



## CONFLICTS IN THE TURKESTAN SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT (1917)

**Abdullaev Zafar**

*Teacher of Namangan State University*

### ABSTRACT

*Tsarist Russia period was important in Uzbek history especially The February Revolution of 1917 disrupted the system that had been formed for decades, not only in the central provinces of Russia, but also in Turkestan itself, and the previous agreements, guidelines, and orders had lost their force in practice. At the same time, in the absence of full implementation of the existing legal and regulatory documents of Tsarist Russia, the Provisional Government itself issued orders and decrees, decrees, had to issue instructions along the way. Turkestan was based on legal and regulatory documents, in general and in some areas, depending on the conditions of the country. And again, the relationship between the two sides was based on military-political governance. This was under the control of the Governor-General in Turkestan and his military governors in the provinces. The February Revolution of 1917 disrupted the system that had been formed for decades, not only in the central provinces of Russia, but also in Turkestan itself, and the previous agreements, guidelines, and orders had lost their force in practice. At the same time, in the absence of full implementation of the existing legal and regulatory documents of Tsarist Russia, the Provisional Government itself issued orders and decrees, decrees, had to issue instructions along the way. Moreover, the ongoing war, even after the fall of Tsarist Russia, had in fact exacerbated the chaos. Thus, despite the fact that the February Revolution of 1917 created great opportunities for Russia and its peripheral countries in the democratic process, political movements, party formation, it did not allow true freedom, self-determination of nations, elections on a democratic, equal basis.*

**KEYWORDS:** *revolution, democratic, force, revolution, province, restriction, legal.*

### INTRODUCTION

The February Revolution of 1917 was a democratic process for the peoples of the Russian Empire, especially for Turkestan, a remote country: equal elections, overcoming economic dependence, active participation in the socio-political life of the country, expanding opportunities for indigenous peoples in the system of governance, expanding political rights, lifted cultural and educational restrictions and gave hope for reforms in the administrative, political, cultural and educational spheres in the country. Of course, the changes in all directions, the reforms were to be in the interests of the people of Turkestan, all of which had to be carried out on the basis of relevant legal and regulatory documents. For decades, Russian rule in Turkestan was subordinated to the interests of the empire, and the socio-political, military, economic, cultural and enlightenment life of the country was completely extinguished by the interests of the

metropolis. Of course, the administration in Turkestan was based on legal and regulatory documents, in general and in some areas, depending on the conditions of the country. And again, the relationship between the two sides was based on military-political governance. This was under the control of the Governor-General in Turkestan and his military governors in the provinces. The February Revolution of 1917 disrupted the system that had been formed for decades, not only in the central provinces of Russia, but also in Turkestan itself, and the previous agreements, guidelines, and orders had lost their force in practice. At the same time, in the absence of full implementation of the existing legal and regulatory documents of Tsarist Russia, the Provisional Government itself issued orders and decrees, decrees, had to issue instructions along the way. Moreover, the ongoing war, even after the fall of Tsarist Russia, had in fact exacerbated the chaos. However, it should be noted that despite the February



Revolution and the overthrow of the tsarist government, the former governor-general of Turkestan continued to rule the country, especially in the wake of the growing revolutionary mood, "in his order to the [military] governors of the officials said they would continue to perform their duties. In a telegram sent to the military governor of the Samarkand region on March 13, 1917, he said that "Russian representatives in the ranks of members of the city Duma (Parlament) should be at least half of the members of the Duma". Because, in his opinion, the natives of Turkestan are like the Russians ... they should not be equal to them in law". The content of the telegram sent to A.N.Kuropatkin by A.Miller, a resident of Russia in Bukhara, shows that the violation of the rights of the local population continues in Bukhara. The telegram stated that the non-participation of 5,000 Russian Muslims in the March 12, 1917 elections to the Executive Committee in New Bukhara had provoked strong protests, in which it was stated that "the non-participation of Muslims on an equal footing with other Russian citizens disturbed the mood".

