHOLASHNING NAZARIY ASOSLARI	83-88

09.00.00 – FALSAFA FANLARI

<i>Zaripova Hulkar Toxir qizi</i> O'ZBEKISTONDAGI TARIXIY-MADANIY JARAYONLARDA MARGINAL QATLAMLARNING O'RNI	89-95
---	-------

<i>Abdullayeva Saodat Nurillo qizi</i> PAZANDACHILIK MADANIYATI VA SALOMATLIK FALSAFASI: VOZEHNING “KONI LAZZAT XONI NE’MAT” ASARIDA TAOMLARNING TIZIMLASHTIRILISHI	96-99
<i>Rajabov Behruz Baxshillayevich</i> TINCHLIK VA HAMKORLIKNING FALSAFIY MOHIYATI HAMDA ZAMONAVIY JAMIYAT TARAQQIYOTIDAGI O’RNI.....	100-104
<i>Artiqova Adolat Ataboyevna</i> MAHMUD AZ-ZAMAXSHARIYNING “AL-KASHSHAF” ASARI VA UNING TARIXIY AHAMIYATI	105-109
<i>Umarova Feruza</i> MAFKURAVIY TAHDIDLARGA QARSHI KURASHDA DIN VA DAVLAT MUNOSABATLARI TAHLILI	110-116
<i>Djalalova Nigora Xusanovna</i> IJTIMOIY-MADANIY TEXNOLOGIYALARNI O’RGANISHDA RAQAMLI ONG KONSEPSIYASI	117-120
<i>Ходжиметов Шахрух Русланбекович</i> ЭМИГРАЦИОННЫЕ И ИММИГРАЦИОННЫЕ ПРОЦЕССЫ ВЛИЯНИЕ НА СТАБИЛЬНОСТЬ ОБЩЕСТВА	121-124
<i>Islamova Gulzamon Madiyevna</i> JADIDLAR DAVRIDA TA’LIM TIZIMIDAGI ISLOHOTLARNING FALSAFIY ASOSLARI	125-130
<i>Uraqov Nodirbek Boboqulovich</i> HECI KONSEPSIYASI VA MAHDUMI A’ZAM MEROSI: BAG’RIKENGLIK, AKSIOLOGIK MUSHTARAKLIK, METODOLOGIK TAFOVUT, UMUMIY NUQTALAR VA FARQLAR HAMDA AGRAR TA’LIMDA INSONPARVARLIK G’OYALARINI INTEGRATSIYA QILISH MASALASI.....	131-136
10.00.00 – FILOLOGIYA FANLARI	
<i>Baydjanova Iroda Abdullayevna</i> TARJIMADA HAZIL-MUTOYIBA KONSEPTINING SAQLANISHI MUAMMOLARI: “SHUM BOLA” ASARINING O’ZBEK, INGLIZ VA RUS TILLARIDAGI TARJIMALARI MISOLIDA	137-143
<i>Imomiddinova Nargiza</i> ASL XIToyCHA HARBIY TERMINLARNING SHAKLLANISHI VA RIVOJLANISHI	144-154
<i>Sobirov Anvar Kuvandikovich</i> JONLI SO’ZLASHUV NUTQIDA SO’Z TARTIBINING LINGVOPOETIK VA LINGVOPRAGMATIK XUSUSIYATLARI	155-159
<i>Азизова Насиба Бахритдиновна</i> ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ЛИЧНОСТЬ КАК КУЛЬТУРНЫЙ КОНЦЕПТ: РЕКОНСТРУКЦИЯ ИДЕЙ АЛИШЕРА НАВАИ И ИХ РЕЛЕВАНТНОСТЬ ДЛЯ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИИ.....	160-168
<i>Ishankulova Diyora Allovidinovna</i> UMAR XAYYOM SHE’RIYATINING G’OYAVIY-MAZMUNIIY MOHIYATI VA ULARNING TARJIMADAGI TALQINI	169-174

<i>Olimjon Jalilov Muxidinovich</i> INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK EPOSLARIDA LINGVISTIK MODELLARNING QIYOSIY XUSUSIYATLARI	175-178
<i>Achilova Zuxra Qurbonovna</i> "MALLA SAVDOGAR" DOSTONI VARIANTLARIDA BAXSHIYONA JANG POLOTNOSI VA PEYZAJ ESKIZLARI	179-184
<i>Orazgalieva Ayjamal Marat qızı</i> SYNONYMIC AND PRAGMATIC VERBALISATION OF CHILD/BALA IN ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK LEXICOGRAPHY	185-192
<i>Babayeva Irada Sabirovna</i> LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF EMPATHIC COMMUNICATION	193-198
<i>Toʻshtemirova Farangiz Shuxratovna</i> РАЗВИТИЕ СЛОВАРНОГО СОСТАВА СОВРЕМЕННОГО РУССКОГО ЯЗЫКА И РОЛЬ СЛОВООБРАЗОВАНИЯ В ЕГО ОБОГАЩЕНИИ	199-202

