

SRSTI 03.23.07

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62724/202420103>

Kurmanalin Samat Bakytzhanuly*1,

Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor, “West Kazakhstan Innovation and Technology University” ZhKBM, Republic of Kazakhstan, 090006, Ural, N. Nazarbayev Avenue, 194, samatbk71@mail.ru, ORCID ID 0000-0001-7670-9495

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE LIBERATION MOVEMENT OF THE KAZAKH PEOPLE LED BY KENESARY KHAN

Abstract. Despite the rich history of the protest movement of the masses against the tsarist government in Kazakhstan in the XVIII-XIX centuries, it is known that there was political pressure to study the liberation struggle led by Kenesary Kasymuly. Kenesary Khan was first published in scientific publications in the late 40s-early 50s of the last century in the difficult socio-political conditions prevailing in the republic at that time. This is why the title of this article attracts historians with its scientific relevance and the need for research.

The purpose of the article is to write the level of research of the movement. The task is to conduct a historiographical analysis of the works published during the development of historical science in the conditions of the tsarist period, the Soviets and independence.

The work examines the works of A. F. Ryazanov, who devoted his research to the whole era of the national liberation movements of the Kazakh people as a whole. Some controversial issues are revealed in the manuscript of the historian, who was one of the first to begin studying the resistance movements. Moreover, the pinnacle of the study of this national movement is the monograph of the famous historian, Doctor of historical Sciences of Kazakh origin Ermukhan Bekmakhanov "Kazakhstan in the 20-40s of the XIX century". The publication gives priority to the historiographical analysis of this fundamental work. Scientific analysis is associated with the formation of prerequisites for the political processes that brought to life the notorious "Bekmakhanov case" of that period. The scientific response to the uprising under Kenesary's leadership has resumed since the 1990s. In accordance with this, the research of historians J. Kasymbayev and E. Ualikhanov became an important contribution to the historiography of the movement.

The historiography of the national liberation movement of the Kazakh people led by Kenesary Khan deserves dedication in a series of articles. And this publication can be perceived as a precursor to our upcoming scientific publications.

Key words. Historiography, Kenesary, scientific approach, liberation movement, colonialism, analysis.

Introduction. Kenesary's personality and the path he traveled remained in people's memory as a symbol of independent Kazakh statehood. Both ideologists and researchers of the metropolis understood well that only by approaching the problem from this point of view, one can see the true image of colonization of the great plain, which lasted for two and a half centuries. Therefore, both during the tsarist period and the Soviet period, this liberation movement was given a one-sided assessment. In all publications of the imperial-colonial era, the popular masses were explained as a "rebellion". And the personality of Kenesary and his closest associates differed depending on the author's point of view. This is evidenced by the articles of military historians on the pages of the "Military Collection", devoted to these issues during the tsarist government.

In the first decades of formation of the historical science of Soviet Kazakhstan, a realistic approach to the history of the movement was characteristic. This was probably influenced by the attitude of the Alash generation to national history. Scientific works of Alash scholars such as H. Dosmukhamedov, M. Tynyshbaev, S. Asfendiyarov, t. Shonanovich, literary and spiritual works of M. Auezov, poetic heritage of M. Zhumabayev gave orientation to the development of nationally comprehensible concept of Kazakh history, formed in the depths of the Bolshevik-class system, including to the movement of Kenesary Khan.

In the 40s - early 50s of the XX century, social sciences developed under the strict control of party committees in a difficult situation when the ideology of socialism reached its heyday. In these conditions, studies of the national liberation uprising of 1837-1847 led by Kenesary Kasymov and the role of Kenesary Khan in history vividly reflected the ideological essence of the totalitarian regime that had developed in Kazakhstan. Supporters of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist science used the party-state leadership approach to governance. Among those who spoke out against those who perceived K. Kasymov uprising as a national liberation event, Kazakhstani historians prevailed, and the approach to the uprising was fundamentally negative. In general, the uprising was recognized as feudal-monarchical, and the author of the study, the talented historian E. B. Bekmakhanov was accused of nationalism and exiled.

The scientific approach to the uprising resumed again in the 1990s. Scientists called for creating a multilateral objective picture of the liberation struggle of the masses and eradicating the stereotypes of old beliefs existing in the public consciousness, as well as searching for new methodological approaches both to the objects of research and to the problems of its historiography and source study.

Results and their discussion. The national liberation movement of the Kazakh people in 1837-1947 under the leadership of Kenesary Khan is considered at different levels in the Russian noble-bourgeois historiography depending on the socio-political views of authors of different directions. From the point of view of that period, Shokan Chingisuly Ualikhanov, an officer of the Russian army, a major scholar of our people, a branch of the Abylai family, openly expressed his opinion about Kenesary's rebellion in the press.

