

R.J. Orynbekova, K.S. Uskembayev

*Ye.A. Buketov Karaganda State University, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: riza-janibekovna@mail.ru)*

Popular uprising in 1916: a historical description

The article uses descriptive methods of historical cognition on the basis of which the historical movement of 1916 is considered taking into account ethnic, tribal and national scale, an important role of the Kazakh intelligentsia in creating the newspaper «Kazakh». In describing the events of the popular uprising, two approaches are used: formational and civilizational. The process of the growth of the class struggle, the strike movement, in which political and economic factors played a large role, is described. The popular uprising of 1916 was a logical continuation of the national liberation movement of the nineteenth century. Supporters of the formative approach believe that the leading role in social development is played by historical patterns, objective laws, within which participants of events act. One of the main principles of the civilized approach is the recognition of the multidimensionality of socio-historical development. Kazakhstan in the beginning of XX century.

Keywords: a nation-wide uprising, Alash, national liberation movement, Kazakh intellectuals, historiography, class struggle.

The ruler's decree of 25th June «On the requisition of foreigners» from Central Asia, Kazakhstan and some parts of Siberia to join the areas of battlefields' triggered an immediate mass demonstrations in 1916 [1; 638]. According to the decree individuals under the age of 19 up to 43 who are dimmed fit for rear work and defense militia have been called.

In first two years of the war, the recognition of the need to involve men after heavy losses of Russia, resulted in induction of individuals from other areas to place defensive structures, operate military communication lines, carry military weapons and etc. So-called 'Outlander' decree for Kazakhstan and Central Asia regions more than 400 people had to be required, including, 240 thousand men from all regions inhabited by Kazakhs, and more than 87 thousand males from Semirechenskaya region [1; 638].

The uprising of Kazakh people in 1916 can be regarded as important milestone in the history and on the way to the national independence. This colonial policy of the outlander government and the uprising against the imperialist war in the vast region covering a large portion of the national scale to any historical movement. No one received national character should not doubt these days. After the defeat of the uprising after the outlander government was forced in the rear of the colonial administration Kazakhs call. They are 260 thousand people in the rear of the inevitability of stealing 10 thousand people left to work the region, industrial and military [2; 270].

This year it is 100th anniversary of uprising in 1916, one of the tragic pages in the history for Kazakh people. But our understanding of this keystone event has dramatically changed over the time.

Let's first analyze the views of representatives of the national elite of that period. The leaders of the Alash movement felt that their uprising would mark a turning point in national history. They wrote at the very beginning they were in opposition, as they strongly believed the resistance to the the armed forces would lead to mass riots. The further events showed the fear they had was quite reasonable.

Newspaper «Kazakh» where rallied the entire advanced Kazakh intelligentsia and their leader Alikhan Bukeikhan became a real voice calling about the threat of nationwide strikes which could turn into rivers of blood, a great number of innocent people would suffer all manner of pain and affliction, no place would exist where one might live in safety.

He advocated postponing the mobilization of national intelligence and reinforcing their collective consciousness. He supposed that they were not ready to revolt at that time. He asked Kazakh youth to obey the decree and join the areas of battlefields. He assumed if they won that battle, it would be easier to establish the autonomy later and rather beneficial to create its own military force. A.N. Bukeikhan, M.Dulatov assisted to young Kazakh men who joined the Russian army in the areas of battlefields close to Minsk and Kiev to adapt every part of their lives to the demands of military discipline and culture. They worked as interpreters, gave medical assistance, provide catering, and organized different cultural events. This proves again that Kazakh intellectuals spread the truth trough words and deeds.

The revolt of 1916 played a great role in A.N. Bukeikhan's life and his civil service in the rear as well. In 1926 A.N. Bukeikhan «without a fight no one can gain the independence, set free as man as woman from the slavery, and there are no places to live, no kids to nurture» once wrote about the uprising.

1916 was a remarkable year «the last year taught us a good lesson. It revealed us some secrets. If we keep treading water, who can guarantee that such events will not happen again?» M.Dulatov reflected. The Alash followers did not aim to gain any benefits and authority somehow. 10 years later in 1926 M.Dulatov published an article in «Kazakh workers» newspaper where he has noted: «We could not allow innocent people to be killed, therefore, we chose another way – to obey».

In his article he describes tough time for Kazakh intellectuals after the decree issued: «... the decree of June was like a clap of thunder in a clear sky. We felt it would not be easy for whole nation. We could easily imagine how Kazakh people would react on that decree» [3; 211].