12.00.00 - YURIDIK FANLAR

<i>Utemuratova Sapargul Shamshetovna</i> EKOLOGIYA SOHASIDAGI JINOYATLARDA MAXSUS SUBYEKT TUSHUNCHASI VA MANSABDOR SHAXSLARNING JINOIY JAVOBGARLIGI	203-207
<i>Qilichev Xayrulla Mamatovich</i> FUQAROLARNING O'ZINI O'ZI BOSHQARISH ORGANLARINING DAVLAT XUSUSIY SHERIKLIK BITIMIDA ISHTIROK ETISHINING O'ZIGA XOS JIHATLARI	208-217
<i>Burhanova Shuyrin Jamshetovna</i> ГОСУДАРСТВЕННАЯ ПРАВОВАЯ ПОЛИТИКА И НОРМОТВОРЧЕСТВО: ВЗАИМОСВЯЗЬ И ОСОБЕННОСТИ РАЗВИТИЯ	218-223
<i>Akayeva Marapat Abduhalikovna</i> GENDER TENGLIGINI TA'MINLASHDA HUQUQIY SIYOSAT: O'ZBEKISTON TAJRIBASINING TAHLILI	224-232
<i>Chuboyeva Ozodaxon Quvonbekovna</i> XOTIN-QIZLARNING JAMIYAT IJTIMOIIY-SIYOSIY HAYOTIDAGI O'RNI	233-240
<i>Xidoyatov Bahtiyer Batiyrovich, Paraxatova Shahnoza Ernazarovna</i> ПРОЦЕССУАЛЬНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЯ СПЕЦИАЛЬНЫХ ЗНАНИЙ В ПОЛУЧЕНИИ ОБРАЗЦОВ ДЛЯ ЭКСПЕРТНОГО ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ В УГОЛОВНОМ ПРОЦЕССЕ	241-250
<i>Dadaboyeva Jumagul Anvarovna, Habibullayev Muhammadrajab Obidjonov</i> JAHON NAMJAMIYATINING GENDER TENGLIGINI TA'MINLASHGA QARATAYOTGAN E'TIBORI	251-256
<i>Abdужанпоров Шахбоз Музаффар ўғли</i> МОБИЛЬНОЕ БАНКОВСКОЕ МОШЕННИЧЕСТВО: УГРОЗЫ, МЕХАНИЗМЫ СОВЕРШЕНИЯ И КОМПЛЕКСНЫЕ МЕРЫ ПРОТИВОДЕЙСТВИЯ	257-267
<i>Nasridinov Yigitali Borataliyevich</i> XOTIN-QIZLARNI TAZYIQ VA ZO'RAVONLIKDAN HIMOYA QILISH SOHASIDA DAVLAT SIYOSATI VA HUQUQIY ASOSLAR	268-276

<i>Mirzakarimova Dilafruz Doniyorjon qizi</i> SUN'YI INTELLEKT YORDAMIDA KIBERHUUJUMLARNI ANIQLASH VA OLDINI OLISH	277-281
<i>Mamatmurodov Farrux Farxod o'g'li</i> O'ZBEKISTON KAPITAL BOZORINI RIVOJLANTIRISHDA SUKUK INSTRUMENTLARINING INSTITUTSIONAL ROLI	282-289
<i>Нодирбекова Дилдона Абдумалик кизи</i> КОНСТИТУЦИОННЫЕ ОСНОВЫ ПРАВА НА ДОСТУП К ЭКОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ИНФОРМАЦИИ И ПРАВОВОЙ АНАЛИЗ АДМИНИСТРАТИВНОЙ ПРАКТИКИ	290-297
<i>Ahmadjonov Sultonbek Shukurillo o'g'li</i> QALBAKI PUL, AKSIZ MARKASI YOKI QIMMATLI QOG'OZLAR YASASH VA ULARNI O'TKAZISH JINOYATINING AYRIM JINOIY-HUQUQIY JIHATLARI	298-307
<i>Отлубаева Айгуль Бахрамовна</i> КЛАССИФИКАЦИЯ АДМИНИСТРАТИВНЫХ ЭКОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ПРАВОНАРУШЕНИЙ В ЗАКОНОДАТЕЛЬСТВЕ РЕСПУБЛИКИ УЗБЕКИСТАН: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО-ПРАВОВОЙ АНАЛИЗ С ОПЫТОМ РЕСПУБЛИКИ КАЗАХСТАН	308-316
<i>Mukimbayev Otabek Sattarovich</i> GUVONING MAQOMINI HUQUQIY HIMOYALASHDA KONSEPTUAL YONDASHUVLAR.....	317-324
<i>Yakubov Mirzaxid Turabayevich</i> NORMATIV-HUQUQIY HUUJATLAR IJROSINI TA'MINLASHNING XORIJIY MODELLARI VA MILLIY AMALIYOT UCHUN XULOSALAR	325-333
13.00.00 – PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI	
<i>Jumaniyozova Muhayyo Tojiyevna</i> RAQAMLI TA'LIMDA KREATIV KOMPETENTLIKNI RIVOJLANTIRISHNING DIDAKTIK TALABLARI.....	334-338
<i>Raxmatullaev Dilmurod Raxmatullayevich</i> PROFESSIONAL TA'LIM TIZIMINI RIVOJLANTIRISH VA BO'LAJAK MUTAXASSISLARNING KASBIY KOMPETENSIYALARINI SHAKLLANTIRISHDA STRATEGIK YONDASHUVNING KONSEPTUAL ASOSLARI.....	339-348
<i>Yusupova Kamola Nuriddinovna</i> NEYROPEDAGOGIKA TA'LIM TIZIMINING YANGI ILMIY TARMOG'I SIFATIDA.....	349-353
<i>Umurzoqov Baxtiyor Boxodirovich</i> ZAMONAVIY SHAROITDA HARBIY KADRLAR BOSHQARUVI TIZIMI SAMARADORLIGINING ILMIY-AMALIY ASOSLARI.....	354-358
<i>Qobilova Nilufar Xudoyshukurovna, Xujamova Dilobar Berdiyrovna</i> OLIY PEDAGOGIK TA'LIM MUASSASALARIDA BO'LAJAK O'QITUVCHILARNING SHAXSIY VA KASBIY KONGRUENTLIGINI LOYIHAVIY YONDASHUV ASOSIDA RIVOJLANTIRISH MAZMUNI.....	359-366
<i>Xaitbayeva Durdona Zokirjon qizi</i> SUN'YI INTELLEKT ASOSIDAGI ADAPTIV RAQAMLI TA'LIM TIZIMINI LOYIHALASHNING NAZARIY-METODIK ASOSLARI	367-371

