

A.S. Yskak , G.B. Zhumatay ^{*} 

Narxoz University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: sakmaral7@gmail.com; gzhumatay@gmail.com)

The Implementation of the Imperial System of Governance in Semirechye in the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries

The article is devoted to the study of one of the less studied problems of Russian history — Semirechye in the management system of the Russian Empire. The purpose of the study is a comprehensive study of the problems of introducing the system of colonial administration in Semirechye. In the second half of the 19th century, the Semirechye region, which was of strategic importance for the Russian Empire, was brought into the new imperial system of governance, alien to Kazakh society. Based on extensive literature and archival documents, it has been established that Semirechye was governed by state power and an administrative apparatus, which constituted a gigantic structure encompassing a vast system of institutions with a complex hierarchy of officials. The operation of this vast administrative apparatus in the region, under the direct control of the military governor, was not without its shortcomings. The vastness of the territory, the lack of sufficiently experienced officials, and the widespread weakness of oversight created conditions for all manner of abuses. An analysis of the identified shortcomings and abuses in the regional administration and state apparatus was conducted. Although audits, as a method of overseeing regional governance, identified shortcomings, they did not effectively address their consequences. A comprehensive study was conducted of factors such as the dual subordination between ministries and the Turkestan Governor-General, the shortage of qualified employees with knowledge of local languages, and an indifferent attitude toward official duties, which gradually led to the development of bureaucratic relations within the colonial administration system.

Keywords: Semirechye, Russian Empire, Kazakhs, management, institution of governorship, state apparatus, system of institutions, office work, officials.

Introduction

Semirechye, as part of the Turkestan region in the 19th century, held economic, political and strategic significance for the Russian Empire [1, 2]. Despite its importance, the problem of Semirechye in the management system of the Russian Empire has not been sufficiently studied, since it has not previously been subjected to comprehensive scientific research. However, historical science has studied various aspects of the political, socio-economic history of Semirechye. Certain aspects of the problem during the period under consideration were reflected in the works of pre-revolutionary scholars, officials, and travelers, such as A.I. Levshin, Ch. Valikhanov, N.A. Aristov, V.V. Velyaminov-Zernov, N.I. Veselovsky, and others [3–7]. Despite the presence of knowledge of individual aspects of the problem, there is a need for a thorough and comprehensive study. The study of the problems of managing Semirechye is of scientific interest and allows us to highlight one of the main issues of colonial administration — the introduction of an European State Management Apparatus that was alien to the region and its inhabitants, the Kazakhs.

Until today, the specifics and features of the implementation of the colonial administration system in Semirechye, namely the state apparatus of administration, the institution of governorship in pre-revolutionary Kazakhstan, have not received proper attention in the scholarship. One of the important issues when studying the governance system in the region is the issue of the state administrative apparatus with its extensive network of imperial institutions. It should be noted that this problem has not been the focus of attention of researchers, since more emphasis has been placed on examining general issues of governance in Turkestan in a broad historical context [8–14].

Moreover, there is a paucity of research on management issues at the regional level from new perspectives. The study of the problem is interdisciplinary in nature, since it first concerns issues of the history of office work (during the period under study, office work was an integral part of public administration), as well as such independent scientific areas as the history of state institutions and archival affairs. Exploring this problem will make it possible to further characterize the processes of documentation and document flow of the period under study, as well as analyze the evolution of the development of documentation systems. All

^{*} Corresponding author's e-mail: gzhumatay@gmail.com

this will contribute to the study of the management system of the Kazakh steppe as a whole through the prism of documentation and the formation of documentation systems.

Materials and methods

Over the past three decades, scholars have published a huge amount of research on the issue of general governance of Kazakhstan during the imperial period. Research by Kazakh scientists is primarily focused on examining the formation of the Kazakh bureaucracy, the institution of volost managers and their integration into the imperial management system [15–17]. In the current research, both published and unpublished materials were used as part of this study. Among the unpublished materials, there are archival data and documents from the collections of the Central State Archives of the Republic of Kazakhstan (CSA RK) that we referred to extensively in analyzing the topic under study. Of particular interest is the huge array of written sources from the management institute — the Semirechye Regional Government (Fond 44), the personal fond of G.A. Kolpakovsky (Fond 825) and collections of copies of documents from foreign archives (Fond 2300). Furthermore, regularly published by the Semirechensk oblast (regional) administration, such publications as the “Address-calendar”, “Memorial book”, as well as the periodicals “Semirechenskie oblastnye vedomosti”, “Tashkentskiy kur’er”, “Rech”, “Voprosy kolonizatsii” contain extensive information about the structure of the state apparatus and officials, audits and everyday life in Semirechye.

