

Turkestan at the Beginning of the 20th Century: the History of T. Riskulov's Struggle Against the Establishment of a Totalitarian System of Government

*Kandov Bahodir Mirzayevich*¹

Abstract: This article reveals that T. Riskulov and his national communist comrades remained faithful to the national interests of their people, although they mainly adopted the Bolshevik ideology. The article also describes the history of T. Riskulov and his comrades, living with the idea of the unity and development of Turkestan, who are in official opposition to the representatives of the Center and the Soviet government, as far as possible, and their struggle for the sake of national interests. The article analyzes the struggle against the establishment of a totalitarian system of governance in Turkestan and the features of the socio-political life of Turkestan.

Keywords: national leaders, T. Riskulov, Turkestan ASSR, public life, Turkish Commission, political crisis, unity of Turkestan, national interests, national communists, national opposition.

The colonial policy and strong centralization efforts carried out by the Soviet authorities and the authorized bodies of the Center in Turkestan caused strong dissatisfaction among the national leaders working in the governing bodies of the TASSR. The National Communists first wanted to use the "Ideas of October" for the happiness of their people. But they tried to adapt these ideas to the specific characteristics of Turkestan.

Turor Riskulov, Kaygisiz Otaboev, Abdulla Rahimboev, Sanjar Asfandiyorov, Nazir Torakulov, Inomjon Khidiraliev, Sultanbek Khojanov, Nizomiddin Khojaev, among the national communists of the Turkestan ASSR, Munavvar Qori, Abdulla Avloni, among the modern progressives, worked for the interests of the indigenous peoples in various responsible positions in the Soviet offices during this period. fought valiantly against their opponents. During the initial period of Soviet power - 1919-1920, their active efforts achieved significant results.

hoped to capture the main layers of Turkestan society and mask the colonial forms of Soviet socialist construction. The measures taken on the "localization" of the state apparatus and power institutions, the system of "political concessions" aimed at softening the religious policy, more faithful attitude to national customs and traditions, served to partially restore the mechanisms of market regulation. solving a number of painful problems. At the same time, due to the communist genetics of the Soviet system, the original totalitarian-imperial nature of the Soviet socialist system, and the invasive character of the Soviet power, it was not possible to adequately eliminate the phenomena of national and religious discrimination. undermining the political will of the indigenous population. Thus, despite the increase in the stratum, representatives of the "working" part of the local population expanded the scope of using national languages in party-soviet structures and state bodies, and the Center essentially continued to rule the region as a sovereign. The persecution of mainly Muslim clerics has not stopped. The attack on the property layers and ancient culture of the peoples of Central Asia continued. A new economic policy was carried out with obvious deformations in national aspects. In particular, the issues of its comprehensive subjugation to the interests of the metropolis, which are important for the destruction of the colonial trend and the development of the domestic economy, have not been resolved. For example, the state monopoly on cotton remained until 1923, which explained the long-

¹ Associate professor, doctor of Philosophy in Philosophical Sciences (PhD), Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan



lasting crisis of cotton production in Turkestan. The centralization of the management of the national economy of the region by the center increased rapidly. The problem of irrigation remained acute, and the question of land was not sufficiently resolved.

The reaction to the centralization policy of the national communists in Turkestan was particularly evident in the activities of the Muslim Bureau of Turkestan (Musbyuro), which worked for a short time in 1919-1920 under the leadership of Turor Riskulov.

Although the issue of involving the representatives of the local nation in the work of the state apparatus caused intense debates at every meeting of the Turkestan regional councils, it ended almost ineffectively. Finally, in March 1919, this issue was again put on the agenda at the meetings of the national affairs section of the 7th Extraordinary Congress of Soviets of the Turkestan ASSR in Tashkent. In sharp debates, the Muslim deputies criticized the Soviet government's alienation of the local population, distrust of Muslims, and failure to bring them closer to the government organizations[1].