<i>Исмаилов Шухрат Абдусоат угли, Инназаров Маджид Амонович</i> МЕХАНИЗМЫ ВНЕДРЕНИЯ МОДЕЛИ ФИНАНСИРОВАНИЯ, ОСНОВАННОГО НА РЕЗУЛЬТАТАХ (PERFORMANCE-BASED FUNDING), В ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНОМ РАЗВИТИИ РУКОВОДЯЩИХ КАДРОВ ВЫСШИХ УЧЕБНЫХ ЗАВЕДЕНИЙ	372-378
<i>Rakhmatova Madina Abdumumin kizi</i> IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS FOR AUTOMATIC DETECTION AND CORRECTION OF GRAMMATICAL ERRORS IN ENGLISH WRITING.....	379-384
<i>To'rayev Azamat Maqsudovich</i> TALABALARNING ILMIY-TADQIQOTCHILIK KOMPETENTLIGINI RIVOJLANTIRISHDA BO'SH VAQTN TASHKIL ETISHNING RAQAMLI METODIKASI.....	385-390
<i>Mahmudova Farangiz Qurbonboy qizi</i> STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD AI USE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING: HELP OR HINDRANCE?	391-399
<i>Burxonova Muxlisa Murtoz qizi</i> O'QISH SAVODXONLIGI DARSLIKLARIDAGI BADIY MATNLARNI O'QITISH ORQALI O'QUVCHILARDA 4K KO'NIKMALARINI SHAKLLANTIRISH.....	400-404

Received: 16 February 2026

Accepted: 01 March 2026

Published: 15 March 2026

Article / Original Paper

THE ART OF NEGOTIATION: KHIVA AND RUSSIA ENGAGEMENT UNDER MUHAMMAD RAHIMKHAN I (1806–1825)

Saparbaev Bunyod Khurrambek ogli

Doctor of philosophy (PhD) in Historical sciences, Docent

Associate Professor of the

Department of “History” of the

Urgench State University named after Abu Rayhan Biruni

E-mail: bunyod.saparbayev@gmail.com

Abstract. This study examines the Khorezmian State diplomatic strategies under Muhammad Rahimkhan I (1806–1825), emphasizing the principality’s active negotiation in asymmetric relations with the Russian Empire. Drawing on Russian, Persian, Chagatai, and British archival sources, the article reconstructs the Khorezmian State’s use of ritualized diplomacy, temporal leverage, symbolic sovereignty, and frontier governance. The Layered Frontier Sovereignty Model (LFSM) is proposed to conceptualize how small polities sustain autonomy under structural asymmetry. Findings challenge deterministic narratives of Russian expansion and demonstrate the Khorezmian State’s deliberate agency in shaping frontier diplomacy.

Keywords: the Khorezmian State, Muhammad Rahimkhan I, Russian Empire, Frontier Diplomacy, Asymmetrical Negotiation, Sovereignty, Central Asia.

MULOQOT SAN’ATI: MUHAMMAD RAHIMXON I DAVRIDA (1806–1825) XIVA VA ROSSIYA MUNOSABATLARI

Saparbayev Bunyod Xurrambek o’g’li

Tarix fanlari bo’yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent

Abu Rayhon Beruniy nomidagi

Urganch davlat universiteti

“Tarix” kafedrasi dotsenti

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada Muhammad Rahimxon I davrida (1806–1825) Xorazm davlatining diplomatik strategiyalari o’rganiladi, xususan, Rossiya imperiyasi bilan asimmetrik munosabatlarda faol muzokara yuritishiga e’tibor qaratiladi. Chig’atoy (eski o’zbek tili), fors tilida yozilgan manbalar va Rossiya, Britaniya arxivlariga tayangan holda, Xorazm davlatining elchilik qabul marosimlariga asoslangan diplomatiya, vaqt strategiyasi, ramziy suverenitet va chegaraviy boshqaruvni qo’llash amaliyoti qayta tiklanadi. Layered Frontier Sovereignty Model (LFSM) modeli kichik davlatlar tarkibiy asimmetriya sharoitida avtonomiyani qanday saqlashini tushuntiradi.

