

## NEWS

OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

SERIES OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES

ISSN 2224-5294

<https://doi.org/10.32014/2020.2224-5294.134>

Volume 4, Number 332 (2020), 321 – 328

Z.Ye. Kabuldinov, F.R. Lebayev

Ch.Ch. Valikanov Institut of history and ethnology, Almaty, Kazakhstan.  
E-mail: [kabulzia@rambler.ru](mailto:kabulzia@rambler.ru), [tazshaboy@gmail.com](mailto:tazshaboy@gmail.com)

### SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF KAZAKHS ON THE RIGHT BANK OF THE IRTYSH IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE XIX CENTURY

**Abstract.** The article considers the social and economic situation of Kazakhs in the right bank of the Irtysh in the first half of the XIX century on the basis of written and archival sources. There was no independent body of national administration of the right-bank Kazakhs of the Irtysh. It is noted that the problem aspect is associated with the lack of independent Management of the Kazakhs of the right Bank of the Irtysh. Loyal Kazakhs, the so-called «internal», officially admitted by tsarism to the «eternal nomad» on the right Bank of the Irtysh at the end of the XVIII century. They did not have a clear and understandable idea of their legal status and the rules of their stay on the inner side of the Irtysh border line. The authors emphasized that from the beginning of the first transitions, up to 1854, there was a truly unique situation when the Kazakhs did not have their own separate Management. It is proved that neither the «Charter on the Siberian Kirghiz» of 1822, nor the «Regulations» of 1838 solved the problem of regulating the order of their stay on the internal side. In these conditions, the Kazakhs became the object of arbitrariness on the part of officials of the Altai mountain district, as well as the peasant authorities and, in particular, the military-Kaisak population of the Irtysh line. Apparently, the tsarism deliberately avoided bringing the legal framework under the question of loyal Kazakhs, fearing that it could later harm the tsarism, since the free lands of the Tomsk province were intended in the future for the relocation of peasants from the European part of Russia. By the middle of the XIX century, despite their internal unrest, the Kazakhs of the West Siberian region achieved certain results in economic terms. Their main occupation was cattle breeding. Regarding this problem, the authors used the works and notes of Russian researchers and governors-General, as well as correspondence of inter-governmental bodies. Socio-economic and political prerequisites for the creation of the Semipalatinsk inner district are highlighted. Statistical materials are given population growth in the districts on the right bank of the Irtysh.

**Keywords:** Kazakhs of the right bank of the Irtysh, the right to move, «internal» Kazakhs, «loyal» Kazakhs, independent body, national administration, district, province, parish, West Siberian region.

As you know, loyal Kazakhs, officially admitted by tsarism to the «eternal nomad» on the right Bank of the Irtysh at the end of the XVIII century, did not have a clear and understandable idea of their legal status and the rules of their stay on the inner side of the Irtysh border line.

Even the «Charter on the Siberian Kirghiz» of 1822 clearly did not explain the order of their stay on the territory of the inner districts of Tobolsk and Tomsk provinces adjacent to the Middle Zhuz [1; 399-428].

Every attempt to determine their «rights and duties» led to many long conversations of various departments, and as a result, they was «sprayed» on numerous legal documents, not directly related with their socio-legal status.

In these conditions, the Kazakhs became the object of arbitrariness on the part of officials of the Altai mountain district, as well as the peasant authorities and, in particular, the military-Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) population of the Irtysh line. Apparently, the tsarism deliberately avoided bringing the legal

framework under the question of loyal Kazakhs, fearing that it could later harm the tsarism, since the free lands of the Tomsk province were intended in the future for the relocation of peasants from the European part of Russia. This, for example, was openly written about in 1897. collectors of materials on Kazakh land use in the Pavlodar district of Semipalatinsk region: «...in the first half of the XIX century, the Kirghiz nomads were located so widely that they reached the Ob. The wave of Russian colonization from the North, represented by the peasants, threw the Kirghiz back to the South. For the latter, the struggle with the new newcomers was too much for them – they were supported by a more «high culture» and The administration of the Altai mountain district, which repeatedly used coercive measures...» [2].

