

Some Reflections on the Turkestan Autonomy and its Activities (Based on Archival Documents)

Rasulov Mamurjon Foziljonovich

*Assistant professor, Philosophy doctor of Historical Sciences (PhD)
Department of World History, Fergana State University*

Abstract: Based on the documents of the Fergana Regional State Archive, the article analyzes some information about the Turkestan Autonomy. In particular, documents reflecting the attitude of the local population, local government bodies and public organizations to the Turkestan Autonomy, as well as its liquidation were studied.

Keywords: autonomy, Duma, Kokand Autonomy, archival funds, Skobelev, congress, Provisional government, illiterate, deputy, proletariat, court-martial.

The struggle for independence of Uzbekistan, the autonomy of Turkestan and its activities play an important role in the history of the national statehood movement. Research on issues related to the autonomy of Turkestan and its activities has been going on from the period when the autonomy was terminated to the present day. In Soviet historiography, the issue of Turkestan autonomy was not objectively assessed, it was falsified. But the events of 1917 were covered relatively impartially by Turkestan (Uzbek) historians and politicians who also walked in emigration during the years of the rule of that Soviet state. In particular, on the issue of Turkestan autonomy, the works of Mustafa Chukay, Ahmad Zaki Walidi, Boymirza Hayit can be shown [21.].

After Uzbekistan gained independence, radical changes took place in the approach to the issue of autonomy of Turkestan. In the scientific research of the M.Hasanov, Sh.Danielov, S.Azamkhojayev, N.Norqulov, H.Sadigov, N.Karimov, the events related to Turkestan autonomy were interpreted objectively on the basis of new evidence [2.]. In these studies, the attitude of the local population of Turkestan and the bolsheviks towards the autonomists was also shown. In this matter, there are many documents in the funds of the state archive (later – FVDA) of the Fergana region that have not yet been subject to research. The documents contain evidence covering events directly related to the autonomy of Turkestan and its activities. These documents provide valuable information about the relations of the governing bodies of the Fergana region, workers of factories and factories, in general, local residents with autonomists, their relations with them, about the events associated with the suppression of autonomy and its consequences. documents related to Turkestan autonomy held in the FVDA can be divided into the following groups: Documents on the attitude of the population of the Fergana region to the autonomy of Turkestan; Documents covering the interaction of the autonomy of Turkestan and local government bodies; Documents related to the suppression of the autonomy of Turkestan and its consequences. It is known that the second assembly of the IV territorial Muslim sezd was about joining the South-Eastern Union. This was economically beneficial to the country. Because grain products from the North Caucasus and Orenburg were brought to the country. These areas are called ataman A.I.Dutov was under the army. In addition, it was likely that the Government of autonomy also had the goal of receiving military assistance from this friendship, if necessary.

From these circumstances, *sezd* decides to enter this union. The Cossack troops, in turn, recognized the autonomy of Turkestan as the only legitimate government in the territory. Let alone the recognition of the Soviet of people's commissars of Turkestan (in the next place – the ISS), they are called “criminal shayka, robbers and safeguards who shamelessly seized power in the territory,” they say: “comrades and citizens. For three months now, criminal shayka, open robbers and shameless vagabonds (demagogues) have taken power in the land. Kolesovs, Poltoratskys, Sendi, Sinitsins, Frolovs and the like, with their criminal activities such as a series of murders, robberies under bolshevism, disgraced our bright, glorious revolution before the eyes of all peaceful citizens, especially before the eyes of Muslims”. The Cossacks went on to say, “...we are going to our homes to build (establish) our own life (farm), and we want the Turkestan country to build (establish) its own life (power) freely and freely, without separation from Russia...” This call concludes with the words: “Long Live the Revolutionary People, the Revolutionary Army and the autonomous Turkestan!” [3.]. Another document that recognizes Turkestan autonomy as the only legal government in the country pleads for prisoners of war to be dealt with by the Provisional Government as a legitimate government of issues of Paragraph * 4. The prisoners of war, being the Skobelev City Duma and the Fergana Soviet, appealed to the Kokand, the provisional government. Because they had also recognized this government, they had expressed confidence in it.

