HSR London International Conference on Multidisciplinary Academic Research
(HSR-ICMAR) 2026
https://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/conference

DIRECT COLONIAL ADMINISTRATION AND PROTECTORATE DEPENDENCE IN THE ZARAFSHAN VALLEY (SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH – EARLY 20TH CENTURY)

Mahbuba S. Tilavova
Researcher at the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23890892

Abstract. The article examines how the division of the Zarafshan valley after the Russian conquest of 1868 produced two administrative orders within one river basin, the Zarafshan okrug (from 1887 the Samarkand oblast) under direct imperial rule and the Bukhara Emirate under protectorate dependence. Using comparative historical, systemic and source-critical methods, the author analyses Russian official reports, travel accounts, the works of local chroniclers and the historiography of the Soviet and independence periods. The study shows that control over the distribution of Zarafshan water served as the principal lever of pressure on Bukhara. The «military-popular administration» of the okrug reduced traditional local offices to executive functions, while cotton specialisation, railway construction and Russian banking tied both parts of the valley to the economy of the metropole. Despite their different legal forms, both regimes subordinated the valley to the raw material needs of Russian industry.

Keywords: Zarafshan valley; Zarafshan okrug; Samarkand oblast; Bukhara Emirate; protectorate; colonial administration; water distribution; cotton monoculture; K.P. Kaufman; Russian Empire.

ПРЯМОЕ КОЛОНИАЛЬНОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ И ПРОТЕКТОРАТНАЯ ЗАВИСИМОСТЬ В ЗЕРАВШАНСКОЙ ДОЛИНЕ (вторая половина XIX – начало XX века)

Тилавова Маҳбуба Шокировна
Соискатель Национального Университета Узбекистана имени Мирзо Улугбека

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается разделение Зеравшанской долины после русского завоевания 1868 г., в результате которого в бассейне одной реки сложились два административных порядка. Зеравшанский округ (с 1887 г. Самаркандская область) перешёл под прямое имперское управление, а Бухарский эмират оказался в протекторатной зависимости. На основе сравнительно-исторического, системного и источниковедческого методов анализируются официальные отчёты, путевые записки, сочинения местных историков, а также историография советского периода и периода независимости. Показано, что контроль над распределением воды Зеравшана служил главным рычагом давления на Бухару, а система «военно-народного управления» превратила традиционные местные должности в исполнительные звенья русской администрации. Хлопковая специализация, строительство железной дороги и деятельность русских банков привязали обе части долины к экономике метрополии. Автор приходит к выводу, что при различной правовой форме оба режима подчинили долину сырьевым потребностям русской промышленности.

Ключевые слова: Зеравшанская долина; Зеравшанский округ; Самаркандская область; Бухарский эмират; протекторат; колониальное управление; распределение воды; хлопковая монокультура; К.П. Кауфман; Российская империя.

Introduction

Until 1868 the Zarafshan valley formed a single economic space. Its irrigation network fed the agrarian heart of the Bukhara state, and the Samarkand and Kattakurgan districts were among the emirate's main sources of food and revenue. The campaign of that year ended with the fall of Samarkand on 2 May and the defeat of the emir's army at Zirabulak on 2 June. The valley was then cut in two. Its upper and middle course became the Zarafshan okrug under Russian military administration, while the lower course stayed with the emirate, which after the treaties of 1868 and of 28 September 1873 lost its freedom in foreign affairs.

After 1868 one river basin was governed under two models of imperial control, yet historians have usually studied the Turkestan Governor-Generalship and the Bukhara Emirate separately, and a comparative picture of the valley is still missing. The aim of this article is to compare the administrative and socio-economic consequences of direct colonial rule and protectorate dependence in the Zarafshan valley between 1868 and the early twentieth century. The study rests on the principles of historicism and objectivity, on comparative historical analysis and on a critical reading of sources written by authors with very different political positions. The source base includes reports of the Turkestan administration and the Samarkand oblast, statistical surveys, the diaries of Russian diplomats who visited Bukhara, the notes of British and American travellers and the chronicles of Bukhara authors. Since each group reflects the interests of its writers, the article sets their testimony on the same events side by side.