But at the same time, it was not always possible to forcibly evict nomadic Kazakhs «from a long time ago». On the one hand, they had official permission to roam in the inner districts of the Tomsk province since the end of the XVIII century. on the other hand, they found different ways to avoid forced evictions. Constant complaints of Kazakhs and peasants of the inner districts against certain representatives of the official authorities of the region caused the Main Department of Western Siberia to send an official on special assignments Trofimov to the territory of the Tomsk province, which began its work on June 30, 1839. After passing the line to the Yamyshev fortress, Trofimov notes that «this people roam not only in the depths of the line in different directions at a distance of 300 or more versts, even beyond the Vats and Narym, but also at the villages themselves, where the volost authorities have no power» [3; 192]. In this case, we are very interested in the information collected by Trofimov, describing the social and legal situation of the Kazakh population in the territory of the Tomsk province, which, without any doubt, could not but affect the formation of specific demographic and economic features of their life.

Here's what he wrote Trofimov, for example, about the relationship between Kazakh and Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) population in their secret «Note on the abuse of Management within the line of nomadic Kyrgyz»: «...going from Ust-Kamenogorsk down the line and having reached the left flank 7 Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) regiment, from the first redoubt started I get a loud complaint loyalists of the Kirghiz that all a comfortable place in the space owned by the villages, the Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors) annually divide among them, that have left everyone from his household to give them half the annual cash fee, charge for a tithe under the arable land of the already degenerated strip from 3 to 5 rubles, and for a tithe or a pledge under 7 and 8 rubles and for a plot of mowing for 150 and 200 kopens from 20 to 50 rubles. In addition, some redoubt commanders demand payment from them even for places under yurts...» [3; 353-353 Ob].

And this is despite the fact that the «Charter of the Siberian Kirghiz» of 1822 did not contain provisions that for the use of village lands nomadic Kazakhs had to bear some monetary expenses [1; 399-428]. This cannot but indicate the existence of Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) arbitrariness in relation to the autochthonous inhabitants of Western Siberia.

And the Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors), taking advantage of the lack of clear regulations on the use of their neighbors priirtyshskih lands, sophisticated in their illegal actions. For example, in the redoubts of Talitsky and Ozerny, the Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors) «are so bold in their claim to the Kirghiz that they have invented a customs duty even on their own products, such as koshem, leathers, and others, arbitrarily calling them foreign...» [3; 353 vol.].

Naturally, in the conditions of the unbearable situation on the Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) lands, most of the Kazakhs were forced to seek a better «shelter» from the peasants of the Tomsk province. Moreover, the peasants, having a need for workers and shepherds, themselves invited Kazakhs to permanent and seasonal work, reducing the rent for arable land and mowing almost twice than it was established by the Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors). In addition, when the inspection was that the peasants «please cancel» the frequent eviction of the Kazakh population and «to permit them to keep them on their lands freely, explaining that they are the only one here capable work-class men and without them the economy of farmers in the end will be ruined in a short time» [3; 361 vol.]. Of course, this fact could not be alerted of the Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors), which in any way did not make such «pulling» of Kazakh peasants.

In these conditions, the Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors), fearing to remain without income, found more sophisticated methods of extracting money from the Kazakhs. For example, they released Kazakhs only if they paid the Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) societies sums of money in the amount of 1 to 5 rubles per Yurt. Often the Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors) forced the steppe people to buy tickets for the right to migrate to the

areas of peasant villages [3; 355 vol.]. they were no longer satisfied with the Repair duty and numerous illegal levies, «finding» more «legal» ways to withdraw money from the disenfranchised Kazakhs.

The Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors), taking advantage of the fact that the Mining authorities periodically made an initially impossible decision to evict the Kazakhs, were able to extract material benefits for themselves. For example, in just one summer, they went to the land of the Mining Department three times and forcibly «tried» to evict the Kazakhs from the Irtysh line. Naturally, in such a situation, the Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors) were in a better position, because they "beat out" money from the Kazakhs for the right to be non – populated, and from the peasants-for the right to use relatively cheap Kazakh labor. In addition, when bypassing the Kazakh villages and Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) villages, it was revealed that the Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) guards take money, allegedly, «not for themselves, but present them to their regimental commander Esaul Potanin» [3; 355].

Not having time to recover from the claims of the Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors), Kazakhs and peasants became the object of extortion by land managers and even clerks. Trofimov on this occasion notes that "those and others, at least twice a summer, insist that the peasants do not keep the Kirghiz on their lands, but are inclined by gifts to condescend (gifts are mostly monetary)... they come down a year from each village, actually for the Kirghiz up to 150 rubles" [3; 354ob.].

Thus, the volost clerk Mazin received 10 rubles from Kazakhs traveling at the factory and the village of Polovinkina, and for «40 rubles that were not received for his purpose, he left two Bukhara robes» [3; 356]. Or the Zemstvo administrator Zubarev from each village illegally received from 100 to 150 rubles. By the way, according to the peasants, Zubarev and Mazin were characterized extremely negatively and did not enjoy authority among the local peasant population [3; 356].

Existing lease payments for the use of land further aggravated the situation of the Kazakh population of the Tomsk province. Here is how Trofimov writes about it in his secret report: «...wandering on a line below Semey to Outpost Cheremhovskogo and to the right of tracts Belagak having considerable herds, hire pastures from the Bailiffs and Kamyshin Korosteleva leasecom-constable Eremina and Vandakurov subordinated Loktevsky factory office, learned his Management of all the places in the Belagach steppe and Shulbinskaya to zmeevskaya the cutting area and Narrow steppe from Lyapunov lake and its neighboring Galskogo the Bor to the memorial bish-Karagay. These two persons, as if deliberately chosen from the entire factory Department, would Rob the Kirghiz without any pity. For the right to roam and winter on the steppes, which are not occupied by any factory and the salted quality of the land is no more than pastures, inconvenient, they are forced to pay Yerebin and Vandakurov annually with money, the best horses, oxen, sheep, sheepskins, koshmas and Bukhara robes... in a year from each nomadic village there descends twice, and sometimes more collected on the line from the infidel Kirghiz annual repairs...» [3; 356 vol.].

According to Trofimova, not entirely legal and he was a fine collection of the Kazakhs the same repair fee: «by reason of the establishment of this duty and to common sense, it justly may be charged in favour of the Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) troops only when paying it is land belonging to their own army, on the contrary, the Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors) , gradually relegating the major part of these Kirghiz lines on the state-owned land and peasant and removing there re ireposquery of the Irtysh river and collect toll at all with naisagawa allegiance to Russia, where they would be in the lines, no wandering» [3; 377-377 about.]. In the existing conditions, he proposed to contribute the amount received from the repair fee to the benefit of the state Treasury only [3; 337 vol.].

In his secret reports to the Governor-General of Western Siberia, Trofimov also describes in detail the life of internal Kazakhs and comes to the logical conclusion that the Kazakh population feels a desire to transition to a settled lifestyle. This was evidenced by the occupation of Kazakhs in the Tomsk province by such crafts typical of the settled population as tailoring, shoemaking, blacksmithing, carpentry, leather cultivation, spinning, weaving and, in particular, hay harvesting and agriculture, and, quite possibly, the Kazakhs were familiar with all this «no less than the Russians». In addition, the Kazakhs built wooden houses and even started a flour mill on the river [3; 360]. Straited on all sides by the migrant peasantry, according to Trofimov, «not having a single piece of land at their arbitrary disposal, they do not even dare to drive a stake for a solid settlement, and therefore they themselves can not do anything to improve their life...» [3; 360]. It is impossible not to agree with the impartiality of this person in assessing these and other facts of the poor socio-legal situation of the Kazakh population, who noted that «... these poor people (Kazakhs-the authors), strictly called loyal subjects of Russia, do not have a place where they

