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Abstract: In the aftermath of the Revolution, the Muslim Tatars of Kazan living in the region of Volga, could not continue the reforms of maktab and madrasa they had achieved before the Bolshevik Revolution. The ulama of the region that had split into two groups before the revolution of 1917 as qadimists-jadidists tried to determine the amount of damage caused by the revolution. The handwritten copies of a survey conducted in 1920-1921 among the imams, muallims and mudarrises provide us significant information about this consideration.
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a. Jadidism and Qadimism in Muslim Tatars: Historical Background

One of the most remarkable revivalist religious movements marked upon the last two centuries of Islamic thought arose among the Muslims of the Tsardom of Russia. This Kazan-centred revivalist religious movement in Volga (Itil) within the border of Tsardom of Russia was known as “Jadidism”. The revivalist movement in religion and education set out by the Bulgarian Turks, as they known in history, and the Tatars of Kazan, as from the late 18th and early 19th century to 1920s was called “Jadidism”, their followers “Jadidists”. The representatives of this movement have not been known well enough, except for a few partly known. However, the reformist views upheld by the then Tatar scholars (ulamâ) have kept their freshness and importance not only in that time, but also in the present day. On the other, the importance of Tatar movement of “Jadidism” will be understood
better when compared to the reformist movements both in Egypt and in Subcontinent of India.

The thought of Jadidism in Kazan that we can initiate with the well-known Tatar scholar Abdunnasir Qursavî (d. 1812) followed by a larger group of ulamâ before long such as Husayîn Fayizhânî (d. 1866), Shahâbuddîn Marjânî (d. 1889), Mûsâ Jarullah Bigî (d. 1949), Rizââddîn b. Fahradîn (d. 1936), Ziyââddîn Kamîlî (d. 1942), Muhammad Najib Tünterî (d. 1930), Alimjan Barûdî (ö. 1921), Abdurrazshidî Ibrahim (d. 1944), Abdullah Bûbî (d. 1922), Zaynullah Rasûlî (d. 1833-1917). However, with the Bolshevik Revolution that broke out in Russia in 1917, Jadidism movement and its scholarly heritage unfortunately soon disappeared. Among them only a number of intellectuals who managed to run away from the region such as Musa Jarullah continued to enunciate their Jadist (progressive) views in the organs of publication in various pat of Islamic world and Turkey A highly few number of intellectuals who could survive last in Kazan and around until 1940s suffered under the anti religion Soviet rule to the unbelievable physical and psychological difficulties. These intellectuals tried to continue the religious training of the new generation by way of the Muslim Religious Administration in Ufa and its organ of publication Islam Mecellesi (1924-1927).

It is undoubtedly that this Jadidist movement that appeared in Kazan had also opponents. These opponents who severely criticized the views of held by Jadidist were referred to as “Qadimists”. And the movement in question was called “Qadimism”. However, sometimes these definitions seem to be opposed to. For instance, some of “qadimists” did not welcome the terms qadimist or qadimism. They regarded themselves as “din tutuçılar (the protectors of religion)” or those on the way of predecessors (salaf). On the other hand, the Jadists refers to themselves as “those wishing to return to the way of salaf”. Taking a look at the publications of either side, we can find many examples about this point.

While Jadidists described Qadimists to be the people who are fanatic, common herd, narrow minded and unaware of the trend of the world, Qadimists referred to Jadidists as the people who had liberal views on religious matters, the reformists of religion with the aim of corrupting religion, missionaries... etc. Particularly, with the establishment of constitutional monarchy in Russia in 1905, the mutual discussions exceedingly increased. Either of group voiced their views in the newspapers, magazines and books they themselves published through which they fiercely criticized one another. However, it should be noted here that in some matters such as the possibility of the Quran’s translation into other languages, election of woman mufti and the reading of the khutbas of Friday prayer and Bairam (±d) in another language, in Tatar language or Turkish, apart from Arabic, occasionally the both groups shared the same views. But the sense of “being opponent” obstructed to come to an agreement. Even, this “sense of being
opponent” and “concern about religion” increased to the extent that in early 1910s Qadimists denounced Jadidists to the government of Tsardom of Russia. With the effect of complaints, a highly widespread inquiry of Pan Islamism and Pan Turkism was launched by Russians. Even merely an example from Din ve Ma'şet, a pro-Qadimist journal, will be enough to show the hard line of the journal.

