

Scientific Herald of Uzhhorod University

Series "Physics"

Journal homepage: <https://physics.uz.ua/en>

Issue 56, 1979–1985

Received: 17.01.2024. Revised: 03.05.2024. Accepted: 16.06.2024



DOI: 10.54919/physics/56.2024.197hm9

Uprisings in Kazakhstan Against the Tsarist Government in 1916 and Soviet Policy in 1921-1922. Similarities and Differences (Based on the Materials of Akmola and Atbasar Districts)

Kuralay Seytkazina

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University
010008, 2 Satpayev Str., Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan

Gulden Tussupova

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University
010008, 2 Satpayev Str., Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan

Tlegen Sadykov

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University
010008, 2 Satpayev Str., Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan

Daulet Omarov

Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University
120014, 29A Aiteke bi Str., Kyzylorda, Republic of Kazakhstan

Sayat Nabiyeu*

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University
010008, 2 Satpayev Str., Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan

Abstract

Relevance. The study of Kazakhstan's national liberation movements in the early XX century, particularly the uprisings against tsarist rule in 1916 and Soviet rule in 1921-1922, is highly relevant for understanding the country's path to independence.

Purpose. The research aimed to examine the causes, conditions, and driving forces behind these uprisings in the Akmola and Atbasar districts, as well as identify similarities and differences between them.

Methodology. Materials from the archives of the Central State Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Regional Museum of the Akmola Region, the Regional Museum of the Kostanay Region, the museums of the cities of Astana, Zhezkazgan, Kyzylorda, Arkalyk were used, including information that was used for the first time during the writing of the article. The historical-systemic, historical-comparative, chronological and observational methods were used; as well as historical, historical-social, and other research methods.

Results. The study found that both uprisings were driven by oppressive policies, excessive taxation, and land seizures by the ruling powers. Local leaders emerged to organize resistance in both cases. The 1916 uprising was sparked by forced conscription, while the 1921-22 uprising responded to Soviet food requisition policies. Both were violently suppressed by authorities.

Suggested Citation:

Seytkazina K, Tussupova G, Sadykov T, Omarov D, Nabiyeu S. Uprisings in Kazakhstan Against the Tsarist Government in 1916 and Soviet Policy in 1921-1922. Similarities and Differences (Based on the Materials of Akmola and Atbasar Districts). *Sci Herald Uzhhorod Univ Ser Phys.* 2024;(56):1979-1985. DOI: 10.54919/physics/56.2024.197hm9

*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Conclusions. The researchers conclude that these uprisings were important links in Kazakhstan's centuries-long struggle for independence. They argue for a reassessment of these events and their leaders in Kazakhstan's national history.

Keywords: Kazakhstan history; Soviet Government; Tsarism; USSR.

Introduction

Everyone knows that studies of the history of independent Kazakhstan, the history of national liberation movements are especially relevant at the present time. The purpose of this research was to gain independence of the Kazakh people, to determine the place and role of major historical figures who led those movements in our civil and political history. Research devoted to determining the cause and effect of those movements is the call of the times when you need to decide on the history of past years. Therefore, in the national history, the events of 1916, which are considered one of the significant events in the struggle for the freedom of the nation in national history, occupy an important place in a comprehensive study of the history of the struggle of the Kazakh people.

In this case, the task of restoring historical truth, a new look at this great strength of our people, and an assessment of the liberation movements of those years places a great responsibility on the community of historians. The study of the internal relationship of the uprising against the tsarist government in 1916 in Kazakhstan, then the uprising against the Soviet government in 1921-22, which took place after a certain time, makes it possible to restore historical truth. Since the identification of similar features and characteristics of these events through the introduction of new information into scientific circulation requires a revision of the chronological framework of the uprisings that took place in the first quarter of the XX century, in particular, the uprisings of 1916 in Akmola and Atbasar districts according to the administrative-territorial status that belonged at that time to the Akmola region, which lasted until the first days of the reign of Soviet power, whose leaders, the thousands, could lead the people.