*could safely spend not only the summer, but even the winter, and must hide with cattle, with yurts, like hares, in logs and in ravines...» [3; 355].*

Of course, in these conditions, it was unthinkable to talk about the transition of Kazakhs to a settled agricultural lifestyle. In this regard, the hackneyed thesis of Soviet scientists that there is a certain «favorable influence» of the former on the latter in places where the settled agricultural peasant population comes into contact with the pastoral Kazakh population, as a result of which the latter, allegedly, everywhere switched to a more "progressive" sedentary agricultural lifestyle. Yes, it is impossible to deny the fact that the prerequisites for this transition were – most of all normal, mutually beneficial economic contacts of the Kazakhs were formed with the simple peasant population. But the uncertainty of the social and legal status of Kazakhs on the right Bank of the Irtysh left no chance for closer economic convergence of the displaced Russian and autochthonous Kazakh population.

Special attention should also be paid to the problem of resolving claims by linear authorities, which became more acute by the 30s of the XIX century. As revealed Trofimov, linear bosses, acquiring the right to disassemble them with each other and not knowing firmly steppe of the laws and customs, *«resolves conflicts and requires them lawsuits coming from the Russian claim, against all belief and justice, which summons the Kirghiz arbitrarily, without reference to their elders and judges and keep for a few days in outposts under arrest, and sometimes punish them bodily, without letting the elders know what Straeven the elders and biys themselves have their own power... the Kirghiz do not make any claims against the Russians, and because of the insignificance of their effective power, they are not able to do so...» [3; 355].*

The uncertainty of the social and legal status of the internal Kazakhs primarily negatively affected their attempts to resolve lawsuits that arose in their relations with the settled Russian population. According to M. Krasovsky, Kazakhs, *«roaming in the vicinity of peasant and Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) villages, often encountered settlers quite often; they were drawn to the massacre in the Zemstvo courts of Omsk, Kolyvanskogo, Barnaul and Biysk counties, despite the fact that they were not subject to these courts by any government regulations; they were also disturbed by the Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) authorities, and the mountain authorities did not leave them alone. In short, there was utter disorder in this part of the steppe...» [2, 4].*

By the middle of the XIX century, despite their internal unrest, the Kazakhs of the West Siberian region achieved certain results in economic terms. Their main occupation was cattle breeding. Here is how one of the commanders of the 6th Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) regiment, Sotnik mahonin, writes about it in his report to General Bronevsky dated January 24, 1827: *«at the distance of the regiment entrusted to me, it is known that the loyal Kirghiz people do not have grain farming, and have never started it before because of the barren land here...» [5].*

And in the early 30s of the XIX century. S.B. bronevsky himself also stated that *«some livestock farmers are engaged in grain farming, which unwittingly leads them to a settled life. but this beneficial effect has still weak results» [6; 181].*

The same applies to the middle of the XIX century and writes Gagemeister: *«all Kirghiz lead a nomadic lifestyle and become sedentary only in extreme need." He also notes that at this time among the West Siberian Kazakhs were very large cattle owners:" the most numerous herds are probably among the Kirghiz, where one owner had up to 10 000 horses» [7].*

The highest «peak» of the development of cattle breeding among loyal Kazakhs is, perhaps, 1832. At this time, according to the information collected by the assessor of the Semipalatinsk land court Usov, 2036 Kazakh farms (4275 men) of the factory Department (Tomsk province) had 54054 heads of horses, 14313 – cattle and 68879 – small [3; 40]. On average, there were 12.7 heads of horses, 3.4 heads of cattle, and 16.1 heads of small animals per male head. This information is interesting in relation to 1840. about the size of cattle breeding in the Kazakhs of Tobolsk and Tomsk provinces.