The unworthy unambiguous assessment "feudal-monarchist, reactionary" that dated this uprising in a special resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, adopted in connection with an article that seriously affected the future of the study of the history of Kazakhstan, published in the newspaper "Pravda" on April 10, 1951, is closest to the conclusion in Shokan's writings in connection with the uprising. Shokan summarizes this rebellion by distorting the truth; "the rebellious Sultan Kenesary - joined the feudal-monarchical movement, tried to restore the power of the khanate, wanted to create a Kazakh khanate similar to the Central Asian feudal state" [1, p.379]. In the explanation of the second work there are places where the great Kazakh traveler praises Kenesary, saying that "in this period the old and the new came in contact with each other, the Muslim East and Russian phenomena" [1, p.389]. It should also be noted that the generally one-sided assessment given by Sh. Valikhanov served as a significant source for later Russian historians.

Among the works published in the second half of the XIX century, we should highlight the works of M. Krasovsky [2] and I. Zavalishin [3], who specifically studied the Kenesar uprising. Especially interesting is the analysis of M. Krasovsky, linking the uprising with the foreign policy pursued by the tsarist government. Although M. Krasovsky's study was devoted to the history of the "Siberian-Kyrgyz region" as a whole, he gave an explanation of the uprising, which began as a result of the tsarist statute of 1822, was explained in the direction of justifying the conquest policy of the tsarist government. The description in I. Zavalishin's book is written in terms of glorifying the empire's policy of conquering peripheral areas and expanding its territory. Both of these works have the same orientation and the same form in

terms of propaganda of colonial policy. Among the works published in the second half of the XIX century, stands out a valuable study by N. Sereda [4], published in 1870 in two issues of the journal "Herald of Europe". This work is unique in terms of abundant use of various data, territoriality of the problems considered, according to which it has great scientific value. The author's assessment of Kenesary and the definition of the nature of the rebellion contained a contradiction from the author's point of view. The people's uprising is written as "rebellion", "the cause of bandits", the khan himself is compared to "whirlwind and storm", and sometimes to the great commanders of European armies. The content of the work can be referred to the academic direction, because the material collected by N. Sereda gives information about the history of the Kazakh people, as well as about Kazakh heroes who organized rebellions against the colonization of the Kazakh steppe. This is of great importance, as documentary material based on objective reality and systematic review of the historical period of the 30-40s of the XIX century constitute the main value of the book. Such facts do not indicate the author's support of the royal power or Kenesary, only historical facts are systematically reported.

Although the works of military historian V. Potto, colonel of the Russian army, researcher M. Venyukov are devoted to other issues, they can give interesting information about the rebellion, for example, personal data related to the siege of the rebels' Catherine village can be found in the Central State Archive of Kazakhstan and V. Potto's journal "Military Herald" for 1873. It is presented in full only in the work "On the steppe campaigns", published as No. 1-4. It is not difficult to notice that A. Yanushkevich, who participated in the expedition of General Vishnevsky, who in 1846 kept records of the number of livestock and population in the border zone of the Great Zhuz and Middle Zhuz, himself participated in the Polish liberation movement in 1831-1833, addressed the leader of the uprising. And the article by F. Steklova, who translated this work from French into Russian (much work on translation into Kazakh language was done by publicist M. Sarsekeev) about Kenesary and the uprising led by him, is written from the point of view of tyranny of individual ideology of the Communist Party, and this is opposite to the opinion of Yanushkevich. The Polish revolutionary compares the Kazakh khan with the Numidian king Yugurta, who fought with the Roman Empire, and Abd-al-Kader, the leader of the liberation struggle of the Algerian people in the 80s of the XIX century [5].

The great traveler P. Semenov Tien-Shan, who visited the city of Verny in the 50s of the XIX century, collected various information about this rebellion and compared Kenesary with Mithridates VI Eupator, the ruler of a small Pontic king in Asia Minor in the II century BC, an opponent of the hostile policy of the Roman slave state, praises Kenesary Khan, who restored the Kazakh feudal state, albeit temporarily [6, p.48].

The work of Kenesary Khan's son Akhmet Kenesarin "Sultans Kenesary and Sadyk" cannot be considered as a deep, specialized study. Due to the fact that this work is written from the point of view of memory, many information about the uprising was overlooked. Initially, the writing of Kenesary's Rebellion was assigned to Sultan Sadık, who had reached a certain age by that time. However, due to the fact that the pen of the famous Sultan Sadık was "insignificant", he entrusted the job to his younger brother Ahmet. In 1887, the manuscript was handed over to N.I. Grodekov, governor of the Syrdarya region and chairman of the statistical committee. The manuscript, translated from Kazakh into Russian, was edited by Prof. E. T. Grodekov. T. Smirnov and soon published in Tashkent [7]. Professor Smirnov sent a copy of the book to General Chernyaev, who lived in St. Petersburg at that time, who fiercely fought with Sadyk Sultan, mercilessly stormed the cities of Auliyata, Shymkent and Turkestan and was famous for his sharpness and cruelty. August 2, 1889 General Chernyaev in a letter to Professor Smirnov expressed his opinion on this book. And published a critical article in the journal "Russian Bulletin", which indicates the cold perception of the book out of print.