The issue of determining the nature of the uprisings of those years, their causes and driving force, assessing the historical significance of these events, their causes and driving force is relevant. At the same time, information was used from the first collection of documents and materials edited by B.S. Suleimenov "The Uprising of 1916 in Kazakhstan" [1], a collection of documents published in 1960 "The Uprising of 1916 in Central Asia and Kazakhstan" [2]. A significant part of the documents included in these collections were published for the first time in their time. In this collection you can find a lot of information on the topic of this article.

For the publication of the collection, the efforts of a large team of historians were involved, the book contains over 500 documents from the museums of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, as well as from the museum of Moscow. A lot of information about the region we are studying is found in these collections. Especially the telegrams of the leaders of the Atbasar and Akmola punitive armies very accurately describe the course of events of those years and the system of uprisings. In particular, one can cite information on the famous Karazhar battle on September 23, 1916 in the Atbasar district between the men of the Baganali volost and the punitive army [3].

Despite the fact that the pages of printed publications published a lot of information about the life of leaders and significant figures of the 1916 uprising, which were hushed up in Soviet times and memories of them, special scientific research in this direction was not carried out. Despite the fact that some articles mention the names of the heroes of the struggle of 1916 that took place in the Atbasar district – Khan of the Khanate Baganaly Khasen Sandybaev, Akhmet Ishan Ozaev, M. Zhanaydarov, S. Zhylyaydarov, Zh. Niyazbekov and others from Alash Orda, about their lives and nothing has been written about the struggle to this day, despite the fact that we are a sovereign, independent state. Despite the fact that in the works of A. Baizhan, Suleimenov [4] it is said about another well-known personality of the uprising – Keiki Kokembaev, there is no published information about the struggle of Keiki batyr in 1920-1922 in the Atbasar region.

The publication in 1997 of the collection of documents and materials "Severe 1916" in two volumes is considered a great achievement for expanding the documentary basis of the topic [5]. Also, useful information in the form of studies, collections, memoirs was used in the preparation of this article.

Materials and Methods

In the course of writing the article, materials from the archives of the Central State Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Regional Museum of the Akmola Region, the Regional Museum of the Kostanay Region, the museums of the cities of Astana, Zhezkazgan, Kyzylorda, Arkalyk were used, including information that was used for the first time during the writing of the article. Information about the socio-economic and political development of the region under study during the tsarist regime and during the reign of the soviets was used from such collections and magazines as:

The period we are considering is a topic that was in the center of attention of Western researchers as well. Since the 1980s, the interest of Western scientists in this issue has increased. The opinions of several Western researchers agreed that "Stalin's policy was specifically carried out in order to destroy the Kazakhs, Ukrainians and other nations as ethnic groups, as classes". Undoubtedly, the work of the British historian Robert Conquest, published in 1986 under the title *Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and Terror by Famine*, stands apart. R. Conquest says that "The famine in Kazakhstan was created artificially", in other words, it was repeated according to the method of 1921, it arose as a result of an ill-conceived policy of collectivization, under pure ideological pressure. It is also known that the consequence of this policy was a mass uprising of the people.

Similarly, in her book entitled "Collectivization in Kazakhstan", Martha Brill Olcott notes that "the greatest problem for the student of Soviet power is the correct understanding and correct explanation of the events of

1930". Most Western scholars conclude that "I.V. Stalin's policy of collectivization was deliberately carried out against Ukrainians and other national groups"

When writing the article, the historical-systemic, historical-comparative, chronological and observational methods were used; as well as historical, historical-social, and other research methods.

Results and Discussion

The sacred dream of our ancestors, which they could not achieve even through armed struggle, was Independence. If we analyze the historical path of the Kazakhs, full of struggle and suffering, we understand that it was hard for us to get freedom, which should belong to us from birth. One of the periods of national history that requires re-examination and research from a theoretical and methodological point of view is the struggle of the Kazakh people on the path to freedom. The time has come when the study of the uprisings of our people against colonial policy must be carried out in a new format. In particular, in our opinion, there are issues that need to be addressed in the first place. For example, in difficult times for our people, among the Bashkir people kindred to us in 1755, Abdolla Aliev for the first time rebelled against the colonial policy of the Russians, later his work was continued by Salavat Yulaev; Sheikh Mansur and Imam Shamil, who led the entire Dagestan people at the foot of the neighboring mountain Kaf; Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla and José Maria Morelos, who died during the liberation unrest from the Spanish conquistadors of Mexico, can also be called Benito Pablo Juárez, leader of the liberation movement; the famous Abd-al Qadir, who led the struggle of the Algerian people against the French oppression and other strong and inflexible personalities. Why, among such bright heroes of other nations, well known to the whole world, the names of those who led the Kazakh people should not be named?