This is due to the following reasons. First, the Kazakhs of the Tomsk province are mainly those who were officially admitted by the tsarism to the «eternal nomad» back in 1788, i.e. they had some legal basis for their stay, although in the absence of their own administration, they also had enough problems. Secondly, on the Novoishimskaya side, including in the inner districts – Kurgan and Ishim – Tobolsk province, the struggle of the Kazakhs for the return of their ancestral lands, which resulted in the mid-XIX century, did not subside for a long time. in organized horse theft by Kazakhs temporarily staying here. And, therefore, in this situation, it was impossible to talk about the normal development of the cattle-breeding economy of the Tobolsk Kazakhs.

At the same time, it is not difficult to notice that, in comparison with the data for 1832, the Tomsk Kazakhs have a slight decrease in the number of livestock per male soul. This trend can be explained by a number of reasons. First, since the beginning of the 30s of the XIX century, the question of the need to evict the Kazakhs from the area of the factory Department was raised, and the tsarism began to take concrete measures to resolve this problem. Secondly, the gradual growth of the population of the Altai mountain district left Kazakhs with few places for the development of cattle farming, i.e. the latter were caught in the tight grip of the peasant-Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) land-owning population on both sides. And, finally, the lack of loyal Kazakhs of their own separate management could not but lead to a rather precarious position of most farms.

The authors explains this condition by saying that *«cattle in the hands of a settler are more important than those of a nomad, because they are better kept and give a large income»* [7; 293,294].

Here, of course, the authors completely omitted two things: that in relation to the Kazakh population, the tsarist government used a policy of forced eviction from the Novoishimsky district, and that the peasant population was still settled in land and administrative terms. Some development of cattle breeding among the internal Kazakhs in relation to the period up to the middle of the XIX century, despite its gradual decline, we explain as follows.

First, the internal Kazakhs, despite their administrative and land unrest, for more than 60 years of their stay did not pay any taxes and did not bear duties to the state.

Secondly, they, having early come into contact with the settled agricultural Russian population, were no longer burdened with the non-equivalent exchange that the Kazakhs of the outer Kazakh districts suffered from. In particular, they were the first to contact buyers of livestock products directly, without intermediaries, at numerous peasant fairs and Torzhok.

Third, the internal Kazakhs, due to their land unrest, were forced to put more emphasis on the development of cattle breeding, without much distraction from farming.

In addition, in the forest-steppe expanses of Western Siberia, up to the middle of the XIX century, especially in the Russian districts bordering the Kazakh steppe, they were almost the only pastoral population. But the mass influx of peasant migrants is still at a later time.

At the same time, we should not forget that, according to CH. CH. Valikhanov, *«the livestock industry thrives only in those districts that have the most places convenient for winter camps»*, where the inner Semipalatinsk district was considered no exception, *«covered with solid forests and dense meadows»* [8]. Among them were often wealthy cattle breeders who had several thousand head of horses in their herds. For example, according to Radlov, the famous Bai Maika had 1000 horses, 1500 sheep and 200 cows. And that wasn't the limit. Have Twice Nurekenov and his brothers were alone horses 7000 goals [9].

But in the future, as we noted, it was necessary to expect a decrease in the number of cattle among loyal Kazakhs, since the situation in which they were, could not but lead their cattle farms to some disorder [10].

We explain the trend of further deterioration of the livestock farming of Kazakhs on the domestic side, first of all, by the lack of their own management for almost 66 years, which could not but play a negative role: they became the object of arbitrariness of different departments [11].

Secondly, it is impossible not to take into account the fact that the addition of Kazakhs to the outer districts since 1849, with the subsequent collection of yasak, could not but play a negative role. Apparently, the Kazakhs tried to get rid of a large number of livestock, so as not to pay a large tax [12].

Third, the Kazakhs began to actively transfer to lease terms, which in itself could not but hit, and strongly, their livestock farming, not to mention agriculture [13].

And, finally, since the 40s of this century, tsarism, accusing the Kazakhs of horse theft and robberies of the peasant population, begins a series of continuous evictions of them to the territory of the outer districts.

