

SRSTI 03.23.07

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62724/202440105>

Kurmanalin Samat Bakhytzhonovich*¹

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

KAZAKH NATIONAL LIBERATION UPRISINGS AGAINST RUSSIAN COLONIAL POLICY: CAUSES OF DEFEATS, PECULIARITIES, RELATIONSHIPS

Abstract. National liberation rebellion is characteristic of colonial countries. The Kazakh people also resisted the metropolis for a long time to preserve their independence. The resistance movements were persistent. The values of honour and dignity were high. Secondly, we consider political, social, economic reasons. A bright and tragic page of Kazakh history is when the Kazakh people throughout the XIX century periodically rose to major uprisings and defended their independence. Because of unequal strength all resistance was defeated. The main reason for the defeat was the military technique between colonists and colonisers. The paper analyses the reasons for the defeat of the armed struggle against the empire. The historical significance, general patterns, interrelationships of the uprisings led by Kazakh leaders in the history of the nation will be studied.

The rebellions were led by heroes from dynasties that enjoyed great authority in Kazakh society. One of them was Yeset Kotibaruly from the Shekty clan. The rebellion of Eset batyr was defeated in history. However, the reader and subsequent generations have created history so that it can be studied. That is its peculiarity. The national uprisings had interconnections. The leaders had not only outwardly familiar-knowledgeable, but also communicative relations. There were strongholds to each other. There was military support. Recognising bravery and valour, they followed each other. They were united by common interests against a common enemy. This is noteworthy. Because past historiography has divided the uprisings of the Kazakh people against colonialism. We subscribe to the concept of the unity of the freedom movement.

Key words. Colonialism, national liberation, independence, heroes, bij, continuity, historiography.

Introduction. The movements of the masses in Kazakhstan in the nineteenth century against the tsarist power ended in defeat. At that time it could not be otherwise. As the historian A. F. Ryazanov said, ‘with their weak strength could not stop Russia, a large conquering state seeking a new colony, a new market, in scattered, underdeveloped, poorly organised nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes and peoples scattered over vast steppe regions’ [1, p.22]. In fact, the permanent Russian military staff, quite armed with the latest achievements of the then science and practice, could not resist the detachments of Yeset batyr, armed mainly with swords and spears. But this historical struggle was a struggle for freedom and honour of the country.

A number of leaders of the Kazakh national liberation uprisings Zholaman Tlenshiuly, Yeset Kotibaruly, Zhankozha Nurmukhameduly, in turn, did not aim to join the heads of all rebel units of the Younger Juz. It was difficult to coincide with the tsarist punitive forces, well armed, trained in a special military order. Despite the fact that the rebels had numerical superiority, enough courage in battles with enemy forces, they had many shortcomings in fighting tactics and military organisation. Partisan methods of armed struggle and constant escape from tsarist troops at crucial stages of the movement did not lead to a productive victory. For example, the defeat of the Yeset Batyr rebellion was a historically inevitable issue for the

tsarist government. As the causes of the rebellion were obvious, the lack of a clear political programme predetermined that they would be defeated and led to many complex phenomena. Also, the main reasons for the defeat of the uprising lie primarily in the internal political situation when the uprising took place, i.e. it was during this period in the conditions of the failure of attempts to create a centralised independent Kazakh state, i.e. after the collapse of the super-powerful Kenesar movement, the victory of the Yeset uprising was impossible.

Results and their discussion. In the Kazakh liberation movements of the XIX century the spontaneity of the rebels' actions prevailed, and at crucial moments their impassability created a great ease for the troops of the authorities in the struggle with the Kazakh soldiers. As the rebels stood in one place, the tsarist punishers would concentrate on that place and find a way to quickly and easily eliminate the centre of rebellion.

The innocent, excessive destruction of a peaceful country by the punitive forces was also a great moral blow to the rebels, bringing the leaders of the rebellion to a crisis. Moreover, the deliberate aggravation during the uprising of the policy of the tsarist authorities, which pitted the Kazakh clans against each other, could not but affect the defeat of the movement.