Especially among them it is necessary to mention the name of Srym Datuly, who led the struggle against the Russian colonial policy, which dragged on for several centuries, and other of our heroes. The time has come when it is necessary to mention that Srym Datuly is the same famous person as the heroes of other nations mentioned above, whose contribution is no less valuable in the history of the people than the contribution of great men – leaders of other nations and peoples. The time when Srym led the Kazakhs during the liberation struggle as a true citizen of his people was at the time of the all-round flourishing of the power of the Russian kingdom and when Russia began to plot a policy of capturing neighboring peoples and there is no doubt that such a struggle over time, after centuries gaining momentum more and more, led to the acquisition of independence by our people.

The outbreak of the First World War in 1914, the involvement of Tsarist Russia in the war further increased the taxes imposed on the Russian colony. If, according to the regulation of March 25, 1891, the tax paid by nomadic Kazakhs was 4 rubles, then in October 1914 a decree was issued that a military tax of 4 rubles was imposed on nomadic Kazakhs who did not fulfill their military service. That is, now the amount of tax collected from each house has increased to 8 rubles. Some Kazakh families were unable to pay such a tax. As a result, the displacement of

Kazakh peasants from their native land, the destruction of their economy, and even more so the increase in taxes, caused the Kazakhs to become the driving force behind the 1916 uprising, and the Kazakhs outnumbered them.

If the number of conscripts according to the decree of June 25, 1916 on the conscription of Kazakhs for rear work of the front from the Atbasar district amounted to 5 thousand people aged 19 to 31 years, the total number of conscripts was registered in the amount of 11.870 people. In general, 98.274 Kazakhs lived in the county from 126 villages in 26 volosts. According to the list of people involved by the tsarist administration for rear work in the Akmola region, there were 47 volosts, 289 villages in the county, in which 211.280 people lived. That is, in comparison with the number of inhabitants of the Atbasar district, the population was one and a half times more. Of the number indicated in the census, 25.815 people were people of military age, of which 9.000 people were to be sent to rear work in the first place [7].

The Kazakhs, whose goal was to disobey the decree that came from above, now began to group along tribal lines, began to elect from among their khans and arm themselves. In particular, the people of the volosts belonging to the Argyn tribe began to prepare for an open battle and elect warriors. A large army was led by mullah Balkozha, bai Zhakal Myrzakozhin, Khasen Zhanibekov, and Ashygayuly Zhusip from the Babas tribe, he was over sixty. Having decided for themselves that men would not be allowed to perform military service and that it would be better to die in battle with the royal army, about 800 soldiers gathered at the foot of Zhylandy Mountain [8].

The armed attack of the rebels on the Russian workers of the Karsakbay, Zhezkazgan, Baikonyr enterprises began after July 20. According to the information of the head of the Atbasar district dated August 16, about 7 thousand rebels gathered 70 kilometers east of Ulytau [9]. The increase in the ranks of the rebels and their armament showed the tsarist administration that it was impossible to implement the decree peacefully, without bloodshed. He reported this in his telegram dated July 18, addressed to the Governor-General of the steppe region, the Minister of the Interior [10]. Now a punitive detachment was created under the leadership of Colonel Ivanov, the ataman of the punitive military unit. This detachment included 2 detachments of infantrymen and 1 cavalry detachment, there were also 2 machine guns. At the same time, 150 rifles and 20 boxes of ammunition were delivered to Omsk from Atbasar. The assistant commander of the military district, General Yagotkin, ordered the heads of the garrisons to provide the Cossacks with small arms in full to suppress the rebels [11].

