

## **ON THE NATIONAL FREEDOM STRUGGLE OF 1916 IN TURKESTAN (ON THE EXAMPLE OF SYRDARYA REGION)**

**Majidov Anvar Sirajovich**

**Senior teacher of history faculty of Jizzakh State Pedagogy university**

**Abstract:** This scientific article studies the national liberation struggle in Turkestan in 1916, in particular the events that took place in the Syrdarya region. The article analyzes the social, economic and political factors of this period, their impact on the national movements among the local population. It also highlights the strategies of the population of the region to resist the pressure of the Russian Empire, the historical significance of the main characters and events in the struggle. The article, analyzing various archival documents, personal memoirs and historical literature, assesses the role of the Syrdarya region in the liberation struggle and its place in the context of the broader national movement.

**Key words:** Turkestan, national liberation struggle, Syrdarya region, Russian Empire, social movements

The colonial aggression and subjugation of Central Asia by the Russian Empire in the middle of the 19th century brought great hardships and trials to the peoples of Turkestan. The Uzbeks, Tajiks, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Turkmens, Karakalpaks and other peoples, who fell into the clutches of colonialism and national oppression, were subjected to unprecedented oppression and suffering, and their national culture, values, customs and national pride were trampled on. The oppressive position of the imperial government aroused deep hatred in the hearts of the peoples of Turkestan, and this feeling was passed down from generation to generation. Therefore, our free-spirited people waged a relentless struggle against the colonial oppression of tsarist Russia. The uprisings that broke out in our country in 1892, 1898 and 1916 were written in golden letters on the pages of history. These uprisings were linked to each other in every way based on historical logic and took place under the banner of independence and freedom. The uprisings that took place in the Syrdarya region in 1916 occupy an important place in the history of our Motherland. The most powerful and intense of the uprisings that took place in this year, the mass wave that shook the empire, occurred in this region. Because this region was considered the most significant socio-economic region of the Turkestan Governorate, its borders stretched from Orenburg and Alma-Ata on the one hand, and from the Amu Darya and Jizzakh on the other. The region included Tashkent, Shymkent, Avliyata, Perovsk, Kazalinsk and the Amu Darya department. The city of

Tashkent alone included a significant part of the industrial enterprises, trade and commerce sectors, and railway services in the region. If we take into account that Tashkent was the political and cultural center of the entire Governorate-General, the Emirate of Bukhara and the Khanate of Khiva, then there is no doubt how high the status of the Syrdarya region was at that time. It should be said that the prosperous and abundant part of present-day Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkestan was part of the Syrdarya region of the governorate [1:134].

The popular movements that took place in the Syrdarya region are an integral part of the history of the national liberation struggle in Turkestan, and it is appropriate to reinterpret all the uprisings in the region related to this problem. Many books have been written about this, widely publicized, and the popular movements against the oppression of imperial colonialism are also reflected in them to a certain extent. In particular, the first work on the 1916 uprising was published by T. Riskulov in 1924. In his scientific article entitled "From the History of the Struggle for the Liberation of the East," the author assessed this uprising as a national movement and a revolutionary struggle [2]. This approach to the issue is also reflected in T. Riskulov's second article written in 1927 [3:124].

A number of works on the freedom struggle were published in the 30s and 40s, in particular, the works of A.V. Shestakov, Yu. Felix, Z.D. Kastelskaya, I.K. Dodonov, A.G. Zima, P.P. Mironov, E. Mavloni and others should be noted [4:8]. It is also clear from this that in the 20s and 40s of the last century, many scientific articles were published mainly on the national freedom struggle of 1916. Although the works of such authors as N. Khalfin, A.F. Yakunin, O.K. Kuliev, T.E. Yeleuov have a certain importance in our study of the history of the 1916 uprising, they incorrectly assessed the content and direction of the freedom struggle. That is, this uprising was one-sidedly characterized as an integral part of the all-Russian revolutionary movements, and the fact that the freedom struggle was aimed at restoring the unity of Turkestan was denied. In studying the history of the national liberation uprising, the doctoral dissertations of Kh. Sodikov and N. Abdurakhimova are of great importance [5]. The authors' works objectively reveal the political and socio-economic landscape of the colonial period, the various conditions necessary for the maturation of the national liberation uprising, and the measures taken by the imperial authorities to prevent it.

When extremely difficult conditions prevailed in the Turkestan region, on June 25, 1916, the tsar's decree on the involvement of the indigenous population living in Turkestan and other parts of the empire in rear-line work was published [6:1747]. It also mentioned the Syrdarya, Fergana, Samarkand, Trans-Caspian, Akmola, Ettisuv, Semipalatinsk, Ural and Turgai regions of the region. However, it was planned to

recruit representatives of the poor who were not suitable for daily labor. Although the decree did not officially state that the wealthy should not be mobilized, in practice their children were not included in the list.

Finally, the people's hatred and anger at the hard life and the imperial decree turned into open rebellion on the morning of July 11, 1916. Poverty, high prices, and humiliation even inspired women to fight. The fact that thousands of men were being forced into forced labor and the worries about making ends meet shook women. In particular, women and men from various neighborhoods of Tashkent gathered in front of the Ministry of Culture on what is now A. Navoi Street. In front of them, women, filled with rage, walked briskly. They were armed with clubs, stones, iron bars, knives, hoes, and similar simple objects. The rebels entered Almazar Street with shouts and shouts and surrounded the police station. They stormed the police station courtyard with shouts of "...we may die here, but we will not send our children anywhere!", "...we are exhausted from suffering. May the tsarist government that oppressed us be destroyed!" [6:121].

