

Comparing Russian and British Colonial Policies: Colonial Cities in Pakistan and Uzbekistan

Ayşe Çolpan Kavuncu*

1. Introduction

Modernization theory has dominated almost all comparative studies on non-Western countries, as the prevailing paradigm of development for decades, in line with the rapid industrialization and modernization of the core West. In the beginning, comparative studies rarely addressed the impacts of the “colonial past” while analyzing the development of third world countries in post-colonial nation-state processes.

Modernization theory has shaped the urbanization policies for many decades in underdeveloped and developing countries or in non-Western countries, which were sometimes called “Third World” countries in the literature. Interestingly, although the urbanization of these countries was quite different from Western urbanization in terms of their historical characteristics and dynamics the same policies were considered universal applicable. Colonial history can be seen as one of the most universally reasons for this difference. Although colonialism created different urbanization dynamics in the colonial countries compared to the Western countries, studies often neglected the issue of colonialism. While urban studies acknowledged colonial legacy as historical background, they developed urbanization policies based on the urbanization policies of the West, which had no experience of colonization, and ignored the colonial legacies of the non-western countries.

However, most of the countries known as the Third World today were the colonies of Western countries until World War II. The

* Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Turkey.

imperialist states dominated these countries and implemented their colonial policies strongly in the capitals and/or the big cities. The big cities or capitals played a key role as the central bases of the imperialist powers controlling these countries. Therefore, the traces of colonial policies in Third World countries can easily be seen in these cities in the current post-colonial period. In fact, the urbanization literature on the Third World rarely discussed the forms of urbanization that emerged in the colonial periods, while heavily debating where the Third World actually is.

This study compares Russian and British colonial policies, based on the urbanization characteristics of two ECO countries, Pakistan and Uzbekistan. The second part of the study explains the common characteristics of Third World urbanization within the context of urbanization theories. The third part explores the colonial policies of Tsarist Russia and the British Empire by comparing their interventions to the cities to reveal their differences. The fourth part makes a comparison between the colonial policies of Tsarist Russia and the British Empire by focusing on three examples of the Third World cities with colonial past, Lahore, Karachi, and Tashkent, based on their (a) functions; (b) their institutional structures; (c) cultural and socio-demographic structures; and (d) their socio-spatial structures. The conclusion reveals that contemporary urban problems of these Third World cities such as administrative, social, economic, and spatial issues, are consequences of the policies of colonial past rather than the post-colonial period.

2. Third World Urbanization: Theories of Modernization and Dependency

Urban theories are primarily based on the structures that emerged in developed countries. Consequently, these studies often neglect the urbanization processes in underdeveloped and developing countries. Although the exact location of the Third World is still being discussed in the literature, the urbanization dynamics of this uncertain geography show similar patterns.

Although, which territories the “Third World” refers to is still controversial, in terms of urbanization, it is possible to say that it refers to the urbanization of non-Western societies.¹ Urbanization

¹ Ruşen Keleş, *Kentleşme Politikaları (Urbanization Policies)* (Ankara: İmge Yayınları, 2006), 81.

patterns that emerged in the Third World countries can be summarized as follows:

- Economic development varies widely between the regions and cities of the Third World countries. According to the “monocentric city” model, there can be only one or two cities in the country that are constantly growing and prominent while other cities remain in the background. This large city is the only unit that enables a country to communicate with the world.
- The urbanization process in the Third World started relatively late, and these countries witnessed rapid and distorted urbanization. Until recently, agriculture was the main economic sector in the Third World. In these countries, rural areas are usually larger than urban areas, while rural population exceeds urban population.
- In Third World countries, there were mass migrations to the big cities especially after the Second World War and these cities have grown continuously.
- Structural unemployment persists due to inadequate industrialization. The population remains disproportionately large compared to the employment opportunities offered by the city.
- The informal sector remains at a consistently high level. Those who cannot be employed by modern economic sectors in these cities shift to the informal sector.
- The housing problems in urban areas pose a great challenge. Slum development is the most prominent feature and the biggest problem in Third World cities. State and market dynamics fail to meet the housing demand of the incoming population.
- Service infrastructure is generally inadequate in cities of Third World countries.

In fact, the urbanization processes in these countries cannot be fully understood without the underdevelopment debate. Two main approaches reveal the dynamics of urbanization in the Third World by establishing a relationship between development and urbanization: (a) Modernization theory and (b) Dependency theory.

According to modernization theory, human history follows a progressive trajectory. Through this progressive trajectory, the core

Western countries have experienced industrialization and industrial revolution two centuries earlier than other countries. Accordingly, they moved towards modern life from traditional life. Modernization theory suggests that this progress is unstoppable and inevitable; that the rest of the world will eventually follow this process of industrialization and modernization, and abandon traditional forms of life. Thus, the successful modernization of these societies depends on an accurate analysis of the Western experiences and their proper importation. According to this theory, every country can complete their development successfully and become like the Western countries by applying the policies of the West. Although this approach is subject to criticism in every sense today, it has been a dominant perspective for many decades, especially in the colonial regions, along with its *orientalist* and *European-centered* perspective. More importantly, colonial countries, once completed their nation-state processes, started to imitate the “correct” policies of the West, after they gained their independence.

However, today it is clear that the so-called correct policies of the West are not universal and each society has different experiences with its own unique internal and external conditions. It is very unlikely that Third World countries could become like Western countries by simply pursuing Western-centered policies. More importantly, the modernization approach, which ignored historical ties in the spatial sense, concealed the fact that non-Western countries remained underdeveloped because they were exploited by the West throughout the development process of the Western countries. Thus, this theory actually legitimized colonialism in a hegemonic sense. This legitimization continued with the policies imported from the West in the post-colonial period.

The aforementioned understanding of the modernization school influenced the field of urbanization under different names. Perhaps the most famous approach here is the Chicago School’s understanding of urbanization, known as the *ecological approach*. This understanding, which ignored the political-economic dynamics, was based on the premise that the cities all over the world would gradually become modern cities with “natural” effects (these effects refer to industrialization and modernization) and they would also have the experiences of Western cities.

The ecological approach defines almost identical problems that are based on the dichotomy of the modern versus the traditional. It divides cities into two groups: (a) modern residences versus traditional residences; (b) modern values versus traditional values; (c) modern organizational structure versus traditional organizational structure. According to this approach, this dual structure within the city will disappear in time, and traditional societies will gradually modernize together with the traditional cities. If correct policies are implemented at this point, these differences will disappear and all cities will be completely modernized. Thus, modern citizens will be created with modern cities.

This approach was applicable to Western cities until the 1960s and it still underlies the contemporary analyses of Third World cities.² However, this approach has been criticized since the 1960s. Scholars working within the Weberian approach first criticized this approach for neglecting the political nature of the city. According to them, the Chicago School failed to understand the political processes of the city, focusing solely on conflicts between different urban groups in different parts of the city. Secondly, the Chicago School was criticized for using the positivist methodology for they only analyzed one city (Chicago) and made generalizations for all cities based on this analysis and a Universal understanding of history.

