Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research Fundamentals (ISSN: 2748-9345)

Received: 18 March 2026 | Accepted: 05 April 2026 | Published: 30 April 2026

DOI: 10.55640/jsshrf-06-04-15

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Dynastic Succession Crises and Political Security Mechanisms During Executive Power Transitions in The Emirate of Bukhara

Alisher M. Egamberdiev

PhD Candidate, National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulughbeg, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue04 2026

PAGE: 64-68

Copyright © 2026 Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research Fundamentals, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

This study investigates the political, administrative, and security mechanisms governing the transfer of supreme executive authority in the Emirate of Bukhara under the Manghit dynasty. Employing an IMRaD framework, the article examines the operational measures deployed by the central administrative apparatus – predominantly the chancellery of the supreme vizier (kushbegi) – to mitigate the governance vacuum during the interregnum between the demise of an incumbent sovereign and the formal investiture of his designated successor. Drawing upon indigenous Persianate chronicles, nineteenth-century diplomatic correspondence, Russian military-statistical surveys, and contemporaneous foreign accounts, the inquiry reconstructs the institutional strategies designed to preempt palace coups, manage strategic information asymmetry, secure urban defensive strongholds, and curb peripheral separatism. The findings reveal that systemic succession ambiguity compelled the central bureaucracy to establish rigorous crisis management protocols, demonstrating that institutional continuity in patrimonial polities relied heavily on the cohesion of senior administrative elites and external geopolitical realignments.

KEYWORDS

Emirate of Bukhara, Manghit dynasty, dynastic succession, interregnum, governance vacuum, Kushbegi chancellery, political security, Bukhara Ark, regional separatism, state continuity.

INTRODUCTION

In the political traditions of early modern and modern Islamic polities across Central Asia, the maintenance of administrative continuity and the regulation of dynastic succession represented permanent systemic vulnerabilities. Within the Khanate and subsequent Emirate of Bukhara under the Manghit dynasty (1756–1920), the absence of a codified, universally recognized principle of primogeniture generated recurrent governance crises upon the death of an incumbent sovereign. The temporal interval between the demise of an emir and the formal investiture of his designated successor – characterized by the traditional elevation on white felt and the collective swearing of allegiance (bay'ah) – constituted a volatile interregnum. During this sensitive transitional phase, the resilience of the central bureaucratic apparatus and the loyalty of peripheral administrative echelons were subjected to acute stress.

In patrimonial monarchical systems, political legitimacy and operational authority were intertwined with the personal charisma, religious prestige, and coercive capacity of the reigning monarch. Consequently, the physical absence of the sovereign created an immediate institutional void. This vacuum routinely activated palace factions, prompted rival dynastic claimants to mobilize private retainers, and incentivized armed attempts to seize sovereign assets, notably

the state treasury and municipal arsenals within the citadel (Ark). Simultaneously, the temporary weakening of central surveillance encouraged semi-autonomous provincial governors (beqs) to withhold fiscal remittances and military levies, while inviting neighboring regional powers to interfere in domestic dynastic disputes. In this context, the traditional political dictum "The old emir has died; long live the new emir" did not signify an automatic, tranquil transition; rather, it functioned as an imperative security directive demanding the immediate eradication of the governance vacuum.

Investigating these transitional episodes provides meaningful insights into the internal mechanics of pre-colonial and protectorate-era Central Asian governance. Rather than viewing succession merely as a sequence of genealogical ruptures or dynastic intrigues, modern historical scholarship requires an analysis of the structural and bureaucratic mechanisms that preserved institutional continuity under extreme duress. This article examines the nature of security threats generated during power transfers in the Emirate of Bukhara, assessing the efficacy of the crisis protocols executed by the central administration, led by the supreme vizier (kushbegi).

METHODOLOGY

This study is grounded in historical objectivity, contextual analysis, and comparative source criticism. To capture the multidimensional nature of succession crises and the corresponding security apparatus in nineteenth-century Bukhara, a triadic methodological approach was implemented:

First, the comparative-historical method was employed to trace the institutional evolution of succession practices. By juxtaposing early modern precedents from the Shaybanid and Janid (Astrakhanid) eras with nineteenth-century Manghit governance, the inquiry identifies institutional continuities, shifts in patrimonial authority, and the growing reliance on bureaucratic stabilization.

Second, the structural-functional approach was utilized to dissect the operational hierarchy of the Bukharan state apparatus during crisis periods. The interregnum was treated as an operational stress test, illuminating the functional coordination between the supreme vizierate (kushbegi), the capital's military garrison (sarbazes and cavalry detachments), the Islamic judiciary (ulama and qadis), and provincial administrations.

