



Journal Website:
<http://usajournalshub.com/index.php/tajssei>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

The Role Of The Principalities Of The Kashkadarya Oasis In The Political History Of The Bukhara Emirate In The XIX-Early XX Centuries

Akhmadjon Kholikulov

Associate Professor, Candidate Of Historical Sciences (Uzbekistan) Department Of History Of Uzbekistan, National University Of Uzbekistan

Ozodbek Nematovich Nematov

4th Year Student, Faculty Of History, National University Of Uzbekistan Named After Mirzo Ulugbek, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Information on political relations between the government of the Emirate of Bukhara and the principalities of the Kashkadarya oasis in the early XIX-XX centuries is reflected in the works of local historians and Russian tourists, diplomats, the military. Local historians such as Muhammad Mirolim Bukhari, Muhammad Siddiq, Mirzo Abdulazim Somi, Mushrif Bukhari, Ahmad Donish, Mirzo Salimbek, who lived and worked during this period, were government officials and dedicated their works to the reigns of the Mangit emirs.

KEYWORDS

Chirakchi Mirolim, Bukhari kenagas, Bukhara Emirate, Amir Haydar

INTRODUCTION

The works of historians of the Bukhara Emirate contain various information about the genealogy of the supreme rulers, relatives, friends and enemies, their struggles for the throne and military campaigns, the appointment of local beys by the Emir. It should be noted that in the works of some authors, Shakhrisabz kenagas and local beys

are described as “rebels”, and the causes of local protests and uprisings at different times have not been sufficiently analyzed. Mirolim Bukhari praised Amir Nasrullah's 1834 campaign against Chirakchi and Shahrisabz and praised his work. A similar approach is found in the work of Mirzo Salimbek. The author

describes Kitab and Shahrisabz kenagas as "rebels" who opposed Amir Muzaffar.

THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

With the accession of Amir Haydar (1800-1826) to the throne of Bukhara, relations between Shakhrisabz and the central government of Bukhara became more tense. During this period, Niyaz Ali was the governor of Shakhrisabz, and although he was subordinate to the Bukhara Emirate, he was working for independence. As a result, Amir Haydar was forced to reconcile with Shahrisabz's independent policy.

The rulers of Kokand, who sought to reduce Bukhara's political influence in the region, also sought to cooperate with separatist forces in the emirate. In particular, at the beginning of the XIX century political relations between Shakhrisabz and Kokand khanate were strengthened. The fact that the governor of Shahrisabz Niyaz Ali lost the war with the Emir of Bukhara and took refuge in the presence of Kokand khan Umar Khan also testifies to the essence of these relations. Shahrisabz-Kokand relations led to increased political competition between the Kokand Khanate and the Emirate of Bukhara.

Later, Amir Haydar chose the path of political compromise with the beys of Shahrisabz, Kitab and Yakkabag, and local beys, usually given titles and positions given to palace officials, were awarded. For example, the governors of Yakkabag were given the title of Toksobo, which ranks 7th in the hierarchy of 15 high-ranking deeds of Bukhara, and the beys of Shakhrisabz were given the highest titles of "Fatherhood" (Otalik). Even the governor of Shakhrisabz, Daniyov was presented as the property of the principality of Shakhrisabz for

his help to the father in the battle with the Kokands. However, the Emir of Bukhara was politically incapable of completely resolving the political conflict between the Shakhrisabz principality and the Bukhara Emirate. The fact that the Shahrisabz people were on the side of the rebels during the china-kipchak uprising in Miyankol in 1821-1825 showed that the roots of these political conflicts were deep.

After the death of Amir Haydar in 1826, his three sons Husayn, Umar and Nasrullah ascended the throne. Political unrest in Bukhara led to renewed protests in Kitab and Shakhrisabz. After Crown Prince Hussein sat on the throne for 2 months and 14 days, his brother Umar was enthroned. Umar devoted his short (nearly 4 months) reign not to the establishment of state rule, but to luxury. Ahmad Donish writes that even when his brother Nasrullah came from Samarkand and besieged the Bukhara arch, 'Umar was drunk and could not defend himself in time. As a result, he manages to escape the Ark, wearing a shawl with his loved ones. On the last Thursday of Ramadan 1242 year, Nasrullo ascended the throne of Bukhara.