According to the Theory of Dependency, which emerged as a challenge to the Theory of Modernization, structural differences between developed and undeveloped countries are the result of unequal exchange and exploitation. This duality is inherently structural and the fundamental problem is not temporal. During the same period, these countries had different but related experiences, and this is the main cause of the differences.

Developed countries themselves produced the conditions of underdevelopment and they continue to do so. Therefore, the traditional structure of the economy and social life is not a thing of the past since it is a part of underdevelopment and stemmed from unequal relations between Western countries and less developed

² Tark Şengül, *Kentsel Çelişki ve Siyaset: Kapitalist Kentleşme Süreçlerinin Eleştirisi (Urban Contradiction and Politics: A Critique of Capitalist Urbanization Processes)* (Ankara: İmge Yayınları, 2009), 167.

countries. In other words, these traditional structures are the results of exploitation in every sense.

These structures show similar characteristics in several colonial countries. Moreover, these structures are also commonly seen in colonial cities. This traditional/modern duality would never disappear with the implementation of the right policies since it is not a product of wrong policies. It emerged from the relations of exploitation. Therefore, these problems cannot be solved unless this exploitation relationship, that is, the unequal relationship style, disappears. Hence this approach suggests breaking the connection as a solution, which means getting out of the current world system. For the supporters of this approach, this dilemma is rather permanent than temporary.³

3. Cities and the Colonial Policies of the British and Russian Empires

The cities in Pakistan and British cities share many similarities as much as Tashkent and Russian cities. Nevertheless, British and Russian historians and urbanists focused on the old differences between these cities from an orientalist point of view rather than exploring the similarities.⁴ Although it can be argued whether the Russians and the British were the leading colonial powers among the imperialist powers of history; undoubtedly, they were among the best city builders. British Empire was the first modern industrial power in the world to realize the advantages of building their cities. When the Russians arrived in Central Asia, they built quite modern structures while establishing their own Russian-type cities right next to the existing cities for the European (Russian) population coming to the region.

Home⁵ noted that three factors played a key role while selecting the locations of colonial cities during the first two centuries of British overseas expansion. It can also be argued that these three factors also influenced urbanization dynamics in Central Asia as a part of Tsarist Russia's policy of going south. The first factor is the style of

³ Şengül, *Kentsel Çelişki ve Siyaset*, 165.

⁴ William J. Glover, "Constructing Urban Space as Public in Colonial India: Some Notes from the Punjab", *Journal of Punjab Studies*, 14/2 (2007): 213.

⁵ Robert Home, *Of Planting and Planning: The Making of British Colonial Cities* (Oxford: E&FN SPON, 1997), 2.

state control. British Empire preferred to control its colonies from a state center through the rulers and institutions which were agents of this center. Tsarist Russia also adopted a similar approach. Shortly after capturing Kazakhstan and Central Asia, Russia established the Governorship of Kazakhstan and Turkistan (Gubernator), ruled and controlled the region through these governorates.⁶

According to Morrison,⁷ who compared Russia and the British Empire in terms of their colonial policies, they adopted quite different strategies in Central Asia and India in some respects. First of all, the relationship between Russians and Turks in Central Asia was very different from the relationship between Indians and British people in India. Morrison noted that in Central Asia, the Russians controlled the region mainly through a multi-ethnic elite group. This group included Russians, Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, Tatars, and Central Asia's own elites. While the colonization was carried out through ethnic discrimination in India, it was carried out by an elite and multiethnic class in Russia.

The second factor was the degree and scope of the capitalist production relations. British colonialism was based on a more advanced capitalist system compared to the Tsarist Russia of the time. There was a system of commercial exploitation, especially based on public-private partnerships. For example, Wellesley was called to India after the continuous decline in profits due to expenditures by the famous East India Company in India in 1805.⁸ This approach was quite different from Russia's colonial understanding. Russia was still at the beginning of the industrialization process and even continued the serfdom system until recently. In this sense, Russian merchants and soldiers first reached Central Asia rather than Russian companies, unlike the British counterparts. For example, the Tsarist dynasty often sent delegations of specialist soldiers, bureaucrats, and merchants to the region to conduct investigations especially before the invasion of the Central Asian Khanates. Therefore, Tsarist Russia had established a trade network based on primitive mercantilism in

⁶ David Mackenzie, "Kaufman of Turkestan: An Assessment of His Administration 1867-1881", *Slavic Review*, 26, no. 2 (1967): 269.

⁷ Alexander Morrison, "Russian Rule in Turkestan and the Example of British India, c. 1860-1917", *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 84, no. 4 (2006): 667.

⁸ Home, *Of Planting and Planning: The Making of British Colonial Cities*, 4.

the colonial regions. As a result, Tashkent became a city that was quite different from Karachi. Again, according to Morrison, while Britain's colonial system in India aimed at economic exploitation, Russia rather aimed to achieve military control in Central Asia.⁹

A third factor was that new lands offered much more opportunities to the utopian colonial groups than they could get in their homeland. Here, both religious motivations such as escaping religious oppression and the opportunity to obtain the wealth of new land played key roles. Russia liberated the peasant serfs throughout Russia between 1832 and 1842 after the peasant rebellions. This created both a problem of population and a territorial problem for Tsarist Russia. Leaving aside the other reasons for colonization, virgin Central Asian lands offered a unique opportunity for Tsarist Russia to solve the problems caused by the freed serfs. This was also true for the British workforce, which saw India and Pakistan as sources of opportunities for finding new jobs. In addition to this, in these early periods of the Enlightenment, political theorists developed new philosophies and argued that new lands would provide an ideal environment for bringing these philosophies to life by establishing a new social structure, culture, and order. According to them, it was possible to achieve an ideal organization in these unplanned settlements with regular physical planning.

While the main motive of British colonialism was to acquire new sources from India, other factors also played an important role in Russia's colonization of Central Asia. For Russia, which had just begun the industrialization process, Central Asia was an important source of raw materials, while other colonial powers focused on this region in their struggle to share new markets. Russia placed special importance to acquire cotton raw materials and therefore seize a cotton-producing region such as Central Asia.¹⁰ Russia also feared that Britain, which had come as far as India, would take central Asia and completely encircle Russia from the south. Therefore, it was much more advantageous to have Central Asia under its control

⁹ Morrison, "Russian Rule in Turkestan and the Example of British India, c. 1860-1917", 681.

¹⁰ Geoffrey Wheeler, *The Modern History of Soviet Central Asia* (New York: Frederick Praeger, 1964), 65; Adeeb Khalid, *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia* (California: University of California Press, 1998), 48; Kathleen B. Carlisle, *Clan and Politics in Uzbekistan*, (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 2001), 67.

rather than British control, as a buffer zone between Russia and Britain.