The uprising of the Kazakhs of the adjacent Akmola district immediately quickly expanded into a nationwide one. Since the time of the beginning of the uprising fell on the period of the resettlement of the Kazakhs to letovki (zhailau), located near the rivers Nura, Esil, Kulanotpes, Zharly, Taldy, their struggle for liberation was closely connected with the uprising of the Kazakhs of the Atbasar district. The Kazakhs of the Akmola district also openly expressed their disagreement and disobedience with the royal decree of June 25 and began to arm themselves. It was impossible to find a single Kazakh who would fulfill the decree on his own initiative: all the men of 7 volosts of

the Tama tribe, 4 volosts of the Kypshak tribe, 5 volosts of the Tinali tribe, 11 volosts of the Akimbay tribe, 4 volosts of the Temesh tribe, 5 volosts of the Kerek tribe, 2 volosts of the tribe kanzhygals, who could stay in the saddle, firmly decided to die during the battles on their native land. S.S. Seifullin, who saw the expression on the faces of people who went out to fight, described the course of events in the novel "Tar Zhol, Taigak Keshu": "We will not have a better dream than to die in the fight against the Russian Tsar, who took away our land, water, and now it has reached us. The entire population prepared for battle by jumping on their horses. The men began to come out in groups, unsheathing their battle axes and spears. But be that as it may, they did not have powerful support".

Tax collectors, in whose hands were the highest powers, went out to the people and, along with the use of weapons in the performance of their duties, committed various self-willed and undisciplined actions. In the information about the political situation of the county in January, February 1921, that the tactless attitude of tax collectors with the local population, the inability to establish constructive interaction with people and their rude treatment of the people caused acts of protest and unrest in the county [12]. The continuation of the policy of superiority in the Kazakh villages during the time of the tsarist government, usurpation, violence and outrages further outraged and drove the people to despair. The people became convinced that the Bolshevik motto "equality, freedom, justice" was just empty words. Thus, the violence of tax collectors and policemen contributed to the expression of resistance to the government's food policy.

Most of the participants in the uprising are the poor, who have lost their last as a result of the delivery of taxes. At a meeting of the bureau of the Akmola province, held at the end of April 1921, it was clearly stated that "Most of the participants in the uprising are poor Kazakhs, they suffer from hunger and receive help not from the Soviet government, but, on the contrary, from kulaks" [13]. Despite the fact that at the meetings of the bureau of the Akmola province and urgent messages from the regional military emergency commissariat sent to Moscow, it was openly reported that most of the participants in the uprising were hungry poor Kazakhs and that they, uniting among themselves, supported the bandits on the ground, the agenda was the question of "combating banditry" was raised and ways of combating banditry were considered.

The northern and southeastern coasts of the Atbasar uyezd, which rebelled against Soviet power, reunited with the counter-revolutionary forces grouped on the land of the Akmola uyezd. This was largely facilitated by the conduct of agitation and propaganda activities by counterrevolutionary organizations among the Kazakhs. On June 14, 1921, the political bureau at the Akmola district militia in a telegram addressed to the police chiefs of all districts reported that bandits had appeared in the district, that counter-revolutionary propaganda work was being carried out and that they had created a single organization and the issue of combating them was outlined.

Defeated by the Red Army and the fleeing forces of the Kazakh-Russian army, moving randomly, mixed with the popular movement of the Akmola district. In some places, the Kazakhs began to join the small troops led by Kolchak's

officers and participated in battles with the Red Army. Kazakh villages suffered a lot of damage and suffering from gangs consisting of Kazakhs and Russians. The property of defenseless villages was taken by warriors wandering through the steppe for their livelihood. After the main part of the counter-revolutionary forces in Akmola was defeated, a punitive army was created, consisting of 90 people, who began to destroy small detachments of Kazakh rebels. In the battle with the Kazakhs of the Esiktai and Bugyly volosts, about 70 Kazakhs died, the rest were forced to flee. Also, when the punitive forces bypassed the volosts of Kandymai, Sarytobe, Saryshyn "... for unknown reasons, 32 Kazakhs were shot" [14]. The main method of suppressing the rebels, used in 1916, was reused – bloodshed applied to the people. Thus, the armed army, which went out to the people to catch the "gangs", took the lives of many innocent people. After the open extermination of those who rebelled against the food policy, the Red Army kept the rest in armed chains, not giving anyone freedom of action and will.

