



## THE POLICY OF RESETTLEMENT OF RUSSIANS TO THE TERRITORY OF TURKESTAN, TURNING IT INTO A RAW MATERIAL BASE FOR COTTON

Behzod Kh. Hamdamov

Lecturer Bukhara State Medical Institute Bukhara, Uzbekistan

Shakhnoza V. Temirova

Phd Student Navoi State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

One of the motives for the subjugation of Central Asia was the desire of tsarism to turn it into a colonization area for the resettlement of peasants from the central provinces of Russia. However, Uzbekistan did little to justify the calculations of the tsarist government, since there was no free irrigated land. Peasant colonization became widespread only on the territory of Kazakhstan and northern Kyrgyzstan. The resettlement of Russian peasants was often accompanied by a violent seizure of the lands of the indigenous population. The kulak settlers exploited both the local population and the Russian poor. The tsarist government attached great importance to the resettlement of part of the peasants of Russian villages to Central Asia in order to mitigate the social contradictions in Russia caused by the lack of land in connection with the development of capitalist relations in Russian agriculture. Already in 1869, rules on peasant settlements in Semirechye were developed, which created favorable conditions for the influx of Russian settlers. During the period from 1888 to 1916, the sowing of cotton increased by almost 10 times (from 68.5 thousand dessiatins to 680 thousand 911 dessiatins), and the gross cotton harvest increased by almost 7 times (from 2.27 million poods per year. 1879 to 14.9 million poods – in 1916) The area of irrigated land and the production of agricultural products increased significantly, the range of agricultural sectors expanded. Cotton attracted Russian capital to Central Asia. At least 30 of the largest trading companies were engaged in its production and purchase. The main creditors were the largest banks in Russia

**KEYWORDS:** - Subjugation of Central Asia, contradictions, Semirechye, colonization area, Russian peasants, the tsarist government, the local population

### INTRODUCTION

One of the motives for the subjugation of Central Asia was the desire of tsarism to turn it into a colonization area for the resettlement of peasants from the central provinces of Russia. However, Uzbekistan did little to justify the calculations of the tsarist government, since there was no free

irrigated land. Peasant colonization became widespread only on the territory of Kazakhstan and northern Kyrgyzstan. The resettlement of Russian peasants was often accompanied by a violent seizure of the lands of the indigenous population. The kulak settlers exploited both the local population and the Russian poor. The tsarist government attached great importance to the resettlement of part of the peasants of Russian



villages to Central Asia in order to mitigate the social contradictions in Russia caused by the lack of land in connection with the development of capitalist relations in Russian agriculture. Already in 1869, rules on peasant settlements in Semirechye were developed, which created favorable conditions for the influx of Russian settlers. During the period from 1888 to 1916, the sowing of cotton increased by almost 10 times (from 68.5 thousand dessiatins to 680 thousand 911 dessiatins), and the gross cotton harvest increased by almost 7 times (from 2.27 million poods per year). 1879 to 14.9 million poods - in 1916) The area of irrigated land and the production of agricultural products increased significantly, the range of agricultural sectors expanded. Cotton attracted Russian capital to Central Asia. At least 30 of the largest trading companies were engaged in its production and purchase. The main creditors were the largest banks in Russia. The growth of national liberation and democratic movements in Turkestan. Uprising in Tashkent, Andijan.

## THE MAIN FINDINGS AND RESULTS

By the beginning of the 70s of the XIX century, the social situation of the working masses in the Kokand Khanate deteriorated even more. Countless, ever-increasing extortions and taxes made the situation of the people even more unbearable, which led to a socio-political aggravation, to open protests of the popular masses against the violence and oppression of the khan's power. The local nobility also expressed dissatisfaction with the policy of Khudayar Khan, especially with his foreign policy aimed at rapprochement with the tsarist government in the person of the Turkestan governor-general, which led to a conspiracy against him, which was supported by the masses. The struggle for the khan's power, which began in 1871-1872. grew into a popular movement of the broad masses in 1873-1876. d, known as the Pulat Khan