On the domestic side, normal conditions for the development of trade were not created for the Kazakhs. It is known that in the beginning of XIX century the Kazakhs were trying to create for themselves some trading privileges, but the tsarist government did not go as envisioned here, an *«important damage border trade, which lay their hands on is their main goal»* [14; 29 ob.]. It is no accident that even in relation to 1840 on the right Bank of the Irtysh, which was concentrated a significant number of internal Kazakhs, we do not see wide distribution among them trade. At this time, *«only two of these Kirghiz are engaged in trading, Sasyk and Basar Jan - kpaevs of the Kipchak family, who annually*

*exchange cattle, lard and skins of Asian goods for 15 thousand rubles or more at the irbitskaya fair» [3; 379 ob.].*

Despite the gradual trend of deterioration of the social, legal and economic situation of loyal Kazakhs, it is impossible not to notice that at the same time their number has grown somewhat. So, according to S.B. Bronevsky, by the beginning of the 30s of the XIX century loyal Kazakhs numbered about 12 thousand people [6; 180-182].

In 1852, there were already 18985 people on the right Bank of the Irtysh, not counting those who roamed the territory of the Tobolsk province [10; 259]. Although, according to Idarov, by 1854 loyal Kazakhs to the very beginning of the formation of the Semipalatinsk inner district of the Semipalatinsk region already numbered 16,000 people. As we can see, some decline in the number of Kazakhs is evident [15].

We are inclined to explain the decrease in the number of internal Kazakhs by the following reasons: first, in 1849, they were forcibly assigned to the outer steppe districts, which could not but lead to a certain outflow of Kazakhs outside the right Bank of the Irtysh; second, the beginning of the 50s of the XIX century was marked by mass forced eviction of them on the basis of the traditional accusation of Kazakhs in horse theft.

At the same time, the urban population, on the contrary, grew, although at a small rate. For example, in one of the largest cities in Western Siberia – Omsk in 1823 there were only 22 Kazakh citizens, in 1840 – 109, in 1847 – 117. We should not forget that among these urban residents there were many people who studied in local educational institutions [16].

As you know, the majority of Kazakhs used the adoption of the Christian faith as a way of «legal transition» to the inner side in the conditions of numerous prohibitions to migrate. However, tsarism failed to achieve the appearance of a significant number of baptized Kazakhs on the residential side. For example, according to the results of the 9th audit in 1851, on the territory of the Tobolsk province alone, there were only 50 baptized Kazakhs who lived compactly on the territory of the Kain district [10; 142]. Or in the Tomsk province: according to the same census, among the category of burghers, where the Kazakhs especially aspired, there were only 12 baptized steppe dwellers [10].

So, the absence of the Kazakhs of the Tomsk province of their own management, established rights and duties, places of permanent residence, developed a mechanism for resolving conflicts with the settled agricultural population led to numerous violations of their rights, the deterioration of their socio-economic situation. Kaisak (kazakhs – authors) constables, peasant authorities, as well as officials of the Altai mountain district, taking advantage of the social and legal insecurity created among the Kazakhs, committed numerous outrages and arbitrariness in relation to the latter. To some extent, the simple peasant population suffered from the arbitrariness of the Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors) and their superiors for the right to attract Kazakhs to various economic work.

**З.Е. Қабылдинов, Ф.Р. Лебаев**

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты

**XIX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БІРІНШІ ЖАРТЫСЫНДАҒЫ ЕРТІСТІҢ  
ОҢ ЖАҒАЛАУЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚТАРДЫҢ  
ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК-ЭКОНОМИКАЛЫҚ ЖАҒДАЙЫ**