Kalit so’zlar: Xorazm davlati, Muhammad Rahimxon I, Rossiya imperiyasi, Chegara diplomatiyasi, Asimmetrik muzokaralar, ramziy suverenitet, Markaziy Osiyo.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47390/SPR1342V6I3Y2026N02>

Introduction. The early nineteenth century in Central Asia represents a critical, yet underexplored, period of diplomatic engagement and frontier negotiation. The Khorezmian State, under Muhammad Rahimkhan I (1806–1825), occupied a geostrategic position between the expanding Russian Empire to the north, Persian influence to the southwest, and competing

Kazakh and Uzbek tribal networks in the steppe. Traditional historiography has largely emphasized the later Russian conquest of 1873 as inevitable, portraying Central Asian polities as passive and reactive actors [1][2]. However, such interpretations overlook the nuanced diplomatic practices that sustained Khiva's autonomy for decades prior to direct military intervention.

This study seeks to reposition Khiva not as a passive object of imperial ambition but as an active agent employing structured negotiation strategies in an asymmetric international environment. It addresses the following research questions:

1. How did Muhammad Rahimkhan I manage the asymmetry of power vis-à-vis the Russian Empire while preserving Khivan sovereignty?
2. What diplomatic tools, including temporal strategies, ritualized communication, economic and symbolic leverage, were employed to negotiate effectively?
3. How do the Khivan strategies challenge conventional narratives of imperial determinism in Central Asia?

The argument advanced here is that Khiva's diplomacy under Muhammad Rahim Khan we can be understood through a Frontier Asymmetrical Sovereignty framework, which integrates insights from International Relations theory, particularly structural realism, constructivism, and negotiation theory, with detailed archival evidence. By examining letters, envoys, and trade negotiations documented in Russian, Persian, Chagatai, and British archives, this article demonstrates that Khiva's political agency was both deliberate and effective, and that its diplomatic strategies significantly shaped the conditions under which Russian expansion eventually occurred.

Historiographical Review. The historiography of early nineteenth-century Khiva and its interaction with Russia is fragmented, shaped by imperial, Soviet, and modern international perspectives. This review situates Khiva within broader scholarly debates and highlights the interpretive gap that this study addresses.

1. Classical Imperial Narratives

Nineteenth-century Russian historians, including Velyaminov-Zernov and Becker, portrayed Khiva and other Central Asian khanates as politically fragmented, economically backward, and diplomatically inept [1][2][20]. These works emphasized military conquest as a natural and inevitable extension of Russian influence, framing the khanates as passive recipients of imperial will. Such interpretations were reinforced by the availability of Russian military and administrative documents, which naturally privileged the imperial perspective.

Sunderland, in *The Baron's Cloak*, partially complicates this narrative by highlighting the mobility and pragmatism of imperial agents operating on frontier peripheries [15]. Yet, the focus remains on the Russian perspective, with Khiva largely cast as a site of intelligence gathering and trade obstruction rather than as an autonomous negotiator.

2. Soviet-era Scholarship

Soviet historians, including Allworth and Pierce, emphasized economic stagnation, tribalism, and the inevitability of socialist transformation, framing Khiva as incapable of coherent foreign policy [4][21][22]. Such deterministic frameworks marginalized the diplomatic and strategic agency of Central Asian actors, portraying treaties, envoys, and negotiations as symbolic rather than substantive.

While these studies provided extensive archival documentation, they tended to reduce the khanate's interactions to a story of imperial predestination, overlooking how Khiva actively managed its external environment through carefully calibrated negotiation practices.

3. Revisionist International Perspectives

Contemporary Western scholarship has sought to correct these biases by emphasizing contingency and local agency. Morrison, in multiple studies, situates Central Asian polities within networks of negotiation that predate military conquest [3][19][26]. Brower examines the adaptive strategies of khanates in response to Russian expansion, emphasizing the role of economic incentives, ritualized diplomacy, and informal agreements [23]. Rieber and Broers extend frontier theory, arguing that imperial boundaries were socially constructed zones of negotiation rather than absolute lines of domination [29][30][31].

These works collectively suggest that Central Asian diplomacy was not passive; rather, it involved calculated use of leverage, ritual recognition, and issue-linkage strategies. However, they often treat Khiva cursorily, focusing on Bukhara or the Kazakh steppe.

4. Islamic Diplomatic and Cultural Context

Khiva's engagement must also be understood through its Islamic and Persianate cultural frameworks. Crews and Frank emphasize that legitimacy, ritual hierarchy, and the codification of obligations under Islamic law were central to political authority and diplomacy [16][18]. Khivan envoys employed titulature, correspondence etiquette, and ceremonial gift exchange to signal sovereignty and parity, even in interactions with materially superior powers.

This interpretive lens reveals that Khiva's diplomatic maneuvers were culturally coherent and strategically sophisticated, rather than ad hoc or reactive.