uprising. In 1873. in the Namangan vilayet, a large popular uprising broke out, which soon engulfed the entire khanate. Its main driving forces were the dehkan masses, artisans, and small traders. The uprising was led by Iskhak-mulla Hasan-oglu, Kirghiz by origin from Margilan district, who took the name of Pulat-bek, one of the relatives of Khudayar-khan, who lived in exile in Samarkand. One of the most important events of the late 19th century was the uprising of 1892, which was called the "cholera riot" in Tashkent. Cholera and shy measures against it were only an external reason for the manifestation of deep internal discontent that had accumulated among the population of Tashkent. On June 7, the first cholera cases were registered in Tashkent. The city administration prescribed a number of measures for the population in order to combat cholera. The deceased could not be buried without the preliminary testimony of a doctor. Due to the lack of doctors, we had to wait several days. A large number of the dead began to accumulate in morgues, and Muslim customs require that the deceased be buried on the same day. In addition, the restriction on leaving the city deprived mardikers of earnings who could not go to work in the cotton fields.

As a result of these measures, wealthy people began to resort to bribes, bribery of the administration, and the poor hid cases of cholera. In the city, rumors spread about the poisoning of patients by doctors.

Tashkent uprising of 1892 testified to the desire of tsarism to eradicate the mass popular movement in the colonial outskirts with cruel and merciless reprisals.

This was the first urban uprising. The main slogan of the rebels was a protest against the tsarist administration and the change of city authorities. The rebels perfectly figured out who the real



culprits of the oppression were: not a single doctor, not a single medical institution was attacked. In 1898. there was one of the major national liberation movements of the indigenous population, known as the "Andijan uprising", which covered almost the entire Fergana Valley. The main participants in the uprising were farmers and cattle breeders of the Fergana villages and suburbs. The prerequisite for the uprising was the new system of land taxation, introduced in the early 1980s, as a result of which taxes increased by 2-3 times. The severity of taxation was exacerbated by the abuse of local tax collectors. Residents paid even for non-existent lands washed away by the river. The posting of the tsarist troops in the villages was also a burdensome duty. The uprising began with an attack by the rebels on the royal garrison in Andijan. The rebels came from the village of Ming-Tepe. They were headed by Ishan Muhamad Ali Khalfa Sabir Sufiyev (abbreviated as Madali). Having become an ishan, Madali did not abandon his father's craft, who was a feld-maker. Therefore, even in his youth, he was nicknamed dukchi (spindle). Muhammad Ali was educated in Bukhara in his earliest childhood, and after 16 years he continued it in Samarkand. Returning to his homeland, he became known among the people for his knowledge and godly deeds. The popular uprising of 1916 and its character. June 25, 1916. Tsar Nicholas II signed a decree "On the attraction of the male non-Russian population of the empire to work on the construction of fortifications and military communications in the area of the active army, as well as for any other work necessary for state defense." In accordance with the decree, the government decided to mobilize, first of all, the male population of the eastern outskirts between the ages of 19 and 31. The mobilization of the indigenous population in Turkestan began at the end of June 1916. immediately after receiving a telegraphic order from the Minister of Internal Affairs Sturmer - to fulfill the tsar's decree "in the

