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Abstract
The article touches upon the originality of the development of the Karakalpak novelism of the 80s of the XX century. The author, analyzing the novels of famous Karakalpak writers T. Kaipbergenov “The Eye of the Eye”, K. Mambetov “Conscience”, focuses on such important issues of the poetics of the novel as the plot, composition, which serve to reveal the originality of the artistic skill of the Karakalpak novel of this period. In the history of the development of Karakalpak romance, this decade is considered a fruitful period. In the 80s, modernity became the main theme of novelists. In the novels, the question of the role and place of man in society is resolved.

Introduction:
That the former Soviet Union was going to split up soon became clearer at the second half of the 1980’s. However, literary figures: writers, poets and dramatists had already felt it and started to write without following the strict rules of socialist realism, principal direction of the communist ideology. The most topical problems in the Aral Sea region of that time was caused by the mismanagement of the water resources which led to the pollution of the environment, over-salinization of the soil, worsening of the quality of fertile lands, accumulation of underwater, and withering of gardens. Furthermore, the unreasonable activities of man, namely, overuse of water to irrigate cotton and rice fields significantly decreased the amount of water falling to the Aral Sea from the Amudarya and Syrdarya rivers, as a result the sea started to shrink, causing an unprecedented ecological crisis in the region.

Methods And Description:
These and other events were truthfully depicted in the articles of People’s writer of Karakalpakstan and Uzbekistan, the laureate of the international M. Khazhgariy and M. Sholokhov awards, the laureate of the former USSR state awards, the Hero of Uzbekistan T. Kaipbergenov and in his novels and essays such as “The Ball of the Eye”, “Letters to the Other World to My Grandfather”. We planned to research the role of collision in transforming the reality of life to artistic truth in the writer’s novel “The Ball of the Eye” (Kaipbergenov, 1986).

Conflict one of the literary categories which serves as the basis for the development of events in literary works especially, in novels and in transforming the realities of life to artistic truth. Therefore, it is even impossible to define the artistic skill and the poetic originality without defining how the everyday contradictions and the conflicts among characters are depicted. In this light, if we pay attention to the peculiarities of depiction of everyday realities in Karakalpak novels of 1970-2000, first of all, we know that literary conflicts were skillfully used.
It not only increases spiritual and emotional influence of novels on the reader but also serves to increase the level of artistic mastery in our national prose. Perhaps due to its actuality some valuable works have been published in the world literary science on the nature of literary collisions, their importance in increasing writer’s skills and on some other similar issues. As, “… it is impossible to imagine a story line depicted without the collision (long term or short) between characters” (Khalizev, 2000).

It should be pointed out that some works trying to describe everyday realities on the basis of principles of justness and humanistic ideas had been published even before the Republic of Uzbekistan achieved its independence.

For example, truthfully and acutely depicted life contradictions in the books “Intikhan” (An Examine) by K. Mambetov, “Watan Gedaiy” (The Man Who Lost His Motherland) by M. Seintiyazov, “Pir Khakhkhan” (Crazy) by D. Aitmuratov revealed the drawbacks of the totalitarian system through literary collisions, and caused disputes and even contradictory opinions among literary critics.

As the policy of the stagnation period was against expressing the truth, open and fierce debate of the social ills. Furthermore, activities of party leaders, men of letter, even the literary critics who could not overcome their conservative views and strictly followed the ideology of that time prevented honest and impartial evaluation of the books similar to above mentioned works.

One of the books which evoked different literary disputes and reviews, and had repercussions in the field of literature was the novel “The Ball of the Eye” published in the second half of 1980’s. Various obnoxious phenomena which took place in our republic during the so-identified stagnation period are truthfully described in the novel, for example, illegal business deals in cotton harvesting, false reporting on the amount of gathered cotton, wasting of material and financial resources, most of all, the Aral Sea ecological catastrophe, now considered one of the most urgent problems in the world and other ecological problems. Therefore, it aroused widespread public interest: Russian, Uzbek and Karakalpak literary critics enthusiastically expressed their opinions on it (Shermukhamedov, 1982; Shermukhamedov, 1985; Orynbetova, 2001; Allambergenov, 1987; Oteuliev, 1988; Nurzhanov, 2009). Meanwhile, the role of the literary collision in depiction of the truth of life has not been studied yet.