Under the Soviet government, the uprising of Kenesary Kasymov was mainly studied on the basis of Bolshevik ideology, class struggle, and social principle, in connection with which mono-communist orientation dominated the discussion and in-depth study of the issues of the liberation struggle of the people. Despite this, a number of publications published the works of A. F. Ryazanov among scientists who did not hide their opposing views on the communist ideology that dominated the official science [8]. The famous historian Yermukhan Bekmakhanov, in turn, noted that "the manuscript of A. F. Ryazanov is the most voluminous work and the only monograph in this field. Due to the death of the author, the manuscript was not published" [9, p. 22]. In this work of A. Ryazanov has serious shortcomings.

The chronological study covers the period from the end of 1838, when the eastern districts of the Orenburg region became the center of the liberation movement. Therefore, the initial stage of Kenesary's movement, which unfolded in the middle zhuz, was not included in the work. As a result, a particularly important question about the reasons for the origin of the movement and the state of unification of the Kazakhs of the middle and younger zhuzes for a joint struggle against the tsarist colonizers was not determined. A. Ryazanov limited himself to the course of the uprising of the Kazakhs of the Orenburg department and did not give the history of the participation of the Kazakhs of the middle zhuz in the uprising. The reason: A. Ryazanov wrote his work only on the basis of archival data of the Orenburg Frontier Commission.

In his famous monograph E. Bekmakhanov, who wrote a great work on Kenesarology, analyzes the study of this movement. Accordingly, he points out a number of fundamental errors in the work of A. Ryazanov. First of all, A. Ryazanov negatively explains the cause of the national liberation movement. First of all, A. Ryazanov negatively explains the cause of the national liberation movement. He generalizes the history of colonial policy of the tsarist authorities and, without determining the socio-economic roots of the discontent of the Kazakhs, looks for the origins and causes of the movement in the natural conditions of certain regions and psychological features of the Kazakhs. At the beginning of Kenesary's rebellion, the Kazakhs were subjected to a land crisis. It is clear how important this problem is in determining the true causes of Kenesary's revolt. A. Ryazanov did not understand the origin of the land crisis. The scientist looks for the cause of it in the drying up of rivers, drying up of lakes, formation of deserts, i.e. he refers to the changes occurring over millennia. The author has a negative understanding of the course of individual military operations, he always portrays Kenesary as a man who fought for his personal interests. A. Ryazanov misunderstood the role of Kenesary. He exaggerates the importance of Kenesary's personal interests in the development of the struggle. He describes the masses as a puppet, obeying his orders.

A. F. Ryazanov devotes much space to the description of military expeditions and campaigns organized by the tsarist government. Among them, the description of the military campaign of Dunikovsky and Zhemchuzhnikov in 1843-1844 and Dolgov's embassy took about one third of the monograph. The author failed to show Kenesary's tactics. He underestimated the variety of Kenesary's tactics, so he did not know why all punitive expeditions returned uncompleted. This study is limited to reporting on events up to 1845. Further history of the rebellion, which took place in the territory of the Great Juz under the leadership of the border chief of the Siberian Kazakhs, is not stated. Therefore, the reasons for the defeat of the uprising are not named.

Despite the shortcomings, the work of A. F. Ryazanov deserves special attention, where for the first time the history of the Russian military campaign against Kenesary is written in detail and the department's intelligence in Kazakhstan is studied in detail. Of particular value is the first introduction by A. F. Ryazanov into the scientific turnover of many archival materials not previously used by researchers.

A milestone in the description of Kenesary's movement is the "History of the Kazakh SSR" edited by A. Pankratova and M. Abdikalykov, published in 1943. On the basis of the main problems of the uprising, on the basis of detailed and consistent data, the assessment of the uprising in this publication was summarized by meaningful conclusions [10].

A significant event in the study of the uprising of 1837-1847 is the famous work of the prominent historian E. Bekmakhanov, published in 1947. [9]. This monograph was a particularly valuable work in the region of Central Asia and Kazakhstan in those years, as evidenced by the modern development of historical science. Most of the book, describing the socio-economic life of Kazakhstan in the first half of the XIX century, is devoted to the liberation movement under the leadership of Kenesary Kasymov. It reveals the driving forces of the uprising, its overthrow in the middle zhuz, Kenesary's measures to strengthen Kazakh statehood, the struggle against Kokan, his attempts to involve the Kyrgyz in this struggle, as well as the death of Kenesary and his relatives at the hands of Kyrgyz rulers. In conclusion, the author summarized the events of the 20-40s of the XIX century in Kazakhstan and determined their impact on the future fate of the Kazakh people in Central Asia as a whole.