We know that the rebel population is a nomadic pastoralist community. Therefore, the actions of the rebels depend entirely on the situation of the cattle. Despite the fact that during the rebellions the country survived by retreating to the border with Ustyurt and Hiua, this situation was not always successful.

In particular, our research shows that the rebellion led by Yeset Kotibarula lasted more than ten years. That's quite a long time. And the prolongation of the rebellion depended on the tactics that the leaders of the royal authority had in dealing with Yeset's rebellion. This is one of the most serious problems for researchers.

At first, the rebellion of Yeset batyr was underestimated by the Orenburg administration. The authorities, who believed that all the hero's actions, as in previous periods, were mere obstacles, handed over the suppression of the 'rebellion' to the ruling sultans. But after nothing came out of the field governors' attempts to suppress the rebellion, the Orenburg administration, fearing that a "rebel" known to the government for decades would acquire a high profile, had to change its previous tactics and preferred to tread carefully. However, the authorities did not despise the strength of the rebellion and did not believe in the danger of the struggle. Initially, the royal administration regarded Yeset's actions as 'ordinary plundering'. The authorities, who regarded his actions as temporary, believed that there were no political threats, no matter how hard Yeset batyr tried.

Only after all attempts to negotiate, deceive and push to their side did not yield anything, there were expeditions aimed directly at suppressing the rebellion. According to this, the famous historian-scientist J. Kasymbayev, who studied the movement of Kenesary Kasymuly, said that 'due to the vastness of the Kazakh steppe rebels' knowledge of their land to bushes and pits, it was extremely difficult for the executioners to search for them and fight' [2, p. 217] speech refers to other national liberation uprisings led by Kazakh heroes.

Studying the popular uprising in the Younger Juz led by batyr Yeset Kotibaruly in 1847-1858. [3], we were convinced of this. One of the differences that the tsarist authorities held in the period up to July 1855 was that the authorities always intended to deceive the leader of the uprising. The authorities, who believed that the uprising was spontaneous, always raised the question of arresting the leader of the uprising as a matter of priority. And the Orenburg administration, seeing the impossibility of taking him alive or dead, intended to go there and suppress him with the forces of the army, fearing the widespread spread of the revolt.

Most effective for them was the approach taken by the colonial authorities during the uprising: pursuing individual rebel detachments without engaging them in combat, smashing peaceful villages returning from wintering to pasture and from pasture to winter settlement, and

destroying them in spite of their children. Such exploits forced the leaders of the Kazakh liberation struggle of the colonial era to isolate themselves along with few comrades.

Any applicant who concentrated on the study of resistance movements through archival data, referring to the written in the archival documents of academician M.Kozybaev, that, 'Cossack detachments of punitive military posts, continuously sent to the Kyrgyz steppes, burned the Kazakh sahara and destroyed hundreds of villages'. [4, 18 p.] - would be convinced of his opinion.

During 1855-1857 horse-cossack punitive detachments defeated the peaceful country and under the pretext 'to establish peace between the Kirghiz-Kaisaks', 'to reimburse military expenditures for the destruction of brigands' destroyed about 320 villages in the Younger Juz, stole cattle and sold them to the military frontier markets, receiving a total of 125241 soms of profit [5, p. 63].

The past historical periods of the Kazakh people have always been an integral part of the social and political consciousness. Therefore, a special place in the national consciousness is occupied by a deep understanding, understanding of the essence of the national liberation movement.

At certain stages of social development, the issue of national liberation movements in the history of Kazakhstan was considered in parts. In particular, the National Movement led by Syrym Datuly - 'uprising of Kazakh peasants', Isatay-Makhambet's action - 'uprising of Bukey peasants against khan's tyranny', Zhankozh Nurmukhamedula's uprising - 'agitation of Syr Darya farmers', movement of Yeset batyr - 'protest of Kazakhs from Shekty clan', and all movements originating from the Tore clan, i.e. led by Kazakh sultans in the 19th century, were assessed as anti-Russian reactionary, feudal-monarchical movements and thus formed in the historical memory.