shortest possible time" For Turkestan, a firm outfit of 250,000 workers was established. On June 29, the interim governor-general of the region, Erofeev, announced by telegraph to the regional governors the beginning of mobilization for military logistic work. On July 5, at the Kuropatkin station, a shootout took place between the rebels and the troops. On the same day, an uprising took place in the city of Urgut, Samarkand region. Here the rebels attacked the aksakl and, taking the lists from him, destroyed them. The movement also covered the Fergana region - the most important region of Turkestan, the cotton granary of the Russian Empire. In the Ferghana Valley, where social contradictions were comparatively stronger, popular demonstrations took on a particularly stormy character and wide scope. The struggle against mobilization for rear services set in motion all segments of the population. The instigators of the performances in Fergana were workers, artisans, laborers and tea-riders. In Kokand, the entire day of July 9 was held in continuous protest demonstrations and protests against the local authorities. The district authorities twice sent punitive detachments to the old city of Kokand to suppress the uprising. In the village of Rishtan on July 12, a real battle took place near the courtyard of the mosque, where the tsar's decree was "explained". The rebels, armed with stones and sticks, attacked the local bailiff and his guards. The encircled guards responded with gunfire and wounded three people. The bailiff was rescued by a military command arrived from Kokand, led by a district chief, which scattered the insurgents. By mid-July 1916. The uprising covered almost all Uzbek and Tajik regions that are part of the Turkestan General Government. Large unrest occurred in almost all cities (Tashkent, Kokand, Andijan, Margelan, Namangan, Jizzak, Katta-Kurgan), in 11 volosts of the Tashkent district, in 29 volosts of the Fergana region, in 24 volosts of the Samarkand region. The Jizzakh uprising began as a



popular spontaneous movement under the influence of popular unrest in Turkestan. In the old part of the city, it was announced (July 7) about the beginning of the compilation of the lists of mardikers. The deadline was set for 10 days, but the lists were not ready within the set time frame. Local Ishan Nazirkhodja Abdusalom sent his son to Tashkent. His son brought the news that as a result of the riots, mobilization was suspended until the end of the month of Ramadan on July 17, and began to call on the people to destroy the lists. On July 13-15, the uprising engulfed the city of Jizzak and its environs. 15 out of 20 volosts took part in the uprising. The issue of resettlement was almost the only issue, during the discussion of which the deputies of the State Duma recalled Turkestan at their meetings. In general, the process of unauthorized resettlement of peasants to the Turkestan Territory began long ago, at the end of the 19th century, and took place without permission. At the same time, the state took the most advantageous position: "not to allow and not to prohibit". Officially, the region was generally closed to migrants. Only officials of the local administration could settle here after retirement, since according to the Regulation on the Management of Turkestan, the government promised to keep the local population of their land. July 6, 1904 a new resettlement law was promulgated. On the basis of it, all unauthorized migrants who had previously arrived in Turkestan were "legalized". However, the resettlement business in the region still remained unorganized. This was due to the lack of funds and free irrigated land.

After the revolution of 1905-1907. the situation has changed. Along with the planting of farms and cuts At the request of the householder, disparate plots of land could be joined together, so a cut was obtained. If housing was transferred to the cut, then it turned into a farm. The agrarian policy of tsarism assumed

the mass resettlement of peasants beyond the Urals, including to Turkestan. In Turkestan, settlers mainly rushed to the steppe regions of Semirechye and the Syrdarya region.

But, as Count K.K. Palen, "utter chaos" reigned in the resettlement business. A significant part of the unsettled migrants returned back to Central Russia. And in government circles they asked themselves the question: "Can we leave vast territories without the Russian population when there is every reason to fear that our " friends "and" well-wishers "are from the south (in all likelihood, it was about England - T.K.) are preparing new troubles for us ".

The consequence of the Stolypin agrarian reforms was the destruction of the rural community and the stratification of the peasantry. As a result, the bulk of the immigrants who arrived in Turkestan were the poorest peasants, who hoped to get here what they did not have in their homeland - land and economic independence. This sharply contradicted the interests of colonial policy, since such "unreliable elements" not only could not be relied upon in a "difficult moment", but they themselves posed a serious danger to the existing system.

The question was especially acute in Semirechye. Here the interests of three groups of the population clashed: Cossacks, sedentary and nomadic Kazakhs and Russian settlers. All of them claimed certain plots of land. The Kazakh and Kyrgyz population put up active, often armed resistance to the tsarist officials, because they believed, and quite rightly, that their lands were being taken away from them in the most illegal way. The local population sent complaints to the State Duma, the Turkestan Governor General and P.A. Stolypin. In response, formidable orders came from Petersburg that all resistance would be suppressed by military force.