4. Colonial Urbanization Policies in Lahore, Karachi, and Tashkent

As a result of the policies implemented by the British and Russian colonial powers, the urbanization in Pakistan and Uzbekistan showed both similar and different characteristics. It is possible to summarize the urbanization policies in colonial-era Pakistan and Uzbekistan by using the examples of Lahore, Karachi, and Tashkent. As a matter of fact, these cities were the places where the colonial powers of Russia and Britain implemented the colonial policies the most. It is still possible to see the basic characteristics of Third World urbanization more or less in Lahore, Karachi, and Tashkent today. As Third World countries, Pakistan with a population of 150 million and an urbanization rate of 40%, and Uzbekistan, with a population of 30 million and an urbanization rate of 40%, showed both similar and different characteristics in their urbanization process.

Karachi, Pakistan's largest city, has a population of 14 million. The city consists of 18 towns and 178 union councils. The city has a large share of Pakistan's foreign trade and 30 percent of the country's industry. Karachi is the largest city in Pakistan, holding 20 percent of the GDP of the country and 50 percent of the manufacturing added value. In this sense, Karachi can be seen as a good example of the theory of the monocentric city, which is the main feature of Third World countries. More than half of Karachi's population lives in the *katchi abadis* (informal settlements-slums). This reveals the city's high poverty rate, which is another characteristic of a typical Third World urbanization process.¹¹

In 1947, Pakistan gained independence and Karachi became the first capital of the newly established Pakistan. From independence to 1951, more than 600,000 refugees came from India and established slums in the city. Karachi continued to grow demographically even after Islamabad was made the new capital in 1958. The city faced a new influx of migrants from Bangladesh and Afghanistan also in the 1970s and 1980s. The Census of 1981 revealed that a total of

¹¹ Arif Hasan, "The Urban Resource Centre, Karachi", *Environment & Urbanization* 19, no.1, 275.

1.72 million refugees were living in Karachi. The resettlement of migrants has been an ongoing problem in Karachi.¹²

Lahore, in the northeast of Punjab, close to the Indian border, covers an area of about 1,772 square kilometers. With a population of 11 million according to the 2017 census, Lahore is one of the largest cities in the country. With approximately 6,300 people per square kilometer, it has a higher population density than Bangkok (5259), Riyadh (4400), and Bandung (2325).¹³ With a massive road network of 1,265 km surrounding the city, the city is well-connected, while the main train station in Lahore provides access to other cities. Allama Iqbal International Airport, the only commercial airport in the city, is the second-largest civilian airport in the country. Approximately 2,233 factories are registered in the city, which experienced significant industrial growth in the last decade.¹⁴

Tashkent is the capital of Uzbekistan and it has a population of about 2.5 million according to official figures and over 4 million according to unofficial figures. The urbanization rate in the city, which has an area of 15,600 km², is around 4.1%. The city is divided into eleven administrative regions (*tuman*). These regions cover 474 neighborhoods (*mahalle kengashi*). Tashkent, the capital and most developed city of Uzbekistan, was the fourth largest city of the former Soviet Union. Tashkent's economy is primarily based on trade and especially specialized in the production of agricultural machinery. The city, which has a large share of GDP, is the only city in the country with a subway. The city also has an airport and a large rail network connecting the city to all of Uzbekistan and the former CIS countries. While the traffic density was low in the past due to the urban policies of the Soviet Union, the city started to face traffic congestion. Again, there are no slum-like settlements in the city or the country due to the influence of the Soviet urban policies. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union had always implemented a strict immigration policy. These two characteristics made Tashkent different from other Third World cities where the capitalist world

¹² Salman Qureshi, "The Fast Growing Megacity Karachi as a Frontier of Environmental Challenges: Urbanization and Contemporary Urbanism Issues." *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning* 3, no.11 (2010): 307.

¹³ I. A. Rana and S.S. Bhatti "Lahore, Pakistan – Urbanization Challenges and Opportunities", *Cities* 72 (2018): 352.

¹⁴ Rana and Bhatti, "Lahore, Pakistan – Urbanization Challenges and Opportunities", 351. (Based on information obtained from Punjab Statistics Bureau (2015).

system prevailed. However, as an example of underdevelopment, Tashkent has grown and continues to grow disproportionately compared to other cities, in accordance with the theory of the single largest city.

In fact, these three cities inherited several characteristics of Third World urbanization from the policies implemented during the colonial periods. In this sense, Russian and British colonial powers exerted great influence on the cities of Uzbekistan and Pakistan respectively. Urban policies of these colonial powers in Tashkent, Karachi and Lahore can be compared in terms of: (a) their functional characteristics (b) their performance as corporate structures (c) their effect on the cultural and socio-demographic structure of the colonial cities and (d) their socio-spatial policies. According to King, three variables (Western culture; capitalist system; political structure of colonialism) inherent in the concept of colonialism played an important role in the urban development of the colonial regions and determined the function (economy-technological structure), the political power structure (organization), culture (socio-demographic structure) and socio-spatial structures of colonialism.¹⁵

4.1. Colonialism and Urban Function

Similar to Calcutta and Bombay, Lahore was a prominent city in the British colony. The most important feature of the city is the central role it played for the imperialist capital within a regional urban network.¹⁶ Lahore is surrounded by walls that protected it from external threats and secured the trade that passed through it.¹⁷ That's why Lahore had already been well-equipped in terms of security when it was captured by British forces. In Lahore, a military garrison was established thanks to this secure structural base. Secondly, the most important facet that made Lahore a colonial city was the construction of railways. In general, railway construction in the colonial cities played an important role as a dynamic of development. Those who worked at railway construction in Lahore

¹⁵ Anthony King, *Colonial Urban Development Culture, Social Power and Environment* (Boston: Routledge, 1976), 30.

¹⁶ Glover, "Constructing Urban Space as Public in Colonial India: Some Notes from the Punjab", 219.

¹⁷ Rana and Bhatti, "Lahore, Pakistan – Urbanization Challenges and Opportunities", 353.

were usually given land on the outskirts of the walled city. This area not only brought the new city closer to the habitat of the indigenous people like a magnet but also created a boundary between the two. An early Lahore newspaper noted that “The Railway, an entirely new and separate Department, with its large staff, and bringing with it an enormous following of workmen and their families, filled-up another great gap in the new site.”¹⁸

Karachi’s geographical location, on the other hand, functionally made the city a major trade hub for Britain. In 1886, the establishment of the port transformed the city into a major metropolis and improved maritime trade. Built in 1867 as a gateway, the Jetty and Napier Mole Bridge played a key role in connecting the British main port to the city. These constructions enabled new investment flows and embodied technological innovations. British Empire also radically changed the physical landscape of Karachi by establishing a new structured environment. The transformation of Karachi into a major port also turned it into a new market for traders. With their policies, British forces incorporated this city into the increasingly capitalist world economy.¹⁹ In this sense, British imperialism in South Asia moved beyond the capture of indigenous people; it also created a whole new commercial network.