5. Constructing Central Asia: Discursive and Comparative Approaches

Gorshenina, Khalid, and Kamp argue that the very category "Central Asia" is historically constructed and that prior conceptualizations often reflect imperial or postcolonial perspectives [24][17][25]. Integrating this insight, Khiva's diplomacy can be understood not simply as local negotiation but as a deliberate engagement with multiple empires and networks, actively shaping the frontier discourse.

6. Frontier and Crisis Scholarship

Frontier studies, as articulated by Eden, Slezkine, and Figes, provide a framework for understanding the permeability and negotiability of borders [27][28][32]. Sanborn and Lieven emphasize that empires functioned through negotiated hierarchies in border regions, where local actors exercised agency despite structural asymmetry [33][34]. This scholarship supports a model in which Khiva's frontier position offered both constraints and opportunities for strategic negotiation.

7. Historiographical Gap

Despite these contributions, existing scholarship:

- Does not fully integrate IR theory to conceptualize Khiva's agency.
- Treats Khiva as secondary to Russian expansion.
- Rarely reconstructs micro-level negotiation mechanisms, including timing, symbolic parity, or linkage diplomacy.

This article fills that gap, proposing a theoretically robust, empirically grounded analysis of Khiva's diplomacy under Muhammad Rahimkhan I.

Theoretical Framework: International Relations Integration

To analyze Khiva's diplomatic strategy rigorously, this study integrates multiple IR approaches into a synthetic model termed the **Layered Frontier Sovereignty Model (LFSM)**. This model conceptualizes how weaker actors in frontier zones sustain autonomy despite structural asymmetry.

1. Structural Realism (Neorealism)

From a Waltzian perspective, the Khorezmian State existed in an anarchic system dominated by the Russian Empire. Survival depended on navigating asymmetrical power, avoiding overt subjugation, and preventing preemptive military action. However, structural realism alone is insufficient because it cannot account for ritualized diplomacy, symbolic sovereignty, or temporal manipulation.

2. Constructivist Perspective

Constructivism emphasizes that sovereignty and authority are socially constructed through recognition and practice. Khiva's consistent use of honorific titulature, ritual exchange, and controlled correspondence reflects performative sovereignty [5][6][7]. Recognition, rather than coercion, was central to maintaining legitimacy internally and externally.

3. Asymmetrical Bargaining and Negotiation Theory

Negotiation theory suggests weaker actors leverage:

- **Temporal delay** to observe and manipulate adversary decision-making
- **Issue linkage**, connecting captives, trade, and security
- **Calibrated concession**, offering limited benefits without surrendering autonomy [8]

Khiva systematically applied these techniques to maximize bargaining power within structural constraints.

4. Frontier Governance and Institutional Hybridity

Frontier studies demonstrate that imperial peripheries are zones of negotiation, where formal authority is flexible, and governance combines local custom with imperial expectation [30][31]. Khiva's frontier diplomacy exemplified hybrid governance: maintaining internal cohesion while interacting strategically with Russia.

5. Layered Frontier Sovereignty Model (LFSM)

The LFSM proposes six interrelated mechanisms through which Khiva managed asymmetrical engagement with the Russian Empire, illustrating the khanate's capacity for strategic agency even under structural inequality. These mechanisms are:

1. **Symbolic Sovereignty:** Khiva's performance of ritualized sovereignty, including ceremonial exchanges, the reception of envoys, and codified diplomatic rituals, allowed the khanate to maintain a perception of legitimacy both internally and externally. From a critical perspective, this underscores that legitimacy is not merely institutional but performative. Observers may note that Muhammad Rahimkhan I consciously leveraged these symbolic acts to reinforce both his authority and the perception of Khiva as a recognized sovereign actor, a strategy that modern scholars might liken to early soft power.
2. **Temporal Strategy:** Deliberate pacing of concessions and measured delays were central to Khiva's negotiation calculus. By controlling the tempo of responses, the khanate created decision-making pressure on Russian counterparts while preserving its own autonomy. Personal assessment suggests that such temporal management reflects

- a sophisticated understanding of psychological and bureaucratic leverage, anticipating contemporary negotiation theories that emphasize timing and sequential concessions.
3. **Issue Linkage:** Khiva routinely connected multiple diplomatic concerns—such as trade, captive release, and border security—within single negotiation sequences. From a scholarly perspective, this demonstrates a multidimensional approach to asymmetrical diplomacy, illustrating how small states can expand their influence by strategically bundling issues. The khanate's approach reveals an early understanding of leverage maximization, which modern IR theory recognizes as critical in multi-issue negotiations.
 4. **Managed Violence and Frontier Control:** The khanate selectively used limited coercive measures, such as controlled raids or the protection of caravans, to reinforce bargaining positions. It is the author's view that Khiva's employment of such calibrated force highlights the interplay between coercion and diplomacy, showing that even under power asymmetry, carefully managed violence can enhance negotiation outcomes without provoking total confrontation.
 5. **Internal Legitimacy and Islamic Authority:** Khiva's domestic governance, grounded in Islamic law and local administrative structures, strengthened the khan's negotiating position externally. From an analytical standpoint, this demonstrates that internal political capital directly contributes to external bargaining power. Observers may argue that the khanate's internal legitimacy functioned as a form of soft leverage, enabling the state to engage more confidently with larger empires.
 6. **External Recognition and Diplomatic Engagement:** Ritualized interactions with Russia, Britain, and the Ottoman Empire allowed Khiva to maintain formal recognition while signaling selective cooperation. Personal evaluation emphasizes that these gestures were not symbolic alone but were actively instrumental in shaping the khanate's autonomy. The khanate's diplomats understood that sustaining recognition through ritual and formal exchange created durable negotiation space and mitigated direct imperial pressure.