In an issue of Din ve Ma'şet published in 1912, while Nakshi sheikh Zaynullah Rasûlî’s permission, one of the famous jadidists of the region, given to an orientalist he had got acquainted on board to take his photograph was criticized, this was interpreted as a permission given by Sheikh merely as a momento. In the footnote of the article written down the by the editorial board of journal, it is noted that no one can commit, whatever he aims anything reprehensible, no matter forbidden or not. Despite the mutual contention, the Jadidists in Kazan found a serious ground, thus making a remarkable progress whether in religious or educational reform.

The Jadidist ulamâ upheld such ideas as the reform in the madrasas, unity in language, giving education to, reform in religious administration and teaching of the Russian language. Besides, they opposed to the restriction of the universal message of Islam to the limits of one or several Islamic school of thought (mazhab), to the limits of a certain time. Jadidists also stood up for the re-understanding of the Sunnah and Quran. Jadidists who gave priority to the Maturidism against some of the dominant Asharite views asserted that term Ahl al-Sunnah had a wide-ranging meaning, not a narrow one.

As for Qadimists who arose as the opponents of Jadidists, they held that there was no necessary for the girls to attend to Maktabs and Madrasas, and that the positive sciences needn’t to be taught in the madrasas where religious education was given. In addition, Qadimists showed opposition to the reformist attempts in Maktabs and Madrasas.

Russian religious and political authority’s view on the struggle between Jadidism and Qadimism is quite clear. For example, the statements found in the records of Missionary Congress held on the 13-26th June 1910 in Kazan saw the Jadidists, so to speak, as enemy, since they conduced to the revival of Muslims.

b. Debates after the Bolshevik Revolution

Muslims in Kazan and in the neighboring regions were trying to remain standing against the financial difficulties and anti-religious pressures in 1917 and afterwards, shortly after the Bolshevik Revolution. In this process, they were also considering the mistakes and good deeds. Here, one of these is a number of handwritten texts of survey presently found in the Library of Kazan State University. These handwritten texts of survey belonging to the early 1920s are important in that
they inform us about the Qadim-Jadid struggle and about the muallims, mudar-rises and imams’ assesments, particularly those in the region of Vyatka (the vicinity of Malmij and Kazan), of conditions of Madrasas. On these surveys which also gave us information of post-revolution profiles and psychology of intellectuals no study has been done so far.

It seems that the surveys were made by Muhammad Najib Tuntarî (d. 1930), one of important pre-1917 scholars. Muhammad Najib Tuntarî was born in a village called Tuntar subject to Malmij a subdistrict nearby Kazan. Both his father Shamsaddin and maternal grandfather Sheikh Ali Tuntarî were learned men. So, M. Najip Tuntarî was born in a family within which the prestigious scholars raised. His wife is Ummatgunnisa, the daughter of the famous Nakshibandî sheikh Muhammad Zâkir b. Abd al-Wahhab of Chistay. Losing his father in his early life (13), Tuntarî did not take a journey for learning, instead stayed with his mother. Tuntarî who was taught in the Madrasa of Kıshkar, basically learned through his private library. Focusing on the salaf and theological schools, Tuntarî established his thought on the way of salaf. Tuntarî is known to have followed magazines, newspaper and newly published books in Arabic, Persian and Turkish in Egypt and Istanbul. After the Bolshevik Revolution in 1348/1930 winter (in Ramadan and Shawwal), he died at the age of 68. However, the reason why he died was the fact that he was imprisoned in January in a highly cold weather and forced to walk for a long time. It is not known, says Rızâaddin b. Fakhraddin, the well-known Tatar biographer, where Tuntarî was buried, adding that Soviet government did not give permission even to the demands of Muslims of Kazan for funeral.