New engineering methods shaped the development of the port area. The “calculation” and mathematical order, which Foucault described as a characteristic power of the modern state, revealed itself in Karachi.²⁰ In 1892, as a result of port engineering, the port reached an anchorage of 250 million cubic feet and the walkable area increased by 203 acres. Established as a key military base and commercial hub, Karachi became a typical British colonial city. Thus, besides a new administrative control institutionalized in Karachi, a new economic order was also created.²¹

¹⁸ *Lahore Chronicle*, March 21, 1866, 186 quoted in Ian J. Kerr, “Bombay and Lahore. Colonial Railways and Colonial Cities: Some Urban Consequences of the Development and Operation of Railways in India, c. 1850-c. 1947,” Paper presented at the Congress of Railway History Aranjuez, 7-9 February 2001. 1-21.

¹⁹ Arif Hasan and Masooma Mohib, “The Case of Karachi, Pakistan” in *Understanding Slums: Case Studies for the Global Report on Human Settlements* (London: UN-Habitat, 2003), 6.

²⁰ Michele Foucault, *Cinselliğin Tarihi [History of Sexuality]*. (Istanbul: Ayrinti, 2006), 397.

²¹ Khaliq Uz Zaman and Arif Anwar Baloch, “Urbanization of Arable Land in Lahore City in Pakistan: A Case Study.” *Canadian Social Science* 7, no.4 (2011): 59.

On the other hand, Tsarist Russia did not focus on the economic function of Tashkent, which was established in line with the military priorities and chosen as the central city to maintain control in Central Asia. In this sense, it emerged as a city consisted of state and military-civilian bureaucrats isolated from the elements of economic exploitation that were seen in British colonial cities. However, many changes occurred in commercial areas and the economic structure of the colonial city.

Until the Soviet regime, Tsarist Russia had never made arrangements that directly interfered with the economic life of indigenous people in Tashkent and other Central Asian cities. They did not even interfere with their daily lives and forms of management. However, the economic juxtaposition of the two communities indirectly destroyed the domestic economy and reduced the quality of life for the local people. In Tashkent, two different social groups, namely the indigenous people and the European people, maintained two different economic patterns which created a major divide between them.²² Tashkent's domestic craftsmen could not compete with the cheap and better quality of textile production in Europe with mass production. For example, the number of small household workshops producing textile products in Shayhantahur district decreased from 576 to 42 (1864-1912) after the establishment of Russian textile factories.²³ The number of small domestic workshops in leathering also decreased from 341 to 66 (1871-1892).^{24 25}

More importantly, after Tashkent was captured, Tsarist Russia opened more than 60 factories in the city, that manufactured products such as alcohol, textiles, cotton, and oil.²⁶ A lot of villagers migrated to the city in order to work in these factories and make a living. As a result, a working-class gradually emerged in the city. The working class also displayed more complex characteristics,

²² Dimitry Pashkun, *Structure and Practice of State Administration in Uzbekistan*, (Budapest: Open Society Institute, 2003), 51.

²³ Hafeez Malik, *Central Asia: Its Strategic Importance and Future Prospects*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994), 31.

²⁴ Ş. M. Fahrudinovna, *Toshkentning XIX. Asrning ikkinchi Yarmida XX Asr Boshlaridagi Ijtimoiy Siyosiy Ah'voli* (Tashkent: Avtoreferat, 2004), 19.

²⁵ Abdullayev Arifhanova, *Tashkent Mahalleleri: Ananalar ve Zamanaviyler* (Tashkent: Yangi Asr Avlodi, 2002), 18.

²⁶ R. Kravets and Jannat Ismoilova, *Toshkent – O'rta Ociyoning Revolyutsiyon H'arakat Markazi*, (Toshkent: O'zbekiston SSR Fan, 1983), 7.

compared to the dual ethnic structure in India. As of 1871, 628 workers worked in the factories, who had just arrived in Tashkent. Of these, 348 were Russians, 159 were Uzbeks, 87 were Kazakhs, 19 were Jews and 15 were Tatars.²⁷ Furthermore, approximately 2000 workers, who worked in the railway construction around Tashkent also started to live in the city, increasing the number of workers.²⁸

4.2. Colonialism and Institutional Structure of the Cities

After gaining independence in 1947, Pakistan was organized as a federation of four provinces, each governed by an elected parliament. Each state is divided into provinces and districts (zilas), sub-regions (tehsils), and unions. Union councils are the lowest level administrative units. Local governments have autonomy in three areas: raising funds, planning, and implementing physical and social developments.²⁹

After gaining independence in 1991, Uzbekistan which announced its shift to an open market economy, quickly established its institutional structure.³⁰ In the early days of independence, the government of Uzbekistan reorganized its own administrative system and the local government departments by examining historical experiences, traditions, and experiences of other countries around the world. In some cases, the government preserved the existing state government agencies, but it also tried to adjust them to the new conditions. In addition to the centralized presidential system, Uzbekistan is now administratively divided into provinces, cities and tumens; under which there are also neighborhoods and villages.³¹ *Hakimiyetler* (governorships) were established in the provinces and Tashkent, as well as other cities, and districts of Uzbekistan. Provincial governorship, city governorship, and

²⁷ Jannat Ismoilova, *19. Asrning Ikkinchi Yarmi – 20. Asr Boshlarida Toshkentning Yangi Shahar Kismi Tarihi* (Toshkent: Fan va Tehnologiya, 2004), 39.

²⁸ Wheeler, *The Modern History of Soviet Central Asia*, 71; Kravets and Ismoilova, *Toshkent - O'rta Osiyoning Revolyutsiyon H'arakat Markazi*, 71; Carlisle, "Clan and Politics in Uzbekistan", 78.

²⁹ Hasan, "The Urban Resource Centre, Karachi," 275.

³⁰ Ayşe Çolpan Kavuncu, "Özbekistan'da Merkez-Yerel İlişkisi: Taşkent Mahalleleri Üzerine Bir Deneme" (Center-Local Relationship in Uzbekistan: An Essay on Tashkent Neighborhoods), *Bilig*, no.71, (2014): 124.

³¹ Ayşe Çolpan Kavuncu, "Taşkent", in *Türk Dünyası Başkentleri [Capitals of the Turkic World]* ed. Murat Yılmaz-Ayşe Çolpan Kavuncu, (Ankara: Ahmet Yesevi yayınları, 2014), 544.