And in the conditions of formation of independent national historiography in the last thirty years, the anti-Russian uprisings and their interconnection and continuity became an urgent aspect of the issues. In the first years of independence, a unique scholar was M.Kozybaev, who proposed to consider the problem from a new methodological point of view. His '... Historians of Kazakhstan have so far considered the national liberation movement primarily in isolation. And in fact, the uprisings of Isatay and Makhambet (1836-1837), Kenesara (1837-1847), Zhankozhi (1856-1857), Yeset (1855-1858) covered Atyrau, Arka, Syr, the Kazakh country as a whole, and the beginning of one was not accompanied by the second? And who can say that the interrelation of these movements, their main essence, their key motive do not coincide [4, 21 p] - emphasised the consistent study of the uprisings of the entire Kazakh people against Russian colonialism.

During the struggle of the Kazakh people against tsarist colonialism, which lasted one hundred and fifty years, there is no doubt that the uprisings led by individual figures are linked to each other.

The name of a colony is colonialism, so a country under the control of a powerful state is a colony. And the origin of the opposition of a colonial country to the colonising state is a historical pattern. All the actions of the colonial country against the colonists, whether armed or ideological struggle, or rebellion in a narrow circle which would otherwise take little time, is the struggle of an oppressed nation against the exploiters. And all this implies a national liberation struggle.

The liberation movement in the Kazakh country has one peculiarity: from the beginning of the first colonial action of Russia in Kazakhstan until the fall of tsarist power in 1917, the struggle for independence in the Great Steppe was going on continuously, not interrupted for a moment. There are a number of objective reasons why tsarist Russia could not suppress the nationwide movement of Kazakhs on the way to freedom. Firstly, the national qualities of the

Kazakh people, developed before they fell into the colonial blockade, are fighting ability, vigilance, bloodthirstiness and spiritual power. Secondly, the natural and geographical location of the great steppe favoured Kazakh rebels, defenders of the nation's independence. The Kazakh steppes sometimes struck fear into the colonists and protected their children.

The study of the issue of national liberation movements in Kazakhstan began in the pre-revolutionary period and continued in Soviet times, but there are still many gaps in its history. Party requirements of the past narrowed the field of this problem, leading to failure to reveal the connection, continuity and various distortions of some issues, especially national uprisings. It is clear that the correct assessment of these complex historical processes is very important for the present and future of our independent young state, for the unity of the various nationalities and ethnic groups living in the republic, for the national integrity and continuity of the Kazakh people.

For researchers of national liberation movements in Kazakhstan today, it is necessary to pay attention to the interconnectedness of these uprisings. The policy of the Russian Empire in Kazakhstan in the XVII-XIX centuries ultimately undermined the national dignity and livelihood of Kazakhs as a people. The violation of the national mentality, which began as a result of territorial and administrative reforms carried out by the tsarist authorities, was the main starting point, the driving force of all the movements in the region. Although outwardly these movements differed from each other, their first point was the violation of this mentality. Not to mention all the other reasons why the fate of the nation was in the balance, while the ultimate goal-objective of the armed movements that erupted and raged in the vast steppes was the same. It was independent life.