The national affairs section pointed out that the national party committee of the republic is not doing enough work among representatives of local nationalities, and the mutual relations between people of different nationalities are increasingly strained. The section passed its famous decision of no confidence in the country committee of the Turkestan Communist Party. In the decision, it was noted that the tendencies of chauvinism of the big country are growing, and the representatives of Turkestan indigenous population are not appointed to the leadership positions in the higher bodies of the republic[2].

The fact that A. Kazakov, who was sent from the center to Turkestan and known for his chauvinistic actions, was elected to the position of the chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Turkestan ASSR at this congress was a clear result of the mood of the participants of this congress of European communists and Soviets.

At the closed session of the Seventh Congress of Soviets of the Turkestan ASSR on March 8, 1919, the leader of the national communists, Turor Riskulov, said: "The Russians are mistrusting Muslim workers and Muslim leaders, even if they have no basis. Based on the events that happened when I myself worked in the anti-hunger commission, I know that they look at us with distrust as the leader of the Muslim poor"[3].

Economic and political actions planned by the center were still often carried out by means of revolutionary pressure methods, including military influence, and their content retained a clearly defined class and ideological orientation. The result was the manifestation of mass discontent, increased friction in the leadership of the Turkestan ASSR, especially between European workers and representatives of local peoples, new outbreaks of armed resistance to Soviet power, and division in society. The current situation had a heavy impact on the state of the national economy of the region, contributed to the worsening of the financial situation of the population, deepening of crisis events in the social and spiritual spheres.

Bolsheviks was so strong that P. Kobozev, the extraordinary commissar of the Center in the Turkestan region, made the following false promises to the Muslims at the 1st conference: "Only 5 percent of the population of the Republic of Turkestan are Russians, and it is these 5 percent of the population who have gathered all the power in their hands. those who received Thus, there is national violence, that is, national violence of the minority. But this is temporary. "When the Muslim world is ready, we will give him the leadership of the republic and help him"[4, 5].

At the 2nd conference of the Muslim Bureau of the Turkestan regional committee held in Tashkent on September 12-19, 1919, these issues were put on the agenda even more sharply. T. Riskulov, who gave a lecture on "Current situation" at the conference, sharply exposed with evidence that the situation in Turkestan has not changed despite the instructions sent from the Center, and that the leaders of the Soviet government continue the colonial policy in the country. In his speech, T. Riskulov commented as follows: "Despite our demands and the instructions given by the Center, a policy against its interests



is being pursued in Turkestan. They distrust us and say that if you are given power, it will fail, that you are not ready yet. We are dissatisfied with this... They accuse us of chauvinism, they don't understand that we can conduct national politics. "We know very well that if the Soviet government is overthrown in Turkestan, the first blow will fall on the Muslim proletariat and the communists"[4, 35-36].

In his speech, T. Riskulov addressed the chairman of the MIK of the Turkestan ASSR A. Kazakov and his deputy K. Uspensky (Uspensky was the former leader of the left-wing works), the chairman of the Turkestan ASSR HSC K. Shows the chauvinistic policy of the Sorokin group with a number of arguments[4, 34-35; 5, 168-169].

The sharp protest of the local population was caused, first of all, by the reluctance of the Center to take national interests into account. In this regard, on March 8-16, 1921 in Moscow, G.I. Safarov states in his speech that "until now, our party has been very little interested in the national issue" and that the "October Revolution" happened "absolutely unexpectedly" for the oppressed nations[6, 190-191]. G.I. Safarov, trying to correct theses on the national issue, put forward a proposal about the need to take into account the demands of peoples to sovereignty, at least within the framework of "cultural-national self-determination", to which the People's Commissar I.V. In his final speech, Stalin said: "We have long said goodbye to vague slogans of self-determination - there is no need to restore them"[6, 223]. Safarov's amendment was not supported.

This approach is reflected in the practical activities of central authorities and their local control structures. As noted above, although almost no derogatory words about indigenous peoples were spoken from the tribune, the attitude towards local national cadres remained moderate, nevertheless, in Central Asia, including Turkestan, the Turkic Commission of the Central Committee of the RCP(b) and the Turkburo deal with all important issues of life. continued, their members worked very hard to strengthen the dominant position of the Centre.

