




B. Yensepov¹ , S. Tokbolat² , B. Dzhursinbaev³ 

¹Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University named after S. Seifullin, Astana, Kazakhstan

²Taraz International innovative institute named after Sh. Murtaza, Taraz, Kazakhstan

³Taraz Regional University named after Dulati, Taraz, Republic of Kazakhstan

(E-mail: ensepov_81@mail.ru; seiltokbolat@gmail.com; bakytzhan_72@mail.ru)

The rebellion of the Syr-Darya kazakhs, led by Zhanhozha Nurmukhameduly, in opposition to the Russian empire's expansionist policy

In the article the 1950s uprising of the Syr-Darya Kazakhs, led by Zhankozha Nurmukhameduly, as a response to the encroaching expansionist policies of Imperial Russia was considered. It uncovers the oppressive tactics employed by the tsarist government's local officials. The study highlights how the construction of coastal forts along the banks of Syr-Darya River enabled control over the pastures and wintering grounds of the Junior Horde Kazakh clans. The study additionally reveals archival discoveries, such as the substitution of the Hojaniyaz fortress, which fell due to the directives of the Orenburg frontier commission, with the Kazaly fort. The study links these events to the revolt of the disenfranchised tribes in the lower Syr-Darya region. Through the use of newly available archival data, it offers a detailed examination of the structure and progression of the uprising. Furthermore, the research thoroughly details the arming of Russian-Cossack forces with sophisticated weapons, ammunition, and technical means employed to suppress the rebellion. The research posits that the timeframe of the Syr-Darya Kazakhs' liberation uprising spanned from 1856 to 1862, thereby contesting the previously accepted historical timeframe of 1856-1857.

Keywords: Russian Empire, Khanate of Khiva, Fort Raim, Hojaniyaz, Fort Kazaly, Zhanhozha Nurmukhameduly, Azbergen Munaytpasuly, V.A. Perovsky.

Introduction

The 19th-century Russian expansion into Central Asia, particularly along the Syr-Darya, presents a critical juncture in the historical narrative of the region. This period, marked by the Russian Empire's strategic maneuvers, significantly altered the socio-political landscape, especially for the Kazakh tribes whose traditional way of life and societal structures faced unprecedented threats. To fully comprehend this era, it becomes essential to explore the political and social situation of Kazakhstan under Tsarist rule, with a specific focus on regions like the Syr-Darya area.

Research in this area relies heavily on scholarly articles that investigate the nature of Russian dominance along the Syr-Darya and the ensuing resistance by the local population. Such a detailed examination is crucial for understanding the broader implications of Russian colonization on Kazakh society. The Russian Empire's agenda extended beyond mere territorial annexation; it sought to dismantle traditional Kazakh societal structures, divide the Kazakh steppe, and, ultimately, weaken the state's sovereignty. This aggressive policy triggered a sustained national liberation movement fueled by the local population's growing dissatisfaction with Russian intrusion.

One of the most notable manifestations of this resistance was the mid-19th-century struggle for freedom led by the Shekti clan in the lower reaches of the Syr-Darya. Characterized by direct confrontation with the invading Russian army, sabotage of the tsarist-constructed fortresses, and opposition to oppressive taxation policies, this struggle exemplifies the depth and complexity of Kazakh resistance. Understanding the significance of these actions requires a specialized study that delves into the motivations, strategies, and implications of this resistance movement.

The research problem, therefore, lies in bridging the gap in historical understanding of these events. While there is extensive literature on Russian imperial expansion, the specific socio-political impacts on the Kazakh tribes, particularly along the Syr-Darya, remain underexplored. The nuanced responses of these tribes, their strategic resistance, and the roles of key figures within these movements have not been comprehensively examined, particularly in the context of their underlying motivations and objectives. This gap hinders a complete understanding of the regional upheaval during this critical period and the enduring effects on Kazakh national consciousness and identity.

In essence, this research endeavors to unravel the complexities of the Kazakh response to Russian expansion. By providing a comprehensive account of this transformative era in Central Asian history, the study aims to contribute to the nuanced understanding of the historical trajectory of the region, emphasizing the significant impact of these events on the formation of Kazakh national identity and the region's socio-political landscape.

In the vast landscape of historiography covering Russian imperial expansion, a nuanced understanding of the socio-political ramifications for the Kazakh tribes along the Syr-Darya remains relatively unexplored. The intricate responses of these tribes, their resistance strategies, and the pivotal roles of central figures within these movements have not been thoroughly examined, especially concerning their motivations and strategic objectives. This gap in historical understanding hinders a comprehensive understanding of the regional upheaval during this critical period.

This study is propelled by the question: How did the Russian Empire's military expansion policy along the Syr-Darya influence the socio-political dynamics in the region, and what were the consequent impacts on the Kazakh resistance movements, specifically focusing on the strategic responses and the underlying motivations of key historical figures like Zhankozha Nurmuhameduly?