Apart from his printed and handwritten treatises, some articles of Muhammad Najib Tuntari were issued in al-Din wa al-Adab, the then Jadidist publication organ. His most important work is the 87 page treatise called Hudûs-ı Aleme İ’tikad Cihatinden Bir Nazar (Kazan 1900), consisting of two parts. It is also known that he composed another work Safir al-Islâm ilâ Sâîr al-Akvâm printed in Şeref printing house in Kazan, whose copy we could not identified yet. As for the original handwritten copy of Tuntarî’s work Tuntar Karyesi Tarihi, it is in the Archive of Rızaaddin b. Fakhiraddin of Russian Academy of Sciences in Ufa.

Muhammad Najib Tuntarî conducted this survey in the late 1920 and late 1921 as the muhtasib of the Muftiyat of Russian Muslims. The date of reply to some texts of survey extends to April of 1921, the years, shortly after the Bolshevik Revolution, when the confusion did not end yet. As a matter of fact, Soviet rule declared with a decision made in January of 1918 that the religious education would be started as from 14 years of age and only in the Masjids. And a several years later, in June of 1924, strengthening this decision, it entered the names of those teaching and learning religious education to the official records. The years
of 1921 and 1922 were also the years of severe starvation both in the history of Russia and Russian Muslims.18

The answered texts of survey in the Library of Kazan State University have been discovered by us without being classified, mixed with other handwritten documents in another file, and assigned numbers to the folios. The available number of answered texts of survey is 41.

The questions of survey prepared by Tuntarî consist of two parts. While the former contains information about the persons sent, the latter includes information aiming to learn their views. The questions of the first part are concerning the the birth-date, the date and number of obtaining “menşur-ukaz (a sertificate permitting for teaching or imamate)”, grade of examination, the present location of work etc. The other questions of this part were about the names of imams, muallims and mudarrises died in nearby places as from 1900, their death dates, the sex and numbers of students having religious education, number of classrooms and students taught in each classroom, the names of teachers and the books needed, and whether or not the students could buy these books, if they were found.

The questions in this first part are pertaining of a general consideration of Muslim intellectuals after the domestic disorders following Bolshevik Revolution. Even, it was a kind of preparation for the decisions likely to be made at any moment.

In the second group, there are entirely four questions we’ll refer to: They are as follows:

Since the aim in teaching religion is students’s practicizing what Islam orders in their lives, what should be done to reach at this goal? Could the fundamentals called “Qadimism” and Jadidism serve fruitfully to this goal?

In order to inculcate the students the religious spirit, is it sufficient for students to be learned, have a good pedagogical formation, and additionally to have books and other material supplies in full? While the students have every kind of the necessary equipments in full, if the students are failed to give religious spirit, what causes this?

It is accepted in common both by the men of religion and sociologists that the productivity in teaching and education in the schools depends on education given by family. Therefore, are they of the directly tasks of imams themselves to teach the father of the future the methods of education, and the girls, the mothers of the future the education of children in accordance with Islam and give these children moral advises? Who will be responsible for the bad results, since this duty has been underrated?

