This book studies and interprets an aspect of Soviet development. The "modernization" of Soviet Central Asia between 1865 and 1965 has been well documented. But the character and evaluation of this transition from medieval to modern systems remain a matter of controversy. The controversy reflects differing value positions, and while we are interested in these differences as observers of conflict, our main concern lies in understanding the significance of the historical achievement that the development of Central Asia represents.

The evidence suggests that the social and cultural revolution that has occurred, particularly in Uzbekistan, ranks as the first effort of its kind to bring about major social changes through radical institutional means. It also points to a somewhat unique role performed by education, which has been employed in a dynamic way in the attempt to bypass traditional social institutions and thus to accelerate a people's acculturation to modern ways. Compared to European standards, Uzbek culture languished in a state of deprivation. That the subsequent cultural and social revolution has been popularly termed a communist one, does not detract from its significance.

Recent research on the comparative historical development of Western industrial societies, in works like those of C. E. Black and C. A. Anderson, show that the modernization patterns pragmatically worked out in those nations have largely set the types of later patterns followed in developing countries. The Soviet effort at modernization, however, took some principal exceptions to the processes followed in the West. While in the latter, educational institutions were by-and-large incidental to the main course of economic and social development, in the alternative Soviet approach the educational system appears to exercise a much more instrumental role in building new culture. To explore this Soviet context, and to design an educational model for rapid change embodying some different alternatives, are the main concerns of the authors.

We therefore seek to analyze the particularly dynamic and change-producing roles that Soviet policies have sought to formalize through educational institutions in Uzbekistan; to measure the kinds of change brought about in that society, especially in the values and functions of education; to reconstruct from our findings an educational model for development; and finally to engage in some interpretations about the directions in which Uzbek society is moving.

In pursuing these objectives, we do not minimize the importance of the power factor: Soviet political control (or "Russian" control, linking together Imperial and
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TABLE 1

Comparative Indices of Social Development (1955)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Educational Services at Secondary-Higher Levels</th>
<th>No. Students per 1000 pop.</th>
<th>No. Teachers per 1000 Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(1951)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Health Services (1955)</th>
<th>Physicians per 1000 pop.</th>
<th>Hospital Beds per 1000 pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Germany</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. K.</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Soviet periods) has been a prevailing factor among several variables impinging on the development of this once backward region. But inasmuch as many Western studies take this factor into prominent account, we have decided not to be preoccupied here with the power problem.

The principal methods used in this investigation are historical, sociological, and psychological, each interacting with the others so as to produce as many perspectives as possible and to cross-validate findings. The research is also a before-and-after case study of the ways in which a traditional culture adapted to the functions of modern systems. In addition to collecting data from a wide variety of published sources (see Bibliography), the authors conducted a number of field visits. One or more members of the study group made extensive contacts with both Russian and native (Asian minority) institutions in 1959, 1962, 1964, 1965, and 1967 for the purposes of this study. Nearly 1,000 hours of visitation have been accumulated in over 200 classrooms, the vast majority of which occurred in Uzbekistan during 1962-1965. A large number of interviews, both structured and casual, have been recorded in notebooks. For observing and analyzing classroom dynamics, a schema for generating items for classification was applied during visitations. These methods provided much of the data included in this study. Further information on methodology is reported in an original report.¹
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