The research posits that the Russian Empire's military expansion catalyzed far-reaching socio-political changes within the Syr-Darya region. This expansionist policy triggered a multifaceted resistance movement among the Kazakh population, far from being a mere reactionary response. It was a deliberate reaction to the systematic usurpation of land, cultural suppression, and economic exploitation by the Russian authorities. Figures such as Zhankozha Nurmuhameduly were not only central to this resistance but also exemplified a strategic and nationalistic response to the geopolitical circumstances of the time.

This study aims to enrich the historical narrative of Central Asian resistance movements, particularly against Russian imperialism. Through a detailed analysis of archival materials, historical accounts, and scholarly works, it seeks to offer an in-depth perspective on the resistance strategies employed, highlight the roles of key Kazakh leaders, and evaluate the broader implications of these movements on regional history and identity formation. The goal is to bridge the existing knowledge gap and provide a nuanced understanding of this crucial historical period, emphasizing its enduring impact on Kazakh national consciousness and identity.

Methods

The methodology section of this research focuses on providing an objective assessment of the Russian Empire's military expansion policy along the Syr-Darya. This is achieved through a comprehensive analysis of both existing literature and newly available archival documents, incorporating them into the scientific discourse.

A significant portion of primary data was sourced from the Central State Archives of the Republic of Kazakhstan. These archives offered invaluable documents detailing the Kazakhs' resistance against Russian colonization, the strategies employed by the tsarist administration to occupy the region, and the operational procedures of its military-administrative offices in countering the Kazakh liberation efforts. Additionally, insights were gleaned from the statements of Russian army and border chiefs, providing perspectives on the interactions and conflicts between the Kazakhs of the Syr-Darya and the tsarist administration.

The research involved a thorough review of numerous published scientific works to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the historical context. These works provided a foundational knowledge base and helped in contextualizing the archival findings.

Documents from the Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan, specifically from fund No. 715 "Colonel Serebrennikov's information about the Turkestan region" were also scrutinized. This collection yielded data on the diplomatic activities of the Russian administration, the construction of fortresses on Kazakh lands, and the political and social dynamics within the local clans. This information was crucial in delineating the broader impact of the Tsarist Russian Empire's conquest campaigns, the local population's response, and the roles of key Kazakh leaders and figures.

The research adhered to principles of historicity and systematicity, ensuring that the analysis remained anchored in historical contexts and was systematically structured. Comparative analysis was employed to draw parallels and contrasts between various data sources, enhancing the depth of understanding. The methodology was guided by a commitment to objectivity and scientific rigor, ensuring that the conclusions drawn were based on evidence and scholarly analysis rather than conjecture or bias.

The archival data were systematically categorized and critically analyzed. This process involved correlating the newly discovered archival information with existing historical narratives, thereby allowing for a more nuanced understanding of the Russian Empire's policies and their implications on the Kazakh populace.

In summary, the research methodology combined a meticulous review of archival sources with a critical analysis of existing literature, underpinned by a rigorous academic approach. This blend of primary and secondary sources, coupled with a methodical analytical framework, provided a comprehensive understanding of the complex historical events during this challenging period.

Discussion

The literature review on the study of the Russian Empire's military expansion policy in the Syr-Darya region reveals a significant shift in historiographical perspectives over time. Initially, Soviet historiography, as exemplified by the works of T. Shoiynbaev [1], N.A. Khalfin [2], B.S. Suleymenov, and V.P. Basin [3], approached this subject predominantly through a Marxist-Leninist lens. This perspective often recast the Russian Empire's aggressive expansionist policies as a process of "voluntary joining", reflecting the ideological biases inherent in Soviet historical analysis.

However, post-independence scholarship has marked a departure from this one-dimensional interpretation. Historians have started to re-evaluate the narrative of national liberation, emphasizing the roles and positions of key individuals in the resistance against Russian colonial policies. A notable contribution in this regard is the monograph by S.M. Mashimbaev [4] (1994), which offers an in-depth analysis of the colonial policies and military-administrative structures of the tsarist government in South Kazakhstan. Mashimbaev's work is instrumental in shedding light on the complexities and nuances of the Kazakhs' opposition to Russian rule.

Furthermore, the perspective on the national liberation movement of the Kazakh people has been enriched by the inclusion of foreign historiography. K.L. Esmagambetov's work [5] (1994) stands out in this context. Esmagambetov integrates the methodological positions and conclusions of international researchers, thereby broadening the understanding of the liberation struggle. His approach allows for a more comprehensive interpretation of the actions and impacts of historical figures such as Zhankozha Nurmukhameduly and Davit Asauuly, situating them within the broader context of the Kazakh people's national liberation struggle.

Overall, the literature review underscores a dynamic evolution in the historiography of the Russian Empire's expansion in the Syr-Darya region, transitioning from a Soviet-era class-based analysis to a more multifaceted and inclusive understanding that incorporates both local and international scholarly perspectives.

