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Abstract: This article discusses the basis of the ethnographic methodology of scientific-historical knowledge. Undoubtedly, its successful solution implies the intensification of research aimed at the methodological support of the cognitive process, the continuous improvement of the scientific-theoretical and methodological level of scientific research.
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Introduction

It is well known that national history is an integral and integral part of world history. However, at the level of concrete research, in the historiography of all countries, the history of the homeland and the general history are studied separately. The specific material, foundations, principles and methods of research, the approaches, assessments and descriptions on which the historian works will vary.

National historiography goes through different periods in its development. Each such period, each individual stage leaves its mark on the study of the history of the homeland, is imprinted in the memory of society, and also forms the experience of historiography.

Undoubtedly, the history of the Motherland in Uzbekistan is often based on the inductive method and work with sources, while the general and world history is studied mainly in the comparative, deductive method. This does not mean that the historiography of Uzbekistan in recent years was a separate field of scientific and historical knowledge, separated from world history.
The main findings and results

The historian of Uzbekistan is brought up mainly by the works of researchers of our country, he goes through the school of domestic history, and accordingly the traditions of the national school of history are formed, philosophical components of scientific and historical thinking are formed.

What was the science of history, especially ethnography, like in the twentieth century? To what extent were he affected by social processes? To what extent did the science of history know, interpret, and explain the events of the last century? These and many other questions are, of course, directly related to the understanding of the meaning of history, the social function of historical science and the role and importance of historical science in the qualitatively new system of social relations that is being formed today.

When it comes to the essence of the process of historical cognition, one of the most important methodological and methodological questions that arises in an absolutely natural way is “can and should a historian evaluate the recorded facts, events and processes of material and spiritual reality?” is a question.

In our view, evaluation is in fact an integral part of the science of history. However, it should be noted that emotional determination, in most cases, has a much faster effect on the evaluation process and the assessment itself, especially when it is determined by the authors' personal attitude to the period under analysis rather than nationality [1.3-17].

By the way, it is important not only to analyze the world historical processes or their own national history, but also to study and collect the achievements of foreign historians who actively study the science, culture, modern processes of other countries, including Uzbekistan.

Another methodological aspect concerns the compositional structure of scientific and historical creativity. It is quite natural that the basis of any scientific work is periodicity. This is reflected in the conceptual, expressive and philosophical deterministic approach to the science of history as a system of scientific knowledge.
The problem of periodicity, of course, also applies to ethnographic research. Authors who create generalizations covering a large period of time in the field of ethnography can also “easily” choose and exaggerate this or that period of time. At the heart of this “convenience” is the ability to use existing historical and ethnographic evidence.

Typically, the basis of periodicity is the objective and subjective factors of science. It is safe to say that the criteria for the periodicity of the science of history and its ethnography include:

- first, the objective political aspects of science that determine the conditions for the development of science and set appropriate requirements for it;
- secondly, first of all, expanding the set of research problems in the development of basic concepts, improving the methods and techniques of research, enriching its analytical basis with relevant information, as well as internal concrete (positive and negative) changes in the structure, organization and activities of science.

In this regard, the periodicity scheme that forms the basis of this report, taking into account the two main criteria described above, distinguishes the following main, largest periods of development of ethnographic science in Uzbekistan in the twentieth century.

1. The first two decades of the twentieth century, 1900-1917, were, after all, the colonial period - until the October Revolution. During these years, ethnographic research was conducted mainly by Russian researchers in order to develop the country in the interests of the Russian Empire (which is only a unique work Turkestan collection of essays and articles relating to Central Asia in general and the Turkestan region in particular- Consists of 594 volumes, the first volumes 1-416 were prepared in St. Petersburg by bibliographer Vladimir Mezhov in 1867-1887. Subsequent roofing works were restored in Tashkent in 1907 by NV Dmitrovsky, in 1910 127 chapters (417-543 chapters), in 1911 by Alexander Semenov another 48 chapters (544-591), the last 3 chapters were built by bibliographer E.K. Prepared in 1939 by Betger).
2. 1917-1930 - the period of formation of the science of national history and the science of ethnography in its structure. This period is characterized by the emergence of the first scientific centers and educational institutions (faculties of history), the beginning of the training of historians and ethnographers among local peoples, the formation of the foundations of the national school of ethnography.