The issue of Turkestan autonomy was also considered at a joint meeting of the Fergana regional public organizations held in Skobelev on January 17, 1918. On Issue 3 of the meeting agenda, the attitude of representatives to autonomy was expressed, and they decided: “unanimously on issue 3, the following resolution (resolution) was adopted: “recognizing and supporting the self-determination rights of peoples, ask the soviet of soldier, worker and peasant deputies to follow the path of recognizing the provisional government and stopping the struggle for power” [12.]. From the above documents, the conclusion is that the Cossack troops, who, together with the broad popular masses, fought against the illegal making of the Russian revolution by the bolsheviks their own, various public organizations in the territory, even the recognition and confidence of prisoners of war, for many years the communists “nationalist autonomists could not receive popular support”, “the working people did not support them”, – the information that is said to prove that it is not objective, showing that they falsified historical events.

Now let's dwell on the document in which the autonomy of Turkestan was treated in a completely different way. This document is interesting in that it was “prepared” to determine the attitude towards the autonomy of Turkestan in response to the letter of the Soviets of soldiers, workers and peasants Deputies of the Fergana region dated December 12, 1917 No. 938, that is, rather a document organized against autonomy. On December 21, 1917, a general meeting was held in the presence of 15 Russian housewives living in the Mariinsky settlement under the market-fortress volost of Andijan uezd, chaired by commissar Pavel Grigoryevich Turtov. In this case, the following decision is made regarding the autonomy of Turkestan: the word autonomy, without explaining its meaning, is less understandable to many of us. for some of us, Turkestan autonomy is as important as a new door to an ordinary goods House. our attitude to Turkestan autonomy is as follows: Without asking the people of Turkestan, their ideological leaders, who themselves declared Turkestan autonomy, like former officials of the old regime and former rich translators who have been exploiting their people so far, do not gain our confidence; many of the inhabitants of Turkestan, with their ignorance and unconsciousness, not only have an understanding of Turkestan's autonomy, but also consider it a harm for themselves, local adventurers and foreign spies who, having driven the people against the Russian population, benefit greatly from the subconscious of the local people. Our desire is as follows, no autonomy can be granted until the mental and moral exaltation of Turkestan, Turkestan must obey the laws of the Russian republic. We sign this sentence, demanding that they (autonomists) be immediately imprisoned and that they be tried as traitors of the Russian Democratic Republic (uzurpator) and that they illegally seize power: signatures” [10.].

In response to letter 938 of the Soviet of the Fergana region, a telegram sent from Andijan sounded as follows: “for the inhabitants of the Georgian Garrison, especially for the Russian population, the autonomy of Turkestan is disastrous” [19.]. This telegram was sent by the bolshevik Rogoyanov. When both of these documents were analyzed, the decisions made in the first document were signed by 4 Russian men and 11 Russian women. It is interesting that only 6 of them were literate, the rest were illiterate. Even said that Russian people who do not even know how to sign this sign (the document says “Yelena Titova signed on behalf of the illiterate”) are judging the local people as ignorant, low-consciousness, while judging the autonomists. The statement of sezd of soldier, workers' and Muslim deputies and representatives of trade organizations and factory committees of the Fergana region, which is kept in the archive, is also noteworthy [13.]. 2 issues will be discussed in this session: On the attitude to the autonomy of Turkestan; On the reorganization of the management of the region. The imposition of the issue of autonomy in sezd is the subject of various controversies. For example, the deputy of the Fergana Regional Soviet V.Doriomedov opposes putting the issue of autonomy on the agenda. Deputy of the Regional Soviet of Fergana M.I.Podolyak also says that this issue should be discussed only together with the autonomists. Skobelev city Soviet deputy K.P.Osipov emphasizes that sezd should express its attitude towards autonomy, so this issue should be discussed.

Thus, after much debate, the issue of autonomy is put on the agenda of the Congress. Different opinions on autonomy are expressed in the Congress. In particular, Andijan Soviet Deputy Brizgailov expressed the following opinion on the issue of autonomy: “in general, the issue of autonomy is not met with opposition, but it is necessary to pay attention, by whom and how it was announced. After the revolution, power in Turkestan was in the hands of Europeans, who made up 2 percent, it should be understood that the declaration of autonomy is an exit from the current state, even if it is wrong. The hardworking public did not participate in the declaration of autonomy, it was declared by the Muslim and European bourgeoisie, who were extremely dangerous for the revolution. The mission of democracy is to actively participate and maintain a situation that encourages the active employment of Muslim democracy”[13.].