Third, historical hermeneutics and source triangulation were applied across divergent categories of primary evidence. The corpus includes indigenous Persianate dynastic narratives (such as Mir Abdoul Kerim Boukhary's chronicle), official Russian military-statistical records (surveys edited by N. N. Obruchev and analytical treatises by N. V. Khanykov), diplomatic exchanges and foreign policy documentations (N. Kh. Wessel), alongside accounts by contemporary European and Russian travelers, diplomats, and military observers (O. Olufsen, G. Meyendorff, E. Schuyler, W. E. Curtis, and G. N. Curzon). Cross-referencing these independent sources minimized observational bias and established an empirical foundation for evaluating state security practices.

RESULTS

Primary historical evidence indicates that central authorities in Bukhara operated within a distinct, highly formalized framework of emergency measures whenever a sovereign's health deteriorated or an unexpected death occurred. A compendium of diplomatic and intelligence data published in 1821 underscores that political instability and sedition were counteracted through stringent, pre-planned security interventions [1; p. 313]. In 1800, when Emir Shohmurod became terminally ill, the supreme vizier, Kushbegi Utkur Biy, acted preemptively to safeguard the claims of the designated heir, Mir Sayyid Haydar, dispatching an express courier to the prince's provincial seat in Qarshi [1; p. 313]. To avert popular insurrections and preempt rival aristocratic factions within the capital, the vizier concealed the sovereign's death from senior dignitaries until the designated successor could march to the capital accompanied by a loyal military detachment [1; p. 313].

The necessity of such preventative measures was rooted in long-standing historical precedents. Throughout the seventeenth century, lineage alone rarely guaranteed undisputed authority. For instance, in 1605, Vali Muhammad Khan secured the throne only after defeating his nephews in a pitched battle near Termez, illustrating that dynastic legitimacy depended on armed capability and political coalitions [2; p. 509]. By the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, administrative decay under the later Janids, particularly under Abulfayz Khan, exacerbated internal fragmentation, paving the way for Nadir Shah's subjugation of Transoxiana [2; p. 509]. These historical crises demonstrated that unresolved succession disputes routinely translated into state fragmentation and foreign subjugation.

The vulnerability of the interregnum manifested clearly upon the death of Emir Shohmurod in 1800. Mir Abdoul Kerim Boukhary records that although Shohmurod passed away on a Friday night, intelligence of his death leaked into the city by dawn [3; p. 154]. Because the legitimate heir, Mir Haydar, had not yet arrived from Qarshi, the deceased ruler's brothers – Umar Biy, Mahmud Biy, and Fazil Biy – mobilized their armed retainers, occupied the Registan square before the Bukhara Ark, and sought an opening to storm the palace [3; p. 154]. In response, loyal administrative officials, notably the Kushbegi and Khoja Sadiq, organized an immediate defense of the citadel, shackled unreliable elements, and secured the gates with trusted guards [3; p. 154]. When Umar Biy launched an armed assault on the Ark gate prior to Friday prayers, the capital's military and religious leadership mobilized the citizenry to sustain the defense until Mir Haydar arrived with reinforcements [3; p. 154].

Even when the capital remained secure, succession friction reverberated across the provinces. Military-statistical records compiled under N. N. Obruchev document that following Shohmurod's death, the temporary relaxation of central authority allowed Balkh and Ura-Tyube to break away from Bukharan suzerainty, while the strategic city of Khujand fell under the control of the Kokand Khanate [4; p. 104]. Central authority was restored only after Emir Nasrullah consolidated military control over Bukhara and Shahrisabz, suppressing peripheral rebellion through sustained campaigns [4; p. 104].

Foreign observers routinely highlighted the pervasive climate of suspicion surrounding the Bukharan court. Baron Georges de Meyendorff noted during his 1820 embassy that Emir Haydar harbored deep mistrust toward his inner circle, going so far as to compel his own son to leave the capital whenever the monarch spent the night outside the city walls [5; p. 258]. This practice underscores the persistent apprehension of sudden palace coups and the perception of the heir as a potential focal point for aristocratic intrigue.

During the 1826 power transition, the structural centrality of the Kushbegi was reaffirmed. N. V. Khanykov observed that the Kushbegi operated as the premier political arbiter, responsible for preserving civic order, safeguarding the citadel treasury, directing the consensus of the nobility, and organizing the formal enthronement [6; p. 232]. Yet, this position involved substantial personal peril, as incoming monarchs frequently purged or executed the previous administration's leadership to consolidate autonomous authority [6; p. 232].