E. Bekmakhanov was a descendant of Abylai Khan, who in Soviet times showed a new example of writing the history of the national liberation uprising. From Uali Khan's son Tauke came Zhanpeis, from him - Zhanbobek, from him - Begen, from him - Bekmakhan, from him - Yermukhan. Although the researcher evaluated Kenesary Khan's campaign to Kirghizia as a mistake on the part of the Khan, the beginning of the question still remains open: "Kenesary's affairs in Kirghizia are so little studied that it is difficult to fully restore the course of events". The scientist pointed out the inferiority of his work: "the worst part of my work in relation to the Kirghiz is that I could not define clearly enough the relations of the Kazakhs of the Great Juz with the Kirghiz". The use of the manuscript of the work of the Kyrgyz historian Belek Soltonoev, who was arrested in 1937 as an enemy of the people and shot in 1938, despite the ban and fearlessness, positively assessed the outstanding courage of the Kazakh historian and the merits of the Kyrgyz historian, and emphasized his commitment to science, which was passed on to later researchers.

As is known, this work, written on the basis of archival data and documents of various nature, shook the scientific community. However, even before the book went out of print, a part of scholars found this work and strongly opposed it. Of course, the author of the book specifically emphasizes that even in this valuable book it is impossible to fully describe all aspects of Kenesary's rebellion. "In the absence of other works and monographs on which we will be guided and relied upon, the work of studying materials such as those we are discussing causes many difficulties, so the author fully recognizes that some of the principles he puts forward are still a pressing problem that requires further deeper analysis. For the same reasons, not all chapters of this work can fully set forth the problems they touch upon" [9, p.5-6].

However, the criticism of the book was aimed not at the content of the work, but at breaking the mind of a talented scholar. A. F. Yakunin and H. Aidarova, among the authors who especially attacked this book, did not want to deviate from their unique directions. And in 1946, in one of the articles published by H. Aidarova in the academic press, E. Bekmakhanov's article on this uprising was evaluated as "an uprising with extensive use of archival data and wide participation of the masses" [11, p. 12].

It should be noted that in the first critical article published in the book written by Bekmakhanov in 1948, historian E. Dilmukhamedov drew attention to a number of shortcomings of the study and concluded that it is basically a very valuable book. Also, historian K. Sharipov emphasized that the uprising of 1837-1847 was studied by E. Bekmakhanov as a whole. For this reason, he fell into the trap of "critics". The discussion in the Academy of

Sciences in 1948 showed that the split had deepened. One problem should be emphasized here: a party, its information agency, always favors the side it supports.

"E. Bekmakhanov, unfortunately, did not achieve his goal. The book is adamant in its content, does not meet the political requirements, there is a deviation in the idea, hence a useless work", - the words of H. Aidarova.

A. F. Yakunin set his main task to accuse E. Bekmakhanov of "nationalism". In an article written before the war, Yakunin characterized Kenesary's movement as a struggle for national liberation, but later became an accuser of both the uprising and E. Bekmakhanov. Bekmakhanov. He even discusses the former vice-president of the Academy, S. Kenesbaev, who objected to the biased criticism of the book, the "nationalist" opinion of E. Bekmakhanov and the secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, I. Omarov.

"Kenesary's movement can be characterized as progressive and revolutionary, he fought against the colonization policy of tsarism, but since Kenesary supported his own feudal interests, this struggle cannot be considered progressive and revolutionary" - ambiguously concludes A. Yakunin in another article. However, A. Yakunin in the main article published in the central edition - "Questions of History" (1951, No. 4), tries to connect the work of E. Bekmakhanov with "ideologically destroyed figures of Alashorda". "E. Bekmakhanov is not unique in praising the khanate and the nationalist movement. E. Bekmakhanov, licking the backs of the Alashorda people, is trying to introduce the point of view of the counter-revolutionary Alash into our Soviet reality".

On December 26, 1950 in the newspaper "Pravda" was published a sharp critical article "let us present the problems of the history of Kazakhstan from the Marxist-Leninist point of view". Authors Shoyinbaev, Aidarova, Yakunin. "Only Bolshevik Pravda revealed the feudal-monarchical and reactionary character of the Bolshevik movement of Kenesary".

One of the famous scholars who supported the viewpoint of E. Bekmakhanov was A. Yakunin, who did not insist on the identification of Kenesary with Shamil S. V. Yushkov as a "mistake", always relying on the party leaders who supported him. "Shamil destroyed khan clans, equalized all before the law, created a theocratic state. Kenesary, however, did not create a state, did not destroy the Kazakh feudal lords".