The crowd, led by the rebels Mahmudkhodja Mirzakhodjaev, Yakub Murodzhabbarov, Faiziali Rakhimboev, Pulatkhodja Inogomkhodjaev, Gulom Kamolov, Murodkhodja Mukhammadkomilkhodjaev, Abdurakhmon Kayum Sofiev and Nizomkhodja Zainutdinkhodjaev, raised their voices and stormed the courtyard of the police department building, injuring four of the police officers[7]. At the same time, they severely beat the secretary of the police department and threw iron rods and stones at the bailiffs and the police officers [8:121,122]. In short, the uprising that took place in Tashkent is a vivid example of the struggle for freedom, with its extreme severity and intensity. Its most important feature is that it was first initiated by women, and then men followed.

In response to the popular movements in Tashkent and its districts, uprisings broke out in a number of places in the Syrdarya region. Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and Karakalpaks participated in them. The uprisings were especially sharp in the Avliyota district of the region. Although the difficult political and socio-economic conditions and the emperor's decree on the recruitment of laborers gave rise to the uprisings, there were other reasons for their seriousness.

There were several Russian settlements in the Avliyota district that were engaged in farming and other activities. According to sources, the Russians living in the settlements were extremely rude to the local population, treated them with contempt, disregarded them, and were violent. Colonel Kastalsky, the head of the Avliyata district, writes: "The Russian population of the district consisted of "scoundrels" who were brought from the interior provinces of Russia and carried out field work like

savages. Before the war, they were involved in drinking and entered the indigenous population not with their culture, but with their bad behavior. They had a derogatory attitude towards the Kazakhs, exploited and oppressed them with flattery. It is clear that with such an attitude, the Russians could not win the trust of the Muslims” [9:5]. On September 1, crowds gathered around the villages of Podgor and Lugov, which belong to the Avliyata district of the region, and rebelled against the emperor’s decree on labor. At that time, Kazakh rebels occupied a 10-kilometer stretch starting from Chaldavar, and in many places they cut off telephone wires. They clashed with Russian armed volunteers [10:18]. On September 3, the rebels attacked a railway station being built near Lugov. A military force of 100 people was sent against them. They were defeated, and some fled to the mountains, while the rest fled to the Chu River. As a result of the uprising, the construction of the Pishpek-Avliyota railway was stopped. Postal communication with Tashkent was also cut off [10:79]. And thus the uprising was suppressed at the cost of many people being killed. In short, the First World War made the political and socio-economic life of the country unbearable and brought the masses of the people to the brink of destruction. In such difficult conditions, the proclamation of the imperial decree, the colonial and nationalist policies of the empire led to the uprising of the Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz and Karakalpaks. The participation of not only men, but also women in these freedom struggles was of great importance, and this process shows us how high their political consciousness and loyalty to the Motherland were.

### **List of used literature and sources**

1. Turkiston: Rossiya Turkistoni, Qo’qon, Buxoro va G’uljaga sayohat qaydlari. Y. Skayler. – Z. Saidboboyev tarjimasini. Toshkent: “O’zbekiston” NMIU, 2019.
2. Risqulov T. Sharqni ozod qilish uchun kurash tarixi // “Novyy Vostok”. Kn.6. – Toshkent, 1924.
3. Vosstanie tuzemtsev Sredney Azii v 1916 yil. – Qizil-O’rda, 1927.
4. Suyunova A. Turkistonda 1916 yilgi milliy-ozodlik kurashi (Sirdaryo viloyati misolida): Tarix fanlari nomzodi ilmiy darajasini olish uchun yozilgan dissertatsiya. – Toshkent, 1997.
5. Abduraximova N.A. XIX asrning ikkinchi yarmi XX asr boshlarida Turkistonda mustamlakachilik tizimi. – Toshkent, 1995.
6. Sobranie Uzakonenny i rasporyajenyi pravitelstva. Otdel 1, №182. 6 iyulya 1916.
7. Z.A. Saidboboev, N.U. Musaev, G.N. Saidboboeva. History of constructing of electric stations and its activity in Turkestan region in 1909–1913 // Journal of Critical Reviews, 2020. Vol. 7. Issue 3. P. 453.

8. National archive of Uzbekistan (NAUz) I-17-fund, 3-inventory, 436-case, lists 121-122.
9. NAUz I-1-fund, 31-inventory, 1300-case, list 5.
10. NAUz I-1-fund, 31-inventory, 1134-case, lists 18, 79.
11. ERALOV A. BUXORO VILOYATIDA TURIZM SOHASINING RIVOJLANISH ISTIQBOLLARI //News of UzMU journal. – 2024. – T. 1. – №. 1.2. – С. 8-11.
12. Eralov A. J. MUSTAQILLIK YILLARIDA O ‘ZBEKISTONDA TURISTIK OBYEKTLARNI RAQAMLASHTIRISH JARAYONLARI //Science and innovation. – 2024. – T. 3. – №. Special Issue 3. – С. 654-660.
13. Эралов А. Ж. К ВОПРОСУ О МЕТОДИЧЕСКИХ ВОЗМОЖНОСТЯХ ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ ЮРИДИЧЕСКИХ ПОНЯТИЙ //Научное сообщество студентов XXI столетия. Общественные науки. – 2017. – С. 151-154.
14. Jomurodovich E. A. Possibilities of Developing Tourism in the Southern Regions of Uzbekistan (In the Case of Kashkadarya, Surkhandarya) //The Peerian Journal. – 2022. – T. 11. – С. 92-96.