Results

During the 1850s, Kazakh dissatisfaction with the tsarist administration's colonial policies in the Syr-Darya region escalated significantly. The Russian authorities, aware of the mounting unrest and confined to the Perovsk fort, recognized the increasing danger. In 1855, responding to this threat, the Russian government decided to establish a new fort on the Kazaly branch, considering the strategic position and remoteness of the Rayim fortress, with the intent of utilizing it as a port. This strategic move was partly aimed at mitigating the imminent threat from Khiva to the Rayim area. The opportunity for Russian expansion presented itself when the Kungrat uprising erupted in Khiva, leading to the destruction of the Khoja Niyaz fortress along the lower Syrdarya. Consequently, on March 9, 1856, the Governor-General of Samara and Orenburg tasked College Assessor Osmolovsky with a crucial mission: to gather 50 camels from the Kazakhs for the purpose of seizing the abandoned Khoja Niyaz fortress and constructing a bridge over the Kuan Darya River [6]. This resulted in the construction of the Kazaly fort, effectively replacing the demolished Khoja Niyaz fortress. The personnel and operations of the Rayim fortress were subsequently transferred to this new location [7; 79–80]. With these strategic moves, including the linking of the Perovsk fort with other fortifications, the Russian administration laid the groundwork for further incursions towards the Kokand Khanate, aiming to extend its influence along the Syr-Darya. However, these expansionist ambitions were interrupted by the onset of the Kazakh uprising in the Aral region in 1856, which temporarily derailed the Russian imperial plans.

The Syr-Darya Kazakh Uprising, which began in December 1856, represented a significant confrontation against the colonial endeavors of the Russian Empire. Orchestrated by Zhankozha Nurmukhameduly, a prominent figure within the Shekti tribe, this insurrection highlighted the complexities of Kazakh-Russian relations during this era. A.A. Abdualiev, a scholar specializing in the interactions between Kazakh and Khiva societies, sheds light on the nuanced dynamics that led to Zhankozha's initial acceptance and eventual repudiation of a Russian noble title. Abdualiev identifies the tax policies enforced by Obruchev during the

erection of the Raim fortress as a pivotal factor influencing Zhankozha's change in loyalty. Despite initially embracing the conferred Russian nobility, Zhankozha orchestrated a revolt in retaliation to Obruchev's violation of a crucial agreement. This accord promised that Kazakhs would be subjected to taxation solely per household and for the utilization of camels in transport. However, the contravention of these terms incited Zhankozha to mobilize resistance against the imperial Russian authority [8; 138].

In 1856, the Aral region became the epicenter of a notable Kazakh insurrection led by Zhankozha, marking a pivotal moment in Central Asian resistance against external dominion. This uprising was characterized by its strategic collaboration with Azbergen Munaitpasuly, a revered military and strategic figure in Central Asia. Evidence of their cooperation is documented in a letter from V.A. Perovsky to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, dated August 11, 1856. This correspondence highlights Azbergen's newly acquired title of "bek" in Khiva and his allegiance to Eset Kotibaruly. It further outlines Azbergen's invitation to Eset to consolidate forces on the Usturt plateau, with plans to muster a contingent of 2000 at the onset of winter. The strategy aimed to sway, or when necessary, coerce the allegiance of Kazakhs who had succumbed to Russian control, with explicit intentions to assault Kazakh settlements should they resist [9].

Zhankozha, in alignment with this strategic pact, engaged with the peasantry under Khiva's influence. In response, Azbergen Bi, leading the Khiva tribes, expressed readiness to support, though he stipulated that his involvement could only commence in the following spring [10]. However, this collaborative endeavor was ultimately derailed in 1857 by a Turkmen insurrection within Khiva, which obstructed Azbergen Bi's capacity to partake in the anticipated uprising. This disruption underscores the volatile dynamics of regional alliances and the challenges faced in mobilizing a unified resistance against the imposing Russian influence.

The strategic implications of the Khiva Kazakhs, under the leadership of Azbergen Bi, siding with Zhankozha's insurrectionary efforts are illuminated through the reflections of Fliegel adjutant Butakov in his correspondence to the Orenburg corps commander dated September 14, 1863. Butakov, revisiting the tumultuous period of 1856-1857, recounted the extensive regional upheavals orchestrated by Zhankozha Batyr. Russian military forces, already spread thin, found themselves hard-pressed to secure their fortifications, particularly as insurgents sabotaged essential supplies, including grass reserves. The crisis reached a point where General Fitingoff, dispatched from Perovsky with a significant military detachment, was necessitated to quell the uprising. Nevertheless, the rebellion's quelling did not eradicate the prevailing unrest, underscored by the spiritual endorsement the Khiva Kazakhs offered to the insurgents and the missed opportunity by the Kokand to leverage the turmoil. Butakov highlighted the persistent threat posed by internal dissent among influential Kazakh clans, exacerbated by the Russian military's insufficient presence in the region. He pinpointed the fragility of security along the Syr-Darya line to ongoing disturbances in Khiva and Kokan, further threatened by potential actions from the Emir of Bukhara [11].

The potential for the rebellion's escalation was further underscored by the head of the Orenburg border commission, who raised alarms over the Senior Shekty clan (tileukabaq) of Kazakhs in Khiva potentially rallying behind Zhankozha, significantly broadening the scope of the uprising [12]. The rebellion's extensive reach, engulfing the entire Kazaly region with over three thousand participants and centralizing around the strategically fortified Zhankala by Azbergen, highlighted the rebellion's meticulously organized and premeditated nature. This situation underscored the strategic and political complexities faced by the Russian Empire in managing peripheral insurrections, reflecting the nuanced dynamics of regional resistance movements and the intricate interplay of alliances that could significantly influence the stability of Russian colonial dominions in Central Asia.