Known for his brutality among the Bukhara emirs, Amir Nasrullah during his reign (1826-1860) carried out regular attacks to recapture the Shakhrisabz oasis. During this period, defensive fortifications were built in several villages near Shakhrisabz and Bukhara soldiers were stationed there. In the attacks on Shakhrisabz and Kitab, these forts served as a stronghold. For this reason, the townspeople often attacked these forts and tried to destroy them.

It is known that Ahmad Donish has also been sharply critical of Amir Nasrullah's potential as a head of state and his morals. This information

is in line with the views of foreign tourists who visited the emirate during the reign of Nasrullah. It is known that during the reign of Amir Nasrullah, many British and Russian ambassadors visited the emirate. Among them were British officer A. Burns, Russian spies, tourists P.I. Demezov, Vitkevich, N.Khanykov and others. Their assessment of Amir Nasrullah as a ruler is also noteworthy. In particular, the Russian traveler Vitkevich, who visited Bukhara in 1835, spoke about the activities of Amir Nasrullah, noting that he was the Emir or king only in his name, and that the main state affairs were ruled by Hakimbi. He describes Hakimbi as a man who is resourceful, who does everything himself without delivering anything to the Emir, who does what he wants in governing the state, who is the richest in the Emirate, even richer than the Emir, and who cannot resist the Emir. This idea was supported by G.O. Gens, who devoted his entire life to gathering information about Central Asia. Even after the above conclusion of G.O. Gens about the emir was stated, Amir Nasrullah ruled the country for another twenty years and organized marches on Shakhrisabz and Kokand every year.

Amir Nasrullah, who "conquered the territories from Kokand to Kesh", went down in history as the last independent ruler of Bukhara. After Nasrullah, in 1860, his son Muzaffarkhan ascended the throne of Bukhara. From the first years of his reign, Shakhrisabz and Kitab again took the path of disobedience to Bukhara at the initiative of local beys.

When Amir Muzaffar came to power, Amirbiy was governor of Shakhrisabz and Zakirbiy was governor of Kitab. The governor of the Kitab, Zakirbi, made great efforts to carry out the policy of the emir in the principality. In 1865,

Hakimbi died and was replaced by Bobobek. According to Mirzo Salimbek, in 1864 the Shakhrisabz and Kitab kenagas revolted against Amir Muzaffar. The Amir besieged Shakhrisabz and Kitab for two months, could not subdue them, and made peace with the Kenagas and returned to Bukhara. As a result of the efforts made in the oasis, Bobobek ruled in Shakhrisabz and Jurabek ruled in Kitab. Thus, Shakhrisabz and Kitab were again ruled independently until 1870.

During the reign of Amir Muzaffar (1860-1885) part of the Bukhara Emirate was occupied by the Russian Empire. After the Russians occupied Samarkand in 1868, the first movement against the Russian invasion began in the Kashkadarya oasis. Dissatisfaction with the Emir's policy is growing in Bukhara. At this time, the prince of Guzar, Abdulmalik (Katta Tora, the eldest son of the Amir), rebelled against the Amir. He was greatly assisted by Jurabek, governor of Kitab and Bobobek, governor of Shakhrisabz. Mirzo Salimbek writes, "Abdulmalik Tura was proclaimed the supreme ruler at the Shakhrisabz Oqsaroy. Rebels gathered in Shakhrisabz."

Khudoyor Tuqsabo, Abdulla Tuqsabo and Ibrahim Tuqsabo, Yakkabog and Chirakchi, as well as armies from Surkhan oasis and Gissar joined the Abdumalik Tura movement.

Dissatisfied with the Emir, the people of Karshi in 1868 expelled the mayor. At the same time as Amir Chirakchi and Yakkabog were occupied, in the fall of 1868, Abdumalik Tura captured Karshi for the second time. The Kashkadarya oasis remained under war. In the midst of a sharp escalation of the conflict, the Emir had no choice but to ask the Russians for help. General Abramov's troops fought fiercely to hand over the city to Muzaffarkhan. On

October 19, 1868, General Abramov, with eight companies, six artillery pieces, 250 Cossacks, and several rocket launchers, began a military march in the opposite direction to suppress the movement of Abdumalik Tura. In October 1868, Karshi was occupied by Russian troops and returned to Amir Muzaffar.

As a result of this struggle, the city of Karshi was destroyed, and the condition of the people became deplorable. It should be noted that the Russian army had a stronger weapon and modern combat tactics than the Abdumalik Tura's army. As Samiy lamented in his book, "Uzbeks have learned to fight valiantly, to fight bravely on the battlefield, and they have no concept of an unacceptable war. Their courage and bravery yielded nothing but the dead and wounded.