Under the conditions of the current difficult political situation, ignoring party pressure and risking their lives, a group of outstanding scientists of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR S. V. Bakhrushin, B. D. Grekov, N. m. Druzhinin, A. P. Kuchkin, M. K. Rozhkova and others took part in the discussion of this book took an active part and maximally welcomed the correctness of E. Bekmakhanov's approach. Corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences S. V. Bakhrushin drew the attention of his colleagues to the illegality of the accusation of Kenesary in the manifestation of brutal violence. In the further development of the feudal state, Ivan III, Ivan IV and Peter the Great gave an example that the tsars did not start with "barbarism" and bloodthirsty deeds.

The persecution of E. Bekmakhanov did not stop, even exceeded the limit. "His enemies accused the scientist of being a bourgeois nationalist and warned that his book had a negative impact on scientific and other circles" [12, p.33], - academician N.M. Druzhinin wrote about the atmosphere surrounding the book in those years. Everyone knows how serious were the consequences of the "discussion" of the monograph of E. Bekmakhanov for the persecution of national science. Bekmakhanov for the persecution of the national intelligentsia. Without even mentioning that Bekmakhanov's path was narrowed, a big barrier was put up and he tried to crush his spirit, a number of famous researchers abandoned their views, ideological convictions in order not to fall into the trap of difficult times. One of them is the outstanding researcher M. P. Vyatkin, whose monograph "Bатыр Сырым" won the Great State Prize of the USSR. In a letter to the board of the journal "Questions of History", concerning the reasons for his "delusions",

the scientist translated all his works to A. F. Ryazanov, who passed away a few years ago. "The bourgeois nationalist A. F. Ryazanov devoted a number of his works to the struggle of the Kazakh people, his views were widely disseminated, and I could not get rid of bourgeois-nationalist errors in some of my works. Among them one of the grossest is my mistake in describing the uprising of Kenesary Kasymov" [13, p.158].

In 1947, together with the works of E. Bekmakhanov's work "Kazakhstan in the 20-40s of the XIX century" was published by Eltok Dilmukhamedov "1837-1847. Rebellion under the leadership of Kenesary Kasymov". E. Dilmukhamedov defended his thesis at the Academic Council of the Faculty of History of the Central Asian State University in Tashkent on December 17, 1946. The official opponents were doctors of historical sciences Dodonov I. K. and Bekmakhanov E. and candidate of historical sciences Zhitov K. E. However, when the case of E. Bekmakhanov, who defended his doctoral dissertation on the subject of Kenesary, was initiated and he was exiled, Yeltok Dilmukhamedov was deprived of his scientific title. Dissertations will be removed from libraries and scientific environment and destroyed. However, in 2010, the B. Taizhan Foundation republished the version of E. Dilmukhamedov's dissertation preserved in the hands of his descendants and presented it to the Russian Academy of Sciences. Dilmukhamedov and presented it to the public. The value of E. Dilmukhamedov's research work lies in providing a military map of the punitive detachments sent to suppress Kenesary's rebellion. And the saddest thing is that the plot of Kenesary's campaign against the Kyrgyz has not been fully preserved and was torn up by law enforcement agencies during the seizure.

In the 1960s, when a one-sided attitude was deeply rooted in the issues of the uprising, Kyrgyz researchers did not refuse to determine the significance of the epochal events of this movement and the colonial policy of the tsarist government. An example of this is the research of B. Zhamgerchinov, published in 1945 and 1963. The first volume of the History of the Kyrgyz SSR, published in 1984, gave a significant and serious assessment of the uprising.

In the 1990s, when public opinion about the uprising under the leadership of Kenesary Khan woke up again, new, fresh information began to be published, the first to do so was the outstanding writer Mukhtar Magauin, who took it upon himself to organize a round table. In the magazine "Zhuldyz" he gathered historians-literary writers and for the first time gave a fair assessment of Kenesary's movement. The participants of the round table were academician M. Kozybaev, corresponding member R. Berdibaev, professor J. Kasymbaev, researcher M. Absemetov, writers G. Akhmedov, T. Zhurbaev.

The article by Academician R. Suleimenov and Professor J. Kasymbayev, published in 1991 in the 3rd issue of the journal "Communists of Kazakhstan" [14, p.62-72], written on the basis of archival data, served as an impetus to the study of those aspects of this problem that have yet to be revealed.

In 1993 was published the work of the famous scientist J. Kasymbaev "Kenesary Khan politician and military leader". The author argues that until recently the activity of the prominent military leader Kenesary Kasymov, the organizer of the uprising of Kazakhs in 1837-1847 against the military-colonial expansion of tsarist Russia was written unambiguously and subjected to historical abuse, relying on historical documents related to the change in public opinion, on the cause and nature of the uprising, its driving force, on the activities of Kenesary to organize the uprising of Kazakhs against the colonial policy of the empire from a new point of view. In the work of J. Kasymbaev the uprising is described as a national liberation uprising, which was carried out to restore an independent Kazakh state during the reign of Abylai Khan. The assessment of this uprising in historical works is considered separately [15].