Disdain for the local population was especially evident in the matter of personnel in the state administration apparatus. Therefore, Sultanbek Khojanov, one of the national leaders at that time, later confirmed that T. Riskulov's demand was justified as follows: "Separation of European and local population is in practice in the authorities. At the 3rd meeting of the party, Sorokin said that in one of the meetings of the Executive Committee of Turkestan, he expelled the representatives of the old city from the room when solving some issues[7, 12].

The growing discontent of Turkestan's indigenous population has taken many forms, from spontaneous protests to armed conflict. One of them was the opposition of national statesmen and public figures in power, which arose after the revolutionary changes. Continuing to hope that life in the Central Asian region would follow the attractive slogans of national self-determination and the outwardly attractive ideals of socialism promulgated by the Soviet government, national leaders consistently defended the interests and dignity of indigenous peoples, and boldly opposed the ambassadors of the center and the local orthodox communists.

Today, it can be seen that the patriotic views of the national leaders combined with the will of various social strata and groups of the Central Asian society became a visible liberal-democratic alternative to the revolutionary ideological expansion originating from the Center. It was based on the national idea, and was aimed at rejecting the politics of class approach as the main condition for the improvement of society, ensuring the independence of the state entities in the region, and validating the principles of freedom, national sovereignty, democracy and national well-being.

the center and the local Bolsheviks (orthodoxam), the national leaders believed that the priority task in the transformation process should be to preserve the national mentality, adhere to humanist values, create favorable conditions for the rise of the national economy and the flourishing of national culture. They always emphasized the need to solve all current problems in the region taking into account the interests of the indigenous population, the warring parties and the positions and opinions of the leading layers of society.



Participants of the opposition movement in the party and state structures were accused of “national deviance” and subjected to administrative repression. In particular, the chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Councils of the Turkestan ASSR, Turar Riskulov, the first representative of the local nation, was removed from his post in the early 20s, along with a number of other high-ranking officials, because he dared to express his opinion about the need to provide Turkestan with real independence.

According to the leaders of the national opposition, the normal independent life in the region was seriously hindered by the policies of the Center and its authorized representatives in the Central Asian region, apart from the local imperialist European communists.

At the same time, in the early 20s, the national question became increasingly acute in the context of the growing political crisis, which was clearly demonstrated throughout the territory of the Soviet state, including Turkestan. Dissatisfaction with the Soviet government, as shown above, manifested itself in all layers of Turkestan society. The political confrontation between the government and the administration has also increased. This was evident in the ongoing debate about trade unions.

Discussions about trade unions that arose at the center, as a rule, were aimed at solving specific problems that were not directly related to the national question. But in Turkestan, where all socio-economic and cultural-spiritual problems are inevitably illuminated from the prism of national relations, the debate about trade unions took on a national character. Thus, even many European communists who opposed the Leninist platform were forced to admit that Soviet national policy was characterized by an imperial orientation. For example, Pravdin, Semenov, Vey ngard “the victorious proletariat is national on the edge colonialism policy is continuing”, he said reliable way emphasized . They are at least to the people of Turkestan national and cultural own destiny designation opportunity to give they[8, 515] offered.

In particular , the town associations internal party building problem during the discussion related to Tursunkhodjaev, Khidiraliev and many others Turkestan Supporters of “national deviation”. Turkestan The complete independence of the compartment from RKP(b) and Turkish Commission they[9] demanded cancellation.

The radicalization of the positions of the national opposition in the echelons of power helped them to converge on a number of points with the demands of the armed opposition. For example, according to the report of a Chekist spy who attended a meeting of Fergana rebels led by Kurbashi Parpi, during the discussion of the prospects of an armed struggle against the Soviet government, "Riskulov's name was mentioned several times and the hope was expressed that he would soon return from Russia"[10].