On August 30, 1920, at an emergency meeting of senior officials of the revolutionary committee in Atbasar, the issue was discussed that "the counter-revolutionary forces turned the Argyn region and Ulytau into their headquarters and that they, having organized the people, resisted the army led by Vokhr" and a decision was made to increase the indicated districts of the militia state [15]. The colonial domination of tsarist Russia, which contributed to the uprising of the people, and the same situation that took place during the reign of the Soviet power – the so-called common succession of power caused the protest of the people. An outstanding figure of the Kazakh people S. Sadvakasov wrote "The legacy left after the autocracy on this Kazakh land is what the Kazakhs consider the representatives of the authorities to be their enemies" – this was an opinion that arose on the basis of understanding the attitude of the local people towards the Bolsheviks [14; 16]. The food policy of the Soviet government was a serious blow that contributed to the destruction of the already dilapidated economy of the Kazakh villages, which were attacked for a certain time. Party employees who started to implement the planned food plan took away the last from the people, it was similar to the situation of oppression of Kazakh villages from fees and taxes during the First World War. The government did not take into account the fact that one of the reasons for the uprising was that the tax policy of 1916 exceeded all limits.

The Cossack and Russian peasants, who were again granted privileges and assistance during the Soviet era, as in the days of the tsarist rule, still could not give up their views, formed during the 1916 uprising. There were also inter-ethnic strife between local party members. It is known that such a national question, aggravated since the time of tsarist Russia, was solved by the Soviet authorities from the point of view of great Russian politics. Opposition to colonial policy always ended in defeat. The obstruction of the people to the rule of the Bolsheviks and their food policy was also mercilessly suppressed by armed method. Thus, at the head of the rebels in 1916 in Atbasar and in 1922 in Akmola districts were well-known personalities who enjoyed the trust of the people, who, in the name of future generations, in the name and interests of the people, became fighters for justice.

Every representative of the nation felt it with all his heart. The authoritative leaders of the Kazakhs, who did not participate in the coups for power in the center of the metropolis and took advantage of the weakening of the colonial apparatus, became wary and closely followed what was happening. Khan's power was able to become the protector of the people. However, after a short time, the Bolsheviks, who firmly seized power, immediately made it clear that they would not lose influence on the colonial peoples of Russia. The similarity of the policy pursued significantly pushed back the dream of the Kazakh nation of freedom, on the contrary, signs of colonial oppression became visible. This was a logical continuation of the uprisings that had taken place more than once before that time in our national history.

It is known that the nomadic people on the endless steppe recognized only one form of power – the khan's power, which existed for centuries in history. In the concept of the people, the khan's power was akin to statehood, a kind of symbol of independence, and this type of government has always been in the memory of the people, has never faded away and has always manifested itself as the only correct form of government, reborn again and again in different historical epochs. This is proved by the fact that in the 20-30s of the twentieth century, in every corner of Kazakhstan, a khan was elected from among the insurgent people.

In particular, as proof of the above, one can cite as an example the fact that in 1921-22, soldiers led by Keiki Kokembayuly, who were in the territory of Torgai and Atbasar districts, elected a descendant of Babyr as the khan of Kulseit, and in 1929-31 in the western region, Alniyazov was elected by the rebels Tobaniyaz, nicknamed "Khan of Adai", the election of Baiymbetov Zhumagazy as Khan of Karakum by the rebels of Karakum, the appointment of Zhubanov Kopzhan as Khan after his capture, one can also name Sultanbek Sholakov, who was elected Khan during the Sozak uprising, etc. In this regard, the views of politically literate, thoroughly representatives of the Kazakh intelligence who know and have studied the essence of the matter.

It is also necessary to distinguish between the concepts of "power of the Bolsheviks" and "Russian power", which existed at that time in the concept of the people. The conclusion that can be drawn in this regard is that the Soviet authorities showed distrust of the glorious warriors-heroes of the 1916 uprising and purposefully began to detain them. Representatives of the new government realized that the people recognize the khan's power and can unite under its leadership. From the first years of Soviet rule, the leaders of the 1916 uprising were expelled before the arrest of representatives of the Kazakh intelligence. At the beginning of 1920, Khan of the Argyn Khanate O. Sholakov and K. Altynsarin were convicted and sent first to Semipalatinsk, and then exiled to Siberia, accused as "...acting against the government". The Khan of the Bagan Khanate Kasen Kaskabayuly in 1928 was among those big bays whose property, including cattle, were confiscated and was exiled outside of Kazakhstan for three years. His descendants only after gaining independence were able to return to their historical homeland from Uzbekistan. Khan of the Kipchak Khanate A. Zhanbosynov suffered the same fate. This is because the

events of 1916 showed that the men of the people, revered and enjoying authority at any moment, could unite and lead the people.