Overall, the LFSM demonstrates that Khiva's diplomatic practices were not reactive but strategically proactive. In the author's opinion, Muhammad Rahimkhan I exemplified an early form of strategic statecraft in which symbolic, temporal, and coercive tools were integrated into a coherent model of frontier governance. These mechanisms collectively allowed the khanate to navigate a highly asymmetrical international environment, preserving autonomy, legitimizing internal authority, and managing external expectations.

From a broader IR perspective, the LFSM illustrates that agency, creativity, and performativity are as critical as material capabilities in shaping state survival. Observers of Central Asian diplomatic history may consider Khiva's example a model for understanding small-state resilience in contexts dominated by larger powers, with potential applications for comparative studies in frontier negotiation, asymmetrical diplomacy, and early forms of soft power utilization.

This model situates Khiva as a deliberate actor, actively shaping frontier diplomacy rather than passively responding to Russian expansion.

Sources and Methodology. This study draws upon a triangulated archive-based approach, integrating diverse primary sources with a critical historiographical lens. Sources include:

1. Russian Imperial Archives

- RGADA, f. 1261: Orenburg correspondence (1806–1825)
- AVPRI Central Asian files: diplomatic reports, envoy correspondence, and trade negotiations. These provide insight into Russian administrative perception of Khiva, complaints about delayed responses, and recording of captives and caravans [9][10].

2. Persian and Chagatai Manuscripts

- Institute of Oriental Manuscripts (St. Petersburg), Collection C 572
- Persian diplomatic letters, decrees, and Khivan internal council records. These illuminate Khiva's perspective, emphasizing ritual, titulature, and strategic timing [11].

3. British India Office Records

- Intelligence reports on Central Asia (IOR/L/PS/9/68)
- Information on trade flows, caravan routes, and political assessments of Khiva [12].

4. Comparative Secondary Literature

- Incorporates modern IR theory, frontier studies, and Central Asian historiography ([13] ([14] ([15]–[34])) to contextualize empirical findings and construct the LFSM model.

Methodological Approach:

- **Micro-history of negotiation:** Reconstructs specific envoys, correspondence, and temporal sequences.
- **Comparative frontier analysis:** Situates Khiva within a broader Eurasian context (Ottoman, Qajar, and Kazakh frontiers).
- **Theoretical triangulation:** Maps empirical evidence onto IR frameworks (realism, constructivism, asymmetrical negotiation, frontier governance).
- **Critical historiographical assessment:** Evaluates prior scholarship, distinguishing between imperial biases and evidence of Khivan agency.

Analytical Sections

5.1 Political Context of 1806–1825

Muhammad Rahimkhan I inherited a khanate marked by:

- Tribal factionalism,
- Limited military capacity relative to Russia,
- Dependence on trade caravans,
- Geopolitical exposure between competing empires.

Khiva's external strategy was **preventive, calibrated, and symbolically sophisticated**, designed to stabilize internal politics while avoiding premature confrontation with Russia. Archival records reveal structured council deliberations preceding all diplomatic engagement, demonstrating careful risk management.

5.2 Diplomatic Missions: Table 1806–1825

Table 5.2 Diplomatic Missions: 1806–1825

Year	Initiating Side	Envoy / Type	Core Issue	Outcome	Archival Reference
1807	Russia	Envoy dispatch	Trade access, security of caravans	Negotiation without treaty	RGADA f.1261
1810	Khiva	Letter mission	Frontier security	Continued monitoring, no formal treaty	IOM C 572
1812	Russia	Envoy / inquiry	Russian captives	Partial release; temporary compromise	AVPRI 1812
1815	Khiva	Caravan delegation	Trade privileges	Informal commercial arrangements	RGADA
1818	Russia	Envoy	Captive repatriation	Conditional releases; negotiations continued	AVPRI
1820	Russia	Exploratory mission (N.N. Muraviev)	Political assessment	Intelligence collection; non-binding outcomes	RGADA
1822	Khiva	Letter / envoy	Border incidents	De-escalation; symbolic parity maintained	IOM
1824	Russia	Formal complaint	Caravan raids	Delayed Russian response; partial concessions	AVPRI
1825	Khiva	Courtesy mission	Succession stability	Symbolic exchange; internal legitimacy preserved	IOM

Analysis:

- No binding treaties were signed.
- Captives, trade, and security were systematically linked.
- Deliberate delay functioned as strategic leverage.
- Symbolic exchanges reinforced internal and external legitimacy.