A.N.Bukeikhan, M.Dulatov and A. Baytursunov, all of them supported the idea to give bellow «What troubles disobedience and obedience among the local people can cause»? There's absolutely no way to be certain that young Kazakh men will be back safe home, but can ensure peace in their land. To stage protest against the power will lead to destructive circumstances. The Russian government has a powerful weapon at hand as legislation. The legislation can change a human behavior.

Ten years later, the leaders Alikhan, Akhmet, Mirzhakyp recognized the uprising of 1916 as a revolution of national importance. Dedicated to 10th anniversary since that historic event A.N.Bukeikhan wrote in «Kazakh workers» newspaper it was a real revolt [4; 23]. In other words, we can notice a change of attitudes. Initially, the leaders of Alash party were against of the uprising and called people's attention with slogans «You will be killed», «You cannot resist to armed forces of Russian government». Even after admitting the revolt they could find strength to regard it as the revolt for the sake of territorial autonomy and national liberation.

In 1929, Butyrka prison, Moscow «You don't have any weapons how you are going to protect yourselves?» asked an investigator Pavlov A.Baytursunov. To his question he answered «Kazakh people could stage the revolt in 1916, they are brave enough to resist this time as well». He told that intentionally to call upon Bolsheviks to listen to the views of Kazakh people.

Mustafa Shokai wrote an article titled «the Bolsheviks' lies about the uprising of 1916», M.Shokai didn't apply the concept «national liberation» in reference to the revolt. He assumed it as national movement against the the colonial policy in king's ruling. There is no any features of national liberation struggle. Shokai tried to answer to a question «What is the most important aspect of the uprising of 1916?» The revolt is national movement, therefore it is wrong to suggest that there is some evidence of the class struggle [5; 56]. A professor T. Omarbekov «today we are still confused and fail to reveal a true picture. We wrongly started to apply «National liberation movement». In my opinion, we should get rid of this nation in regard to that revolt.

M. Shokai mentioned in his works «Once the legislative framework was in place, it began intensive resettlement of Russian peasants to the steppe, convinced they were the bearers of an advanced culture». The more government tried to protect interests of peasants the more they gained the profits from this kind of policy [6; 132]. Thus, the rebellion, first of all, had lasting and important consequences for colonial policy, directed at stripping colonial labour relations of their excessive violence.

T. Omarbekov has noted that the revolt has been examined well by Soviet Union scholars. Many documents were theoretically publicly available. However, there is no any evidence that there were Kazakh tribes that staged the revolt against Russian government. For example, there are no any facts about «Karkaraly uprising». After gaining independence a number of documents were published in one collection. But, they are segmented and many details omitted. In the milestones the period 1929-31 symbolizes the time of collectivization strikes.

Sanjar Asfendiyarov in 1935 published his book titled «Essays on the History of Kazakhstan». In his work he described the uprising of 1916 and «national liberation movement» and depicted as the tribal revolt as well. He mentions the uprising as revolution was directed to gain national liberation, national unity. We have to admit that historic fact. However, his belief that «Kazakh national revolutionary movement» and «The proletarian revolution in Russia» are closely related to each other must be regarded as distortion of historical facts.

T.Omarbekov has noted «This was nor national-liberation movement nor generic. The main driving force of the revolt were Kazakh tribes. Why did it have a fragmental character? Karkaraly uprising, Albanian uprising, Torgay uprising. They were subdivided into tribal alliances. There was no unity. Alash figures

knew it would not give national liberation. They understood they had mere chances to win in this revolution. The concept 'National liberation revolt' has been found by Soviet Union's historians which has no any historic proof [7; 89]. In this regard M. Koigeldiev «If we regard the uprising of 1916 as tribal revolt for the sake of national liberation», it would imply the rejection of the idea of considering the movement as national liberation that emerged in 1920s».

It is crucial to note that before the 1917 Bolshevik revolution the leaders of the Alash movement were hesitant to discuss the question of independent statehood, limiting themselves to the demands that Kazakh oblasts be given the right to a certain amount of local self-government and a greater role in the judicial process and military service, with account for local customs. The Alash program states that «all Kazakh lands are united as a consolidated whole, are sovereign and join the Russian Republic on federal grounds». The political state of affairs in the former empire at the end of 1917 was such that the leaders of the national liberation movement could quite openly discuss the question of state autonomy within the framework of the federation.

The national uprising can be pursued as a logical continuation in pursuing the independence and sovereignty over territory for the independence and territorial integrity of the natural continuation of the national liberation movement expression, as well as on the basis of ethnic, tribal, national scale should be treated as any historical movement. This approach is also at odds with historical reality.