V.Doriomedov: “Only Yesterday a telegram from the Soviet of people's Commissars was received giving the right of peoples to freely determine their fate. For us (that is, soviet deputies), autonomy can be declared only with the consent of the central universal authority. Telegram creates an unfavorable situation: if we recognize the Petrograd government, then we must obey the Tashkent commissioners; if there is a telegram, it forces us to recognize autonomy. We need to take the following issue seriously. The terms ”bourgeoisie“ and ”proletariat” mean nothing. Kokand sezd was formed from those elected by a common vote at the Constituent Assembly, who were not reactionaries. If we do not come to terms with them, we may be threatened by extermination” [13.].

Uryupin, a deputy of the Andijan Soviet, said: “autonomy must be recognized, but at the top of it now stands a bunch of capitalists who have no eyes on seeing autonomy yesterday. We must drive this gang out and unite with Muslim democracy and stand on top of it (autonomy)ourselves” [13.]. Sugrobov, a deputy of the Skobelev city Soviet, said: “in general, we must recognize autonomy, but the Constituent Assembly, if it stands in the interest of the proletariat, will never recognize the Kokand government. Tashkent workers fought the authorities in barricades, and the authorities should remain in them” [13.]. Deputy M.I.Podolyak said, " I recognize the right of all peoples, and at the same time Muslims, to self-determination. The Tashkent government does not represent the interests of the working masses of Turkestan. Insulting Muslims, he (the government of Tashkent) remains dangerous not only for Turkestan, but also for the whole country, and this can lead to the fact that we can remain abandoned in the country. Government bodies are required to have representatives of the Muslim masses” [13.].

So, sezd passed within the framework of various disputes and disputes on the issue of autonomy. Its results were manifested in the following decisions: the social democratic faction adopted the following decision, introduced by Pavlyuchenko, a deputy of the Skobelev city Soviet:

“recognizing the inviolability of the right of the Muslim people to autonomy and considering it unconditional need for Turkestan, sezd leaves the implementation of this right to an All-Russian Constituent Assembly, corresponding to]. Paying attention to this document, the deputies of the Fergana Regional Soviet, having different reactions to autonomy, do not fully trust the government in Tashkent either.

The Skobelev City Duma and the committee of public organizations, holding a meeting on February 7(20), 1918, make the following decision: “the Skobelev City Duma and the committee of Public Organizations consider it necessary to quickly transfer power to the Autonomous Government of Turkestan, let a temporary public Regional Soviet be established in places until a government is formed in the Fergana Region” [16.]. In this decision, the composition of the timed Soviet is also indicated, and the Duma expresses confidence that the autonomous government will immediately establish its governing bodies in the province, and expresses its contribution to it. From this document it is known to us that the Skobelev City Duma and municipal public organizations recognized autonomy and asked to take power in the region.

The Fergana Regional Soviet did not treat autonomy very well. But, the City Duma supported the autonomists and worked on their position. For example, the city magistrate of Margilon sends the cases of those arrested from the Old City part to the City Duma for consideration. The Duma decides on this case as follows:” the Skobelev City Duma considers it necessary to enter the commission of inquiry into this case in order to guarantee the fair trial of those arrested in the Old City of Margilon, standing up from the point of view of Turkestan autonomy and believing that the investigation of the above should be carried out on the basis of. The Skobelev City Duma makes another following decision, which directly concerns autonomy: ”the Duma asks its delegates to inform the representatives of the government of the autonomy of Turkestan about the Duma's attitude to autonomy and immediately convey to the Duma that the head of government (head of the autonomous government)wants to hear the doclad within its framework” [9.]. From the above decisions of the Skobelev Duma, it can be seen that they fully supported the autonomy of Turkestan and recognized the time government in Kokand as the legitimate government of Turkestan.

On the night of January 31 (February 13) under K.Osipov's command from Skobelev, a detachment of 120 well-armed soldiers, 4 machine guns and 5 cannons arrive in Kokand. The document proving this is the decision of workers, peasants and red Soldiers Deputies of the Fergana Region [14.]. In this decision, a detachment of 250 people will be sent to Kokand. But, the literature records that 120 people were sent. On the day of the arrival of the military detachment in Kokand, an application was written to the autonomists with the following content: Tomorrow in the afternoon until 3 o'clock bring the weapons to Voskresensky Square and hand over; Let the autonomous government surrender and recognize the government of the Soviets [5: 164 P.]. This application is rejected by the autonomists. The Soviets begin firing cannons at the Old Town. Thus the fighting was sporadic and there were several negotiations in the middle. The FVDA also contains documents related to the termination of Turkestan autonomy and the events of February in Kokand. For example, on the night of January 30 (February 11) in Kokand, a telephoneogram was sent to the city of Skobelev [20.].