In 2002, Zhanuzak Kasimbaev published another study on the movement of Kenesary Khan. The monograph "The Last Campaign of Kenesary Khan and its Collapse" is the third

work written by historians [16]. The difference of this work from other studies is that it describes not the initial stage of Kenesary's rebellion, but the near final stage. The author himself indicated the chronological period of his work as December 1846 - April 1847. Consequently, only the last few months of the multi-year rebellion are depicted. The work is based on archival data, in which the events begin with the resettlement of Kenesary to Zhetysu, its causes. In connection with the death of the khan, the researcher cites the data before him, the folk legend told in the book by Sh. Ualikhanov, B. Abdildauly, N. Maev, A. Dobrosmyslov, Y. Polferov, E. Bekmakhanov. The researcher explicitly explains that the reason for the last campaign of Kenesary Khan was that the khan was in a "Machiavellian position" and that the defeat of Kenesary Khan made some of his soldiers flee in fear.

Among the works written about Kenesary, it is known that E.J. Valikhanov's monograph "Kenesary", published in 2004 by the publishing house "Young Guard" in Moscow, does not recognize Kenesary's struggle against the Tsarist Russian Empire during the Soviet period. To fill this gap, Yedige Valikhanov published the book "Kenesary" in Moscow and introduced Kenesary's struggle to a large number of readers. The author noted that the originality of the research work lies in the fact that Kenesary died at the hands of the Kyrgyz, and the second time Kenesary was executed by E. Bekmakhanov, who researched him. And also dwelled on some descendants who descended from Kenesary.

Conclusion. Thus, the history of the liberation movement of the Kazakh people under the leadership of Kenesary Kasymov, including the complex, full of contradictions historical personality of the khan, will continue to be studied in the future. In particular, the problems of military organization of the uprising, changes in political relations with Central Asian possessions, participation of commanders in the uprising, provision of soldiers with weapons, etc. Many questions require radical and serious research. We cannot say that in this article we have analyzed the works of all researchers who contributed to the study of Kenesary. However, a historiographical analysis of a number of fundamental works related to this topic in the national history was carried out.

LITERATURE

- 1 Валиханов, Ч.Ч. Собрание сочинений в пяти томах. Т. 2. [Текст] / Ч.Ч. Валиханов. – Алматы: Наука, 1985. – 379 с.
- 2 Завалишин, И. Описание Западной Сибири. Т. 3 [Текст] / И. Завалишин. – Сибирско-киргизская степь: СПб, 1868. – 165 с.
- 3 Красовский, М. Область Сибирских киргизов [Текст] / М. Красовский. – Материалы для географии и статистики: СПб, 1868. – 157 с.
- 4 Середа, Н. Бунт киргизского султана Кенесары Касымова (1837-1847) [Текст] / Н. Середа. – Уральск, 1992. – 216 с.
- 5 Стеклова, Ф. Адольф Янушкевич и его книга (Дневники и письма из путешествия по казахским степям) [Текст] / Ф. Стеклова. – Алматы: Жалын, 1996. – 304 с.
- 6 Семенов Тян-Шанский, П. Путешествия (Мемуары). Т. 2. [Текст] / П. Семенов Тян-Шанский – Москва, 1949. – 355 с.
- 7 Кенесарыұлы, А. Кенесары және Сыздық сұлтандар [Текст] / А. Кенесарыұлы. – Алматы: Жалын, 1992. – 48 б.
- 8 Рязанов, А.Ф. Восстание Кенесары Касымова (1837-1847 гг.). Қазақ ұлт-азаттық қозғалысы. [Текст] / А.Ф. Рязанов, Алматы: Ел-шежіре, 2007. – 344 б.
- 9 Бекмаханов, Е.Б. Қазақстан ХІХ ғасырдың 20-40 жылдарында [Текст] / Е.Б. Бекмаханов. – Алматы: Санат, 1994. – 416 б.

10 История Казахская ССР с древнейших времен до наших дней. Под ред. М. Абдыкалыкова и А.М. Панкратовой. [Текст] / Под ред. М. Абдыкалыкова и А.М. Панкратовой. – Алматы: Изд-во АН КазССР, 1943. – 672 с.

11 Айдарова, Х. Некоторые итоги и перспективы развития исторической науки в Казахстане [Текст] / Х. Айдарова // Известия казах. филиала АН СССР. серия историческая – 1946 – №2 (27).