Tumen (district) governorship were established replacing the provincial, district, and municipal structures of the Communist Party, which were the local government units of the old period. On the other hand, under these units, neighborhood administrations in villages and cities were recognized as local governments, whose autonomy is guaranteed under the constitution.³² When we examine these governorships in terms of legal regulations, we come across two basic organs. The first body is the people's assemblies, which represent the local people and consist of elected deputies. The second is the governors, who represent the executive branch of the governorships. Governors serve as the heads of the governorships and take their office by appointment. The president appoints the provincial governors and the governor of Tashkent city while the provincial governors appoint the governors of the cities, and city governors appoint the tumen governors in return.

These administrative structures, especially in the provincial administrations, actually inherited the several characteristics of colonial administrations in both countries. The local government system in Uzbekistan was not based on Tsarist Russia's system, but on its successor, the Soviet regime, which had established a massive bureaucratic structure. Neither British Empire nor Russia interfered in the internal affairs of the indigenous people in the places they colonized, but they showed no hesitation in reorganizing traditional laws to manage urban spaces and assets.

The most important institution in the Pakistani colony was the municipal committee, which governed the legal framework of the city. This committee, which was established in 1862, consisted of members selected by local and European inhabitants. Colonial administration created a new regime and order to control construction activities in the city and to keep records. First of all, new laws were passed to reorganize the streets, buildings, and the rights to use them. In general, the British laws were directly incorporated. Karachi municipality had full authority. The colonial power allocated the land of the port of Karachi in line with the interests of the merchants with no regard to the public interest, which created a conflict within the port. Some people, like port engineer

³² Peter Epstein and Matthew Winter, *Assessment of Intergovernmental Relations and Local Governance in The Republic of Uzbekistan* (Washington: The Urban Institute, 2004), 36.

Edward Jackson, claimed that traders improved their business and contributed to the economy of the city and the country by helping them to sell the agricultural products. In fact, this approach created the dynamics of food shortages that still persists in Pakistan.³³ British colonial rule differed institutionally from the Russian rule in terms of the implementation of private-public partnerships. For example, the East India Company and the British governors developed the Port of Karachi together. In fact, over time, the British government stepped in to reduce the costs of the company.³⁴

Tsarist Russia, on the other hand, was neither involved in the life of the local people in Tashkent and nor made any renovations, arrangements, or new institutions.³⁵ All new institutionalization efforts were carried out for the new Tashkent, where the European people lived. However, this also affected the local people. Accordingly, the new regulations created for the European people, which also affected the indigenous people, can be listed as follows: (a) a new urban planning in 1866 for the resettlement of the new European population - a modern European city; (b) land reforms (in 1873 and 1886) and land tax regulation; (c) changing the city's waterways and systems in favor of the European population's habitat; (d) industrialization and the new dual city economy; (e) the construction of railroad; (f) regulations in the education system; (g) new regulations in the field of local governments (in 1865, 1886 and 1892) and the establishment of local *duma* (parliament). In 1865, the Tsarist regime first established a *dasht* commission in the city.³⁶ This institution was established as a commission to regulate social life in all of Central Asia in general and control the entire territory. Secondly, the local *duma* was established to govern the area inhabited by Tashkent's European population.³⁷

Initially no intervention was made in the administrative structure of the indigenous people of the city. However, over time, both British

³³ Nausheen H. Anwar and Sarwat Viqar, "Producing Cosmopolitan Karachi: Freedom, Security and Urban Redevelopment in the Post-Colonial Metropolis", *South Asian History and Culture* 5, no. 3, 5/3 (2014): 335.

³⁴ Anwar and Viqar, "Producing Cosmopolitan Karachi," 332.

³⁵ Marfua Tokhtakhodzhaeva, "Tashkent: Three Capitals, Three Worlds" in *Urban Life in Post-Soviet Asia*, ed. Catharine Alexander, Victor Buchli, Caroline Humphrey (London: UCL Press, 2007), 102.

³⁶ Ismailova, *Toshkentning Yangi Shahar Kismi Tarihi*, 14.

³⁷ Arifhanova, *Taskent Mahalleleri: Ananalar ve Zamanaviyler*, 26.

Empire and Russia hardened their colonial policies due to various uprisings and rebellions. For example, after the cholera epidemic in Tashkent and the riot that followed, the city governors started to appoint and approve the members of the assembly of neighborhood elders, who were previously elected in the areas where the indigenous people lived in Tashkent.³⁸ Likewise, the Mutiny revolt was a turning point for the British Empire. It severed many links between the British and Indian political and cultural institutions. After that revolt, British people began to isolate themselves from Indian habitats, creating a separate environment for themselves. Even the missionaries preferred to live in these areas.³⁹

4.3. Impacts of Colonialism on Culture and Socio-Demographic Structure of the Cities

The first characteristic of the colonial city is that it emerged as a product of relationships between at least two different cultures. In other words, colonialist power relations “allocated” urban areas in the colonial and indigenous sectors of the city, which were perceived, structured, and used according to culture-specific value systems. Markovits revealed that this product of cultural relationship did not emerge as “a combination of institutional elements from both cultures” but emerged as a completely new cultural phenomenon.⁴⁰ Thus, so-called “third culture” was introduced as a feature of the colonial cities.

Indeed, the fact that both Karachi and Tashkent showed different social and cultural characteristics from the rest of the country can be seen as proof of existence of the third culture. Neither the Russians in Tashkent are like the Russians in Russia, nor the Uzbeks are like the Uzbeks in the rest of Uzbekistan’s settlements and this is what is meant by the third culture. Although the spatial dual city structure is the most striking feature in colonial cities, there is an understanding of the “melting pot” in these cities. In other words, while those who migrated to these cities showed different characteristics from those

³⁸ David M. Abramson, *From Soviet to Mahalla: Community and Transition in Post-Soviet Uzbekistan*, (Ph. D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1998), 69.

Kravets and Ismoilova, *Toshkent - O'rta Ociyoning Revolyutsiyon H'arakat Markazi*, 4.

³⁹ Home, *Of Planting and Planning: The Making of British Colonial Cities*, 147.

⁴⁰ Claude Markovits, *Merchants, Traders, Entrepreneurs: Indian Business in the Colonial Era* (London: Palgrave Macmillian, 2008), 25.

who stayed behind, the locals of the city also differed from the locals in other regions.

Although it is possible to find some colonial cities where no rigid spatial segregation existed based on racial criteria, this is not the case for colonial cities in Pakistan and Uzbekistan. In fact, racial and ethnic differentiation revealed itself in spatial segregation in these cities even before they were colonized. For example, communities in old cities were divided by occupation and castes based on ethnic and racial separation both in pre-colonial Africa and in Indian society. Over time, the Western powers implemented technological developments in areas such as sewage, gas, electricity, lighting for the European population living in the parts of Karachi, Lahore, and Tashkent, where the racial differentiation was felt more sharply. Thus, over time, the distinction between the European settlements and local cities created a division between modern and pre-industrial urban areas. Legal and political pressures of the colonial power contributed to the ethnic and racial differences in these cities. Thus, an obvious difference between the East-West lifestyles emerged. Therefore, both the deliberate policies of the colonial power and the existing stratification in the social culture of the indigenous people played an important role in the socio-spatial segregation. The degree of separation varied in each colonial society.