The document provides a summary of the details of those events. The decision of the K.Osipov chief detachment to be sent to Kokand is also an important document (this is mentioned above) [14.]. The following document proves the atrocities and robberies of the Armenian dashnaks: “the son of Yusuf Farzi, who lives in the city of Kokand, made the following known about himself: he has been living in Kokand for three years and is engaged in carter (he has 3 chariots). He was robbed by Armenians as a result of unrest in Kokand and had to flee, leaving his passport in his house. The son of his brother Abdullah Ali Farzi, who gave birth to him in Kokand, and a working Lamb were killed” [15.]. This is the Deputy Chief of police of the city of Margilon It was received in A.Semyonov's notice about the son of Joseph the Pharisee of Kokand, who was caught undocumented in Old Margilon. Such documents are trapped in the archive. Distrust and mass incarceration escalate in the Fergana Valley after the events of Kokand, which is also

caused by calls, and many innocent people are imprisoned. At that time, revolutionary–field courts are organized in Kokand, Skobelev.

Any suspicious-looking person is imprisoned and handed over to the same military-field courts. Another document contains the following information: "pacifying documents are being obtained from all sides, in particular, Kokand reports that the fortress is marvelous, the autonomous government has been overthrown by the people, and the military commander of the autonomous government is calling for representatives to negotiate peacefully" [20.]. This document was sent to organizations and institutions by the Fergana Regional Soviet. This may have been the result of bolshevik propaganda. The Bolsheviks deceived the people in the way of their goals, without pulling a tap from any lies. This document, on the other hand, strongly denies the above point: "at 5.30 am on January 30 (February 12), two bridges were burned at the 164th and 166th. The armed mob acted on behalf of the Turkestan autonomous government" [20.].

The decision to end Turkestan autonomy and take power over the entire territory by the Soviets is also significant. In Sections 1 and 2 of this resolution, which consists of 5 sections, it is said: May the provisional government be imprisoned until all cases are identified by the local soybeans; Let the whole power be seized by the Soviet of soldiers, workers and Muslim peasants in the country [17.]. This same decision became the basis for the destruction of the autonomists and the immersion of the people of the Kokand in blood. One of the people who saw these terrible events of the history of the Soviet period firsthand wrote these words: "our vast land was watered with the blood of their own children, who were sacrificed, and covered with their flesh. Thousands of Turkestan boys died in the struggle against the Old Colonists, who came out wearing a new mask. The revolution, thus met with joy, with hopes, took the form of our national tragedy" [6: 119-b.].

The government of autonomy was overthrown, but its consequences resonated for many years and remained an urgent issue of the agenda. True, the events of the Kokand, in general, for those who were connected to the autonomy of Turkestan to one degree or another and were criminally prosecuted and punished, were declared an pardon in the V country sezd (April 1918)of the Turkestan Soviets [7.]. But did this pardon come true?, what were its results? - it is unknown. But it is very well known that many decisions made by the bolsheviks (later communists), the implementation of laws was not ensured, they were not implemented into life.

Above, some documents related to the suppression of Turkestan autonomy and its consequences were analyzed. The collections of the state archive of the Fergana region 121st fund, list 1, 64, 65, 68 contain many documents directly related to these events. It is necessary to further study these documents. It serves as an important resource in the research of Turkestan autonomy. In place of the conclusion, it can be said that the autonomy of Turkestan was an attempt to realize the aspirations of indigenous peoples and national democracy. This action was ended by the bolsheviks. The civilian population was brutally massacred, and the ancient cultural and rich trading city of Kokand was destroyed. It became known from the early days that the Bolshevik government was built on the basis of a positive system, aggressive chauvinistic policies, decisions reflected in legal documents regarding the granting of independence to the national territories were false promises of the Soviet state.