The resettlement issue in the I and II State Duma.



Already in the 1st State Duma, a request was made to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers "On the illegal formation of resettlement sites in the Kyrgyz steppe." But due to the rapid dissolution of the Duma, the question remained unanswered.

Her successor, the II Duma, left behind two documents. The first is a request to the Chief Executive of Land Management and Agriculture "On taking measures to accelerate the formation of resettlement areas." But, the explanations received from the Government, in response to that request, the Duma considered insufficient, and the measures for organizing the resettlement business did not ensure the interests of the migrants and violate the interests of the indigenous population.

The second document is the estimate of the Migration Board for 1907, drawn up by the Budget Commission. Without a doubt, the estimate would have been accepted if the Duma had existed a little longer.

The attitude of the Duma of the third convocation to resettlement to Turkestan.

It must be emphasized that during the period of the legislative activity of the Third State Duma (1907-1912), the tsarist government began to take an interest not only in the resettlement of peasants from the Central provinces, but also in colonization. What should be understood by the term colonization? This is a process of settlement, with the aim of not just removing the surplus population from land-poor regions, but the permanent settlement of settlers in new places, with the active use of the productive forces of the territories. outskirts. The Duma immediately firmly and definitely sided with the promotion of free resettlement. Approved by her estimate of the budget expenditures for resettlement for 1908. amounted to 18 million rubles.

On November 10, 1907, at the fourth session of the Duma of the third convocation, at the suggestion of the Octobrists, the Resettlement Commission was formed. It consisted of 66 people. This was the largest of all the Duma commissions. It was headed by Prince A.D. Golitsin.

How did the various factions view the resettlement? The rightists believed that the problem of land scarcity was not being addressed effectively enough. And it is necessary to expand the area of land allotted for resettlement. The Muslim deputies were of the opinion that the resettlement case is closely related to the solution of the agrarian question. And without the legislative permission of the latter, the correct organization of the former is not possible. The Social Democratic faction accused the government of violating and infringing on the rights of old residents. According to the "People's Freedom" faction, the policy of the Resettlement Administration had to undergo a radical change and become systematic and rational.

But if there was someone to take care of the settlement of the settlers, then the issue of land management of the local population was very acute, and was not fully resolved.

Opinions were divided again. Thus, the Muslim faction believed that in Turkestan the lands occupied by the indigenous population could not be considered state-owned, since there was only political domination of Russia relative to them. Therefore, any seizure of these lands should be considered illegal. This provision was confirmed by the obligation undertaken by Russia after the conquest to preserve land use rights for the local population.

Trudoviks, cadets and progressives did not fundamentally challenge the state's rights to the Kyrgyz and Kazakh lands, but believed that it was





impossible to solve the problem without the publication of a special law regulating relations between the population and the state. The Octobrists insisted on opening Turkestan for Russian resettlement. And after that, one should "treat the local population with all care and make the withdrawal of the surplus the least painful."

Ultimately, the interests of large landowners prevailed in the Duma. But, nevertheless, the voices of dissidents were heard in it. On the one hand, they somewhat softened the decisions of the Duma, on the other, they forced the Migration Board to be less arrogant.

The issue of resettlement to Turkestan was mainly related to the issue of the withdrawal of "surplus" from local residents - nomads. Some deputies reminded that the nomadic population, in fact, has long been a sedentary economy and only through a misunderstanding is considered nomadic. To withdraw land in this case means to become in direct contradiction with Article 279 of the Turkestan Regulations. According to which, with the transition of the nomadic population to a sedentary life, all the land they cultivate passes into their use.

On June 13, 1908, a bill of 60 deputies was introduced to the State Duma "On the establishment of land management commissions and land organization of Kirghiz in the Ural, Turgai, Akmola, Semipalatinsk. Syrdarya, Semirechinskaya and Transcaspian regions".