**Аннотация.** Мақалада архив құжаттары негізінде XIX ғасырдың бірінші жартысындағы Ертістің оң жағалауындағы қазақтардың әлеуметтік-экономикалық жағдайы сипатталады. Ертістің оң жағалауында Семей ішкі округі құрылғанға дейін қазақтарды ұлттық басқарудың дербес органы болған жоқ. Зерттеудің проблемалық аспекті Ертістің оң жақ жағалауындағы қазақтардың дербес басқару жүйесінің болмағандығына байланысты екендігі атап көрсетілді. XVIII ғасырдың соңында Ертістің оң жағалауындағы «Мәңгілік көшпендіге» патша үкіметі ресми түрде жіберген «ішкі» немесе «адал» деп танылған қазақтар өздерінің құқықтық жағдайын нақты білмеді. Ертіс шекарасының ішкі жағын мекендеу ережелері шаруалар мен жергілікті халыққа анық және түсінікті болған жоқ. Алғашқы қоныс аударудан бастап 1854 жылға дейін қазақтардың өзінің жеке басқару органы болмаған уақытта шын мәнінде бірегей жағдай қалыптасты. 1822 жылғы «Сібір қырғыздары туралы Жарғы» да, 1838 жылғы «Ереже» де олардың ішкі жақта мекендеу

тәртібіп реттеу мәселелеріп шешпеді. Бұл жағдайда қазақтар Алтай тау-кен аймағының шенеуніктері, сондай-ақ шаруа басшылығы, әсіресе, Ертіс желісінің әскери-казак халқы тарапынан озбырлық нысанына айналды. Патша үкіметі кейіннен зиян келтіруі мүмкін деп қауіптеніп, қазақтар туралы мәселе бойынша дұрыс берілген заңнамалық базаны жүргізбеген. Өйткені Томск губерниясының бос жері болашақта Ресейдің еуропалық бөлігінен қоныс аударатын шаруаларға арналған еді. XIX ғасырдың ортасына қарай Батыс-Сібір өлкесінің қазақтары өздерінің ішкі тұрақсыздығына қарамастан шаруашылық жағынан белгілі бір нәтижелерге қол жеткізді. Олардың негізгі кәсібі малшаруашылығы болды. Бұл мәселеге қатысты авторлар орыс зерттеушілері мен губернаторлардың еңбектері мен жазбаларын, басқарушы органдардың алмасқан хаттарын пайдаланды. Семей ішкі округінің әлеуметтік-экономикалық және саяси алғышарттары ашып көрсетілді. Ертістің оң жақ жағалауындағы округтердегі халық өсімі туралы статистикалық мәліметтер берілді.

**Түйін сөздер:** Ертістің оң жағалауындағы қазақтар, қоныс аударуға берілген құқық, «ішкі» қазақтар, «адал» қазақтар, дербес орган, ұлттық басқару, округ, губерния, болыс, Батыс-Сібір өлкесі.

**З.Е. Кабульдинов, Ф.Р. Лебаев**

Институт истории и этнологии имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова

### **СОЦИАЛЬНО-ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОЕ ПОЛОЖЕНИЕ КАЗАХОВ ПРАВОБЕРЕЖЬЯ ИРТЫША В ПЕРВОЙ ПОЛОВИНЕ XIX ВЕКА**

**Аннотация.** В статье рассмотрено на основе письменных и архивных источников социально-экономическое положение казахов правобережья Иртыша в первой половине XIX века. Не было самостоятельного органа национального управления правобережных казахов Иртыша. Отмечено, что проблемный аспект связан с отсутствием своего самостоятельного Управления у казахов Правобережья Иртыша. Верноподданные казахи, так называемые «внутренние», допущенные наризом официально на «вечную кочевку» на Правобережье Иртыша еще в конце XVIII в. не имели ясного и понятного для них и окружавшего их крестьянского и линейного населения представления о своем правовом положении и правилах своего пребывания на внутренней стороне Иртышской пограничной линии. Авторами подчеркнута, что с начала первых переходов, вплоть до 1854 г., сложилась поистине уникальная ситуация, когда казахи не имели своего отдельного Управления. Доказано, что ни «Устав о сибирских киргизах» от 1822 г., ни «Положение» от 1838 г. не решили проблемы урегулирования порядка пребывания их на внутренней стороне. В этих условиях казахи становились объектом произвола как со стороны чиновников Алтайского горного округа, так и крестьянского начальства и, в особенности, военно-казачьего населения Иртышской линии. Видимо, наризм сознательно избегал подведения законодательной базы под вопрос о верноподданных казахах, опасаясь, что она впоследствии может навредить наризму, так как свободные земли Томской губернии были предназначены в будущем для переселения туда крестьян из европейской части России. К середине XIX в., несмотря на свою внутреннюю необустроенность, казахи западносибирского края в хозяйственном отношении достигли определенных результатов. Основным их занятием было скотоводство. Касательно данной проблемы авторы использовали труды и записки русских исследователей и генерал губернаторов, переписки межуправленческих органов. Освещена социально-экономические и политические предпосылки создания Семипалатинского внутреннего округа. Даны статистические материалы роста населения в округах на правобережье Иртыша.