Various conflicts in T. Kaipbergenov’s novel “The Ball of the Eye” appear and develop between the main character, director of the collective farm Zhakhyslyykh Dauletov and the former director Erzhan Serzhanov, namely, between their attitudes to administering business activities, environment, water and land resources and also their individual humanistic attitudes to mode of life.

The novel starts with heightening of the conflict between them – namely, with the description of the meeting at which one of them was relieved from his position to which another was appointed.

Instead of the director of the collective farm “Zhangalykh” Erzhan Serzhanov a young officer Zhakhyslyykh Dauletov is being appointed. Therefore, all active members of the collective farm have come to the meeting.

Just at this moment one can see the writer’s skills to portray contradictions of everyday life, differences in the opinions of each character through the method of psychological parallelism. As a result, the writer’s experience to reveal the acute spiritual collisions of the characters comes into sight.

For instance, drawing main attention to the characters’ immersion into their own thoughts, the writer attaches conflicting qualities to their thoughts and manages to load them with the tasks of the plot. While Erzhan Serzhanov thinks about how he has lost his position as a director, Zhakhyslyykh Dauletov thinks about how he has become a manager and falls into deep psychological reflection about the future events.

On this point, we can agree with the opinion of the well-known Karakalpak literary scholar K. Allambergenov who said: “These two images are great novelty recently introduced into the system of images of Karakalpak prose. The author could artistically describe social ills such as, false-reporting, window-dressing, bribery, bias in administering business and retreat from the principles of democracy, which have never been spoken about in our literature before.

The novel, due to its ideological orientation, stands on the same level with the books “Eternal Truth” by N. Dumbadze and “Game” by Yu. Bondarev” in the All-union prose (Allambergenov, 1987).
It is worth mentioning that books dealing with same problems were also created in the literature of other Central Asian peoples for example, the book “Seng” (Ice Floe) by Kazakh writer F. Nurpeisov, and the book “Diyanat” (Honesty) by Uzbek writer A.Yakubov. They also truthfully revealed the contradictory events of the totalitarian system. It may be concluded that that the abovementioned literary direction brought about a typological likeness among the works by the representatives of Karakalpak, Kazakh and Uzbek literature. From this perspective, the typological closeness between the characters of Zhakhsylykh Dauletov and Erzhan Sershanov created by T. Kaipbergenov and the characters of Narmurad Domla and Atakhozo created by A. Yakubov are worth attention.

This can be explained by the fact that the contradictory events happened in different regions of Uzbekistan took place in the similar circumstances and similar social conditions. Moreover, it is interesting for us to know that the aforementioned Karakalpak and Uzbek writers stayed in the similar position in creating literary conflicts.

The conflict between Zhakhsylykh Dauletov and Erzhan Serzhanov from the book “The Ball of the Eye” by T. Kaipbergenov arose when they were measuring the size of the excess area under crops belonging to the collective farm.

Zh. Dauletov started to take decisive steps when it was clear that excess area was used under crops and significant damage was being caused to the farmers because of it. But the followers of the old method led by E. Serzhanov put up a strong resistance to Zh. Dauletov.

The tightening of conflicts by using dialogues and internal monologues intermittently along with author’s words is one of the artistic signs of the novel “The Ball of the Eye”. While revealing the contradictions between the characters, these descriptive devices fulfill direct functions in the ups and downs of the spot (Khalizev, 2000).

The monologues and dialogues used in the novel serve to convey to the reader the characters’ inner experiences and views, discrepancies and conflicts in their inner world in an impressive, concise and concrete way.

The misunderstandings and conflicts in the family are also skillfully used in the book in order to create literary conflicts.

For example, the episode when Zh. Dauletov gets angry with his wife, when she tells him that she does not want to have more than one daughter, and goes out of his house at night and knocks at Sharipa window, the woman whom he loved before, in our opinion, does not serve to escalate the conflict, but to create a small family conflict and a pretext to accuse Zh. Dauletov of acting immorally. However, the closeness of Zhakhyslykh’s and Sharipa’s thoughts and opinions: coincidence of their opinions on the Aral Sea, the Amudarya River and other problems of water use and management are plausibly depicted in the novel.

Therefore, his passionate monologue (the author’s voice is particularly heard from it), on the necessity of saving the Aral Sea, addressed to Sharipa, is the best part of the novel” (Shermukhamedov, 1982).

The thoughts about the Aral Sea and water had been disturbing Zhakhyslykh Dauletov since the first days when he had become director. Under the influence of these thoughts he comes to the bank of the Amudarya river and utter the following words:

- Hey, Amu! - he said as if he was angry with the river. – Why are you becoming like a merciless mother? Who are you angry with? The Aral Sea which you were filling to the brims are shrinking day by day. Understand me!