The systemic hazards of the interregnum extended into international diplomacy. In his 1853 discussions with British diplomat George Hamilton Seymour, Tsar Nicholas I highlighted that the unanticipated demise of a ruler in an autocratic empire, in the absence of an uncontested succession plan, predictably induced general chaos, social paralysis, and warfare [7; p. 117]. The Russian monarch argued that such domestic crises created immediate pretexts for foreign military intervention [7; p. 117] – a strategic logic that shaped Tsarist policy toward Central Asian succession dynamics in the late nineteenth century.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, succession difficulties became intertwined with regional resistance. The final years of Emir Nasrullah's reign were consumed by protracted campaigns against the rebellious province of Shahrisabz [8; no. 57]. The resistance of Shahrisabz, spanning six months of siege and over thirty armed engagements, demonstrated that central authority remained contested across the periphery [8; no. 57]. When his successor, Emir Muzaffar, ascended the throne in 1860, his attempt to project authority over Shahrisabz six months later collapsed into open unrest, forcing a hasty retreat to Bukhara [9; p. 85].

The military defeats inflicted by Russian forces in 1868 exacerbated internal dynastic fissures. Unsubstantiated rumors regarding the death or impending deposition of Emir Muzaffar triggered immediate succession maneuvers [10; no. 45]. The emir's eldest son, Abdumalik Tura (Katta Tura), broke with his father, established an autonomous base of opposition, and advanced claims over territories bordering Kokand [10; no. 45]. The military operations in Hissar, Kulab, and Karategin between 1869 and 1870 demonstrated that dynastic conflict could evolve into an anticipatory succession crisis even while the reigning monarch remained on the throne.

Throughout these upheavals, routine and emergency administrative functions remained anchored in the Kushbegi's office, which governed the capital during the emir's frequent stays at his Karmana residence [11; p. 196]. This institutional apparatus proved decisive upon the death of Emir Muzaffar in 1885. Because the heir apparent, Sayyid Abdulahad, was stationed in Karmana, the monarch's death was kept strictly secret for twelve hours [12; pp. 121–122]. As William Eleroy Curtis documented, this calculated information blackout prevented urban unrest and preempted opportunistic revolts while the heir made the journey to Bukhara [12; pp. 121–122].

George N. Curzon's analysis of the 1885 transition corroborates that the loyalty of the armed forces and palace guard during this critical interval was secured by the Kushbegi, who traveled outside the city walls to receive the incoming sovereign [13; p. 158]. Concurrently, information was disseminated indicating that Russian troops stood ready to intervene, and Abdulahad arrived accompanied by General Mikhail Annenkov, enabling a bloodless transfer of power under imperial auspices [13; p. 158].

DISCUSSION

The structural and empirical evidence demonstrates that succession in the Emirate of Bukhara was not merely a familial affair, but a core challenge of state security. The lack of a formalized, universally binding law of succession created an institutional vacuum upon the death of every monarch. This recurring interregnum required the deployment of coordinated security and administrative counter-measures.

The empirical data highlights the Kushbegi as the primary guarantor of state continuity. Acting simultaneously as prime minister, minister of internal affairs, and commander of the capital's defense, the Kushbegi controlled the three physical anchors of sovereignty: the Ark, the state treasury, and the central arsenals. The calculated enforcement of information blackouts – lasting up to twelve hours in 1800 and 1885 – constituted a deliberate strategy to control information asymmetry. By monopolizing intelligence regarding the sovereign's death, the central chancellery denied rival agnatic claimants the temporal window necessary to assemble troops and seize strategic infrastructure. When this information boundary failed, as occurred in 1800 on the Registan and in 1868 with the insurrection of Katta Tura, the interregnum escalated into open combat and provincial secession.

The spatial configuration of the Bukharan realm introduced an additional structural challenge. The traditional administrative practice of stationing the designated crown prince as governor of an outlying province (typically Karmana or Qarshi) created an operational race against time upon the ruler's death. While this provincial governorship provided the heir with practical administrative experience, it created an unavoidable logistical delay during transitions. This geographic separation offered rival princes residing within or near the capital a window of opportunity to contest the succession, making rapid intelligence communication and secure escort operations essential.

By the late nineteenth century, the succession dynamic had adapted to the reality of the Russian protectorate. The 1885 accession of Emir Abdulahad illustrated how the central bureaucracy aligned its internal security protocols with imperial diplomatic support. The presence of General Annenkov and the proximity of Tsarist garrisons acted as an external deterrent against potential aristocratic challengers, transforming the traditional interregnum protocol into a coordinated domestic-imperial transition.