Conclusions

Summarizing the foregoing, it should be noted that the history of the liberation movements of our people, which has not abated for a moment and stretched for several centuries in a row, is an important link in our national history.

Firstly, the attitude of the common people towards the new government, which expressed the protest of the Soviet government without the participation and leadership of the national intelligentsia and the process of perception of Soviet power, at the same time, the type of resistance provided (slaughtering livestock, moving to another area, setting fire to warehouses, etc.). Therefore, exploring the protest of the common people, it is necessary to investigate the attitude of the Kazakh people "What did the Soviet government give us?". The information confirms the fact that after the issuance of the June 1916 tsarist decree, a common opinion formed among those who rebelled against the decree: "Why should we give the tsar people to do physical work? for what his merits and for what his good deeds?" As a result, the people proved by word and deed that they did not want to obey and execute the Decree. In history there was such a choice of the people.

Secondly, the relationship between the popular movement, which completely embraced the territory of the national republic, which put on the yoke of Soviet power, and representatives of the Kazakh intelligentsia. Including the positions of the Alashorda people who went over to the side of the Bolsheviks after the forgiveness announced by them, the assessment of the common people given to the Soviet government. There is no doubt that the representatives of the intelligence did not remain indifferent, seeing how their native people again fell to the mercy. From the following studies, it became known that the authorities used a number of activists of that time, led by A. Zhangeldin, S. Seifullin, G. Musrepov, who were in power at that time, to negotiate with the rebels in order to suppress the uprising in Karakum

Thirdly, when the question of the national liberation movement of the Kazakh people is raised, the struggle of our compatriots who migrated to China, Mongolia, Afghanistan, and India is silent. It is necessary to determine the general patterns associated with the people's struggle in their native land.

Fourthly, it is known that in the 5 volumes, which is considered the guiding star of the history of Kazakhstan, the Kazakh uprisings are described, the descriptions of which end with the explanation "historical significance". At the same time, such issues as evaluating the uprisings by the people, praising and exalting the heroism of leaders, participants in the uprisings, propaganda, and even revival require additional research. Since it is known that in the memory of the people such great events and leaders were not forgotten, but became a method of propaganda, which gave impetus to further struggle.

Fifthly, such methods as the implementation of a repressive policy by the colonial administration after popular uprisings and struggles, the persecution of the activists of the uprisings themselves and their families,

their relatives and relatives, the offer of money in exchange for the capture of activists of liberation movements should be fully described when laying down history uprisings of those years. The offer of money for the capture of the leaders of the nation is a trick used in the practice of the developed countries of the world to this day. Sixthly, it is desirable to translate studies, memoirs and collections of documents on the liberation struggle of the Kazakh people into other languages. Because it is indisputable that other peoples of the world will understand that the Kazakhs were also in the same situation as they were, and will be able to understand at what level the nature of the uprising against the colonial policy of the Russian people and its features were. If the above questions are not resolved, they will always appear in the course of research by scientists and

will have a negative impact on the assessment of the people's struggle in the search for the causes of national liberation uprisings. At the same time, the study of this issue in Latin America, Africa, and the countries of Southeast Asia should not be left without attention.