It is the homeland and the colonial policy of the tsarist government that connect the national liberation movements of the Kazakh people, which lasted a hundred and fifty years. It is the homeland and the colonial policy of the tsarist government that connect the national liberation movements of the Kazakh people, which lasted a hundred and fifty years. Referring to the quote by T.Shonanov the roots of the Kazakh war are here [6, 62 pages]. Attempts by the tsarist authorities to turn Zhaiyk into imperial property began already after the death of Abulkhair Khan. The contestation of this land is the basis of actions against any tsars in the Younger Juz. The land issue is a national issue. The war for land is the core of the national liberation uprising. Thus, the struggle of the Kazakhs of the Younger Juz for Zhaiyk is the subject of a great struggle lasting 150 years. When at the end of the XVIII century rebels led by Syrym Datovich addressed the tsarist government with a demand to restore the system of land use established over the centuries and to stop the occupation of Kazakh lands by the Ural Cossack troops, their goal was this very native land - the Zhaiyk coast. The struggle for the Motherland, which became the property of the West Kazakhstan region and the essence of the economy of Kazakh nomads, remained the main demand of the insurgents even in the movements of Yeset Kotibaruly, Azbergen Munaitpasuly[7], Seyil Turkebayuly.

One of the main driving forces of the war for freedom, which became the main support of the leaders of the movement in the popular protests of the 19th century, was the South Ural region, which we called the Orenburg province in connection with the emergence of the city of Orenburg, the homeland of the Shekty and Tabyn clan until the 19th century. This region was not only the edges of Shekta and Tabyn in the Younger Zhuz, but also the summer pastures of several other genera in the tribal associations of Alimuli and Zhetiru. In addition, the South Ural region has long been home to dozens of related peoples with close ethnic and cultural ties with each other. Some ethnic groups, on the basis of several tribal associations, form ethnic integrity and national identity, uniting under one flag, and now, under the influence of the history of the same tribal unions - political phenomena - are divided and absorbed by various related peoples.

So, among the Kazakh and Bashkir ethnic groups inhabiting the South Ural region, the traceability of such tribes as Argyn, Kypchak, Tleu, Tama, Tana, Alshyn, which have preserved customs and linguistic common features, and even the fact that they were identical to tribal symbols, suggests that these two peoples have the same basis [8]

It was from this South Ural region, that is, the Orenburg Territory, that the colonial policy of the tsarist government supplanted the population of the Younger Zhuz during the first half of the 19th century.

The executors of this tyrannical policy were the Orenburg governors Prince Volkonsky, General Essen and Count Perovsky. So, during the reign of these three governors in the Orenburg Territory in the Younger Zhuz, uprisings of the Kazakhs broke out and continued. The loss of the northern part of Zhayyk, Orynbor by the Kazakhs served as a prerequisite for the uprising of Syrym Datula, and Karatai Nuralyuly, and Kaipkali Yesimovich, and Zholaman Tlenshiuly, as well as the cause of Eset Kotibaruly's wars with the tsarist troops in the middle of the 19th century.

Despite the fact that the history of national liberation uprisings in the past era was divided, not to mention the general signs of their character, as events incompatible with each other, and only in this direction was party pressure exerted on research, a number of outstanding Kazakh researchers focused on the unity of national liberation uprisings in the region. One of them, T. Shonanov, said: "The Kazakhs interpreted their native language and the pleasant words of the government in their own way. Kazakhs have well understood the secret of the government's indignation and despondency. Trying not to give the land to a mounted Cossack, they fiercely defended their settlement and fought. Yeset, Zhankozha, Syrym, Kenesary began their uprising. In a historical letter from Shegen Bi to Akhmet Sultan, which stated that in the Irtysh Kulek war, the Malaysarli with the Cossacks was because of land disputes" [6,32-33 pages], he rightly argued.

When studying the history of national liberation movements, the historian should keep in mind the following. The transfer of Isatai Taymanuly, Makhambet Utemisuly and several of his associates to the steppe beyond Zhaiyk coincided with a major popular wave that began in connection with the uprising of Sultan Kenesara Kasymovich in the Younger Zhuz. T. Shonanov noted that "The Isatai uprising is an uprising common to the masses of the Middle and Younger Zhuz. The uprising that engulfed the entire Kazakh steppe. In 1838, the uprisings of Kenesara and Yeset took place " [6, p. 65], which indicates the historical continuity of the struggle on the path to freedom.