In 1921, during the Karategin operation (Eastern Bukhara), an interesting document called “Demands of the Communists of Turkestan” was seized from the national rebels. It clearly expressed the idea that “the management of all of Turkestan should not be in the hands of the Turkestan Commission, the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkey in Turkestan, and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkestan”. The authors of this document demanded “to allow the official existence of a local party other than the Communist Party”. In addition, it was emphasized that “such parties should be given full opportunity to live freely alongside the communist party, to occupy responsible positions in state bodies, to have their own newspapers and literature...”. In the economic sphere, the developers of this document relied on the preservation of private trade, saying “...the current small trade is preserved. Farmers and herders should have the freedom to sell surplus produce and livestock. And this private ... trade should be given a legal character and brought to a position that helps the economic development of the region[11].

The extent to which the armed insurgents paid attention to the said document is evidenced by the numerous emphatic and approving additions.

The revival of the political activities of the national opposition of Turkestan seriously worried the political leadership of the Center. To strengthen his party and political influence, on March 21, 1921, the Central Committee of the RCP(b) appointed Ya.E. Appointed Rudzutak as chairman of the



Turkcommission and revised the composition of the Turkcommission and the Turkburo of the Central Committee of the RCP (b) and submitted to them “with any deviations from the party line on the national issue”^{made}[12] strengthening the struggle a priority . How this work will be done is confirmed by the decision of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkestan to evacuate communists infected with nationalism from the borders of the Republic of Turkestan[13].

However, despite increasing administrative and coercive pressure from the Center and its representatives in Turkestan, the national opposition consistently defended the interests of the country's indigenous population. At the same time, as before, according to the leaders of the national opposition, one of the central tasks was to end the Turkish Commission, which is preventing the establishment of a normal independent life for the region. Thus, T. Riskulov used the pulpit of the II All-Russian meeting of Communists of the Turkic peoples held in Moscow on March 6-7, 1921, critically analyzed the activities of the Turkcommission, and waged a superficial struggle against the colonial elements of the Central Committee of the Turkic Commission and the Turkburo RKP(b). , they do not have a reputation among the “Muslim masses”[14], - he says. At the 6th Congress of the Turkestan CP (August 11-20, 1921), he again accused the Central Committee of the RKP(b) of the wrong national policy in Turkestan, of intensifying the violence committed by the soldiers of the Russian Red Army in the Ferghana Valley. Rightly denying the leading role of the working class in the life of Turkestan, Turor Riskulov rightly claims that the peasants play the main role[15].

The political leadership of the center, striving to improve its political image, recommended to the authorized representatives of the region at the 6th Congress of the Turkestan CP to increase attention to national problems, to expand the national layer in the structure of the supreme party and state bodies of Turkestan, and in certain circumstances to involve even persons who expressed “unacceptable views”. According to these instructions, D.I. Manjara, A. Rakhimboev, N. Torakulov, D. Ustaboev, I. Khidiraliev, S. Khodzhanov and others[12, 543] Members of the Central Committee of the Turkestan CP were elected . In addition, N. Torakulov and A. Rakhimbaev was included in the Central Committee of the Turkburo RKP(b).

National leaders tried to moderate the excesses of the Center's violent policies in Turkestan. However, their options were limited. The growing force of protest among them led to a letter sent to Moscow in the autumn of 1921 by high-ranking officials of local nationalities with a proposal to terminate the Turkish Commission. In particular, M., who was recently appointed as the chairman of the Central Committee of the Turkburo RKP(b). Autonomous representative of Tomsk and LLC in Turkestan F.E. Dzerzhinsky's deputy Ya.Kh. Peters criticized his work. The same demands were put forward in A. Rahimboev's letter. In addition, a little later, A. Rahimboev, who spoke at the IX Congress of the Soviets of the RSFSR held on December 23-28, 1921, told the Russian leadership that the punishment policy in Turkestan “goes beyond all limits” All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the RSFSR (VTsIK) and RCP (b) He openly announced that he was encouraged by the higher supervisory authorities of the Central Committee. Penal authorities in Fergana region take various suspects into their service and[16] say that they work completely autonomously, regardless of party or Soviet power.