Literature review

Four historiographical traditions have shaped the study of the subject. Russian officers and officials of the imperial period, among them M.A. Terentyev, L.N. Sobolev and D.N. Logofet, left detailed records of military operations and of the first administrative measures, presenting the conquest as a civilising mission. Soviet historiography, from P.G. Galuzo to N.A. Khalfin, turned to economic motives and class conflict within the limits of Marxist method. After 1991 Uzbek scholars reconsidered the colonial period on an archival basis. Western authors placed Russian policy in the setting of the «Great Game» and often compared it with British India.

A. Morrison traces the geopolitical reading back to Lord Curzon, who held that a strong position in Central Asia allowed Russia to threaten Britain in Europe by striking at its Asian possessions [1]. Writing from London, Curzon judged Turkestan by its weight in European rivalry, and the life of the local population hardly entered this calculation. Uzbek historiography places economic interest first, and N. Musayev, following P.G. Galuzo, links the conquest of Central Asia directly with the interests of commercial capital and notes the growing weight of industrial capital in the same process [2].

D. Boulger, writing in 1885, assessed the outcome for Bukhara in legal terms. In his view, the loss of strategic towns and the emir's obligation to permit Russian military works and the passage of Russian troops through his lands meant the de facto end of Bukhara's sovereignty [3]. The materials published under the editorship of N.A. Khalfin show that in St Petersburg the fate of the occupied land remained open, while Governor-General K.P. Kaufman insisted on the full annexation of Samarkand and the occupied part of the valley, citing control over the Zarafshan water supply, the symbolic weight of Samarkand and its value as a frontier district [4].

L.N. Sobolev stated the water argument openly in 1874, «The wealth of Central Asia lies in water. We hold the rivers, the Syr, the Amu and the Zarafshan. The economic welfare of Khiva and Bukhara depends on us» [5]. N. Stremoukhov, whose travel notes appeared a year later, was blunter still, «Since the main course of the Zarafshan lies in our territory, its annual distribution also belongs to our government... It is enough to stop the water, and Bukhara will find itself in an extremely difficult position» [6]. Both authors served the imperial administration, so their statements record intentions,

and the extent to which these were carried out has to be checked against administrative practice in the okrug.

R. Kennedy described the legal position of the emirate as «quasi-independence» [7], a term for internal self-government under external subordination. The financing of the Russian mission shows what this meant in daily practice. According to P. Shubinsky, the Russian political agency was founded in Bukhara in the autumn of 1886 «at the wish and request of the emir», and that until 1891 «the entire maintenance of the agency building, the servants and the Cossack guard was carried out from the khanate treasury» [8]. Mirzo Salimbek, a local chronicler, saw the same process from inside and wrote that Bukhara had become «a vassal-dependent colonial state» [9].

I.L. Yavorsky, a member of the Russian embassy of 1878–1879, drew a critical picture of the emirate's own government, observing that «in Bukhara every bek, and there are up to 40 of them, considers himself almost an independent proprietor... their will in their province is law» [10]. E. Schuyler turned similar criticism against the Governor-Generalship itself, finding Kaufman's court excessively lavish, comparing its receptions with the gatherings of the St Petersburg nobility and calling such display «folly» [11]. The Scottish traveller E. Christie noticed that the Russians, as an invariable rule, built their new quarters entirely apart from the native town [12].

On the land question, the collective work edited by D.A. Alimova shows that Kaufman justified the abolition of private landownership as a struggle against the «non-recognition of Russian authority by the local population» and against the local aristocracy, which he called a «political force hostile to the government» [13]. F.U. Suguralieva refers to an agricultural journal of 1911 which described the peasant's meagre share in cotton profits as an «indirect tax» [14]. M. Behbudiy, judging from within his own society, explained the ruin of borrowers who spent credit on weddings and ceremonies by «ignorance, lack of accounting... and disorder» [15].

Water, land and cotton appear in all these sources as the core of imperial interest in the valley. For Sobolev and Stremoukhov control over them meant order. Schuyler and Christie, looking from outside, noticed coercion and administrative excess, and the local authors Mirzo Salimbek and Behbudiy wrote about dependence and impoverishment. How the two regimes interacted within one basin is examined in none of these works, and this question is addressed below.