After Tashkent was captured by Russia in 1864, soldiers, civilian bureaucrats, serfs, doctors, merchants, and teachers flocked to the city from Russia.⁴¹ To encourage this migration, Tsarist Russia promised new jobs and new lands for those going to Central Asia. At the same time, local people also migrated to Tashkent to work in the newly established factories. As a result, Tashkent grew rapidly after it became a colonial city. Between 1869 and 1910, the population of Tashkent increased from 73,800 to 128,900. This rate was even higher than the population growth rate seen in Cairo and Lahore during the same period (12.5 %).⁴²

As a result of these developments, intermediate forms emerged between the old and the new city. As the newly arrived local

⁴¹ Paul Micheal Stronski, "Forging a Soviet City: Tashkent, 1937-1966", (Ph. D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 2003), 8.

⁴² Mohammad Chaichian, *Town and Country in the Middle East* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2009), 137.

population mostly worked in the factories or railway construction, they established new traditional neighborhoods such as Yangiabad district on the periphery of the central European city.⁴³ This marked the beginning of an intermediate form for Tashkent and the creation of the third culture. Workers' migration played a key role by increasing the awareness of the working class in a short time before the October revolution.⁴⁴

The railway work created a significant change in Lahore's social composition. For example, an important British quarter emerged in Lahore that included European society and technical professionals from the empire. Men were brought to India to operate the transported railway technology, leading to creation and management of a new kind of workforce. Eurasians and Parsi also had a prominent presence in Lahore because they both provided cheaper labor for Europeans while being beneficial and loyal to the colonial ventures. The Lahore city guide no 1100.52 reveals the strong supervisory presence of Europeans, who were placed in the railway colony by 1916.⁴⁵

4.4. Socio-Spatial Perspective

The colonial powers implemented colonial urban planning, as a comprehensive and positive example of planning theory, long before applying it in their own societies. According to Scott, the European colonial powers implemented the first modern urban plans not in their cities, but in the cities of the countries they colonized.⁴⁶ They had three aims: (a) to create a living space for European immigrants, (b) to show the natives their modern cities to gain legitimacy and show their hegemonic power, and (c) to use colonial cities as a pilot area for new urban policies to be implemented in their own cities. The British Empire, for example, implemented their comprehensive urban development plans in colonial cities as a true expression of urban and social theory before the "New Towns" built after 1945.⁴⁷ Therefore, in order to understand British urban planning, it would

⁴³ Arifhanova, *Taskent Mahalleleri: Ananalar ve Zamanaviyler*, 23.

⁴⁴ Carlisle, "Clan and Politics in Uzbekistan", 79.

⁴⁵ Kerr, *Bombay and Lahore*, 15.

⁴⁶ James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 90.

⁴⁷ King, *Colonial Urban Development Culture*, 40.

be more beneficial to examine the urbanization of cities colonized by the British Empire rather than the cities in the UK.

The bi-national dual-city structure is the most typical socio-spatial characteristic seen in the cities of Lahore, Karachi, and Tashkent. While the old city existed before the colonialization, the colonial power established a new city right next to this old city, sometimes changing the old city and sometimes without touching it. Generally, the part where the locals lived was called the “old city” and the part where the European people lived was called the “new city.” For example, colonial authorities planned, changed, reorganized, and implemented the landscape of Karachi. Karachi was transformed into a dual city with classical colonial city characteristics, creating a new spatial order for the development of the colonial power. Karachi began to look like a European city with the deliberate planning and regulation of the port, establishment of military cantons, government offices, prisons, hospitals, and road systems.⁴⁸

Colonial urban settlements in the “European” part of the city displayed two important characteristics: the general spatial character of a European city and its distance from the native settlement area. As to the first factor, the specialization in land use in terms of functionality was the main spatial characteristic of the European segment and the most fundamental feature that distinguished it from the local urban segment, which caused the separation of the workplace from the place of residence as an example of an industrial city structure. In general, the old city consisted of home-type workshops or craft production areas intertwined with the living space. On the other hand, new urban settlements separated the workspace from non-work space, dividing the living space and business space. Socially, this was markedly different from the elite-mass dichotomy system of pre-industrial society and the intertwining of business and residential spaces in the form of small workshops. Thus, a capitalist class structure which consists of workers and middle classes gradually replaced elite-mass stratification in the European segment of cities while separating residential and commercial areas as a feature of the industrialized cities. However, the elite-mass stratification continued in other parts of Lahore or

⁴⁸ Anwar and Viqar, *Producing Cosmopolitan Karachi*, 335.

Karachi where the indigenous population lived, while residences coexisted with the business areas in the form of small workshops with traditional crafts.⁴⁹ This situation was exactly the same for Tashkent: artisans and craftsmen lived together in neighborhoods surrounding a bazaar and a mosque in the middle of the bazaar. In other words, according to İsmailova, while residences in the old city intertwined with the business areas, the European population lived in the new city, which consisted of small apartments and houses with gardens, separated from the administrative buildings and industrial segments that were located in different areas.⁵⁰

Another general spatial feature of European cities is grid-type city parcels. The center of these parcels consisted of wide and straight streets and public squares. The four sides of this public square were again surrounded by square parcels. For example, in 1638 the center of New Haven city covered nine regular squares organized in this way, and it was larger than square plots in central London.⁵¹ Thus, the colonial urban grid networks were divided into large rectangular blocks among geometric streets. The plot sizes varied depending on the characteristics of different cities. In general, urban centers were divided into public lands including churches, markets, shops, school buildings, courthouses, prisons, hospitals, and service buildings, and administrative buildings designed for other public purposes. Finally, the green belt surrounding the city was a kind of arrangement that inspired Ebenezer Howard's model of the garden city in the 1900s.⁵²

These characteristics can also be seen in the new Tashkent with some differences. For example, similarities can be found in terms of the allocation of public spaces, green spaces, churches, markets, shops, and school buildings. However, urban planning based on the grid model was not fully implemented until the Soviet period. Tsarist Russia implemented its first urban plans in Tashkent in 1866, when the first city plan, developed by the famous Russian architect

⁴⁹ King, *Colonial Urban Development Culture, Social Power and Environment*, 39.

⁵⁰ İsmailova, *Toshkentning Yangi Shahar Kismi Tarihi*, 22. During this period, in the Uzbek literature, the Russian population was called European and the part of the city where the Russian population lived was called the European city.

⁵¹ Home, *Of Planting and Planning: The Making of British Colonial Cities*, 15.