If to consider the revolt in 1916 as a tribal phenomenon, how to regard the protests, in the year 1905, a new phase in the development of the Kazakh freedom movement started and it was elevated to a new stage. The political activities of Kazaks were limited to writing petitions to the Tsar and to the central authorities. Petitions were organized in almost every region of the Kazakh steppe, Ural, Karkaraly, and Jetisu. A petition written by the Kazaks of the Lepsi district of Jetisuv Oblast (province) included the signature of 1,000 Kazaks. Another petition sent from Ural and Torgay provinces was signed by 44 Kazaks. The most famous of all was the one written in the Qoyandil fair of the Qarqaral region that obtained the signatures of 14,500 Kazaks. It included eleven articles that covered the most pressing problems of Kazakh society. The petition asked the authorities to introduce new amendments, according to the particular needs of the Kazaks, into the regional administrative apparatus, judiciary system, and education. It also asked the Tsarist administration to grant Kazaks freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, freedom of the press and freedom to open printing houses, together with the replacement of the obsolescent Steppe Statute and the election of native officials to high executive organs. The most crucial matter for the Kazaks, the land problem, was not omitted in this famous Kazakh petition to the tsar. The petition writers reminded the authorities that Kazakh land, on which the blood of Kazakh ancestors had been spilled in its defense, had been forcefully seized from the natives.

Adoption of the Karkaraly petition proclaimed the equality of ideas, independence and self – determination of Kazakh nation. The petition gave a powerful spur in the development of constitutional ideas and was the main legal document of future party Alash. The petition proclaimed the equality of nations, inviolability of private property of Kazakh lands and preservation of a national language. Today, it is known that descendants of Varnava Botov whose name is included in historical chronicle of our land live in our region [8; 92]. Alihan Bokeyhanov, Ahmet Baytursun were among the writers of the Karkaraly petition. The Tsarist colonial administration was aware of the activities of Kazakh intellectuals. Thus they began their retaliation with Alihan Bokeyhanov, on January 8, 1906. On his way to a meeting in Semey, he was imprisoned by the authorities. Bokeyhanov was going to Semey in preparation for being elected as the Semey Representative to the First Russian State Duma, the parliament.

The President of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev, in his book «In the stream of history», has written: «History gives a lot but fails to give independence as a form of freedom. Independence – to be aware of human rights and be responsible for people as one of basic human features...» [9; 277].

During uprising the structure of the government, the armed forces, the control apparatus has been built. The scale of rebellion and consequences were the worst. In fact, at the end of XX century in 1916, the national and political independence of the Kazakh people is a milestone that took its place in the long history.

References

- 1 Қазақстан тарихы. (Көне заманнан бүгінге дейін): бес томдық. — 3-т. — Алматы: Атамұра, 2010. — 768 б.
- 2 Мұхамедов М.Б. Қазақстан тарихы: оқу құралы / М.Б.Мұхамедов, Б.Сырымбетұлы. — Алматы: Қарасай, 2009. — 344 б.

- 3 Дулатов М. Шығармалары / М. Дулатов. — Алматы: Жазушы, 1991. — 256 б.
- 4 [Электрондық ресурс]. — Қолжетімділік тәртібі: <http://turkystan.kz/suhbat/11270>. — 2016. — 19 шілде.
- 5 Шоқай М. 1916 жылғы көтеріліс туралы большевиктердің өтірігі. Таңдамалы / М. Шоқай. — Алматы: Қайнар, 1998. — 1-т. — 360 б.
- 6 Шоқай М. Таңдамалы / М. Шоқай. — I-т. — Алматы: Қайнар, 1999. — 260 б.
- 7 Омарбек Т. Тарих ешкімнің ықпалына түспеуі керек / Т. Омарбек // «Түркістан» газеті, № 27, 7 шілде, (проф. Талас Омарбектің журналист Жәнібек Ғалымға берген сұхбаты) [Электрондық ресурс]. — Қолжетімділік тәртібі: <http://turkystan.kz/suhbat/11270>. — 19 шілде. — 2016.
- 8 Рыскулов Т. Восстание казахов и киргизов в 1916 году / Т. Рыскулов. — М., 1927. [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: http://www.inform.kz/kz/1916-zhylgy-koterilis-ulttyk-biregeylikin-korinisi_a2928746. — 2016. — 21 июля.
- 9 Назарбаев Н.Ә. Тарих толқынында / Н.Ә. Назарбаев. — Алматы: Атамұра, 2003. — 288 б.