At this time, N. Torakulov submitted an application to resign from these bodies as a sign of protest against the actions of the Turkic Commission and the Turkburo[17]. Before that, on July 18, 1920, T. Riskulov and several other responsible officials had left the ranks of the Turkestan Communist Party and Turkestan MIK for political reasons[18, 34]. T. Riskulov resigned from the position of the chairman of the MIK of the Turkestan ASSR. This event went down in history as the only resignation of the head of the republic in the history of Turkestan and even Uzbekistan SSR during the Soviet period.

Senior representatives of the local population confidently claim that “Soviet central authorities of Turkestan are sufficiently strengthened” and are capable of independently performing the functions of managing the region[19].

Of 1921, "National deviation" from the center Turkish Commission finish they demanded . Moscow then immediately launched a wave of condemnation of the proposal by "stable Bolsheviks". Turkestan



MIQ Presidium members T. Urazboev, N. Torakulov and S. A letter signed by the Kasimkhojayevs was organized, who, without authority, on behalf of the Communists of Turkestan, asked Lenin to preserve the Turkocommission. According to it, on March 21, 1921, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the RKP(b): “At the request of the Communists of Turkestan, the question of liquidation should be postponed” [20], - made a decision.

Now the proven political technique was used again. On October 12, 1921, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party discussed the issue of work in Turkestan and decided to recall Tomsky, but in order to preserve the “sovereign eye” of the Center, according to the “many requests of the workers”, the Turkburo of the Central Committee of the RKP (b) and the Turkic Commission of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and A new composition of the Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR was proposed, only representatives of local nationalities mixed for appearance, some of them were even anti-Centre. In particular, in November 1921, Atabaev (responsible for Soviet activities), A. Rakhimboev (responsible for TurkTsIK activities), N. Torakulov (organizational work in party bodies) was appointed. I.X. Peters provided general management, Y.Z. Surits, V.P. Nogin was responsible for economic life[21].

On December 31, 1921, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the RKP(b) again considered the issue of Turkestan. In it, the new composition of the Central Committee of the Turkish Commission and the Turkish Bureau of the RKP(b) was approved, including: N. Torakulov, A. Rakhimbaev, K.S. Otaboiev, S. Khojanov, S.I. Gusev, Ya.Z. Surits and G.I. Saltz entered. S.I. as the chairman of the Turkish Commission and the Turkish Bureau. Gusev was appointed[22, 304].

The measures taken were, of course, palliative in nature. They did not cancel the main part of the demands put forward by the national opposition, that is, the demands to ensure independence and to destroy the imperial relations between the Center and the Turkestan ASSR.

A detachment of new emissaries from the center still ruled the region with strong pressure. Sharp conflicts between the local peoples and the sent “leaders” also persisted. In this regard, K. Otaboiev's speech at the 10th Congress of Turkestan Soviets will be significant. He said, “The workers from Russia do not believe in the ability of independent management of the local population, and they are not suitable for administrative work, because they are not familiar with the conditions and life of Turkestan. Even if they come, they will be candidates for the main positions in the Central Apparatus”[23].

In short, the leading cadres composed of representatives of the local nationalities resolutely focused the attention of the central leadership on the difficult situation in Turkestan, sought effective means of overcoming the political crisis, called to ensure civil peace and interethnic harmony by involving all layers of society in creative activities, and fully transferred the powers of the authorities to the central authorities. they demanded to give it to the Central Executive Committee of Turkestan. They also rejected the officially announced myths about the cultural backwardness of the people as offensive, and considered the persecution of religion and priests to be cruel. But they continued to defend their views on the prospects of nation-building in the region. It should be emphasized that national leaders have never completely forgotten their filial duty to the people.

List of used literature

1. MDA of Uzbekistan, Fund 17, List 1, Case 17, Sheet 13.
2. MDA of Uzbekistan, fund 17, list 1, case 16, page 94.
3. MDA of Uzbekistan, fund 17, list 1, case 17, sheet 9.
4. Musburo of the RCP (b) in Turkestan. 1, 2 and 3 Turkestan regional Conferences of the RCP (b) 1919-1920 with an introduction by comrade Ryskulov. - T.: Turkgosizdat, 1922. - 94 p.
5. Ryskulov T. Sobranie sochineniy v trex tomax. T.3. – Almaty: “Kazakhstan”, 1998. – P.168-169.
6. X sezd RKP(b). March 1921 Stenographic report. – Moscow: 1963. - S. 190-191.; 213.