Analysis and results

For four years after 1868 the Zarafshan okrug was neither returned to Bukhara nor formally annexed. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarded it as temporarily occupied, whereas the Turkestan administration treated it as a permanent possession, and the delay reflected a conflict of strategic priorities between St Petersburg and Tashkent. The Statute on the Administration of the Turkestan Region, approved on 12 June 1886 and in force from 1 January 1887, closed the question. The okrug was abolished and replaced by the Samarkand oblast with four uezds. The earlier internal division, recorded in the data of 1874, followed military lines, with the Kattakurgan otdel in the west on the Bukhara border, the Samarkand otdel in the centre as the seat of power, and a mountain district in the east.

In June 1868, while the main forces were at Kattakurgan and Zirabulak, Jurabek of Kitob, Bobobek of Shahrisabz and Umarbek of Chiroqchi moved against Samarkand, and the townspeople besieged the small garrison in the citadel for seven days. After Kaufman returned on 7 June, the city was given over to the troops for three days as punishment for «treason», and leaders of the rising were executed. Direct rule in the valley thus started with a punitive operation, and even after the oblast administration acquired a civil appearance, real power remained in military hands.

In the okrug all civil and military power was concentrated in the hands of a Russian general, and qazis and aqsaqals, though kept in place, became the lowest executive tier of the colonial apparatus. Bukhara retained its court, its beks and the qushbegi, and Islamic law still governed courts and taxes. Before 1868 the qushbegi supervised water distribution along the whole basin from Samarkand to

Karakul, and land was measured for taxation in tanobs, with 100,000 tanobs forming a tuman and 50,000 a hazora. The loss of the upper valley broke this basin-wide system, since the official who had once controlled the river now controlled only its lower course. The treaty of 1873 then limited the emirate from outside, depriving the emir of direct relations with neighbouring rulers, and the political agency became a permanent channel of supervision. Russian pressure extended to taxation too, and on 29 December 1911 the political agent was instructed to persuade the emir to abolish the aminona and zakat taxes. Emir Olimkhon refused, pointing out that zakat rested on the pillars of Islam, while Russian reports noted that the aminona alone brought the treasury about 200,000 roubles a year. Although both taxes survived, the instruction of 1911 shows that by then St Petersburg regarded the emirate's revenue base as a matter for its own decision.

Because the upper and middle course of the Zarafshan lay in the okrug, the Russian administration could reduce the flow to Bukhara in the most sensitive periods of the agricultural year, particularly in the month of «mezon», the season of autumn sowing. The emirate's harvest and bread came to depend on decisions taken in Samarkand. In our view, this hydro-political lever explains why Kaufman fought to keep the okrug and why the empire could press the emirate without new campaigns.

In the Samarkand oblast irrigated land grew, by one estimate, from 8,000 to 55,600 desyatinas, largely for cotton. In the emirate private capital drove the same shift, and in 1887 the firm Kudrin and Co. distributed 20,000 poods of American cotton seed to peasants around Bukhara. In 1888 the merchant S. Mazov leased 30 desyatinas to test the American variety. As cotton displaced grain, Bukhara grew dependent on Russian grain. A country that had once fed itself imported 660,000 poods of wheat and flour and 650,000 poods of rice by 1890. Protective duties on foreign cotton rose from 40 kopecks per pood in 1878 to 4 roubles 15 kopecks in 1892, yet the gain went mostly to intermediaries and banks rather than to growers. In 1912 Minister A.V. Krivoshein went further and calculated that irrigating at least 3 million new desyatinas could raise the price of such land from 10–15 to 600 roubles, which made cotton the declared future of the whole region.

By 1900 there were nine Russian villages in the Samarkand oblast, created on some of the most fertile land taken from local farmers. In the emirate, where direct settlement was formally excluded, Russian settlements still appeared at Karmana, Kagan, Chorjuy and Termez under the pretext of railway construction and protection of the Afghan border. Each new settlement became a point of Russian jurisdiction inside the protectorate, which narrowed the space where the emir's courts and officials could still act.

The Transcaspian railway crossed the emirate and reached Kagan in 1887 and Samarkand in 1888. Telegraph lines, Russian bank branches and the unstable rate of the credit rouble drew Bukhara's market into the financial system of the metropole, and the emir even sent formal thanks to the emperor for the railway.

From 1871 a new Russian town grew beside old Samarkand, separated from it by the Abramov boulevard, nearly 130 metres wide. The boulevard fixed the division between the colonial administration and the local population in the very plan of the city, something that did not happen in Bukhara, whose traditional urban fabric remained intact.