⁵² Robert Ross and Gerard J. Telkamp, *Colonial Cities: Essays on Urbanism in a Colonial Context* (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1985), 52.

Kolesnikov, was put into practice. Firstly, the budget was adjusted to fund housing projects, catering to the accommodation needs of the incoming Russian population settling in the Russian part of Tashkent.⁵³ Secondly, the waterways were rearranged to provide water to the new city by diverting the waterways from the old part of Tashkent.⁵⁴ The agricultural areas communally used by the locals around the old Tashkent were divided into parcels and allocated to the Russian population, and these parcels were sold very cheaply. Thus, it destroyed the collective lifestyle of the local inhabitants. The administration allocated the eastern side of Tashkent, the areas between Bozsuv and Sibli, two branches of Ankhov canal, for housing projects of the Russian population. Hence, the most fertile agricultural areas of Tashkent which were previously used collectively by local communities in Tashkent were also destroyed. Later on, the second plan was implemented in 1879 by Makarov, who designed the new part of Tashkent based on the example of St. Petersburg. The new plan was approved by the local дума chief Ozerov. Just 15 years after this plan, the new urban part of Tashkent became a center of attraction for Russians and transformed into a multi-ethnic cosmopolitan city.⁵⁵ Unlike those of the old town, the governing bodies of the new city employed salaried experts.⁵⁶ A local budget was also created. The Russian colonial order brought a new social and cultural lifestyle to Tashkent, including a modern industry, health and hygiene facilities, and the sewage system. According to Wheeler, even if Tsarist Russia did nothing, it improved urban planning and urban development in Central Asia.⁵⁷ Besides improving the old towns, they also built brand new European cities right next to these old cities.

The second important characteristic is the European city's distance from the old city. Here, the function of the colonial city played an important role. If the colonial city heavily focused on industrial production, a new city would be established close to the indigenous

⁵³ Ismailova, *Toshkentning Yangi Shahar Kismi Tarihi*, 6.

⁵⁴ Ismailova, *Toshkentning Yangi Shahar Kismi Tarihi*, 37.

⁵⁵ Jeff Sahadeo, *Russian Colonial Society in Tashkent: 1865-1923* (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2007), 36.

⁵⁶ David MacKenzie, "Turkestan's Significance to Russia (1850-1917)", *Russian Review* 33, no. 2 (1974): 192.

⁵⁷ Wheeler, *The Modern History of Soviet Central Asia*, 74.

people -thus reducing the cost of transportation for domestic workers (or indigenous slaves) to be brought to the factories every day. On the other hand, if the city was established as a functional control center and political-military base, the new city, and the old city would remain far enough from each other and the local people could be ignored. Geographical conditions also played a key role here. In dry climates, the new cities are built next to the old cities due to the importance of water channels so that the new city could benefit from the irrigation channels of the old city. In this sense, Karachi and Tashkent showed some differences. Although Tashkent was not an industrial center, the new city was located on one side of the river and the old city on the other, due to the irrigation arcs.⁵⁸ Therefore, cities had to be close. In addition, factory workers also moved around the new city over time.⁵⁹

On the other hand, as we noted before, neither British nor Russian colonial powers touched the old cities, and all these developments took place in the new city. Nevertheless, they implemented land reforms, which had very negative effects in the areas where the indigenous people lived both in Pakistan and Central Asia. First of all, the old cities faced drought due to the change of waterways. This led to major diseases such as the cholera outbreak and destroyed agricultural production.⁶⁰ Likewise, Karachi also faced challenges related to health care and epidemics during this period.⁶¹ Secondly, unemployment and poverty increased in the old cities due to the expropriation of the fertile lands that belonged to the old cities and the reallocation of lands for the people living in the new cities. Again, the land tax created a heavy burden for the local people. Most importantly, although colonial powers did not interfere with the administrative structure of the old city directly, old administrative structures lost their power and efficiency with the reallocation of the lands owned by the foundations to the new people in Tashkent by

⁵⁸ İsmailova, *Toshkentning Yangi Shahar Kismi Tarihi*, 22.

⁵⁹ Chaichian, *Town and Country in the Middle East*, 137; MacKenzie, "Kaufman of Turkestan," 283.

⁶⁰ Malik, *Central Asia: Its Strategic Importance and Future Prospects*, 30; Roziya G. Mukminova, *To'rt Asr Oldingi Toshkent, O'zbekiston* (Toshkent: SSR Fan Nashriyoti, 1984); Arifhanova, *Taskent Mahalleleri: Ananalar ve Zamanaviyler*, 21; Wheeler, *The Modern History of Soviet Central Asia*, 72; Sahadeo, *Russian Colonial Society in Tashkent: 1865-1923*, 54.

⁶¹ Ross and Telkamp, *Colonial Cities: Essays on Urbanism in a Colonial Context*, 153.

Duma.⁶² Just like the British Empire, Russia also abused laws and imposed its own administrative traditions in colonial countries. For example, a дума had to be established in cities with a population of over 100,000 to achieve full ethnic representation of the people. Nevertheless, in practice, mainly Russian representatives entered the дума due to miscalculation of the population of the old city in Tashkent.⁶³

5. Conclusion

Most of the territories known as the Third World today were the colonies of Western countries until the Second World War. The imperialist states that dominated these countries implemented their colonial policies strongly in the capitals and/or the big cities of these countries. The big cities or capitals played a key role as the central bases of the imperialist powers to exert their control in these countries. Therefore, the traces of colonial policies can be easily found in the capitals of the Third World countries in the post-colonial period. In fact, literature on Third World urbanization rarely discussed the forms of urbanization that emerged in the colonial periods, while more often debating where the Third World actually is.

This study compared the British and Russian colonial policies, based on the urbanization dynamics observed in Pakistan and Uzbekistan, which are among the ECO countries. Specifically, it explored the colonial policies of Tsarist Russia and the British Empire, the ethnic and nation-based characteristic of colonial policies, the class and ethnic structures of colonial powers, the spatial reflections and the economic features of colonial policies, and the means of socio-spatial hegemony through examples of Karachi, Lahore, and Tashkent. A comparison is also made between the functions, administrative structures, socio-demographic structures, and socio-spatial structures of the two largest cities of Pakistan, namely Karachi and Lahore, and Tashkent, the capital of Uzbekistan. This paper aimed to analyze the legacies of colonial politics observed in Third World countries today.

⁶² Ismailova, 19. *Asrning Ikkinchi Yarmi – 20. Asr Boshlarida Toshkentning Yangi Shahar Kismi Tarihi*, 71.

⁶³ Kravets, and Ismoilova, *Toshkent – O'rta Osiyoning Revolyutsiyon H'arakat Markazi*, 4. MacKenzie, *Kaufman of Turkestan: An Assessment of His Administration 1867-1881*, 284.