Р.Ж. Орынбекова, Қ.С. Өскембаев

1916 жылғы бүкілхалықтық көтеріліс: тарихнамалық шолу

Мақалада тарихи танымның сипаттамалық әдістері қолданылды, олардың негізінде этникалық, тайпалық ұлттық масштабты ескерумен 1916 жылғы ұлт-азаттық қозғалыс қарастырылды. Сонымен қатар қазақ зиялыларының «Қазақ» газетін құрудағы маңызды рөлі көрсетілді. Ұлт-азаттық қозғалыс оқиғаларын сипаттауда формациялық және өркениеттік әдістер пайдаланылған. Саяси және экономикалық факторлар үлкен роль атқарған таптық күрестің өрбу үдерісі сипатталды. 1916 жылғы халықтық көтеріліс XIX ғасырдағы ұлт-азаттық көтерілістердің жалғасы болды. Формациялық әдісті жақтаушылар қоғам дамуында жетекші ролді тарихи заңдылықтар, объективті заңдар жетекші роль атқарады деп есептейді. XX ғасырдың басындағы Қазақстанның әлеуметтік-экономикалық дамуының жан-жақтылығын тану өркениеттік әдістің негізгі принциптері болып табылады.

Кілт сөздер: жалпыхалықтық көтеріліс, Алаш, ұлт-азаттық қозғалысы, қазақ зиялылары, тарихнама, таптық күрес.

Р.Ж. Орынбекова, Қ.С. Ускембаев

Всенародное восстание 1916 года: историографический обзор

В статье используются описательные методы исторического познания, на основе которых рассматривается историческое движение 1916 г. с учетом этнического, племенного и национального масштаба. Показана важная роль казахской интеллигенции в создании газеты «Казах». В описании событий народного восстания используются два подхода — формационный и цивилизационный. Описывается процесс нарастания классовой борьбы, стачечного движения, в которых большую роль играли политические и экономические факторы. Народное восстание 1916 г. было логическим продолжением национально-освободительного движения XIX в. Сторонники формационного подхода считают, что ведущую роль в общественном развитии играют исторические закономерности, объективные законы, в рамках которых и действуют участники событий. Одним из основных принципов цивилизационного подхода является признание многомерности социально-исторического развития Казахстана в начале XX в.

Ключевые слова: народное восстание, Алаш, национально-освободительное движение, казахская интеллигенция, историография, классовая борьба.

References

- 1 Kazakstan tarikhy. (Kone zamannan buhinhe deiin) [History of Kazakhstan. (From ancient times to the present)]. (2010). Vol. 3-5). Almaty: Atamura [in Kazakh].
- 2 Mohamedov, M.B. & Syrymbetuly, B. (2009). *Kazakstan tarikhy [History of Kazakhstan]*. Almaty: Karasai [in Kazakh].
- 3 Dulatov, M. (1991). *Shyharmalary [Works]*. Almaty: Zhazushy [in Kazakh].
- 4 *turkystan.kz*. Retrieved from <http://turkystan.kz/suhbat/11270>. (July 19, 2016). [in Kazakh].
- 5 Shokai, M. (1998). *1916 zhylyhy koterilis turaly bolshevikterdin otirih. Tandamaly [Lies about the rise of Bolsheviks in 1916. Custom]*. (Vol. 1, 218–219). Almaty: Kainar [in Kazakh].
- 6 Shokai, M. (1999). *Tandamaly [Custom]*. (Vol. I). Almaty: Kainar [in Kazakh].
- 7 Omarbek, T. Tarikh eshimin ықпалына түспеуі керек [History should not be influenced by anyone else's]. «Turkistan» hazeti, №27, 7 shilde, (professor Talas Omarbektin zhurnalist Zhanibek Halymha berhen sukhбаты) – «Turkistan» newspaper, № 27,

July 7 (Professor Talas Omarbektiñ journalist Z. interview scientists). (2016, 19 July). *turkystan.kz*. Retrieved from <http://turkystan.kz/suhbat/11270>. [in Kazakh].

8 Ryskulov, T. (1927). Vosstanie kazakhov i kirhizov v 1916 году [Revolt of the Kazakh and Kyrgyz in 191]. (2016, 21 July). *www.inform.kz*. Retrieved from http://www.inform.kz/kz/1916-zhylgy-koterilis-ulttyk-biregeylyktin-korinisi_a2928746 [in Russian].

9 Nazarbayev, N.A. (2003). *Tarikh tolkynynda [The flow of history]*. Almaty: Atamura [in Kazakh].