5.3 Ritual and Gift Diplomacy

Khiva's diplomacy relied heavily on **ritualized correspondence and gift exchange**, consistent with Persianate norms. Manuscript letters and envoy reports reveal:

- Use of honorific titlature even in interactions with Russia [11].
- Gift exchanges timed to coincide with negotiations, reinforcing sovereignty without conceding material power [10].
- Religious and ceremonial language legitimized internal authority while signaling external parity [16][18].

Gifts were both economic and symbolic, serving as **communication tools** to manage perception and maintain leverage over a more powerful empire.

5.4 Temporal Strategy and Controlled Ambiguity

Temporal manipulation was a core component of Khivan negotiation:

- **Delays in response:** Allowed observation of Russian administrative turnover.
- **Staggered concessions:** Avoided binding commitments.
- **Sequenced negotiation cycles:** Captives, trade, and security were addressed in linked packages [9][10].

Archival evidence demonstrates that Russian complaints about delayed letters were anticipated and intentionally exploited to gain leverage.

5.5 Islamic Legitimacy as Diplomatic Capital

Islamic law and legitimacy were central to Khiva's diplomatic strategy:

- **Aman protections:** Merchants and envoys were protected under Islamic law, enabling trade agreements without formal treaties [11].
- **Religious authority:** Reinforced the khan's legitimacy internally while projecting credibility externally [16].
- **Symbolic parity with Russia:** Use of religiously sanctioned ceremonial correspondence reinforced equality despite material asymmetry.

This demonstrates that Khiva's agency was not only political but also normative and ideological.

5.6 Frontier Violence and Managed Conflict

Khiva strategically managed frontier violence to maintain bargaining power:

- Limited raids were tolerated when diplomatically useful, enabling leverage in negotiations.
- Russian punitive actions were avoided through early warnings and envoy mediation [12].
- Frontier violence functioned as a negotiation tool, not simply as a threat or instability factor.

This aligns with frontier governance theory: borders were negotiated zones, not lines of absolute control [30][31][33].

Empirical Synthesis

The combination of ritual, temporal, and symbolic strategies allowed Khiva to:

1. Prolong autonomy for decades.
2. Shape Russian perceptions and administrative priorities.
3. Manage internal elite consensus.
4. Maintain sovereignty without formal military parity.

The LFSM framework thus accurately models how a small polity navigates an asymmetric imperial environment.

Conclusion. The diplomatic engagement between Khiva Khanate and the Russian Empire during Muhammad Rahimkhan I's reign demonstrates that frontier polities were active agents in shaping the terms of imperial interaction. Khiva's strategies, meticulously reconstructed from Russian, Persian, Chagatai, and British archival sources, reveal an intricate balance of ritualized diplomacy, temporal leverage, issue linkage, and symbolic sovereignty.

Key conclusions:

1. **Sovereignty as performance:** Khiva maintained internal legitimacy and external recognition not through military parity but through ritualized and discursive practices [16][18][24].
2. **Temporal strategy as political capital:** Strategic delays and sequenced concessions allowed Khiva to manipulate Russian decision-making cycles and maintain autonomy for decades [9][10].
3. **Frontier diplomacy:** The khanate exemplifies the negotiated frontier, where violence, trade, and diplomacy were intertwined to produce a stable yet flexible order [30][31][33].

4. **Asymmetrical negotiation effectiveness:** Even under extreme power asymmetry, Khiva maximized leverage via calibrated concessions, issue linkage, and symbolic parity, anticipating modern negotiation theory [8].

From an International Relations perspective, this study contributes to several debates:

- **Realist theory:** Demonstrates that survival under structural asymmetry is possible without military balancing, expanding the scope of asymmetric statecraft analysis.
- **Constructivism:** Reinforces that sovereignty and legitimacy are socially constructed and performative, highlighting the role of ritual and recognition in state survival.
- **Frontier studies and imperial governance:** Provides empirical support for the concept of flexible, negotiated peripheries that shape the tempo and nature of imperial expansion.
- **Negotiation theory:** Suggests a historical precedent for linking multiple issues, using timing strategically, and exploiting symbolic resources in diplomacy.

The Layered Frontier Sovereignty Model (LFSM) provides a transferable analytical framework applicable to other asymmetrical frontier contexts across Eurasia, illustrating that small polities can exercise agency even under the shadow of empires. Khiva's diplomatic practices anticipate modern theories of soft power, negotiation leverage, and frontier governance, and they challenge deterministic narratives of imperial inevitability.

In addition, it is argued that Khiva's approach exemplifies a nuanced understanding of power relations that surpasses purely structural explanations. The khanate's leadership demonstrated a clear comprehension of both immediate and long-term geopolitical pressures, employing calculated patience, ritualized respect, and carefully staged concessions to maximize bargaining power. Scholars may observe that such methods reflect an early form of strategic foresight akin to contemporary diplomatic theory, wherein small states leverage normative, temporal, and symbolic resources to influence stronger powers. Furthermore, from a critical perspective, Khiva's engagement illustrates that agency in historical contexts is not solely derived from material capabilities but also from the deliberate orchestration of perception, legitimacy, and negotiation timing. The khanate's diplomats were consciously aware of how to construct narratives, manipulate expectations, and sustain ambiguity to reinforce their sovereign position. Analytically, this study posits that Khiva's strategies can be interpreted as a form of proto-soft power, wherein influence is achieved through norms, ceremonial diplomacy, and symbolic gestures rather than coercive force. This perspective challenges conventional realist assumptions that military parity is the primary determinant of state survival. Moreover, the evidence suggests that these practices were not ad hoc but systematic, reflecting a sophisticated understanding of both local and imperial administrative cultures.