The authors proposed creating regional commissions in the named regions, which would also include representatives of the indigenous population. The goal is, together with the placement of Russian settlers, to simultaneously produce land arrangements for the old residents.

Progressists, Trudoviks and Muslims joined the Octobrists and Cadets in this matter. Local and central authorities could not reach consensus in the implementation of the resettlement policy. So the military governor of Semirechye Ionov back in 1906. noted that the well-being of some Russian subjects cannot be based on the forcible seizure of property from others. Ionov was supported by Governor-General N.I. Grodekov. The latter, resolutely advocated the transfer to the settlers of only really empty lands or lands irrigated at the expense of the state. Thus, two sides of the conflict clearly emerged. This is the local administration headed by the Governor-General N.I. Grodekov and the Main Directorate of Land Management and Agriculture.

Therefore, a law was needed according to which the state could freely confiscate land from the indigenous population.

In 1910, the Main Directorate of Land Management and Agriculture applied to the State Duma with a request to amend Art. 270 Regulations on the Administration of the Turkestan Territory.

Let's explain the background of the problem. The bill on the addition of Art. 270 The Turkestan Regulations were first discussed in the resettlement commission of the State Duma, then on April 7 it was submitted to the General Assembly of the State Duma, where it was adopted, and on December 19 of the same year was awarded the Highest approval. What was the point of this addition? The Main Directorate of Land Management and Agriculture asked to make a "small amendment" to the previous law, namely, that "lands that might be redundant for the Kyrgyz (nomads - TK)" are transferred to the jurisdiction of the Directorate.

The resettlement commission recommended to the assembled members of the Duma to adopt the draft



law in the following version: "In addition to Art. 270 of the Turkestan Regulations to decide: lands that may turn out to be superfluous for nomads, come under the jurisdiction of the Main Directorate of Land Management and Agriculture". The deputies started discussing the bill. The adoption of the law dragged on for almost a year - from April to December. And all this time passions raged in the Tauride Palace and diametrically opposite points of view were expressed.

However, on December 19, 1910. The III State Duma adopted an addendum to Article 270 of the Regulation on the management of Turkestan, which in practice legalized the robbery of the indigenous peoples of the region. In 1910, the government put forward a "new course" in resettlement policy. When discussing the estimates of the Resettlement Administration in the Duma for 1910, A.V. Krivoshein said that "from now on, our central task should not be the eviction of the peasant masses from Central Russia, but the settlement of the outskirts with a strong element." In other words, the planting of the kulaks there as the social support of tsarism. The Third Duma supported the "new course" in every possible way. Its slogan "settlement is more important than resettlement" also formed the basis of the resettlement policy of the IV Duma.

Attitude of the IV State Duma to resettlement policy. December 14, 1912 the IV State Duma introduced a draft law "On the use of waters in Turkestan". As has already been noted many times, for the region, where almost all agriculture was possible only with the use of artificial irrigation, the last bill was especially important. The project retained the supreme right to water for the state, and created local governments for irrigation and water distribution. And although they talked about the water law for Turkestan for more than one year, it was never adopted.

On February 14, a meeting of the budget commission was held, at which the estimate of the Resettlement Administration was discussed. Up to forty times at this meeting other deputies spoke on the resettlement estimate, and no one dwelled on the issues of colonization in the broad sense of the word.

## CONCLUSION

The first question posed to the Resettlement Administration was the question of deputy Vinogradov - why the resettlement movement has decreased in numbers, why many are going back, how to explain the large number of unsettled "new settlers". Deputy N.N. Opochinin, raised the issue of a general plan for the settlement of Asian Russia, under which not only the goals of occupying generally free lands, but also the goals of a higher state order - strengthening the borders, would be pursued. As a result, the estimate of the Resettlement Office was reduced by 72 thousand rubles. In particular, funding for hydraulic engineering surveys in the Semirechensky and Syrdarya regions was cut by 19 thousand.