Speaking to himself walking on the bank of the river, Zh.Dauletov runs into hydrologist Sharipa. These dates which happened after so many years, take place several times later on and serve to heighten the conflicts of the novel.

For instance, their frequent meetings serve as a pretext for his opponents to criticize him: the manager of the shop accuses Sharipa of immoral behavior and tries to offend her father, an old man Nurzjan.

The old man could hardly bear this mockery. One day, he falls from his bed and badly hurts his backbone and dies.
Most of the accusing part of the anonymous complaint about Zh. Dauletov, which had been sent to the authorities, was on his relationships with Sharipa.

We think that, here, we should not forget the opposite side of the problem.

The description of Zh. Dauletov’s frequent rendezvous with Sharipa is perhaps connected with T. Kaipbergenov’s attempt to get rid of the conflict-free theory which has ruled the Soviet literature since the second half of the 1950’s. In other words, this means that the writer avoided portraying the positive characters as ideal men, and tried to tell the readers that they are also common people by describing their weakness in behavior and families, and attempted to describe their real characters and features.

There are more than enough examples of this in the multinational literature of the former Soviet Union. For example, communist Davydov could not control himself and slept with the prostitute Lukashka.

In the dramatic poem “Aktrisanyng Yghbaly” (The Fate of the Actress) by I. Yusupov, the positive character Abdirakhman falls in love with a young and beautiful girl Ariukhan.

In the novel “The Ball of The Eye” the writer deliberately attaches a small, politically harmless drawback to Zh. Dauletov, the main character, who is modest and honest, moreover, has deep philosophical and social views, higher education, management and life experience because the writer was afraid that he would turn into an ideal character.

Sometimes the writer conveys the views and opinions of the character Dauletov directly in the forms of dialogues and monologues, sometimes through the beauties of nature – landscapes described by the character himself; on the other hand he makes us envision the conflicts between E. Serzhanov and Zh. Dauletov by skillfully describing the landscapes.

In our opinion, this shows us the writer’s one more artistic skill in describing the collisions of the novel.

After having finished describing the beauties of nature, all of a sudden, the writer uses the following dialogue between Dauletov and Serzhanov:

“… - Erzhan Serzhanovich, said Dauletov with somewhat negligence. – There was poplar forest around here. We can’t see it …?”

Who said it to you? – said Serzhanov surprisingly. - … That forest has already been destroyed, and turned into a crop area. Those cotton fields appeared instead of it, he said pointing to the cotton field lying at the distance of about one and half kilometers” (Kaipbergenev, 1986).

The novel is full of such conflict situations described by different descriptive methods. For example, “They came to the seashore without much difficulty. Old, dusty barges lie on the dried bed of the sea. Everywhere one can see boats faded by sunshine. This view touched Dauletov’s soul very much: “What a pity! He sighed. Being busy with his thoughts, Serzhanov did not hear what he said” (Kaipbergenev, 1986).

Such inner opinions of Dauletov, which were contrary to Serzhanov’s opinions and mental world, always connected with Sharipa’s thoughts, even, with the main conceptions of her research work.

Therefore, talks between them were about water, the Aral Sea, and the ecological problems and always centered on the idea of finding the methods of saving the nature, the motherland from man-made disasters.

For example, by instilling conflict content in their dialogues during their next rendezvous the writer manages to escalate even more the literary conflict of the book while and describing them figuratively and artistically:

“… A smoke like thing was seen at the seaside. At once Serzhanov shouted
- The sea is on fire! Everybody looked at the seaside …
No one could guess that the dark smoke like thing which rose over the withered bushes of reed on the dried bed of the sea was just a whirlwind.

The smoke of dust is going up winding like a snake. The old fallen leaves of reeds were also going up with the wind.

… - It seems like the sand is going up, said Sharipa.

The head of the expedition was still silent, but after looking a while he said:

- No, friends, it’s not smoke, it’s a whirlwind. It is spreading the ashes of the reeds which burned down last year. Now it will go over the sands which once were under the sea… Go down to the pit, cover your eyes, otherwise… - he said without moving” (Kaipbergenov, 1986).