7. Khodzhanov S.K 10-letiyu Sovetskoe autonomii Turkestana. - T.: Izd. "Pravda Vostoka", 1928. - S.12.
8. History of communist organizations in Central Asia... - S. 515.
9. Russian Center for the Storage and Study of Documents of Modern History (RCSHDNI) f. 17, op 3. d.92 , ll.8-10.
10. RGVA, f.278, op.4, d.74, 5 - 6 -str .
11. AAP RUz , f.58, op.1, d.7195, ll.272-283.
12. History of the Communist Organization of the Middle East... – P.523.
13. Russian Center for the Storage and Study of Documents of Modern History (RCSHDNI) f. 17, op. 12, d. 659, l. 52.
14. Russian Center for the Storage and Study of Documents of Modern History (RCSHDNI) f. 17, op. 2, d. 213, l. 86
15. Rajabov Q. Uzbekistan in the 20th century. Volume 1. – Tashkent: "State enterprise of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan "Fan", 2024. - B.752.
16. MDA of Uzbekistan, Fund 17, Op. 3, d , 70, l. 22.
17. MDA of Uzbekistan, Fund 17, Op. 1, d. 45, l. 45.
18. Ryskulov T.R. Collected Works in three volumes. Volume 1.-Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1997.-336 p. Volume 2.- Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1997.-384 p. Volume 3.- Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1998.-448 p.
19. MDA of Uzbekistan, Fund. 17, Op. 1, d. 45, l. 20 - 20 ob .
20. Russian Center for the Storage and Study of Documents of Modern History (RCSHDNI) f. 2, op. 1, d. 1778. ll . 1-2.
21. Russian Center for the Storage and Study of Documents of Modern History (RCSHDNI) f. 122, op.1, d.56, l.34.
22. Akramov A., Avliyakov K. V.I. Lenin, Turkkommissiya i ukreplenie Sovetskoy vlasti v Sredney Asiai. - Tashkent : Uzbekistan, 1991. - S. 304.
23. MDA of Uzbekistan, Fund. R-17, op. 1, d. 45, l. 456.
24. Abdullaev R.M. National political organizations of Turkestan in 1917-1918. Abstract of diss...Doctor of History. - T.1998. 62 p.
25. Agzamkhodjaev S.S. Turkiston Mukhtoriyati: the struggle for freedom and independence (1917-1918). Abstract of diss...Doc.of History. -T.: 1996. 62 p.
26. Ryskulov T. Revolution and the indigenous population of Turkestan. A collection of articles, reports, speeches and theses with a preface by the author. Part 1. 1917-1919. - T.: Uzbekgosizdat, 1925.-218 p.
27. Ryskulov T.R. Collected Works in three volumes. Volume 1.-Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1997.-336 p. Volume 2.- Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1997.-384 p. Volume 3.- Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1998.-448 p.
28. Independence and History: New Approaches to the Study of the History of Uzbekistan. T.: Tashkent State University Publishing House, 1997,-52 p.
29. Nazarov S. From the History of the Activities of the Central Asian Bureau of the RCP(b). T.: Uzbekistan, 1965.-120 p.
30. The Central Committee of the RCP(b) – the All-Union Communist Party (b) and the national question. Collection of documents. Book 1. 1918-1933. – Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2005. - 784 pp.



31. Rajabov K., Khaidarov M. History of Turkestan (1917-1924). Study guide. -T.: University, 2002. - 168 pages.
32. Rajabov K.K. Struggles for the idea of an independent Turkestan (1917-1935). - T.: Uzbekistan, 2000. -32 pages.
33. History of Uzbekistan (1917-1991). Two books. The first book. 1917-1939 years. Responsible editors: R.Abdullaev, M.Rakhimov, Q.Rajabov. – Tashkent: “Uzbekistan”, 2019.
34. Rajabov K.K. History of Turkestan Autonomy. – Tashkent: “Fan”, 2023. - B.256.