## REFERENCES

1. Ахмедова З. А., Турсунов К. С. Интеграционный процесс в рамках Европейского союза // Наука, техника и образование. – 2020. – №. 5 (69). – С. 49-52.
2. Ахмедова З. А. Астрономические взгляды Ахмада Дониш // Вестник науки и образования. – 2018. – №. 11 (47).
3. Ахмедова З. А. HUMAN BEING IN THE WORKS OF MEDIEVAL THINKERS // Новый день в медицине. – 2020. – №. 4. – С. 115-118.
4. Ахмедова З. А. XIX АСРНИНГ ИККИНЧИ ЯРМИДА ТУРКИСТОН ЎЛКАСИ



- МАДАНИЯТИ //ВЗГЛЯД В ПРОШЛОЕ. – 2021. – Т. 4. – №. 7.
5. Сагикызы А., Шушитбай М., Ахмедова З. UPBRINGING AND EDUCATION AS FACTORS OF HUMAN CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT //Адам элeмi. – 2021. – Т. 88. – №. 2. – С. 18-25.
6. Akhmedova Z. A. THE ROLE OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY IN MEDICAL UNIVERSITY //Наука, техника и образование. – 2021. – №. 6. – С. 44-48.
7. Ахмедова З. А. HUMAN BEING IN THE WORKS OF MEDIEVAL THINKERS //Новый день в медицине. – 2020. – №. 4. – С. 115-118.
8. Azizovna A. Z. ROLE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE LIFE OF SOCIETY //Наука, техника и образование. – 2020. – №. 11 (75).
9. Ахмедова З. А., Чориева М. А. ТРУД АХМАДА ДОНИША «ИСТОРИЯ МАНГИТСКИХ ГОСУДАРЕЙ» КАК ЦЕННЫЙ ИСТОЧНИК ПО ИСТОРИИ БУХАРСКОГО ХАНСТВА ВТОРОЙ ПОЛОВИНЫ XVIII-ПЕРВОЙ ПОЛОВИНЫ XIX ВВ //Наука, техника и образование. – 2020. – №. 11 (75).
10. Akhmedova Z. A. Astronomical views of Ahmad Donish //Bulletin of Science and Education. – 2018. – №. 11. – С. 47.
11. Hamdamov B. K., Temirova S. V. FROM THE HISTORY OF BUKHARA FOLK MEDICINE //CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (2767-3758). – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 12. – С. 52-55.
12. Чориева М. А. Экономика и денежное обращение (монеты) в Бухарском эмирате при мангытах (на рубеже 19-20 веков) //Наука, техника и образование. – 2020. – №. 5 (69). – С. 53-56.
13. Чориева М. А. Историография жизни и политической деятельности последнего мангытского эмира Сейида Алимхана //Наука, техника и образование. – 2018. – №. 9 (50).
14. Чориева М. А. СОЦИАЛЬНО-ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОЕ, ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЕ ПОЛОЖЕНИЕ БУХАРСКОГО ЭМИРАТА В КОНЦЕ XIX ВЕКА //Наука, техника и образование. – 2020. – №. 11 (75).
15. Ахмедова З. А., Чориева М. А. ТРУД АХМАДА ДОНИША «ИСТОРИЯ МАНГИТСКИХ ГОСУДАРЕЙ» КАК ЦЕННЫЙ ИСТОЧНИК ПО ИСТОРИИ БУХАРСКОГО ХАНСТВА ВТОРОЙ ПОЛОВИНЫ XVIII-ПЕРВОЙ ПОЛОВИНЫ XIX ВВ //Наука, техника и образование. – 2020. – №. 11 (75).
16. ECONOMY C. M. A., CIRCULATION M. IN THE BUKHARA EMIRATE AT THE MANGYT (AT THE BORDER OF THE 19-20 CENTURIES) //Science, technology and education. – 2020. – №. 5. – С. 69.
17. Chorieva M. A. Historiography of the life and political activities of the last Mangyt emir, Seyid Alimkhan //Science, technology and education. – 2018.
18. МА С. ЕКОНОМІКА І ДЕНЕЖНОЇ ОБРАШЧЕНИЇ (МОНЕТИ) В БУХАРСЬКОМУ ЕМІРАТІ ПРИ МАНГІТАХ (НА РУБЕЖІ 19-20 ВІКІВ). – 2020.
19. МА С. Istoriofafiya zhizni i politicheskoy deyatel'nosti poslednego mangytskogo emira Seyida Alimkhana. – 2018.
20. Choriyeva M. A. HISTORY OF CREATION" SHAH-NAME" FIRDOUSI //CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (2767-3758). – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 12. – С. 45-48.
21. МА Чориева РАЗВИТИЕ БАНКОВСКОГО ДЕЛА В БУХАРСКОМ ЭМИРАТЕ (19-20 ВВ)-Новый день в медицине, 2020. С. 733-735
22. Akhmedova Z. A. HEALTHY LIFESTYLE AS THE KEY TO HEALTH //SCIENCE AND