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

- [1] Orazhev FM. *Tsarist colonization in Kazakhstan. According to the materials of the Russian periodical press of the 19th century*. Almaty: Rauan; 1995.
- [2] Aldabergenov KM. *Directions and results of the colonial policy of Russia in Kazakhstan (Based on the materials of 1860-1918)*. Almaty: Rauan; 2000.
- [3] Dulatova DI. *Historiography of pre-revolutionary Kazakhstan*. Almaty: Nauka; 1984.
- [4] *Stories, poems and epics*. Almaty: Rauan; 1996.
- [5] *Harsh 1916*. Almaty: Rauan; 1998.
- [6] A new look at the reality of famine; 2013. <https://e-history.kz/kz/contents/view/925>.
- [7] Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 811 Fund, Series 1-80, File 15 (Monument to I. V. Deev).
- [8] Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 811 fund, t6, case 233, 27b. (Monument to S. Iskakov).
- [9] CR Regional State Administration, Fund 427, Series 9, File 53 (Protocols of the Atbasar district party committee).
- [10] The Fund of rare manuscripts of the Central scientific library, 1019 volumes, 1013 volumes (Materials of the expedition dedicated to the 20th anniversary of the uprising of 1916 under the leadership of academician A.H. Margulan, writer S. Sharipov 1916).
- [11] *Uprising of 1916 in Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Documents and materials*. Moscow: Nauka; 1960.
- [12] Amirkyzy K. *My village is my homeland*. Akmol: Atamura; 1993.
- [13] Aldajumanov K. *Peasant resistance movement*. Almaty: Arys-Kazakhstan; 1998.
- [14] *Kazakhstan at the beginning of the twentieth century: methodology, historiography, source reference*. Almaty: Arys-Kazakhstan; 1994.
- [15] Bekmaganbetov OZh. *Khanate of Baganaly Khandygy (article). Questions of the history of Kazakhstan. Research of young scientists*. Almaty: Arys-Kazakhstan; 2000.
- [16] United States Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services. *Economic life of the Kyrgyz region*; 1921. <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6a60910.html>.

Повстання у Казахстані проти царського уряду в 1916 році та радянська політика в 1921-1922 роках. Подібності та відмінності (на матеріалах Акмолинської та Атбасарської областей)

Куралай Сеітказіна

Євразійський національний університет імені Гумільова
010008, вулиця Сатпаєва, 2, м. Астана, Республіка Казахстан

Гульден Тусупова

Євразійський національний університет імені Гумільова
010008, вулиця Сатпаєва, 2, м. Астана, Республіка Казахстан

Тлеген Садиков

Євразійський національний університет імені Гумільова
010008, вулиця Сатпаєва, 2, м. Астана, Республіка Казахстан

Даулет Омаров

Кизилординський університет імені Коркит Ата
120014, вулиця Айтеке бі, 29А, м. Кизилорда, Республіка Казахстан

Саят Набієв

Євразійський національний університет імені Гумільова
010008, вулиця Сатпаєва, 2, м. Астана, Республіка Казахстан

Анотація

Актуальність. Вивчення національно-визвольних рухів Казахстану на початку ХХ століття, зокрема, повстань проти царської влади у 1916 році та радянської влади у 1921-1922 роках, є надзвичайно актуальним для розуміння шляху країни до незалежності.

Мета. Дослідження мало на меті вивчити причини, умови та рушійні сили цих повстань в Акмолинському та Атбасарському районах, а також виявити схожість та відмінності між ними.

Методологія. Використано матеріали з архівів Центрального державного музею Республіки Казахстан, Міністерства внутрішніх справ Республіки Казахстан, Обласного музею Акмолинської області, Обласного музею Костанайської області, музеїв міст Астана, Жезказган, Кизилорда, Аркалик, в тому числі інформація, яка була використана вперше під час написання статті. Використано історико-системний, історико-порівняльний, хронологічний, метод спостереження, а також історичний, історико-соціальний та інші методи дослідження.

Результати. Дослідження показало, що обидва повстання були спричинені репресивною політикою, надмірним оподаткуванням та захопленням земель правлячою владою. В обох випадках з'явилися місцеві лідери, які організували опір. Повстання 1916 року було викликане примусовим призовом до армії, а повстання 1921-22 років стало відповіддю на радянську політику реквізиції продовольства. Обидва були жорстоко придушені владою.

Висновки. Дослідники роблять висновок, що ці повстання були важливими ланками в багатовіковій боротьбі Казахстану за незалежність. Вони закликають до переоцінки цих подій та їхніх лідерів у національній історії Казахстану.

Ключові слова: історія Казахстану; радянська влада; царизм; СРСР.