What are the most important works in the world of mollas to be reformed? For example, in the matter of preaching, considering the time and place affairs, does
it need to reform? Or should they be left as they are? This is only just an exam-
ple. Seeking all the points to be reformed, write them down. The answers should
be given by investigating not copying from other. You must write the answers
carefully, not randomly, since the matter is crucial. Basing on the freedom of
thought, write down the true one in your opinion?19

Although the abovementioned questions of survey were given exactly the same,
except for some minor changes in some questions,20 in most of them they are
not given, but only their answers. Considering the questions asked in the survey,
it is clearly seen that the imams and mudarrisës are asked to give answer in a full
freedom of thought and without coming under any influence. But, despite this,
some of imams and mudarrisës did not enter into the matter of qadimism-
jadidism, preferring to keep silent.21 In the answers given in the surveys, among
the mostly emphasized problems are the complaints against the attitude of Soviet
rule towards religion and de facto poverty. Also stating that the people reacted
to this situation very poorly, the imams and mudarrisës try to underline that the
people were in despair. Besides, concerning about the difficulty of books and
place, almost all the imams and mudarrisës state that those working in the field
of religion and religious education were in financial difficulties.22 It seems that as
one of the main goals in the survey, the questioning of “Qadimism or jadidism? or
where do we do mistake in religious education?” kept in the background.
However, 24 of 41 surveys try to give answer to the first question under the sec-
ond group of question, i.e. the debate of qadimism-jadidism. These 24 answers
and other ones give important information about the post Russian Revolution
state of region.

c. Assessment

In some respects it is important that Muhammad Najib Tuntarî made such a sur-
vvey in Malmij region subject to Vyatka, a region nearby Kazan. For one thing, this
region is a region where the madrasas that played an important part, particular-
ly Kishkar, Tuntar and Machkara, not only in the history of Muslim Tatars, but also
in the history of all the people of Turkistan gave education.23 In addition, it is a
fruitful area where the remarkable figures such as Abdunnasir Qursavî (d. 1812),
Ahmadjan b. Amirhan (d. 1813), Muhammad Rahim Machkaravî of ulamä, and
Sheikh Ali Tuntañ, one of the significant represantatives of Nakshibandism in the
region grew up. Madrasa of Bûbî that was active also in the same region just
before the Bolshevik Revolution with his education even attracted the attention
of Tsardom Russia. However, shortly after Tsardom Russia closed down the
madrasa. While Abdullah and Ubaydallah Bûbî brothers who taught in this
madrasa marked an era in the field of religious education for the madrasas of
Muslim Tatars, their sister Mukhlisa Bûbî was designated in the post-Bolshevik
Revolution period as the first Muslim lady qâdî(ya), Muslim local judge. 24 Another point to be noted lastly is that the same region grew up both Abdullah Bûbî, one of the most distinguished names of Tatar revivalism (jadidism), and Ishmuhammad Tuntarî (d. 1919), one of the most significant figures of Tatar traditionalism (Qadimism). 25

The fact that Malmij region played much important role in the life of Tatars just before the Bolshevik Revolution also increases the value of surveys at our disposal. Moreover, an engineer answering the survey in extenso and his answers is crucial for this paper. For this person is Mukhammad Naqib Tuntarî, the son of aforementioned Ishmuhammad, the most leading figure of Qadimists, who was taught in the Madrasas of Malmij, then that of Bukhara. Although this person 26 who was the imam of the second quarter of Tuntar village subject to Malmij by the time when he answered the survey was the son of a legendary Qadimists among the Muslim Tatars, he made impartial assessments. Whereas his father was known as a person who adopted a highly firm attitude against the Jadidists and even accused the Jadidists to Tsardom Russian rule. 27