The uprising within the Kazaly region can be directly attributed to a decisive action by the commandant of Fort No. 1, who authorized the redistribution of land proximal to the fortress to Russian settlers, thereby stripping Kazakh families of their ancestral agricultural territories. This forceful eviction relegated these families to lands poorly suited for farming, particularly due to the absence of essential irrigation resources such as running water, starkly undermining the Kazakhs' ability to sustain their agrarian lifestyle and infringing upon their historic land rights [13; 44]. This incident was not an anomaly but a manifestation of the systematic exploitation enacted by Russian authorities on the Kazakh populace since their encroachment into the Aral region.

The extent of exploitation imposed on the Kazakhs was vast, encompassing not only a household tax but also a plethora of oppressive duties. These included the repair and maintenance of infrastructure like roads and bridges, the construction and upkeep of canals, providing support to the local administration, monetary contributions for the travel expenses of officials, accommodations for visiting personnel, and the provision of firewood. Furthermore, the tsarist regime compelled thousands of Kazakhs to participate in the con-

struction of fortifications, offering no remuneration for their labor. Such colonial exploitation practices incited profound resentment among the Kazakhs.

This burgeoning discontent towards the Russian imperial policies eventually sparked a widespread rebellion across the Kazaly region, with participation from over three thousand individuals. The Zhankala fortress became the epicenter of this revolt, symbolizing the strategic and symbolic resistance against Russian oppression. A confidential communiqué from Mikhailov, the commander of the Ural fortress, to Fitingof, the head of the Syrdarya line, disclosed the heterogeneous composition of Zhankozha's rebel forces. This diversity not only illustrates the multi-faceted nature of the insurgency but also signals the extensive dissatisfaction and solidarity among various Kazakh clans against the imperial Russian regime [14].

The uprising saw the participation of clans from the Alimuli tribe, marking the initial core of the insurrection. As the conflict escalated, these clans were bolstered by additional Kazakh tribes from the arid sandy regions, illustrating the widespread tribal solidarity against Russian encroachments. The rebellion was co-led by prominent figures such as Sultanbüri, Dabyl, Khozha Baymuhamed, among others, who stood alongside Zhankozha, unifying various factions under a common cause. The insurgents, primarily armed with rudimentary tools like clubs, hoes, and other agricultural implements, showcased their resilience and determination against a well-armed adversary. Despite the scarcity of firearms among the rebels, their concerted effort posed a considerable challenge to the Russian forces.

This formidable challenge prompted the tsarist administration to reassess its strategy, notably attempting to mend frayed relations with the Kokan Khanate. In a significant gesture reflective of the uprising impact, the Russian authorities were compelled to unconditionally release all Kokhanid captives held in Perovsky [15]. This act underscored the rebellion's influence on altering Russian policies and strategies in the region.

In mid-December 1856, the rebellion under Zhankozha's leadership took a decisive turn with the demolition of the Cossack-inhabited settlement of Soldatskaya Sloboda. This initial offensive act was quickly followed by a strategic advance towards key Russian fortifications, including Kazali Fort No. 1 and Perovsk Fort, situated along the vital Syrdarya line. The insurgents executed a series of surprise attacks, signaling a significant escalation in their campaign against Russian control.

By the end of December, the rebellion's intensity further amplified as Kazaly found itself effectively besieged. A detailed account from the head of the Kazaly fort, dispatched to Perovsky on December 28, conveyed the critical state of affairs: the fort was encircled on all sides except the north by the rebels, who had taken strategic positions ready to counter any movement by the Russian forces. This report underscored the insurgents' tactical readiness to advance to the edge of the field at the slightest indication of Russian army movement. In anticipation of an imminent assault, the garrison inside the fort was on high alert, undertaking preparations that included the transportation of hay and the reinforcement of the fort's more vulnerable sections to enhance their defensive capabilities [16].

Mikhailov, at the helm of a Russian detachment consisting of a hundred Cossacks, fifty infantrymen, and armed with one cannon, faced off against the rebels encircling the fortress. The insurgents were not only successful in eliminating three Cossacks but also in setting ablaze the stored grass, a strategic blow to the Russian supplies. Simultaneously, a different faction of the rebellion engaged in combat with another Russian contingent led by Major Bulatov, indicating the widespread and coordinated nature of the insurgent actions. These skirmishes, which continued until the end of December, were marked by their intensity and the changing fortunes of both sides.

In light of the escalating situation and the unexpected ferocity of the uprising, Orenburg Governor-General Perovsky issued orders to Fitingof, the commander of the Syr-Darya line, to suppress the rebellion. Concurrently, Zhankozha and his rebels were laying the groundwork for a major offensive against the Kazaly fort. By January 1857, the rebel forces had grown to approximately five thousand strong, a testament to the uprising's momentum and the rallying power of Zhankozha's leadership. Following Perovsky's directive, Fitingof mobilized a significantly reinforced strength on January 9, comprising 300 Cossacks, 320 infantrymen, equipped with a cannon and two rocket launchers, as detailed in historical records [17]. This preparation signaled a notable intensification of the military response to the rebellion, reflecting the serious threat the insurgents represented.