Based on the above historical evidence, it can be said that General A.N.Kuropatkin refused to unconditionally comply with the decree, orders, despite the change of power in the Center, the formation of the Provisional Government and the relevant decrees, and, if necessary, tried to express his "objection" to them. Failure to comply with the decrees, orders, decrees, resolutions and instructions adopted by the Provisional Government in the conditions of Turkestan was a sign of the chaos in the system of governance in the country, the legal and regulatory imbalances of the old and new order. It can be said that neither the legal documents of the Tsarist period nor those of the Provisional Government served the interests of the native population of Turkestan provinces to prosecute the participants in the 1916 uprising. not to start a new job ... in early March 1892 on the basis of the Statute to form public committees for elections to the City Duma, to replace the police with the police and a search point in the security department INI liquidation orders [1]. Of course, A.N.Kuropatkin's continued orders and directives ... are still evidence that the former governor-general in Turkestan is "showing that his rights are not restricted" or that the interim government is relying on the former governor-general as a base that has no practical and legal influence.

Although the Provisional Government issued a decree on March 4, 1917, "granting equal civil rights" to all peoples, General A.N.Kuropatkin said that the country's Muslim population has no military obligations and therefore the principle of "equality cannot be fully applied to them, otherwise Turkestan

will go back: the majority of the vote will remain in the regimes and they will take everything into their own hands, which is unreliable [1, 24]. In practice, it "returns the smoke". He continued his "arbitrariness" in practice, and in his order of March 8, 1917, he continued to work until a new order came from the Provisional Government. But at the same time, the legal complexity in this system of governance could not last very long. Gradually, executive committees of public organizations began to be formed throughout Turkestan to replace the tsarist administration, which had been abolished by the Provisional Government. The executive committees set up in Tashkent and other cities also included locals, who were still a minority. In practice, progressive-minded, political activists are dissatisfied with the elections to the executive committees, and only A.N. They also expressed their views to Kuropatkin's court, but also to the chairman of the Russian Council of Ministers, the foreign minister, and the Muslim faction in the State Duma. In Turkestan, too, the process of dual power began to emerge[2]. Of course, this dualism could not last long. According to the decision of the Provisional Government, A.N.Kuropatkin and his relatives were removed from office, and on April 7, 1917, the Turkestan Committee of the Provisional Government was established under the leadership of N.N.Shchepkin, which was given the legal status of governing the country. Now the committee has the right to operate in Samarkand, Syrdarya, Ettisuv, Kasbiyorti, Fergana regions of Turkestan and even in Bukhara and Khiva. For a short time, however, the legal turmoil in Turkestan was resolved. However, although the composition of the Turkestan committee was set at 9, only 4 of them were representatives of the Turkic-Muslim peoples. Of those 4, 2 were Kazakhs and 2 were Tatars. Of the multi-million Turkic peoples, only two, A.N.Bukeikhanov and M.Tinishpaev of Kazakh descent, were involved as indigenous peoples, while S.N.Maksudov and A.Davletshin of Tatar origin came from the Volga region. The absence of representatives of Uzbek, Kyrgyz, Turkmen, Tajik, and Karakalpak nationalities in the committee was also a sign that the rights of indigenous peoples were not taken into account [2]. Speaking at a meeting of the committee headed by N.N.Shchepkin, Mahmudkhoja Behbudi said: "... without knowing our lives, we have no choice but to govern. o m a (separated from us - Z.A.)". Indeed, the majority of the committee members, unaware of the situation in Turkestan, the way of life, history, production, culture, traditions and customs of the peoples, had to develop and implement legal documents in Turkestan. Furthermore, most of the committee members did not have an understanding of the language and culture of



the peoples of the country, or of Eastern law: what could be forbidden and what should be allowed [2, 19-22].