**Ключевые слова:** казахи правобережья Иртыша, право на кочевку, «внутренние» казахи, «верноподданные» казахи, самостоятельный орган, национальное управление, округ, губерния, волость, Западно-Сибирский регион.

#### **Information about the authors:**

Kabuldinov Z.Ye. – d.h.s., professor, the director of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institut of history and ethnology, Almaty, Kazakhstan; [kabulzia@rambler.ru](mailto:kabulzia@rambler.ru); <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9625-0535>

Lebayev F.R. – Phd student of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institut of history and ethnology, Almaty, Kazakhstan; [tazshaboy@gmail.com](mailto:tazshaboy@gmail.com); <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4105-7129>

**REFERENCES**

- [1] Levshin A.I. Description Kirghiz Kaisaks (kazakhs – authors) or Kirghiz Kaisak hordes and steppes. Almaty: Sanath, 1996. – 656 p.
- [2] MKZ. Semipalatinsk region. 4. Pavlodar district. Voronezh, 1903. V. 11. 471 p. (49).
- [3] SAOR. F. 3. I. 1. F. 1112. P. 59.
- [4] Krasovsky M. Field Siberian Kirghiz. St. Petersburg, 1868. P. 3. 278 p. (108-109).
- [5] Makhonin. State and loyalists Kyrgyz economy in Omsk // Agrarian magazine. № XIX. Moscow, 1827. P. 163. (5).
- [6] Bronevsky. About Kirghiz kaysakah Middle Horde // Domestic notes. St. Petersburg, 1830. № 121. P. 194. (180).
- [7] Hagemeister. Statistical review of Siberia. P.2. (285). St. Petersburg: Second Printing Branch of His Imperial Majesty's Chancellery, 1854. 101 p.
- [8] Valikhanov Ch. Works in five volumes. V.1. Alma-Ata: Kazakh Academy of Sciences Publishing House, 1961. 777 p. (533).
- [9] Radlov V.V. From Siberia. Diary pages. Moscow: Nauka, 1989. 479 p. (71).
- [10] Razdykov S.Z. Kazakhs of the right Bank of the Irtysh in the XVIII-first half of the XIX centuries: socio-economic system. // Tomsk. 2005. P. 55-60.
- [11] Kabuldinov Z.Ye. Social and legal status of the Kazakh population in the Tomsk Region (the first half of XIX century) // Poisc. 1999. P.85–89. (89).
- [12] Kabuldinov Z.Ye. Creating internal Semipalatinsk region in the Tomsk province, especially its management // Poisc. – 2000. P. 198–203. (199).
- [13] Kabuldinov Z.E. Kazakh population in the Tomsk province in the 80s of XIX – early XX centuries // International scientific conference «Kazakhstan on the way to the state independence: Past and Present». – Families, 2001. – Vol. 2. – 480. (65).
- [14] CSHA. F. 1286. I. 2. F. 148. P. 5.
- [15] Idarov C.A. Siberian Kirghiz steppe and the newly established department in it Semipalatinsk region // Journal of the Interior Ministry. St. Petersburg, 1854. Vol. 7. P. 2–54. (7–8).
- [16] Kabuldinov Z.E. Sultanahmet Sultan: statesman, diplomat and warrior. Almaty: Litera-M, 2018. P. 174-179.