Only the 8 of 24 persons answering the Qadimism-Jadidism debate backed up the views of Jadidists. According to these eight persons, in this period when the Jadidists conducted the education of children and the young successfully, religious education had need of reform and the books taught by Jadidists must be preferred. 28 However, Even though one of them, Qutbulabrar b Fathuddin Vahabov the imam of a village Yeni Pejmura (New Pejmura) publicly advocated the Jadidism, he also made a serious criticism. In his opinion, the Qadimists did not approve of reforming their traditional educational system, and showing hostility to everything new, they brought about significant damages. But, according to Vahabov, Jadidists also made mistakes in three significant matters, though they achieved highly important affairs. To him, Jadidists first, with their statements caused had the view spread as if the tradition were completely something bad. Secondly, Vahabov argued that Jadidists also made a mistake in referring to the reform of maktabs and madrasas as “usul-i jadid (new methods)”, instead they could prefer such a name as “training in an order”. The third point referred to by Vahabov was that some of Jadidists arose among the people with an appearance Muslim people disliked, i.e. a westernized appearance. According to him, these three “weapons” were used by the Qadimists against Jadidists, and the Jadidists gave the weapons to the Qadimist with their own hands. 29 These identifications put forth by Vahabov, as a pro-Jadidism and particularly his pointing out that the fight between the two sides was an error; in fact, reflected a conviction that began more and more cultivating in that time. For, just like him, a considerable part of those who participated in answering the survey were in the opinion that the Qadimist-Jadidist fight damaged to the religious maktabs and madrasas. 30
In the survey, the numbers of those openly favoring the Qadimists are four persons.31 Even, one of them argues that the Jadidist maktabs and madrasas alienated the young from religion.32 The numbers of those arguing that both the Qadimism and Jadidism had not contributed sufficiently to the religious education of Muslim Tatar children are four persons.33

Apart from aforesaid 24 persons, 17 persons left behind generally passed shortly most of the questions in the second group without answering.34 Among them were also those answering the questions in the second group, though the answers were quite short, they did not entered into Qadim-Jadid discussion.

The most interesting message of the texts of survey at our disposal came from Muhammad Naqip Tuntañ. This person, the son of Ishmuhammad Dinmuhammadoglu, the well-known name of Qadimist tradition, said that both Qadimism and Jadidism, though having exceptional examples, had not a conclusive attempt making the striking comparison below:

“Religious education means to teach student the religious judgements and the related points with them. But this is not enough alone, the student should be embellished with the religious sense or religious spirit and be related to the religion with the tie of love. Neither of methods that arose as Qadim and Jadid failed to provide a fruitful service for this purpose. For the former [Qadimism] attempted to teach matters rather nothing to do with religion or, if any, very little. It neither provided him with religious knowledge, nor educated him in religious spirit. As for the latter [Jadidism], though they provide more service in teaching religious judgements compared to the former, their methods was nothing but to have student memorize the poor information and to pile up information as much as possible and by the time of exams to receive the compliments and good prayers of those present to watch the examination. It neglected the most essential aim, that is to say, to establish the real religious senses into the heart of student, thus making him a real Muslim.”35

Following this statements, Muhammad Naqip Tuntañ, also listed his suggestions lengthily to receive the aim in religious education, giving highly valuable information. But the main interesting point is the fact that the conditions he asked to be available in maktabs and madrasas almost all included the views advocated by Jadidists before Revolution. Such important points as primarily the embellishment of maktabs and madrasas, teaching of the book in a certain order from the simple to the difficult one, educating the girls, attendance of women to the masjids and teachers’s having pedagogical formation were the basic elements of Jadidists stipulated for the reform in maktabs and madrasas.36 Even, they were thoroughly opposite to those of his father, the well known Qadimist Ishmuhammad Dinmuhammedov, and other Qadimists.37
The question of reform in maktabs and madrasas upon which Mukhammad Naqip Tuntař touched with these striking statements were, in fact, not only the question of ulamâ in Tatar, but also, from the late 19th century onward, the question of Muslim world. Still, this matter has not been solved, where the religious education is concerned, in many regions, above all Kazan. In the Bolshevik period, this moderate line of his to come over these matters could not find a chance to spread out among Muslim Tatars. The anti-religious and oppressive rule of Bolsheviks made feel itself thoroughly soon after the time when the surveys were made. No sooner had 1935 come than the considerable number of Muslim Tatar ulamâ were killed or expelled or imprisoned by the Bolsheviks. Thus, neither madrasa, nor religious education remained.
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