CONCLUSION

The structural vulnerabilities observed during sovereign transitions in the Emirate of Bukhara reveal that interregnum instability was driven by several interrelated institutional and logistical factors: the premature dissemination of intelligence regarding a monarch's demise, the geographical dislocation of the designated successor from the metropolitan core, and the persistent absence of statutory succession norms governing dynastic branches. These structural ambiguities were frequently compounded by armed contention over the central citadel and state treasury, centrifugal rebellions launched by peripheral governors (beks), and the latent threat of foreign military intervention. In response to these recurrent hazards, the central state apparatus executed a sequential crisis containment framework, beginning with strict informational embargoes and the immediate fortification of the Bukhara Ark, proceeding through the logistical safeguarding of the heir apparent and the assertion of executive regency under the Kushbegi, and culminating in the strategic use of external political deterrence. Ultimately, the Bukharan experience underscores that within Central Asian patrimonial polities, institutional continuity and territorial preservation during moments of sovereign vulnerability depended primarily on the operational capacity, intelligence management, and administrative autonomy of the central bureaucratic apparatus.

REFERENCES

1. Nekotorye svedeniya o Bukharii [Certain Information Regarding Bukharia]. Otechestvennye zapiski, edited by P. Svin'in. St. Petersburg: Printing House of V. Plavilshchikov, 1821, pt. 6. (In Russian)
2. Olufsen, O. The Emir of Bokhara and His Country: Journeys and Studies in Bokhara. London: William Heinemann, 1911.
3. Boukhary, Mir Abdoul Kerim. Histoire de l'Asie Centrale

(Afghanistan, Boukhara, Khiva, Khoqand): Depuis les dernières années du règne de Nadir Chah (1153), jusqu'en 1233 de l'Hégire (1740–1818). Translated and edited by Charles Schefer. Paris: Ernest Leroux, Éditeur, 1876. (In French)

4. Obruchev, N. N. (ed.). Voenno-statisticheskiy sbornik. Vypusk III: Persiya, Afganistan, Beludzhistan, Sredne-Aziatskie vladeniya, Kitay, Yaponiya, Severo-Amerikanskie Soedinennye Shtaty, Meksika, Braziliya i respubliki Sredney i Yuzhnoy Ameriki [Military-Statistical Compendium. Issue III: Persia, Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Central Asian Possessions, China, Japan, United States of North America, Mexico, Brazil, and Republics of Central and South America]. St. Petersburg: Military Printing House, 1868. (In Russian)
5. Meyendorff, G. Voyage d'Orenbourg à Boukhara, fait en 1820, à travers les steppes qui s'étendent à l'est de la mer d'Aral et au-delà de l'ancien Jaxartes. Paris: Imprimerie de Dondey-Dupré père et fils, 1826. (In French)
6. Khanykov, N. V. Opisanie Bukharskogo khanstva [Description of the Khanate of Bukhara]. St. Petersburg: Printing House of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1843. (In Russian)
7. Wessel, N. Kh. Vostochnyy vopros [The Eastern Question]. St. Petersburg: Printing House of A. A. Kraevskiy, 1877. (In Russian)
8. Ocherki poslednikh sobytiy na bukharskoy granitse i v Bukhare [Sketches of Recent Events on the Bukharan Border and in Bukhara]. Russkiy invalid, 1869, no. 57. (In Russian)
9. Schuyler, E. Turkistan: Notes of a Journey in Russian Turkistan, Khokand, Bukhara, and Kuldja. In two volumes. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1876, vol. 1.
10. Polozhenie del v Bukhare [The State of Affairs in Bukhara]. Moskva, 1868, no. 45. (In Russian)
11. Normurodova, G. B. Bukhoro amirligi davlat boshqaruvida Nasrulloxbiy qo'shbegining tarixiy faoliyatiga nazar [A Look into the Historical Activity of Nasrullah Biy Kushbegi in the State Administration of the Bukhara Emirate]. In: O'zbek davlatchilik tizimida dargoh va devonlar [Courts and Divans in the Uzbek Statehood System]. Proceedings of the Scientific-Practical Conference (May 18, 2018). Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2019. (In Uzbek)
12. Curtis, W. E. Turkestan: "The Heart of Asia". New York: Hodder & Stoughton; George H. Doran Company, 1911.
13. Curzon, G. N. Russia in Central Asia in 1889 and the Anglo-Russian Question. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1889.