Conclusion and recommendations

Direct administration in the Zarafshan okrug and protectorate dependence in the Bukhara Emirate served one colonial policy. In the okrug local authority was dismantled, and the population came under military-bureaucratic control from the first weeks after the conquest. Bukhara kept the outer shell of statehood, although the treaties of 1868 and 1873, the political agency and the pressure on its taxes left it without external sovereignty and with limited fiscal autonomy. Control over the river connected these regimes and gave the empire a permanent means of pressure on Bukhara without open force. Cotton specialisation, the railway and Russian credit turned both parts of the valley into a raw

material base of the metropole and weakened their food self-sufficiency. For Bukhara the loss of the upper Zarafshan meant dependence in grain and irrigation water, which no treaty stated formally but which shaped its relations with Russia for the rest of the colonial period.

Further research could produce a historical map of administrative boundaries and water distribution points in the valley for 1868–1917, showing how irrigation systems were adjusted to colonial borders. A comparative study of food security before and after cotton specialisation is also needed. The administrative history of the okrug also deserves separate study on the basis of the records of the head of the okrug, which preserve daily decisions on land, taxes and local appointments. The results may be used in university courses on the history of Uzbekistan and of Uzbek statehood.

References

1. Morrison A.S. Russian Rule in Samarkand, 1868–1910. A Comparison with British India. – Cambridge: Cambridge university press, 2008. P. 34.
2. Мусаев Н. XIX асрнинг иккинчи ярми – XX аср бошларида Туркистонда саноат ишлаб чиқаришининг шаклланиши. – Тошкент: Iqtisod-moliya, 2008. 17-б.
3. Boulger D.C. Central Asian questions: Essays on Afghanistan, China, and Central Asia. – London, 1885. – P. 6.
4. Бухара и Афганистан в начале 80-х годов XIX века (журналы командировок Г.А. Арендаренко) / Ответственный редактор Н.А. Халфин. – Москва: Наука, 1974. С. 10.
5. Соболев Л.Н. Географические и статистические сведения о Зеравшанском округе. – Санкт-Петербуръ, 1874. С. 4.
6. Стремоухов Н. Поездка в Бухару (извлечение из дневника) // Русский вестник. 1875, № 6 (июнь). С. 672 – 673.
7. Kennedy R.J. A journey in Khorassan and Central Asia. March and April, 1890. London Hatchaeds, Piccadilly, 1890. P. 3.
8. Шубинский П. Очерки Бухары // Исторический вестник. – Санкт-Петербургъ, 1892, № 7. С. 126.
9. Мирзо Салимбек. Кашкўли Салимий. Тарихи муттақадимин ва муттаахирин / Форс-тожик тилидан таржима, кириш сўз, изоҳ ва кўрсатгичлар муаллифи Н.Йўлдошев. – Бухоро, 2003. 8-б.
10. Путешествие русского посольства по Авганистану и Бухарскому ханству в 1878 – 1879 гг. Из дневников члена посольства И.Л.Яворского. В двух томах. Том I. – Санкт-Петербургъ, 1882. С. 35.
11. Скайлер Ю. Туркистон: Россия Туркистони, Қўқон, Бухоро ва Ғулжага саёҳат қайдлари / Таржимон З.А.Саидбобоев. – Тошкент: O‘zbekiston, 2019. 56-б.
12. Christie E.R. Through Khiva to golden Samarkand. The remarkable story of a woman’s adventurous journey alone through the deserts of Central Asia to the heart of Turkestan. – Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1925. – P. 25.
13. Мустабид тузумнинг Ўзбекистон миллий бойликларини талаш сиёсати: тарих шоҳидлиги ва сабоқпари (1865 – 1990 йиллар) / Лойиҳа раҳбари ва масъул муҳаррир: Д.А.Алимова. – Тошкент: Шарқ, 2000. 23-б.
14. Сугуралиева Ф.У. История становления, эволюции и деятельности хозяйственных госучреждений колониального Туркестана (1867–1917 гг.). Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата исторических наук. – Ташкент, 2006. С. 50.
15. Ўзбекистон тарихи. Хрестоматия. 4-жилд. 1860 – 1917 йиллар / Масъул муҳаррир ва лойиха раҳбари: Д.Х.Зияева. – Тошкент: Navro‘z, 2014. 218-б.