3. The 1940s and 1950s were a period of further development of the school of ethnography, changes in the organizational system of history (ethnography), in connection with the political demands of the leadership of the Union and the problems of scientific research and the expansion of the scope of scientific work, this science is characterized by qualitatively new tasks.

4. The 1960s and 1980s were a period often remembered by historians as a "period of stagnation" in the social development of the Union. At the same time, this idea cannot be said of ethnography, an integral part of history, because it has developed to some extent, in any case, in spite of the ideological pressure of the "center". How right were the authors, who said that ethnographers “escaped” from the strict ideological and directive instructions of the Communist Party and focused their attention mainly on historical and ethnographic problems. In the early 1960s, “warmth” was particularly pronounced, when a strict totalitarian dictatorship was replaced by a relatively free socio-political profession. It was during this period that advanced historical and prose works of art were published from the point of view of that period.

In the second half of the 1980s, the situation in the sciences of history and ethnography changed dramatically, and this change was due to a process called “reconstruction”. Researchers “had the opportunity” to create a relatively “free” scientific work, actively discussed the problems and prospects of development of nations, including the Uzbek people.

5. The period from 1991 to the present is the period of national-state independence of Uzbekistan, associated with the disintegration of the former Soviet Union and the emergence of new independent states on the world political map. Historians and ethnographers have gradually begun to redefine the historical
past of Uzbekistan, to introduce a new methodology of scientific creativity based on the concept of national independence and the path of development of the Republic of Uzbekistan, and research is being conducted in this regard.

It is safe to say that the work in the field of ethnographic study of the Uzbek people and the peoples living in Uzbekistan has become more active. In addition to reviewing and re-evaluating the scientific data collected in previous years, completely new research topics and problems (ethno-political, ethno-social, interethnic relations and other problems related to changes in the socio-political, socio-economic conditions in the world, Uzbekistan and its environs) became the object of research.

It should be noted that the science of history, the current development of scientific ethnography, the basis of the study of past and present ethnoscans’t be “free” from general conceptual theories that form the researcher’s perception of the world, his perception of the object, subject, methods and forms. However, at the heart of any scientific work on history, ethnography and other disciplines in the field of history lies the cause and effect of various historical times, periods, stages that the researcher must take into account

The dialectic of history is not only an important scientific concept, but also a mechanism of research, a reflection of real reality. History raises serious questions for Uzbekistan and its researchers. Of course, the answers to them will not be simple either. The task of historians and ethnographers is to constantly study the diverse, complex events and processes, often to solve the complex intricacies of fate-determining events.

In this regard, the politics of history and ethnography (In the XIX century, the German historian L. Ranke called on historians to study history objectively rather, it should only show historical processes as they are, using research methods and following the criticisms of historians. This is an ideal study that is difficult to carry out, but it is necessary for a historian to try to do it in full. “L. Ranke’s colleagues in Germany disagreed and objected that the historian could not stay out of politics. a German scholar, a professor) believes that a “historian” can only be
“free from politics (or political affiliation)” while lying in the grave) and the question of ideological affiliation is of great theoretical and methodological importance. The question arises: should the science of history be free from political conditions and ideology? It is clear from practice that this is not a simple question.

It is obvious that this issue, which is now considered important and topical, is a comprehensive study of the problems of history before the science of history and ethnography, which is an integral part of it, popularization of historical-cultural, ethnographic knowledge among the youth, national traditions that have been and remain the most important source of self-organization and traditions necessitate the comprehensive development of spiritual and moral values development for many centuries, traditions necessitate the comprehensive development of spiritual and moral values.

When it comes to conceptual, theoretical and methodological issues of the development of scientific and historical knowledge, the science of history (At the same time, what is said about the science of history is directly related to ethnography, ethnology, anthropology and others, which are an integral part of it) the question of political conjuncture is natural and justified. In this case, the question is to what extent and to what extent the political aspects affect the development and dynamics of scientific ethnography.