In early 1838, Sultan Kenesary, along with his fellow villagers, moved from Sredny Zhuz to Turgay and Irgiz districts. In the spring of this year, unrest will begin among the Kazakhs of the Orenburg department. The wave of the uprising swept the eastern part of the Horde, where the Kazakhs of the Argyn and Kipchak clans settled, then reached the Jagalbayli clan and finally covered the villages of the Tabyn clan, which settled along the Ilek River. From here, batyr Zholaman Tlenshuly, disobeying the royal administration, goes with his tribe to the Torgai River to join Kenesary Kasymuly [9, 39 p.].

The wave of population gradually spread to the Eastern and Middle parts of the Younger Zhuz and eventually penetrated into the western part.

At the same time, Sultan Kaipkali Yessimovich, who was supported by the people of Adai from Mangystau, will resume the uprising against Russia.

There is reason to believe that in the late 30s of the XIX century, the Younger Zhuz was engulfed in the flames of the great struggle for freedom. It can be said that during this period, the national liberation uprisings led by these personalities, who left a noticeable mark on the history of Kazakhstan, developed in connection with each other. Both Isatai, Kayypkali, Kenesary, Zholaman, Yeset and Azbergen carried out armed movements and propaganda work

during this period in the center of the Zhetyru and Alima tribes inhabiting the area of the Jem, Irgiz, Ilek, Kiyl, Sagyz, Oyl rivers and the Mugalzhar mountains and the Barsuk sandy region. The Shekty clan was especially at the epicenter of the above-mentioned uprisings. Here we will not falsely praise the Shekty clan in order to glorify the leader of a certain uprising, in fact, this clan was one of the main pillars of the national liberation movement in Kazakhstan, the most famous historians and scientists wrote about it. For example, A.Ryazanov equates the Shekty clan with the Zaporozhye Cossacks, the instigators of the Ukrainian people's liberation movement of the XVII century. He wrote: "the Shekty clan thought that they were part of the Zaporozhian Sich of the XVII century, a Cossack hospital was concentrated here, and a bold and real invasion of the Russian border line was planned here" [10, 147 p.].

Conclusion. Thus, Russia's conquest of Kazakhstan was carried out gradually, it was not easy for the empire to colonize the Kazakh country, it is known that the decisive role here was played by the resistance of the Kazakh people to the colonization policy of the tsarist government for almost a century and a half. It was more difficult for tsarist politicians to suppress the repeated uprisings of the Kazakh people for freedom than to solve Russia's rivalry in the Central Asian region with well-known states in the world colonial system. The origins of Kazakhstan's independence and the formation of an independent state lie in the centuries-old continuous struggle of the Kazakh people for freedom. That is why respect for the male name, which for years dreamed of liberation, aspired to the white path of justice and fought to ensure that the sacred settlement of the ancestors did not fall into the hands of anyone, is a generational duty, a symbol of the country.