The confrontation reached a pivotal moment in the Arykbalyk valley near Kazaly, where the rebels, utilizing the natural cover provided by reeds, executed a surprise attack on the Russian army. This ambush resulted in six Russian soldiers being wounded, underscoring the rebels' tactical acumen and their ability to inflict damage despite the disparity in arms. As the battle approached a critical juncture, the rebels launched

a bold assault, demonstrating their resilience and determination to challenge the Russian military presence. This significant encounter highlighted the strategic and determined efforts of the Kazakh fighters under Zhankozha's command, marking a crucial phase in the rebellion's ongoing struggle against Russian domination.

Despite their valiant efforts and tactical ingenuity, the rebels faced insurmountable odds due to the superior firepower of the Russian troops, who wielded heavy artillery and rifle fire. The ferocity of this engagement inflicted heavy losses on the rebel forces, compelling them to withdraw from the field of battle. Among those grievously wounded was Zhankozha, the rebellion's leader, whose life was narrowly saved by the quick actions of his comrades, pulling him from the brink of death.

In the aftermath of this confrontation, the tsarist forces executed harsh punitive measures against the defeated insurgents. The severity of these reprisals was marked by the looting and systematic destruction of rebel villages, with as many as 212 homes being razed. Moreover, the Russian military confiscated a substantial amount of property, capturing over 20,000 head of cattle from the rebels. This draconian response not only highlighted the punitive intent of the Russian military but also served as a grim reminder of the consequences of rebellion against the tsarist regime.

The uprising led by Zhankozha and the Kazakhs of the Junior Horde ultimately ended in failure. This defeat can be attributed to several critical factors, including a lack of cohesive organization among the rebel forces. The Kazakh insurgents, primarily armed with traditional weapons such as spears, swords, and bows, were drastically outmatched by the Russian military, which was equipped with the most advanced weaponry of the era. Furthermore, the rebellion's geographical limitation to the Syr-Darya region and the absence of a unified effort across different Kazakh clans significantly hampered the uprising's potential for success. This lack of coordination and inferior armament placed the Kazakh rebels at a decisive disadvantage, culminating in their defeat and the harsh repressions that followed.

The defeat of the Kazakh rebels in the uprising led by Zhankozha Nurmuhammeduly is seen more as a setback to their short-term goals rather than a reduction in the historical significance of their struggle. Historian K. Esmagambetov places this event within a broader historical context, highlighting its importance by noting, "Beginning from the 16th century, the Turkic states have faced six confrontations with hostile empires. Such an enduring struggle underscores the indomitable spirit of the rebelling Kazakhs and the extraordinary heroism of their leader, Zhankozha" [18; 11]. Esmagambetov views the rebellion as evidence of a long-standing Turkic resistance against foreign domination and a testament to the Kazakh people's persistent quest for betterment.

The uprising also indirectly affected the local Kazakhs, influencing resistance leaders such as Eset Kotibaruly. Initially in compliance with Russian rule, Eset considered moving to Khiva to reignite the rebellion. Yet, these efforts were thwarted by the vigilant oversight of the tsarist administration, which closely monitored Eset's activities, preventing any resurgence of the uprising [19].

In response to the potential threat of another uprising by the Syr-Darya Kazakhs, the tsarist government issued a decree of amnesty in 1858 [20]. This act of clemency marked a tactical shift in the administration's strategy to manage unrest within the Kazakh population, aiming to quell dissatisfaction and prevent future rebellions. The government's move towards reconciliation sought to stabilize and pacify the volatile region.

After the uprising's suppression, key figures of the rebellion regrouped. Zhankozha traveled to Daukara to join forces with Azbergen, indicating ongoing efforts to unite resistance against Russian rule. Additionally, Bi Dabyl of the Karasakal clan, along with his entire village, joined Azbergen Bi, further demonstrating the strengthened unity among the rebels [21]. This reorganization among the resistance leaders and their followers signifies a spirit of continued defiance and collective struggle for freedom and autonomy, despite the adversities posed by the tsarist regime.

The uprising experienced a notable resurgence in 1860, reinvigorated under the leadership of key figures such as Sultan Buri, Zhankozha, his son Itzhemes, and grandsons Zhankuli and Zhanmyrza. Their continued resistance against Russian authority is a testament to the indomitable spirit and determination of the Kazakh rebels, embodying a relentless pursuit of autonomy and opposition to foreign rule.

In a significant development reported by Governor-General Katenin of Orenburg in a letter to the Russian Minister of War dated March 1860, the rebels achieved a considerable victory. This letter recounts how Zhankozha, with support from Azbergen Bi, managed to decisively defeat a Russian military contingent led by Elekey Kasymov during the winter of that year [22]. This victory not only highlights the Kazakh resistance's strategic acumen and resilience but also their capability to mount effective operations against Russian forces. The continued successes of the rebels underscored their unwavering opposition to Russian do-

minion, reflecting the deep-seated desire among the Kazakh people for self-determination and the preservation of their rights and freedoms.