True, to depict such tense views with deep content was exceptionally difficult in 1970’s and 1980’s and it would not be an exaggeration if we said it was dangerous for any man of letter. All the same, the pictures of the period full of contradictions even tragedies were brought up in T. Kaipbergenov’s novel which we are discussing. Also, their acute description by way of conflicts, as shown above, demonstrates major distinctive features of the novel.

In general, it was not easy to write honestly about the social ills of the stagnation period especially about the contamination of the environment, wasting of water, shrinking of the Aral Sea, erosion of the soil and the tragic consequences of all of them.

As was pointed out competently by Uzbek literary scholar I. Mirzaev, “… in 1960-70’s, the literature of the former Soviet Union including Uzbek literature was full of works with bathos, i.e., the works praising socialist system, but keeping mum of ecological disasters.” Such writers as Said Nazar, Ibragim Rakhim, Rakhmat Faizi, Khamid Gulyam, Mirmukhsin, Hakim Nazar and some others wrote a lot on this topic.

A.Mukhtar, S. Akhmad, A.Yakobov, P. Khadirov, Sh. Khalmurzaev, U. Usmanov and J. Abdullakhanov are the writers with their own distinct style and by 1985, they had already written about everyday realities without exaggerating facts” (Mirzaev, 1991). From this perspective, T. Kaipbergenov’s novel “The Ball of the Eye” carry weight in exposing the contradictions of the stagnation period. One more side of its peculiar properties in the process of turning the contradictions of the period into the literary collisions is that the writer was able to skillfully depict each character’s inner world and innermost thoughts.

Especially, it becomes clear to the reader from the conflict of Dauletov’s and Serzhanov’s inner thoughts which they experience during the first meeting.

The writer describes each character’s inner monologues, full of controversial thoughts, by using such descriptive devices as remembering and imagining and describes events artistically using psychological principles.

The main peculiarity of the novel “The Ball of the Eye” is the fact that the plot and conflict functions are instilled in the mental world of characters and reflected in it.

Especially the depiction of events intensifying them with the inner monologues of characters and supporting them with the inner dynamism of thoughts was a novelty in our national literature. Therefore, most scientists lay stress on artistic role of such dialogues and inner monologues (Khrapchenko, 1968; Koroban, 1979; Rymar, 1989).

So inner monologues instill a particular feature into the overall artistic structure of the novel, and serve to heighten the tense conflicts even more.

Serzhanov’s thoughts about his inability to depose Dauletov from his post and Dauletov’s anxiety about extra fields are expressed in the form of inner monologues and they have particular importance in the structure of the novel. This method, which has a great role in the description of the characters, serves to further heighten the tense conflicts of the novel and to make them look more natural and real.

In general, skilful use of inner monologues is the key element of the novel.
One of the main characters of the novel Zh.Dauletov asks himself a universal, philosophical question. He envisages the picture of the world, of the humanity which is full of contradictions and looks for the ways of solving them and getting rid of meanness.

It is also one of the artistic devices used in the book to bring up bravely the sharp contradictions of life.

Therefore, ascribing the tension of conflicts of the novel only to the contradictions and mismanagement in industry and cotton growing in 1970-80's would be a biased approach.

Above all, by depicting such concrete working relations, the writer set himself a great task of describing the qualities pertaining to the mankind, to the inner world and moral make-up of man, such as struggle and conflict between frauds, eyewash, status seeking on the one side and humaneness, honesty, humanism, mercifulness on the other. As “The writer not only exposed to sharp criticism the unpleasant developments but also attached a special artistic meaning to the few but strong progressive forces which fight with them. On its turn, it led to the strong domination of the optimistic frame of mind” (Allambergenov, 1987).

Conclusions:

It is fair to say that to achieve his purpose the writer used the events of 1970-80’s as a literary material for his novel.

In conclusion, the novel “The Ball of the Eye” by Karakalpak writer T. Kaipbergenov is the book which truthfully described how the mismanagement of the land and water resources caused the ecological catastrophe in the Aral Sea region and led to bad consequences. Hence it belongs not only to Karakalpak literature but also to Central Asian even to the World literature. In spite of the fact that the novel was forbidden by communist bureaucracy it was published in Russian in 1981, in Uzbek in 1982 and in 1986 in Karakalpak. As a result the novel raised people’s ecological conscientiousness and taught them to care about land and water resources and treat them environment on the principles of universal human values.

We think that T. Kaipbegov achieved this by masterly constructing the literary conflicts. Thus the importance of T. Kaipbergenov’s novel should be evaluated with due regard to these achievements.
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