References:

1. Алексеев П. Кокандская автономия. Ташкент. Узгосиздат. 193.
2. Аъзамхўжаев С. Туркистон мухторияти. Тошкент. Фан. 1996.; Ўша муаллиф. Туркистон Мухторияти: миллий давлатчилик қурилиши тажрибаси. Тошкент. «Маънавият». 2000.; Ўша муаллиф. Из истории движения за автономию Туркестана // Общественные науки в Узбекистане. 1996. № 1-2-3. С.40-48.; Дониёров Ш. Мухторият қисмати // Шарқ юлдузи. 1991. 2-сон. Б. 159-173.; Н.Норкулов. Мухториятнинг тугатилиши // Фан ва турмуш. 1990. 9-сон. Б. 8-9.; Содиков Х. Туркистон уч инкилоб даврида // Фан ва турмуш. 1991. 1-сон. Б. 1-23.; Ҳасанов М. «Кокандская автономия» и

- её некоторые уроки // *Общественные науки в Узбекистане*. 1990. № 2. С. 41-52.; Ўша муаллиф. *Альтернатива: из истории Кокандской автономии* // *Звезда Востока*. 1990. № 7. С. 105-120. Каримов Н. Қимматга тушган тўлов // *Тафаккур*. 1996. 3-сон. Б. 108-119.
3. *Всему населению Туркестанского Края солдатам, рабочим и гражданам ВОЗЗВАНИЕ Сибирского, Уральского, Семиречинского, Оренбургского казачьего войска*. ФВДА. Ф. 121. р. 1. йж. 68. 1-2-варақ.
 4. Дадонов И.К. *Национально-освободительное движение в Узбекистане после свержения власти царизма (апрель – октябрь 1917 г.)*. Ташкент.
 5. Дониёров Ш. *Мухторият қисмати* // *Шарқ юлдузи*. 1990. 12-сон.
 6. Каримов Н. Қимматга тушган тўлов // *Тафаккур*. 1996. 3-сон.
 7. Копия телеграммы Совнаркома. № 1688. 1918 г. 1 май. ФВДА. Ф. 121. р. 1. йж. 37. 9-варақ.
 8. Письмо от начальника в.пл. Офицеров Временному Правительству Автономного Туркестана. Скобелев 23 (10) февраль 1918 г. ФВДА. Ф.121. р. 1. йж. 68. 43-варақ.
 9. Постановление Думы. 20/7 февраля 1918 года. ФВДА. Ф. 121. р. 1. йж. 64. 69-варақ.
 10. Приговор № 26. ФВДА. Ф. 121. р. 1. йж. 1. 17-18-варақлар.
 11. Предложение Штаба войск городской Управе от 18/5 февраля 1918 года, за № 364. ФВДА. Ф. 121. р. 1. йж. 64. 68-варақ.
 12. Протокол объединенного экстренного собрания представителей общественных организаций города Скобелева, созванного Ферганском областном «Союзом союзов» 17/4 февраль 1918 г. ФВДА. Ф. 121. р. 1. йж. 68. 40-варақ.
 13. Протокол Ферганского областного съезда солдатских, рабочих и мусульманских рабочих депутатов и представителей профессиональных организаций и заводских комитетов, 6 и 7 декабря, 1917 года. ФВДА. Ф. 121. р. 1. йж. 23. 248, 251, 253, 255-варақлар.
 14. Протокол № 49 Ферганского областного совета рабочих, крестьянских и красноармейских депутатов. ФВДА. Ф. 121. р. 1. йж. 6. 51-варақ.
 15. Протокол помощника начальника милиции города Маргилана А.Семёнова. ФВДА. Ф.121. р. 1. йж. 64. 2-варақ.
 16. Резолюция Скобелевской городской Думы и Комитета Общественных организаций города Скобелева 7 (20) февраль 1918г. ФВДА. Ф 121. р. 1. йж. 68. 46-варақ.
 17. Резолюция. ФВДА. Ф. 121. р. 1. йж. 65. 48-варақ.
 18. Сафаров Г. *Колониальная революция (Опыт Туркестана)*. Москва. Госиздат. 1921.; Федоров Е. *Очерки национально-освободительного движения в Ср.Азии*. Ташкент. Узгосиздат. 1925. ; Рискулов Т. *Революция и коренное население Туркестана*. Ташкент. Узгосиздат. 1926.; Галузо П. *Туркестан – колония*. Москва. КУТВ. 1929.
 19. Телеграмма областному совету. ФВДА. Ф.121. р. 1. йж. 9. 20-варақ.
 20. Телефонограмма. Военная. ФВДА. Ф. 121. р. 1. йж. 64. 32, 41, 65-варақлар.
 21. Чўқаев М. *Истиклол жаллодлари (1917 йил хотиралари)*. Тошкент. Ғ.Ғулом номидаги нашриёт. 1992.; Валидий А.З. *Хотиралар* // *Шарқ юлдузи*. 1993. 3-4, 5-6, 7-8-сонлари.