LITERATURE

- 1 Рязанов, А.Ф. Набеги хивинцев и туркмен в киргизскую степь в 1848 году [Текст] / А.Ф. Рязанов – Оренбург, 1925. – 23 с.
- 2 Қасымбаев, Ж. Көтерілістің көзден таса беттерінен [Текст] / Ж. Қасымбаев // Хан Кене: тарихи толғамдар мен пьеса, дастандар. – Алматы: Жалын, 1993. – 448 б.
- 3 Құрманалин, С. Кіші жүз және Есет Көтібарұлы бастаған ұлт-азаттық көтеріліс (1847-1858 жж.). [Текст] / С. Құрманалин – Орал: Полиграфсервис, 2019. – 256 б.
- 4 Қозыбаев, М. Жауды шаптым ту байлап [Текст] / М. Қозыбаев – Алматы: Қазақстан, 1994. – 192 б.
- 5 Ресей Федерациясы Орынбор облыстық мемлекеттік архиві (РФ ООМА), 6-қор, 10-тізім, 7176-іс.
- 6 Шонанұлы, Т. Жер тағдыры – ел тағдыры. [Текст] / Т. Шонанұлы – Алматы: Санат, 1995. – 224 б.
- 7 Есеркепова, Ж.О. Әзберген би Мұңайтпасұлы: өмірі және қызметі. [Текст] / Ж.О. Есеркепова – Алматы: Полилингва, 2021. – 240 б.
- 8 Материалы по истории Казахской ССР (1785-1826) [Текст] // Т.ІУ. М.-Л.:АН СССР, 1940. – 543 с.
- 9 РФ ООМА, 6 қор, 10 тізім, 71-75 іс.
- 10 Рязанов, А.Ф. Исатай Тайманов көтерілісі (1836-1838). [Текст] / А.Ф. Рязанов – Алматы: Қазақстан, 1996. – 176 б.

REFERENCES

- 1 Ryazanov, A.F. Nabegi hivincev i turkmen v kirgizskuyu step' v 1848 godu [Nabegi khivintsev and Turkmen in the Kirghiz step in 1848]. Orenburg, (1925): 23 s. – (In Rus)
- 2 Kasymbaev, Zh. Koterilistin kozden tasa betterinen [from the hidden pages of the uprising]. Han Kene: tarihi tolgamdar men piesa, dastandar. Almaty: Zhalyln, (1993): 448 b. – (In Kaz)

3 Kurmanalin, S. Kishi zhyz zhane Eset Kotibaruly bastagan ult-azattyk koterilis (1847-1858 zhzh.). [Zhuz the younger and the National Liberation uprising led by Yeset Kutibarovich]. Oral: Poligrafservis, (2019): 256 b. – (In Kaz)

4 Kozybaev, M. Zhaudy shaptym tu bajlap [The Enemy is tied to the flag]. Almaty: Kazakhstan, (1994): 192 b. – (In Kaz)

5 Resej Federaciyasy Orynbor oblystyк memlekettik arhivi (RF OOMA), 6-kor, 10-tizim, 7176-is. – (In Kaz)

6 Shonanuly, T. Zher tagdyry – el tagdyry [The Fate of the Earth is the fate of the country]. Almaty: Sanat, (1995): 224 b. – (In Kaz)

7 Eserkepova, Zh.O. Azbergen bi Munaitpasuly: omiri zhane kyzmeti. [Tekst] / Zh.O. Eserkepova – Almaty: Polilingva, 2021. – 240 b. – (In Kaz)

8 Materialy po istorii Kazahskoj SSR (1785-1826) [Materials on the history of the Kazakh SSR (1785-1826)]. T.IY. M.-L.:AN SSSR, (1940): 543 s. – (In Rus)

9 RF OOMA, 6 kor, 10 tizim, 71-75 is. – (In Kaz)

10 Ryazanov, A.F. Isatai Taimanov koterilisi (1836-1838) [Isatay Taimanov uprising (1836-1838)]. Almaty: Kazakhstan, (1996): 176 b. – (In Kaz)