Studies on colonial cities in Third World countries offer invaluable insights to historians and other social scientists focusing on colonialism. First of all, historical analysis on urban life in colonial cities provides robust information about the administrative processes of colonialism. If we can fully understand the cities of the colonial countries, we can also analyze the transformation in the social structure of these countries much more easily and realistically. Moreover, these cities also reveal many creative and destructive elements of the dialectical relationship between colonial rulers and colonized societies. Historical analyses on the colonial periods of Third World countries with rapid urbanization also offer significant insights into the origins of urbanization in these countries. Thus, it can be said that to examine a city means to examine the people living in these colonial cities. Moreover, these cities were not just part of the colonial society, they also constituted spheres of representation of colonial powers. In this sense, these spaces also revealed the great tensions imposed by colonialism. Thus, studies on these cities can also offer very powerful insights into the colonial powers themselves. Above all, they can show the colonial roots of contemporary urban problems together with their administrative, social, economic, and spatial characteristics in the Third World countries, which gained independence in the post-colonial period. Thus, they can also show us where to start to solve these problems.

References

- Abramson, David M. "From Soviet to Mahalla: Community and Transition in Post-Soviet Uzbekistan". PhD. diss., Indiana University, 1998.
- Anwar, Nausheen H. and Sarwat Viqar, "Producing Cosmopolitan Karachi: Freedom, Security and Urban Redevelopment in the Post Colonial Metropolis". *South Asian History and Culture*, 5, no.3 (2014): 328-348.
- Arifhanova, Abdullayev. *Taskent Mahalleleri: Ananalar ve Zamanaviyler*. Toshkent: Yangi Asr Avlodi, 2002.
- Carlisle, Kathleen B. "Clan and Politics in Uzbekistan". Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston College, 2001.
- Chaichian, Mohammad A. *Town and Country in the Middle East*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2009.
- Epstein, Peter and Matthew Winter. *Assessment of Intergovernmental Relations and Local Governance in the Republic of Uzbekistan*. Washington: The Urban Institute, 2004.
- Fahrudinovna, Ş. M. *Toshkentning XIX. Asrning ikkinchi Yarmida XX Asr Boshlaridagi Ijtimoiy Siyosiy Ah'voli*, Tashkent: Avtoreferat, 2004.
- Foucault, M. *Cinselliğin Tarihi [History of Sexuality]*. Istanbul: Ayrinti, 2006.
- Glover, W. "Constructing Urban Space as Public in Colonial India: Some Notes from the Punjab". *Journal of Punjab Studies*, 14, no.2 (2007): 211-224.
- Hasan A. "The Urban Resource Centre, Karachi", *Environment & Urbanization*, 19, no. 1 (2007): 275-292.
- Hasan Arif and Masooma Mohib, "The Case of Karachi, Pakistan" in *Understanding Slums: Case Studies for the Global Report on Human Settlements*, London: UN-Habitat, 2003.
- Home, Robert. *Of Planting and Planning: The Making of British Colonial Cities*. Oxford: E&FN SPON, 1997.
- Ismoilova, J. 19. *Asrning Ikkinchi Yarmi – 20. Asr Boshlarida Toshkentning Yangi Shahar Kismi Tarihi*. Tashkent: Fan va Teh'nologiya, 2004.
- Kavuncu, Ayşe Çolpan. "Özbekistan'da Merkez-Yerel İlişkisi: Taşkent Mahalleleri Üzerine Bir Deneme" ("Center-Local Relationship in Uzbekistan: An Essay on Tashkent Neighborhoods"), *Bilig*, no 71 (2014): 118-142.

- Kavuncu, Ayşe Çolpan. "Tashkent", in *Türk Dünyası Başkentleri [the Capitals of the Turkic World]*. Edited by Murat Yılmaz-Ayşe Çolpan Kavuncu. Ankara: Ahmet Yesevi Publications, 2014.
- Kerr, Ian J. "Bombay and Lahore, Colonial Railways and Colonial Cities: Some Urban Consequences of the Development and Operation of Railways in India, c. 1850-c. 1947. Paper presented at the Congress of Railway History Aranjuez, 7-9 February 2001.
- Khalid, Adeeb. *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia*. California: University of California Press, 1998.
- King, Anthony D. *Colonial Urban Development: Culture, Social Power and Environment*. London: Routledge, 1976.
- Kravets, R. and J. Ismoilova. *Toshkent – O'rta Ociyoning Revolyutsiyon Harakat Markazi*, Toshkent: O'zbekiston SSR Fan, 1983.
- Mackenzie, David. "Kaufman of Turkestan: An Assessment of His Administration 1867-1881", *Slavic Review*, 26, no. 2 (1967): 265-285.
- MacKenzie, David. "Turkestan's Significance to Russia (1850-1917)", *Russian Review* 33, no. 2 (1974): 189-231.
- Malik, Hafeez. *Central Asia: Its Strategic Importance and Future Prospects*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.
- Markovits, Claude. *Merchants, Traders, Entrepreneurs: Indian Business in the Colonial Era*. London: Palgrave Macmillian, 2008.
- Morrison, Alexander. "Russian Rule in Turkestan and the Example of British India, c. 1860-1917", *The Slavonic and East European Review* 84, no. 4 (2006): 666-707.
- Mukminova, R. G. *To'rt Asr Oldingi Toshkent*. Toshkent: O'zbekiston SSR Fan Nashriyoti, 1984.
- Pashkun, Dimitry. *Structure and Practice of State Administration in Uzbekistan*. Budapest: Open Society Institute, 2003.
- Rana, I. A. and Bhatti S.S. "Lahore, Pakistan – Urbanization Challenges and Opportunities." *Cities* 72 (2018): 348–355.
- Ross Robert and Gerard J. Telkamp. *Colonial Cities: Essays on Urbanism in a Colonial Context*. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1985.
- Scott, James C. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

- Sahadeo, Jeff. *Russian Colonial Society in Tashkent: 1865-1923*. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2007.
- Stronski, Paul Micheal. *Forging a Soviet City: Tashkent, 1937-1966*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 2003.
- Qureshi, Salman. "The Fast Growing Megacity Karachi as a Frontier of Environmental Challenges: Urbanization and Contemporary Urbanism Issues." *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning* 3, no. 11 (2010): 306-321.
- Tokhtakhodzhaeva, M. "Tashkent: Three Capitals, Three Worlds", *Urban Life in Post-Soviet Asia*. Edited by Catharine Alexander, Victor Buchli, Caroline Humphrey. London: UCL Press, 2007.
- Wheeler, Geoffrey. *The Modern History of Soviet Central Asia*. New York: Frederick Praeger, 1964.
- Zaman, K.U. and Baloch, A.A. "Urbanization of Arable Land in Lahore City in Pakistan: A Case Study." *Canadian Social Science* 7, no.4 (2011): 58-66.