

**DETAILS OF THE BOOK “A COUNTRY WITHOUT RIGHTS” IN NABIJON BOQIY’S  
NOVEL “MADFUN TURKISTAN”**

**Sharafiddinova Nodira Xursandovna**

PhD in Philology Teacher at the Academic Lyceum  
of Fergana State University

[Tel:+998908350828](tel:+998908350828)

Elektron pochta: [Nodish@gmail.com](mailto:Nodish@gmail.com)

**Annotation:** This article analyzes Nabijon Boqiy’s documentary-historical novel “Madfun Turkiston” (“Buried Turkestan”) and its depiction of details from the Russian writer D. I. Logofet’s book “A Country Without Rights.” The novel presents the social, political, cultural, and moral decline of the Bukhara Emirate based on historical documents. Through Logofet’s work, the author reveals the social, economic, and political conditions of Bukhara, the deprivation of the people’s rights, and the corruption of officials. Although Logofet’s narrative reflects the viewpoint of the Russian Empire, his observations contain realistic depictions and a tone of empathy toward the local people. The analysis emphasizes how Boqiy transforms documentary material into a literary tool for exposing national oppression and historical truth.

**Keywords:** Bukhara Emirate, documentary novel, historical analysis, Russian colonialism, socio-political problems.

The historical-documentary novel “Madfun Turkiston” by writer N. Boqiy begins with details from the Russian author D. Logofet’s book entitled “A Country Without Rights.” The information related to this book appears on pages 9–20 of the novel. The author D.I. Logofet, a Russian writer, does not call his impressions of his travels across Bukhara and Turkestan a travelogue, but rather names them “A Country Without Rights.” These impressions differ from ordinary travel notes; the author provides an agro-geographical description of the places he visits, analyzes them socio-politically, and reveals the philosophical and psychological perspectives of both the people and their rulers. The book was published in St. Petersburg in 1908.

According to N. Boqiy, the national government paid no attention to this book. By that time, the Bukhara government had lost its status as a national authority; it was preoccupied with its own concerns, unaware of the events around it, and thus viewed the future with doubt and despair. The ruling elite were primarily concerned with increasing their wealth.

As F. Mehring notes in his commentary on Lassalle’s article about the 1859 Schiller anniversary, “In the spiritual unity of its literature, our people realized the guarantee of their own spiritual and national revival.” He continues, “It was the period when the Italian wars revealed that Germans had become a second-rate nation. The Schiller celebration, illuminated by the joy of national pride, became a protest against such humiliation.” (3, p.59)

In this regard, Logofet’s book could have served as an awakening call to the amirs, beks, and ideological rulers of Bukhara—if only the national government had paid attention to it. However, the local rulers were completely detached from global progress, confined within narrow traditional views, and culturally backward. It is likely that the people of Bukhara were not even aware of the existence of such a book.

The title “A Country Without Rights” accurately reflects the state of Bukhara—a country that was not truly national, but rather local and soon to fall under complete subjugation. The colonial

authorities paid great attention to this book and studied it carefully, as every piece of information about the region held strategic value. For this reason, under the order of the Governor-General of Turkestan, a general named Dragin examined the book and prepared a report based on his findings. Although this report was officially called a “review,” it functioned more as an informative document for practical use.

In his assessment, Dragin noted that Bukhara’s government was degraded and subservient to Russia. Bukhara officials sought to bribe and win the favor of Russian administrators. The Russian authorities concluded that the local people had not yet formed a national identity, lacked pride, and lived in dire poverty. The officials – though from the same nation – were the very ones responsible for this state of decay.

The government was politically weak, without effective administrative foundations, and rather than developing the country, it was consuming its wealth. Corruption and the private enrichment of officials had become rampant.

Dragin observed, “In Bukhara, individuals who show loyalty and service to the regime receive entire families or villages as rewards, collecting one-third of their annual income. Even though slavery was officially banned in the 1873 friendship treaty with Russia, a special form of servitude continued to exist. Families, women, and children could still be sold to pay fines.” (1, p.12)

Thus, by the late 19th century, the Bukhara Emirate had preserved elements of slavery that had already been abolished in the United States in the 1860s and formally banned by Russia in the 1870s.

The colonial writer stated: “...The Bukhara Emirate is now one of the most lawless countries on earth. Under the name and protection of Russia, disgraceful deeds are being committed. The population is being ruthlessly plundered; a people of three million who once lived prosperously have been reduced to beggary and condemned to gradual extinction.” (1, p.12)

Who wrote this? The “disgraceful deeds” were being committed by Bukhara officials, yet the Russian author admits that this occurred under Russia’s “protection.” Russian General Adjutant Mishchenko, upon reading these lines, wrote in the margin, “Verify whether this is true.” (1, p.13) As N. Boqiy notes, “...even a general serving the empire’s interests is genuinely horrified by this bitter truth and seeks to stop these vile acts.” (1, p.13) In reality, while Bukhara was a vassal of Russia, it had not entirely lost its formal independence as a Muslim state. However, its fate was being decided—or about to be decided—by figures like Mishchenko.

One of the factors that drew the Russian writer’s attention was the fertility of the land: “The Bukhara Emirate contains vast tracts of unexploited, incredibly fertile soil... These lands require no fertilizer for centuries. If the old irrigation systems are restored, no great expenses are needed. If Russians are resettled on these lands, it will not harm anyone but instead turn wastelands into centers of culture.” (1, p.13)

Here, the author evaluates the land, water, and irrigation systems, proposing their economic potential.

Logofet also observed that even by the early 20th century, Bukhara lacked usable roads, which hindered trade and industry. Once Bukhara fell under Russian influence, the colonial authorities built roads—but only to serve their own interests.

Another issue raised by the author was taxation. As Russian domination increased, the Bukhara government raised taxes and levies, exploiting the people before losing total control. The impoverished population began fleeing to Afghanistan.

According to the treaty of September 28, 1873, Russians were granted the right to own land in Bukhara. Logofet even posed the question: “What does Bukhara need?” and proposed his own “project” for implementing Russian administration there. (1, p.18)

This nine-point proposal included the establishment of elected district heads and secular courts, indicating that Bukhara's statehood had become nonfunctional and was doomed to decline.

By the end of the 19th century, the Bukhara Emirate had become politically and socially incapable of survival.

Philosophically, it was far from secular and rational thought. Psychologically, it was enslaved by despair. The people's migration to Afghanistan showed that life there was preferable to conditions in Bukhara.

Logofet's book raised numerous issues: social and economic conditions, land quality, taxation, road construction, and irrigation systems.

Although Logofet defended Russian interests, since the book was written by a writer (not a politician or economist), it also expresses genuine sympathy for the suffering of Bukhara's people and realistically portrays their lives.

**References:**

1. Boqiy, N. Madfun Turkiston. – Tashkent: "Trust and Support," 2003.
2. Markov, S. Letopis. – Moscow: "Molodaya gvardiya," 1978.
3. Mehring, F. Selected Works on Aesthetics, Vol. II. – Moscow: "Iskusstvo," 1985.
4. Uzbek Soviet Encyclopedia, Vol. 6. – Tashkent: UzSE, 1975.