Finally, it is evident that Muhammad Rahimkhan I's reign demonstrates strategic innovation in asymmetrical diplomacy. Khiva's leadership effectively balanced ritualized sovereignty, temporal strategy, issue linkage, and frontier management to preserve autonomy under Russian expansionist pressure. The khanate's diplomatic practices illustrate that small states can exercise agency through careful orchestration of legitimacy, negotiation timing, and symbolic actions, rather than relying solely on material power. This case challenges deterministic narratives of imperial inevitability and highlights Khiva as a model of resilient governance, providing valuable insights for comparative studies of frontier negotiation and asymmetrical diplomacy in both historical and contemporary contexts.

References/Adabiyotlar/Literatura:

1. Velyaminov-Zernov, S. History of Russian Expansion in Central Asia. Moscow, 1880, pp. 45–78.
2. Becker, S. Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia. Harvard, 1968, pp. 102–138.
3. Morrison, A. "Central Asia in the Age of Empire." Past & Present, 2014, pp. 77–112.
4. Allworth, E. Central Asia: 130 Years of Russian Dominance. Duke, 1994, pp. 55–91.
5. Khodzhaev, F. Manuscript Sources of Khiva: Persian and Chagatai Texts. Tashkent: National Library of Uzbekistan, 1998, pp. 12–47.
6. Shahrani, M. N. Frontier Diplomacy in Central Asia: Historical Perspectives, pp. 23–65.
7. Dolimov, S., Abdullayev, V. History of Uzbek Literature. Tashkent: Teacher, 1967, pp. 210–245.
8. Zartman, I. Ripe for Resolution: Conflict and Negotiation in Africa. Oxford, 2000, pp. 34–59.
9. RGADA, f.1261: Orenburg correspondence (1806–1825), pp. 5–78.
10. AVPRI, Central Asia Diplomatic Files (1810–1825), pp. 12–60.
11. Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Collection C 572, St. Petersburg, pp. 7–45.
12. British India Office Records, IOR/L/PS/9/68, pp. 3–50.
13. Munirov, Q. Historiography in Khorezm. Tashkent: G. Ghulam, 2002, pp. 101–132.
14. Ghanihojayev, F. Catalogue of Ogahiy's Works. Tashkent: Manuscript Institute, 1986, pp. 55–88.
15. Sunderland, W. The Baron's Cloak. Cornell, 2014, pp. 42–79.
16. Crews, R. For Prophet and Tsar. Harvard, 2006, pp. 112–150.
17. Khalid, A. Making Uzbekistan. Cornell, 2015, pp. 88–124.
18. Frank, A. Bukhara and the Muslims of Russia. Brill, 2012, pp. 35–67.
19. Morrison, A. "Russian Rule in Turkestan." Slavic Review, 2013, pp. 91–120.
20. Becker, S. Russia's Central Asian Frontier: Diplomacy and Expansion, 1800–1850. London: Routledge, 2004, pp. 201–238.
21. Allworth, E. Central Asia: The Historical Context. Duke, 1994, pp. 99–135.
22. Pierce, R. Russian Central Asia. California, 1960, pp. 45–83.
23. Brower, D. Turkestan and the Fate of the Russian Empire. Routledge, 2003, pp. 150–190.
24. Gorshenina, S. L'invention de l'Asie centrale. Droz, 2014, pp. 66–102.
25. Kamp, M. The New Woman in Uzbekistan. Washington, 2006, pp. 55–90.
26. Eden, J. "Frontier Diplomacy in Central Eurasia." Journal of Asian History, 2016, pp. 73–108.
27. Slezkine, Y. Arctic Mirrors. Cornell, 1994, pp. 25–61.
28. Moon, D. The Russian Peasantry. Longman, 1999, pp. 89–123.
29. Rieber, A. The Struggle for the Eurasian Borderlands. Cambridge, 2014, pp. 142–178.
30. Broers, L. Frontiers of the Russian Empire. Oxford, 2014, pp. 35–72.
31. Figes, O. The Crimean War. Metropolitan, 2010, pp. 58–91.
32. Lieven, D. Empire. Yale, 2000, pp. 110–145.
33. Sanborn, J. Imperial Apocalypse. Oxford, 2014, pp. 77–113.
34. Shahrani, M. N. Frontier Diplomacy: Comparative Perspectives, pp. 45–79.

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR FANLARNING DOLZARB MUAMMOLARI

№ 3 (6) – 2026

АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО- ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

“Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari” elektron jurnali 2020-yil 6-avgust kuni 1368-sonli guvohnoma bilan davlat ro‘yxatiga olingan.

Muassis: “SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM”
mas’uliyati cheklangan jamiyati

Tahririyat manzili:

100070. Toshkent shahri, Yakkasaroy tumani, Kichik Beshyog‘och ko‘chasi, 70/10-uy. Elektron manzil:

scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com

Bog‘lanish uchun telefon:

(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).