The participation of Buri Sultan, a relative of Jangazi Khan, in the uprising illustrates the widespread nature of the discontent with Russian rule. Buri Sultan's narrative, marked by initial involvement in robbery, his flight from Khiva to Bukhara, and subsequent movements to Kokan, and then engaging in raids in the Kyzylkum desert, demonstrates the complex socio-political dynamics of the time. His eventual collaboration with Zhankozha in Kyzylkum after an attack on the Russian embassy signifies the broadening scope of resistance against Russian expansion.

Following the suppression of the uprising, Buri Sultan's attempts to mobilize his followers for further actions against Russian interests were met with firm resistance from the tsarist administration. The directive from the Orenburg General-Governorship to the commander of the Syrdarya line to maintain "strong control over the Kazakhs before they start a rebellion" [23] reflects the Russian government's strategic approach to preventing future insurrections. This stance aimed at curtailing the potential for further unrest, highlighting the continuous efforts by the tsarist regime to consolidate control over the region and mitigate the challenges posed by the Kazakh resistance.

The resistance against Russian domination in Central Asia was multifaceted, involving not just armed insurrection but also economic strategies aimed at undermining Russian interests. In 1860, some Kazakh tribes, even those not directly participating in the uprising, engaged in a form of economic resistance by collaborating with the Bukharians. They strategically purchased barley at elevated prices, thereby monopolizing the commodity and obstructing other Kazakhs who intended to sell barley in the Perovsky market on the Syr-Darya's left bank. This maneuver was designed to economically disadvantage the Russians, showcasing the rebels' adaptability and their use of economic tactics as a form of protest [24].

The formal cessation of the uprising was recorded on February 8, 1862, marking a definitive end to this tumultuous period. The surrender of Zhanmyrza Akmurzin, Zhankozha's nephew, to the tsarist authorities at fort No. 1 symbolized the conclusion of the active resistance phase. This event not only represented the physical end of the rebellion but also signified the close of a significant chapter in the history of resistance against Russian expansion in the region [25].

This period of Kazakh resistance against Russian domination, characterized by both military and economic strategies, reflects the complexity of the struggle for autonomy and rights in the face of imperial expansion. The rebels' ability to employ diverse tactics, from direct military engagement to economic sabotage, underscores the depth of their commitment to resisting foreign control and preserving their way of life. The formal conclusion of the uprising, while marking the end of open hostilities, did not erase the legacy of resistance nor the impact of these events on the collective memory and national consciousness of the Kazakh people.

Conclusion

This study delves into the dynamic consequences of the Russian Empire's military expansion along the Syr-Darya in the 19th century, focusing on the socio-political upheaval and specifically the Kazakh resistance movements. At the heart of this investigation were the strategic responses and motivations of key individuals, such as Zhankozha Nurmuhameduly. The research uncovers the nuanced implications of this critical historical period, illustrating that the Russian Empire's territorial ambitions served as more than just conquests — they were catalysts for significant socio-political transformations within Kazakh society.

The findings reveal that the Kazakh resistance was a complex, multifaceted movement, deeply entrenched in a thoughtful reaction to the Russian administration's systematic policies of land usurpation, cultural suppression, and economic exploitation. Guided by strategic nationalistic fervor and a comprehensive understanding of the geopolitical landscape, leaders like Zhankozha Nurmuhameduly orchestrated actions that were part of a broader strategy of resilience and defiance against the overpowering imperial forces.

This research posits that the Kazakh resistance significantly influenced the historical trajectory of the region, affecting subsequent Russian Empire policies and profoundly impacting the Kazakh people's national consciousness and identity. It showcased the Kazakhs' strategic acumen and resilience, underlining their strong desire to preserve cultural integrity and political autonomy.

Contributing to the academic field, this research addresses a crucial gap in the historiography of Russian imperial expansion in Central Asia. Through an exhaustive analysis of archival documents, historical accounts, and scholarly works, it provides a detailed view of the Kazakh resistance strategies, emphasizing the roles of key leaders and the movements' broader implications for regional history and identity formation.

The study highlights the complexities of resistance movements against colonial and imperial forces, stressing the importance of contextualizing historical events within their broader socio-political frameworks. It affirms the Kazakh resistance against Russian imperialism as a testament to the enduring spirit and resilience of a people facing the challenges of colonization. This research not only illuminates a pivotal chapter in Central Asian history but also serves as a poignant reminder of humanity's ongoing struggle for autonomy, self-determination, and the preservation of cultural identity against overwhelming external pressures.

Acknowledgment

“This research is funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. AP19676769)” “Logistics of Imperial Russian military campaigns in Kazakh steppe and Turkestan region: impact and consequences on Kazakh society”.