12 Дружинин, Н.М. Во имя научной истины. История Казахстана: белые пятна [Текст] / Н.М. Дружинин. – Алма-Ата: Казахстан, 1991. – 348 с.

13 Вяткин, М.П. Письмо в редакцию [Текст] / М.П. Вяткин // Вопросы истории, 1952. – №2

14 Сүлейменов, Р.Б., Қасымбаев, Ж.Қ. Тарихи тұлғалар: Кенесары көтерілісі - көне шындыққа жаңа көзқарас [Текст] / Р.Б Сүлейменов, Ж.Қ. Қасымбаев //Қазақстан коммунисті, 1991. – №3

15 Қасымбаев, Ж. Кенесары хан [Текст] / Ж. Қасымбаев. – Алматы: Қазақстан, 1993. – 112 б.

16 Касымбаев, Ж. Последний поход хана Кенесары и его гибель (декабрь 1846 - апрель 1847 гг.) [Текст] / Ж. Касымбаев. – Алматы: Ана тілі, 2002. – 200 с.

REFERENCES

1 Valikhanov, Ch.Ch. Sobranie sochinenii v pyati tomakh. T. 2. [Collected works in five volumes. T. 2.]. Almaty (1985):379 s. – (In Rus)

2 Zavalishin, I. Opisanie Zapadnoi Sibiri. T. 3 [Description Of Western Siberia. T. 3]. Siberian-kirgiz step, SPB (1868): 165 s. – (In Rus)

3 Krasovskii, M. Oblast' Sibirskikh kirgizov [Region of Siberian kirgiz people]. Materials for geography and statistics, SPB: (1868): 157 s. – (In Rus)

4 Sereda, N. Bunt kirgizskogo sultana Kenesary Kasymova (1837-1847). Uralsk, (1992): 216 s. – (In Rus)

5 Steklova, F. Adol'f Yanushkevich i ego kniga (Dnevnik i pis'ma iz puteshestviya po kazakhskim stepyam) [Adolf Yanushkevich and his book (Diaries and letters from the path to the Kazakh step)]. Almaty (1996): 304 s – (In Rus)

6 Semenov Tyan-Shanskii, P. Puteshestviya Memuary. T. 2. [Memoirs. T. 2.]. Moscow, (1949): 355 s. – (In Rus)

7 Kenesaryuly, A. Kenesary zhane Syzdyh sultandar [Kenesary and Syzdyk Sultans]. Almaty, (1992): 48 b. – (In Rus)

8 Ryazanov, A.F. Vosstanie Kenesary Kasymova (1837-1847 gg.). Kazakh ult-azattyk hozgalysy [Uprising of Kenesary Kasymov (1837-1847 GG.). Kazakh National Liberation Movement]. Almaty, (2007): 344 s. – (In Rus)

9 Bekmakhanov, E.B. Kazakhstan XIX gasyrdyn 20-40 zhyldarynda [Kazakhstan in the 20-40s of the XIX century]. Almaty, (1994): 416 b. – (In Kaz)

10 The history of the Kazakh SSR from ancient times to the present day. Edited by N. M.Abdykalykov and A.M.Pankratov. -Almaty: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR, 1943. - 672 p. (In Rus)

11 Istoriya Kazakhskaya SSR s drevneishikh vremen do nashikh dnei. Pod red. M. Abdykalykova i A.M. Pankratovoi. [Specific results and prospects for the development of historical science in Kazakhstan]. Izvestiya kazakh. filiala AN SSSR. seriya istoricheskaya, (1946): 2(27) – (In Rus)

12 Druzhinin, N.M. Vo imya nauchnoi istiny. Istoriya Kazakhstana: belye pyatna [In the name of scientific truth. History of Kazakhstan: White five years]. Alma-Ata, (1991): 348 s. (In Rus)

13 Vyatkin, M.P. Pis'mo v redaktsiyu [Letter to the editorial office]. Voprosy istorii, (1952):27. – (In Rus)

14 Suleimenov, R.B., Kasymbaev, Zh.K. Tarikhi tulgalar: Kenesary koterilisi - kone shyndykka zhana kozkaras [Historical figures: Kenesary Uprising - a new view of ancient reality]. Communist of Kazakhstan, (1991):3 – (In Kaz)

15 Kasymbaev, Zh. Kenesary khan [Kenesary Khan]. Almaty, (1993): 112 b. – (In Kaz)

16 Kasymbaev, Zh. Poslednii pokhod khana Kenesary i ego gibel' (dekabr' 1846 - aprel' 1847 gg.) [The last campaign of Kenesary Khan and his death (December 1846 - April 1847)]. Almaty, (2002): 200 s. – (In Rus)