The tasks of the science of ethnography, its semantic, fundamental and practical components belong to a certain historical period, to a certain period of the nation’s development.

In raising the question of the development of the science of history in terms of political conditions, it should be borne in mind, first of all, that politics is a composite expression of the question of power. Power, whose essence is reflected in clear political - state, legal, ideological and other models of development of society, on the one hand represents specific historical forms of social life and social consciousness, on the other - directly or indirectly reflects the interests of a particular part of society, defines the main directions of social development in specific historical conditions. Thus, in such circumstances, the science of history
cannot be free from the worldview of a particular period and, in particular, “manifests itself as an executor or ally of social orders” arising from political considerations.

As for the objectivity of the science of history, it is achieved by reconciling the current political situation with the historical memory of the nation, as well as by understanding the past from the point of view of the period being studied from the present. It is the harmony of such contradictory principles that is the most important criterion for the truthfulness and objectivity of scientific and historical thought.

Of course, this does not mean that the science of history can be free of ideology in a certain period of history, because, in fact, ideology is the basis of the worldview of the current period. Social order is a manifestation of ideology. Experience - the essence and task of the science of history from the point of view of the period is the creative development of ideological creators.

The current life of the people, its way of life, customs, traditions, beliefs, international relations, ethno-political, ethno-social, ethnocultural and other processes related to peoples do not reflect the political conditions of a certain period, but are a clear manifestation of the same political conditions.

In evaluating the works published in previous periods of historiography, it is necessary to take into account the specific features of the political conditions of the period under consideration. After all, it is possible and necessary to find a reasonable essence in almost every previously published work.

Based on the above, we believe that at the current stage of development it is necessary to identify the following main areas of development of theoretical and methodological problems of historiography, and, consequently, the ethnography of Uzbekistan.

1. At the new stage of independent development of the country, Uzbekistan rightly considers the development of historical science and scientific ethnography as one of the most important political issues. Undoubtedly, its successful solution implies the intensification of research aimed at the
methodological support of the cognitive process, the continuous improvement of the scientific-theoretical and methodological level of scientific research.

Above we have mentioned only some of the outlines of future methodological developments. At the same time, it seems that the possibilities of scientific-historical research in the acquisition of knowledge depend on many objective and subjective conditions, but most importantly - the timely solution of methodological problems, science, analysis of changes in the categorical apparatus of new learning tools and methods. In our opinion, this work is awaiting its own research, and the scope of scientific activity in this area is extremely wide.

2. At the present stage, the process of development of historical science in Uzbekistan places new demands on new forms and methods of scientific knowledge, requires their further improvement, development and introduction. Consequently, the methodology of the science of history consists of a constantly evolving system. The components, principles, approaches and solutions that form the basis of the methodology cannot consist of any blind, definitive “inevitable” and “compulsory for execution” scheme. Hence the need for conceptual approaches in the field of historical sciences, special methodological research and development that define the tools and methods of research.

It is known that the system of scientific and historical knowledge consists of different levels, subsystems and elements. Hence the methodological task of understanding how all these levels, subsystems and elements are compatible with each other, to find ways to overcome the contradictions that may arise between them in order to improve the quality of scientific creativity.

3. Regarding scientific ethnography in the system of historical sciences, it should be noted that the general methodological problems of historiography, which are developed and put into practice, are one of the most important links in the research activities of ethnographers.

According to the rule that the historical approach is the only correct approach to the subject of this or that branch of science, such an approach is absolutely natural and legitimate, after all, mandatory for understanding the essence and
subject of ethnographic research. Therefore, all aspects of the methodology of history can be directly applied to scientific ethnography. Undoubtedly, ethnology has its own characteristics, and therefore a unique, special, but, of course, non-isolated methodological structure.

**Conclusion**

In this regard, the peculiarity of ethnographic historiography in the general methodological context of history is not only the identification of personal opinions of ethnographers and the study of their research results and finished scientific products, it should be noted that these views also include the identification and study of how the results of scientific research are reflected in the quality of science, in the further development of social life.
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