Әдебиеттер тізімі

- 1 Шойынбаев Т. Прогрессивное значение присоединения Казахстана к России / Т. Шойынбаев. — Алматы, 1973. — 246 с.
- 2 Халфин Н.А. Россия и ханства Средней Азии / Н.А. Халфин. — М.: Наука, 1974. — 408 с.
- 3 Сулейменов Б.С. Казахстан в составе России в XVIII — нач. XX в. / Б.С. Сулейменов, В.П. Басин. — Алматы: Наука, 1981. — 247 с.
- 4 Мәшімбаев С.М. Патшалық Ресейдің отарлық саясаты / С.М. Мәшімбаев. — Алматы: Санат, 1994. — 135 б.
- 5 Есмағамбетов К. Қазақтар шетел әдебиетінде / К. Есмағамбетов. — Алматы: Атамұра, 1994. — 240 б.
- 6 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 382. — Оп. 1. — Д. 4. — Л. 14.
- 7 Мейер Л. Киргизская степь Оренбургского ведомства / Л. Мейер. — СПб., 1865.
- 8 Абдуалиев А.А. К проблеме характеристики политической деятельности Жанхожи Нурмухаммедова на примере казахско-хивинских взаимоотношений / А.А. Абдуалиев // Вестн. Каз. нац. ун-та. Сер. ист. — 2006. — № 1. — С. 136–138.
- 9 ЦГА Республики Узбекистан. — Ф. 715. — Оп. 1. — Д. 19. — Л. 232–233.
- 10 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 382. — Оп. 1. — Д. 5. — Л. 57.
- 11 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 382. — Д. 1. — Оп. 47. — Л. 125–126.
- 12 ЦГА РУ. — Ф. 715. — Оп. 1. — Д. 17. — Л. 309.
- 13 Мұсабаев Н.Т. Ортаймаған қазаны — қасиетті Қазалы / Н.Т. Мұсабаев, А.Н. Мұсабаева. — Алматы: Атамұра, 1998. — 200 б.
- 14 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 4. — Оп. 1. — Д. 1439. — Л. 37.
- 15 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 382. — Оп. 1 — Д. 5. — Л. 60.
- 16 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 4. — Оп. 1. — Д. 1441. — Л. 35–37.
- 17 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 4. — Оп. 1. — Д. 1441. — Л. 39–40.
- 18 Ел қорғаған Ер Жәкем. — Алматы: Денсаулық, 2008. — 384 б.
- 19 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 1. — Оп. 382. — Д. 17. — Л. 6.
- 20 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 383. — Оп. 1. — Д. 44. — Л. 6.
- 21 ЦГА РУ. — Ф. 715. — Оп. 1. — Д. 21.
- 22 ЦГА РУ. — Ф. 715. — Оп. 1. — Д. 23. — Л. 121–122.
- 23 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 382. — Оп. 1. — Д. 17. — Л. 39.
- 24 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 382. — Оп. 1. — Д. 38. — Л. 237.
- 25 Оспанов А. Жанқожа батыр / А. Оспанов. — Алматы, 1992. — 657 б.

Б. Енसेпов, С. Токболат, Б. Джурсунбаев

Ресей империясының басқыншылық саясатына қарсы Жанқожа Нұрмұхамедұлы бастаған Сыр бойы қазақтарының көтерілісі

Мақалада патшалық Ресейдің басқыншылық саясатына қарсы XIX ғасырдың 50-жылдарындағы Жанқожа Нұрмұхамедұлы бастаған Сыр бойы қазақтарының көтерілісі қарастырылған. Сол кездегі патша үкіметінің жергілікті жердегі шенеуніктерінің жүргізген саясаты мен олардың шектен тыс озбырлығы ашып көрсетілген. Сыр бойына жағалай бекіністер мен қамалдардың салынуы Кіші жүз

руларының жайлауларымен қоса қыстауларын бақылауға алғандығы нақтыланды. Сонымен қатар, Орынбор шекара комиссиясының ықпалымен қираған Қожанияз бекінісінің орнына шағын ғана Қазалы бекінісі пайда болғаны мұрағат құжаттары арқылы анықталды. Осының барлығы Сырдың төменгі ағысы бойындағы шекті руларының көтеріліс жасауына алып келгендігімен түсіндірілді. Яғни көтеріліс құрамы, барысы тың мұрағат деректері арқылы көрсетілді. Көтерілісті басуда орыс-казак әскерлерінің жаңа заманға сай қару-жарақ, оқ-дәрі, техникалық құрал-жабдықтармен қамтамасыз етілгені жан-жақты баяндалды. Нәтижесінде Жанқожа Нұрмұхамедұлы бастаған Сыр бойы халқының азаттық көтерілісінің хронологиялық шегін бұрынғы тарихнама салған 1856–1857 жылдармен шектемей, 1856-дан 1862 жылға дейін созылды деген қорытынды жасалды.

Кілт сөздер: Ресей империясы, Хиуа хандығы, Райым бекінісі, Қожанияз бекінісі, Қазалы бекінісі, Жанқожа Нұрмұхамедұлы, Әзберген Мұнайтпасұлы, В.А. Перовский.