In Turkestan, in March-April 1917, workers 'and soldiers' deputies were also formed. In March 1917 alone, 75 working-class deputies began to work in Turkestan. But the composition of these soviets was also predominantly European, with none of the natives under his leadership. They also began to show their legal involvement in the management of Turkestan. At the same time, national organizations began to be formed in the country. In particular, the Shorai Islamiya was formed in March 1917, the Shorai Ulamo in June 1917, and the Turkist Centralist Party (Turkistan Federalist Party) in July 1917. Now these political forces have begun to assert their claim to be defenders of Muslim rights. On April 16-23, 1917, at the initiative of the "Islamic Council", the first congress of Muslims of All-Turkistan was held, at which about 20 issues were considered. The congress decided to return the confiscated lands to the local population, emphasizing the need for all citizens, regardless of gender, religion or nationality, to be equal before the law and to have freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, home and person, association and organization [2, 19-22]. The congress also decided to include Turkestan in Russia as a separate territorial autonomy in the construction of national statehood.

Thus, in Turkestan, the Turkestan Committee of the Provisional Government, the Council of Workers 'and Soldiers' Deputies, the organization "Shura Islamiya" (since April, the Provincial Council of Muslims - Kraymussovet) began to operate in the political sphere of the region. Different approaches to the issue of giving a legally appropriate status to the system of governance of Turkestan began to emerge. In particular, the Turkestan Committee of the Provisional Government concluded that full political autonomy for Turkestan was impossible [3, 11-13]. Delegates from socio-political organizations and movements in the country met in Tashkent on April 9-16, 1917. the Russian delegates were in the majority. Z.A.) "opposed the granting of autonomy to Turkestan on the pretext that Muslims were not yet politically and culturally ready for autonomy". A similar decision was made at the I Provincial Congress of the Soviets of Workers 'and Soldiers' Deputies, which was held almost simultaneously. Now the decisions of the Provincial Congress of the Turkestan Committee of the Provisional Government and the Soviets of Workers 'and Soldiers' Deputies have been adopted as instructions by the local authorities. This was in fact contrary to one of the decrees issued by the Provisional Government in March 1917, which stated that "... all existing regulations restricting the rights

of Russian citizens concerning their nationality ... shall be repealed". This was a sign of the legal coordination in the Provisional Government and the system of local government, which in practice could not pass from the declaration to the oil. At the same time, it can be seen that the approach of local intellectuals and Russians and Russian-speakers to the legal status of the Turkestan system of government is different. It can be said that legal discrimination against the population of the region was an expression of contempt and disregard for it. One of the heads of the Provisional Government, A.F.Kerensky, wrote in his diary on April 29, 1917, A.N. He agreed with me that it is not right to give full rights to regimes with unequal obligations to the Russian people [4, 36-37].

## CONCLUSION

Thus, despite the fact that the February Revolution of 1917 created great opportunities for Russia and its peripheral countries in the democratic process, political movements, party formation, it did not allow true freedom, self-determination of nations, elections on a democratic, equal basis. In particular, this can be seen in the chaos in the status of the Turkestan system of government after the February Revolution (1917), the elections, legal disparities and restrictions on the implementation of decisions, orders and decrees issued by the Central-Provisional Government in Turkestan. Although the interim government's policy included decrees to abolish "religious, national restrictions", this was not reflected in the Turkestan context, legally, and in practice.

## REFERENCES

1. *Uzbekistan History, first part. 1917-1939. Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 2019. P.24.*
2. *Turkestan at the beginning of the twentieth century: to the history of the expiration of national independence. : "Sharq", 2000. Pp. 19-22.*
3. *Rasulov. A, Isoqboev. A, Nasretdinova. D. Tatars in the socio-political and cultural life of Turkestan. Tashkent: "TURON-IQBOL", 2019, Pp.11-13.*
4. *Mingnarov A. Coverage of socio-political processes in Turkestan in the national press. (1917-1918) Tashken: "Istiqloq nuri", 2013, Pp.36-37.*
5. *Karimov U. et al. USING NEW INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES IN DISTANCE LEARNING SYSTEM //НОВАЯ ПРОМЫШЛЕННАЯ РЕВОЛЮЦИЯ В ЗЕРКАЛЕ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ НАУКИ. – 2018. – С. 9-11.*
6. *Vutaboev M. T., Karimov U. U. «ЗЕЛЁНАЯ ЭКОНОМИКА». МИРОВОЙ ОПЫТ И ОСОБЕННОСТИ РАЗВИТИЯ В УЗБЕКИСТАНЕ //Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2020. – №. 2. – С. 704-710.*