Muzaffarkhan's rule was established in Karshi, Yakkabog and Chirakchi with the help of the Russians. In Shakhrisabz and Kitab, the struggle against the Amir and the Russians continued. Although relations between Jurabek and Abdumalik Tura were relatively weak, Shakhrisabz and Kitab recognize only the authority of Abdumalik Tura, the southern part of the khanate was entirely at the disposal of Tura. Abdumalik Tura had already taken over one-third of the khanate, which also had a strong economic and material base at its disposal.

Kitab and Shakhrisabz governors were going to ask the Emir of Bukhara Muzaffarkhan from Kaufman for help in the fight against Jurabek and Bobobek. Because an alliance was formed between the Emir of Afghanistan Sherali Khan and Jurabek. The governor of the book, Jurabek, had also embarrassed Governor-General Kaufman. During this period he was much more hostile to the Emir and the

Russians. Due to this, the Russians tried to occupy the disobedient Shakhrisabz and Kitab principalities in order to ensure their security. Amir Muzaffar was trying to subjugate these principalities to Bukhara again. Thus, the principalities of Kitab and Shakhrisabz remained between two powerful enemies.

In 1870, at the request of Amir Muzaffar, who asked for help in the conquest of Shakhrisabz, Russian troops with large military forces were sent from Samarkand to capture Shakhrisabz and Kitab. On August 12, 1870, Russian troops led by Major General Abramov launched an attack on the Book. After three days of fierce struggle, the city of Kitab was captured by the Russians. The main attack of the Russians was made through the Rovatak gate of the Chim defensive wall. After the conquest of the book, the principality of Shakhrisabz became subject to the Russians without resistance.

After the complete subordination of the Shakhrisabz principality to the Bukhara emirate in 1870, the provinces began to be governed by governors or beys appointed by the Amir. The principalities, such as Karshi, Karmana, and Shakhrisabz, which played an important role in terms of their importance and potential, were ruled by the emir's sons or close relatives. The tradition of the heir to the throne to rule in Karshi continued. In particular, it is known from history that Said Alimkhan ruled in Karshi as the heir to the throne.

In 1871, protests were organized by the local population in Karshi and Guzar, which turned into a major uprising. The number of participants in the uprising quickly exceeded 10,000, and the rebels surrounded the bazaar and the fortress and destroyed the lands. In 1873-1875, revolts broke out in Shakhrisabz, Kitab and Guzar principalities. These uprisings

were brutally suppressed by the Russian Cossacks.

In 1885, Amir Abdullah (1885-1910) succeeded Amir Muzaffar to the throne. During the reign of Muzaffarkhan and Amir Alimkhan (1910-1920), the Kashkadarya oasis became one of the important political and economic centers of the Bukhara Emirate.

Mirzo Salimbek, who was appointed the Shah of Shakhrisabz in 1910, writes about the attitude of the Mangit amirs of the Shakhrisabz kenagas towards the people of Bukhara in general:

Kitab, Shakhrisabz and other principalities of the Kashkadarya oasis were invaded in 1870 by the troops of the Russian Empire and then handed over to the Emir of Bukhara. Thus, the wars between the people of the Kitab-Shakhrisabz oasis and the emirs of Bukhara, which began in the middle of the XVIII century, come to an end. However, in the early twentieth century, the threat of revolt remained, and in order to prevent it, the Emirate's troops were detained in the city of Shakhrisabz.

According to the literature, Shakhrisabz and Kitab also served as a political refuge for some officials and creative people who fled the tyranny of the Emir throughout the 19th century. Mirza Shams Bukhari said that after Amir Nasrullah ascended the throne, he killed 50-100 people a day in order to increase fear in the hearts of his enemies. As a result, many people were forced to flee to Shakhrisabz.

The poet Haziq Amir Nasrullah, who lived and worked in Shakhrisabz, was killed by assassins. The poet Hiromi in his works ("Chor dervish", "Tutinoma", etc.) reflects the repression of

kenagas, the policy of violence against them by the central government.