В. Енсепов, С. Токболат, В. Джурсинбаев

Восстание сырдарьинских казахов под предводительством Жанхожи Нурмухамедулы против экспансии Российской империи

В статье рассмотрено восстание казахов Сырского региона под руководством Жанхожи Нурмухамедулы в 1950-е годы против захватнической политики императорской России. Раскрылась политика местных чиновников царского правительства в то время и их крайнее самодурство. Выяснилось, что строительство прибрежных крепостей и фортов по Сыру контролировало пастбища и зимовья малочисленных родов сотни. Кроме того, архивные документы показали, что вместо крепости Кожанияз, разрушенной под воздействием Оренбургской пограничной комиссии, возник небольшой форт Казалы. Все объяснялось тем, что это привело к восстанию маргинальных племен нижнего течения Сыра. При этом состав и ход восстания были показаны с использованием новых архивных данных. Подробно описано снабжение русско-казачьих войск современным оружием, боеприпасами и техническими средствами для подавления восстания. В результате авторы настоящей статьи приходят к выводу, что хронологически освободительное восстание народа Сыра под предводительством Жанхожи Нурмухамедулы длилось с 1856 по 1862 годы, не ограничиваясь 1856–1857 годами, на которые ранее указывала историография.

Ключевые слова: Российская империя, Хивинское ханство, крепость Раим, Кожанияз, форт Казалы, Жанхожа Нурмухамедулы, Азберген Мунайтпасулы, В.А. Перовский.

References

- 1 Shoiynbaev, T. (1973). Progressivnoe znachenie prisoedineniia Kazakhstana k Rossii [Progressive significance of Kazakhstan's accession to Russia]. Almaty [in Russian].
- 2 Khalfin, N.A. (1974). Rossiia i khanstva Srednei Azii [Russia and Khanate of Central Asia]. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 3 Suleimenov, B.S., & Basin, V.P. (1981). Kazakhstan v sostave Rossii v XVIII–nachale XX veka [Kazakhstan as part of Russia in XVIII — beginning of XX century]. Almaty: Nauka [in Russian].
- 4 Mashimbaev, S.M. (1994). Patshalyq Reseidin otarlyq saiasaty [Colonial policy of Tsarist Russia]. Almaty: Sanat [in Kazakh].
- 5 Esmagambetov, K. (1994). Qazaqtar shetel adebietinde [Kazakhs in foreign literature]. Almaty: Atamura [in Kazakh].
- 6 GA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 382. — Op. 1. — D. 4. — L. 14 [in Russian].
- 7 Meier, L. (1865). Kirgizskaia step Orenburgskogo vedomstva [Kyrgyz steppe of the Orenburg department]. Saint Petersburg [in Russian].
- 8 Abdualiev, A.A. (2006). K probleme kharakteristiki politicheskoi deiatelnosti Zhankhozhi Nurmukammedova na primere kazakhsko-khivinskikh vzaimootnoshenii [To the problem of characteristics of political activity Zhanhozhi Nurmukammedova on the example of Kazakh-Khivin relations]. *Vestnik Kazakhskogo natsionalnogo universiteta. Seriya istoricheskaya — Bulletin of the Kazakh National University. Series historical*, 1, 136–138 [in Russian].
- 9 TsGA Respubliki Uzbekistan [Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan]. — F. 715. — Op. 1. — D. 19. — L. 232–233 [in Russian].
- 10 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 382. — Op. 1. — D. 5. — L. 57 [in Russian].
- 11 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 382. — D. 1. — Op. 47. — L. 125–126 [in Russian].
- 12 TsGA RU [Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan]. — F. 715. — Op. 1. — D. 17. — L. 309 [in Russian].
- 13 Musabaev, N.T., & Musabaeva, A.N. (1998). Ortaimagan Qazany — Qasietti Qazaly [Kazan, the holy Kazaly]. Almaty: Atamura [in Kazakh].

- 14 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F.4. — Op.1. — D.1439. — L.37 [in Russian].
- 15 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F.382. — Op.1 — D.5. — L.60 [in Russian].
- 16 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 4. — Op. 1. — D. 1441. — L. 35–37 [in Russian].
- 17 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 4. — Op. 1. — D. 1441. — L. 39–40 [in Russian].
- 18 (2008). El qorgagan Er Zhakem [Er Jakem, who defended the country]. Almaty: Densaulyq [in Kazakh].
- 19 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 1. — Op. 382. — D. 17. — L. 6 [in Russian].
- 20 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 383. — Op.1. — D. 44. — L.6 [in Russian].
- 21 TsGA RU [Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan]. — F. 715. — Op. 1. — D. 21 [in Russian].
- 22 TsGA RU [Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan]. — F. 715. — Op. 1. — D. 23. — L. 121–122 [in Russian].
- 23 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 382. — Op. 1. — D. 17. — L. 39 [in Russian].
- 24 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F.382. — Op. 1. — D. 38. — L. 237 [in Russian].
- 25 Ospanov, A. (1992). Zhankozha batyr [Zhankoja batyr]. Almaty [in Kazakh].

Information about the authors

Yensepov Bauyrzhan — Candidate of historical sciences, associate professor, Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University named after S. Seifullin, Astana, Kazakhstan; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9266-7536>

Tokbolat Seiilkhan — Candidate of historical sciences, Taraz International innovative institute named after Sh. Murtaza, Taraz, Kazakhstan; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3987-2917>

Dzhursinbaev Bakytzhan — Candidate of historical sciences, Taraz Regional University named after Dulati, Taraz, Kazakhstan; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7476-4968>