КЕНЕСАРЫ ХАН БАСТАҒАН ҚАЗАҚ ХАЛҚЫНЫҢ АЗАТТЫҚ ҚОЗҒАЛЫСЫНЫҢ ТАРИХНАМАСЫ

Аңдатпа. XVIII-XIX ғасырлардағы Қазақстандағы халық бұқарасының патша өкіметіне қарсы наразылық қозғалысының бай тарихы бар десек те Кенесары Қасымұлы бастаған азаттық күресін зерттеуге саяси қысым жасалғаны белгілі. Өткен ғасырдың 40-жылдарының аяғы 50-жылдарының басындағы республикада қалыптасқан ауыр қоғамдық-саяси жағдайда да осы Кенесары хан тұлғасының ғылыми жариялануынан бастау алған болатын. Осынысымен де мақалаға арқау болып отырған тақырып ғылыми өзектілігімен, зерттеу қажеттілігімен тарихшыларды өзіне тартады.

Мақаланың мақсаты - қозғалыстың зерттелу деңгейін жазу. Міндеті - патшалық, советтік және тәуелсіздік жағдайындағы тарих ғылымының даму барысында жарық көрген еңбектерді тарихнамалық талдаудан өткізу.

Еңбекте жалпы қазақ халқының ұлт-азаттық қозғалыстарының тұтас бір дәуіріне өз шығармашылығын арнаған А.Ф.Рязановтың туындылары зерделенеді. Қарсылық қозғалыстарын зерттеуді алғашқылардың бірі болып бастаған тарихшы-ғалым қолжазбасындағы жекелеген даулы мәселелер ашылған. Қазақ халқының бұл ұлттық қозғалысының зерттелу деңгейіндегі биіктік – белгілі тарихшы, қазақтан шыққан алқашқы тарих ғылымдарының докторы Ермұхан Бекмахановтың «Қазақстан XIX ғасырдың 20-40 жылдарында» атты монографиясы. Публикацияда бұл іргелі еңбек хақындағы тарихнамалық талдауға басымдық берілген. Ғылыми анализ сол кезеңдегі атышулы «Бекмаханов ісін» өмірге әкелген саяси процестердің алғышарттарының қалыптасуымен байланыстырыла жасалған. Кенесары бастаған көтеріліске ғылыми ден қоюшылық 1990-жылдардан қайтадан жаңарды. Осыған сәйкес тарихшылар Ж.Қасымбаев, Е.Уалиханов зерттеулері қозғалыстың тарихнамасына қосылған сүбелі үлес болды.

Кенесары хан бастаған қазақ халқының ұлт-азаттық қозғалысының тарихнамасы сериялы мақалалар арнауға лайықты. Ал бұл жарияланымды алдағы ғылыми талдауларымыздың беташары ретінде қабылдауға болады.

Кілт сөздер. Тарихнама, Кенесары, ғылыми көзқарас, азаттық қозғалысы, отаршылдық, талдау.

ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ ОСВОБОДИТЕЛЬНОГО ДВИЖЕНИЯ КАЗАХСКОГО НАРОДА ВО ГЛАВЕ С КЕНЕСАРЫ ХАНОМ

Аннотация. Несмотря на богатую историю протестного движения народных масс против царской власти в Казахстане в XVIII-XIX веках, известно, что существовало политическое давление на изучение освободительной борьбы во главе с Кенесары

Касымұлы. Кенесары хан был впервые опубликован в научных публикациях в конце 40-х-начале 50-х годов прошлого века в тяжелых общественно-политических условиях, сложившихся в республике в то время. Название данной статьи этим и привлекает историков своей научной актуальностью и необходимостью исследований.

Цель статьи-написать уровень изученности движения. Задача-провести историографический анализ работ, опубликованных в ходе развития исторической науки в условиях царства, советов и независимости.

В работе изучаются произведения А. Ф. Рязанова, посвятившего свое творчество целой эпохе национально-освободительных движений казахского народа в целом. Отдельные спорные вопросы раскрываются в рукописи ученого-историка, который одним из первых начал изучение движений сопротивления. Вершиной изучения этого национального движения является монография известного историка, защитивший первым среди казахов докторскую диссертацию по истории Ермухана Бекмаханова «Казахстан в 20-40-е годы XIX века». В публикации приоритет отдается историографическому анализу этого фундаментального труда. Научный анализ связан с формированием предпосылок политических процессов, воплотивших в жизнь пресловутое «дело Бекмаханова» того периода. Научное реагирование на восстание под руководством Кенесары возобновилось с 1990-х годов. В соответствии с этим исследования историков Ж. Касымбаева, Е.Уалиханова стали важным вкладом в историографию движения.

Историография национально-освободительного движения казахского народа во главе с Кенесары ханом заслуживает посвящения в серию статей. А данную публикацию можно воспринимать как предшественник наших предстоящих научных изданий .

Ключевые слова. Историография, Кенесары, научный подход, освободительное движение, колониализм, анализ.