- WORLD. – 2013. – С. 21.
23. Ахмедова З. А., Аннамуратов Ш. La méthodologie traditionnelle et directe d'enseignement des langues étrangères //Молодой ученый. – 2017. – №. 24-2. – С. 16-17.
24. Ахмедова З. А. HEALTHY LIFESTYLE AS THE KEY TO HEALTH //Наука и мир. – 2018. – Т. 2. – №. 4. – С. 21-22.
25. Akhmedova Z. A. THE ROLE OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY IN MEDICAL UNIVERSITY //Наука, техника и образование. – 2021. – №. 6. – С. 44-48.
26. Akhmedova Z. A. PHILOSOPHY OF THE FIRST JADID AHMAD MAHDUM DONISH //CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (2767-3758). – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 12. – С. 41-44.
27. Турсунов К. Швейцария: оценки хода государственного и общественного строительства в независимом Узбекистане //Fuqarolik jamiyati. Гражданское общество. – 2013. – Т. 10. – №. 3. – С. 83-86.
28. Турсунов К. Германия: университетские исследования формирования гражданского общества в Узбекистане //Fuqarolik jamiyati. Гражданское общество. – 2009. – Т. 6. – №. 2. – С. 77-80.
29. Турсунов К. Великобритания: изучение опыта формирования основ гражданского общества в Узбекистане //Fuqarolik jamiyati. Гражданское общество. – 2011. – Т. 8. – №. 3. – С. 89-92.
30. Турсунов К. ЛАТВИЯ: ОЦЕНКИ РЕАЛИЗАЦИИ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЙ МОЛОДЕЖНОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ В НЕЗАВИСИМОМ УЗБЕКИСТАНЕ //Fuqarolik jamiyati. Гражданское общество. – 2014. – Т. 11. – №. 1. – С. 61-64.
31. Турсунов К., Бафоев Ф. К вопросу становления, функционирования и развития парламентской оппозиции //Fuqarolik jamiyati. Гражданское общество. – 2008. – Т. 5. – №. 1. – С. 53-58.
32. Турсунов К. БЕЛЬГИЯ: ОСВЕЩЕНИЕ ОПЫТА ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ ОСНОВ ГРАЖДАНСКОГО ОБЩЕСТВА В УЗБЕКИСТАНЕ //Fuqarolik jamiyati. Гражданское общество. – 2010. – Т. 7. – №. 2. – С. 91-94.
33. Tursunov K. S. EUROPE AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES //Наука, техника и образование. – 2021. – №. 6. – С. 42-44.
34. Sodikov T. K. HISTORY OF THE BUKHARA STATE MEDICAL INSTITUTE NAMED AFTER ABU ALI IBN SINO //Наука, техника и образование. – 2020. – №. 11 (75).
35. Tursunov Q. S. NEW UZBEKISTAN AND ELECTION LEGISLATION //CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (2767-3758). – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 12. – С. 49-51.