РЕСЕЙЛІК ОТАРШЫЛДЫҚ САЯСАТҚА ҚАРСЫ ҚАЗАҚ ҰЛТ-АЗАТТЫҚ КӨТЕРІЛІСТЕРІ: ЖЕҢІЛУ СЕБЕПТЕРІ, ЕРЕКШЕЛІКТЕРІ, ӨЗАРА БАЙЛАНЫСТАРЫ

Аңдатпа. Ұлт-азаттық көтеріліс отар елдерге тән. Қазақ халқы да тәуелсіздігін сақтап қалу жолында метрополияға ұзақ қарсылық көрсетті. Қарсылық қозғалыстары табанды болды. Ар, намыс құндылықтары биік көрінді. Сасяи, әлеуметтік, экономикалық себептерді екінші кезекте қарастырамыз. Қазақ халқының XIX ғасыр бойы дүркін-дүркін ірі көтерілістерге шығып, өз тәуелсіздігін қорғап бағуы қазақ тарихының жарқын да қасіретті беті. Тең емес күштің салдарынан барлық қарсылық жеңіліске ұшырады. Жеңілудің басты себебі колонизаторлар мен отарланушылар арасындағы соғыс техникасы. Мақалада империяға қарсы қарулы күрестің жеңілу себептері талданады. Қазақ көшбасшылары бастаған көтерілістердің ұлт тарихындағы тарихи маңызы, ортақ заңдылықтары, өзара байланыстары зерделенеді.

Көтерілістердің басында қазақ қоғамында үлкен беделге ие әулеттерден шыққан батырлар тұрды. Соның бірі – Шекті руынан шыққан Есет Көтібарұлы. Есет батыр көтерілісі тарихта жеңіліске ұшырады. Алайда оқырман мен кейінгі ұрпақ тағылым алатындай тарих жасады. Осынысымен ерекше. Ұлттық баскөтерулердің өзара байланыстары болды. Көшбасшыларының сырттай таныс-білістігі ғана емес, қарым-қатынастары болды. Бір-біріне қорған болды. Әскери қолдау көрсетті. Батырлықтарын, ерліктерін мойындай отыра бірінің соңынан бірі ере білді. Оларды ортақ жауға қарсы ортақ мүдде тоғыстырды. Бұл назар аударарлық жәйт. Себебі өткен тарихнама қазақ халқының отаршылдыққа қарсы көтерілістерін бір-бірінен бөліп тастаған болатын. Біз азаттық қозғалысының біртұтастығы концепциясына қосыламыз.

Кілт сөздер. Отаршылдық, ұлт-азаттық, тәуелсіздік, батырлар, билер, сабақтастық, тарихнама.

КАЗАХСКИЕ НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-ОСВОБОДИТЕЛЬНЫЕ ВОССТАНИЯ ПРОТИВ РОССИЙСКОЙ КОЛОНИАЛЬНОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ: ПРИЧИНЫ ПОРАЖЕНИЙ, ОСОБЕННОСТИ, ВЗАИМООТНОШЕНИЯ

Аннотация. Национально-освободительное восстание характерно для колониальных стран. Казахский народ также долго сопротивлялся метрополии, чтобы сохранить свою независимость. Движения сопротивления были настойчивыми. Высоки были ценности чести и достоинства. Во-вторых, мы рассматриваем политические, социальные, экономические причины. Яркая и трагическая страница казахской истории- это когда казахский народ на протяжении XIX века периодически поднимался на крупные восстания и защищал свою независимость. Из-за неравной силы все сопротивление было побеждено. Основная причина поражения-военная техника между колонистами и колонизаторами. В статье анализируются причины поражения вооруженной борьбы против империи. Будут изучены историческое значение, общие закономерности, взаимосвязи восстаний во главе с казахскими лидерами в истории нации.

Во главе восстаний стояли герои из династий, пользующихся большим авторитетом в казахском обществе. Один из них-Есет Котибарулы из клана Шекты. Восстание Есет батыра потерпело поражение в истории. Однако читатель и последующие поколения создали историю, чтобы ее можно было изучать. В этом его особенность. У национальных восстаний были взаимосвязи. У лидеров были не только внешне знакомые-знающие, но и коммуникабельные отношения. Друг к другу были оплоты. Оказывали военную поддержку. Признавая храбрость и отвагу, они следовали друг за другом. Их объединили общие интересы против общего врага. Это заслуживает внимания. Потому что прошлая историография разделяла восстания казахского народа против колониализма. Мы присоединяемся к концепции единства движения за свободу.

Ключевые слова. Колониализм, национальное освобождение, независимость, герои, бий, преемственность, историография.