The intellectuals, who could not stay away from the mutual struggles between the Amir and the local beys, revealed in their works the negative consequences of these struggles. For this reason, the poet Roji Shakhrisabz was accused of seriousness and executed by the governor of Akramkhan (Amir Alimkhan's uncle). "After Mir Akramkhan was appointed governor of Shakhrisabz," wrote Mirzo Salimbek, "several Kenagas leaders were accused of seriousness and executed, and their property, homes and lands were confiscated." He said the local Jews were 2 million rubles and the rich Muslim 3 mln rubles in taxes. The number of conscripts from each makhalla (neighborhood) of Shakhrisabz has been determined. For fifty years the people of Kenagas had not seen such oppression. The people of the city and its environs revolted. "As a result, Amir Alimkhan was forced to agree to comply with the demands of the city dwellers. These were: the dismissal of 11 landowners who came to Shakhrisabz from Bukhara together with Akramkhan, the abolition of taxes artificially imposed by the governor, except for the Shariah-compliant taxes, and the settlement of all issues related to the population in agreement with Shakhrisabz's brother Abdushukurbi.

In conclusion, the Kashkadarya oasis during this period (early XIX-early XX centuries) was not excluded from the influence of political events in the Emirate of Bukhara and neighboring areas, and in many cases was actively involved in internal political conflicts. During the reign of the Mangit emirs, especially when Amir Nasrullah came to power, he pursued a policy of ruthlessly plundering the

provinces under his control, deliberately escalating disputes between the tribes, and taking over the land. This development of events, of course, had a significant negative impact on the economic and cultural development of the oasis. Nevertheless, the principalities of the Kashkadarya oasis - Karshi, Shakhrisabz, Kitab, Guzar, Yakkabag and Chirakchi in the early XIX-XX centuries as an important part of the Bukhara Emirate played an important role not only in the socio-political but also in the economic life of the state.

CONCLUSION

In general, the analysis of the relationship between the central government and the principalities of the Kashkadarya oasis shows that the increase in taxes in the XIX century, the policy of violence of the Bukhara emirs against the population of the oasis, the tradition of appointing relatives and heirs to the throne were serious protests. .

In different years, the beys of Kitab, Shahrizabz, Yakkabog and Chirakchi refused to pay taxes to the Amir and tried to be independent of the amir by relying on local leaders. For this reason, in the works of some high-ranking Bukhara historians, the Shakhrisabz kenagas were described as "rebels" and criticized. Such an approach is not objective, and these works do not adequately address the causes of the protests that have taken place at different times.

Even after the establishment of the protectorate of the Russian Empire over Bukhara, there was no significant change in the socio-economic life and political situation, those who were dissatisfied with the policy of the Emir were repressed. Until the end of the Emirate of Bukhara by the Bolsheviks (1920), in

order to prevent a possible uprising in Shakhrisabz, the Emirate's troops were stationed in the city, indicating that the political unrest had not ended.

REFERENCES

1. Kholikulov, A. B. (2019). Bukhara emirate's farming in the XIX-XX centuries (in the case of Kashkadarya oasis stables). *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (72), 546-549.
2. Kholikulov, A. (2020). History Of Handicrafts Of Kashkadarya Oasis In The XIX-Early XX Centuries. *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations*, 2(11), 30-35.
3. Kholikulov A.B(2020) The Peculiarities of Development of Farming Culture in Central Asia. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation* 24(07), 8076-8083.
4. Fayzulla, O. (2020). The Craftsmanship Of The Emirate Of Bukhara At The Second Half Of The XIX Century-The Beginning Of The XX Century. *The American Journal of Interdisciplinary Innovations and Research*, 2(11), 33-38.
5. Anke von Kügelgen. Legitimation of the Central Asian dynasty of Mangits in the works of their historians (18th - 19th centuries). - Almaty: Dyke Press, 2004 .- P. 371.
6. Mirza Salimbek. *Tarikh-i Salimi* (source on the history of the Bukhara Emirate) / Per. from Persian, introduction and notes: N.K. Norkulov, ed. Translation: A.K. Anders, preface, ed. introduction and notes: A.S. Sagdullaev. - Tashkent: Akademiya, 2009 .- P. 37.
7. Omonov, Q., & Karimov, N. (2020). Importance Of Ancestral Heritage.

-
- The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations, 2(09), 196-202.
8. Karimov, N. R. (2020). A True Successor of Great Central Asian Scholars. Journal «Bulletin Social-Economic and Humanitarian Research,(7), 62-69.
 9. Turakhanovna, S. U. (2020). The Issue of Literary Heroism in Korean Literature. Solid State Technology, 63(6), 1779-1785.
 10. Kariev, A., & Aminov, H. (2020). New information about Imam al-Zarnūjī and his work “Ta’līm al-Muta’allim”. Solid State Technology, 63(6), 2372-2387.