The gradual spread of imperial laws in Semirechye was clearly visible, as evidenced by the code of laws in the collection in three volumes “Legislative Acts” [18–20], extracted from the Complete Collection and the Code of Laws of the Russian Empire (“Polnoe sobranie i svod zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii”). As colonization of the steppe intensified, expeditionary research was intensively and widely carried out in various fields, having, in addition to scientific, diplomatic, economic and trade tasks, as a result of which special research materials appeared with valuable information about Semirechye. It must be admitted that even fragmentary information significantly supplemented existing individual facts and contributed to the clarification of facts not yet known to us. Valuable information is provided by the studies of scientists and the memoirs of officials [21–23], which, in addition to scientific, had diplomatic and trade tasks. The use of an extensive set of sources and materials contributed to the identification of new facts, their comprehension and interpretation, allowing us to penetrate deeper into the history of colonial administration in Semirechye.

This study is interdisciplinary in nature and therefore utilized various methods and approaches to achieve a thorough understanding and comprehensive examination of the problem under study. First and foremost, the institutional approach allowed us to determine the role and significance of the institution of governorship, particularly the Turkestan Governor-General, within the hierarchy of the imperial system of governance and to identify the specific levels of subordination of institutions. Adhering to the principles of comprehensiveness and holistic approach, published and unpublished archival sources were subjected to a meticulous, critical review and analysis. These sources helped establish the organization of the administrative system in Semirechye, including local imperial institutions, identify the key factors influencing the functioning of the state apparatus, and determine shortcomings and abuses. The use of qualitative methods, such as content analysis and critical analysis, allowed us to identify such specific factors as the dual subordination of local administrations to ministries and the Turkestan Governor-General, the shortage of qualified employees fluent in local languages, and an indifferent attitude toward official duties. Using the systemic method revealed that these factors led to the gradual establishment of bureaucratic relations in the system of colonial governance.

Results

Based on an analysis and summary of the conquest and implementation of the administrative system in Semirechye, the following conclusions were reached. First, the state apparatus in Semirechye, represented by the institution of the governor and the network of imperial institutions, exercised control over all local administrations and played a key role in implementing the imperial system of governance. Second, the system of local institutions in Semirechye represented a ramified imperial structure with dual subordination. Third, the institution of the governorship played a central role in the governance of Semirechye, which gradually increased as the governor’s powers expanded. Fourth, audits, as an instrument of control, served as the state apparatus’s primary method for implementing the imperial system of governance.

State administrative apparatus. In the management of Semirechye, an important role was played by the state administrative apparatus, which was an institution of governorship with an extensive network of institutions. The Institute of Regional Administration consisted of regional administration and district administra-

tion. The latter controlled the activities of volost governors, aul (village) elders and the Russian administration, as well as Cossack villages until 1890.

Established to manage Semirechye, the Regional Board was in charge of all affairs in the region and bore responsibilities for clerical affairs, affairs of zemstvo institutions, for the distribution of taxes, military service, mutual insurance of villages, the Kazakh loan fund, small loans, matters of land seizure [24; 7]. The Board included the Statistical Committee, the Printing House, the Prison Committee, the local department and committees for providing an assistance to residents affected by the earthquake, caring for the wounded and sick in wars, providing charitable assistance to the families of military personnel and others [25; 4, 5]. Due to the location of the region on the border with China, the Regional Administration had the right to resolve border affairs and, overall, its relations with the Chinese border authorities were peaceful. All activities of the administration were aimed at strictly maintaining the terms of international treaties, protecting the state border and the interests of Russian-subject natives in their relations with border tribes [22; 272]. The regional government in this direction acted according to instructions from the Turkestan Governor-General [19; 91, 92]. The first military governor of the region in 1867–1882 was Gerasim Alekseevich Kolpakovsky. He carried out all actions to manage the region through the Regional Board and he had senior and junior officials with special assignments. A separate unit was the position of vice-governor [26; 1, 2]. The military governor's work schedule was regulated, receiving citizens on official business three days a week [27; 4]. The staff of the Regional Board was uniform for the entire region of Kazakhstan. For example, the administrative structure and staff of the Semirechensk and Syr-Darya regions were typical. The number of staff and annual content in the two regions were typical. The only difference was the expenses allocated for hiring scribes and business expenses [28; 102]. Moreover, in the regional center of Verny, a mayor was appointed to manage the city, being responsible for police control [19; 96].

The staff of the district administration consisted of a district chief, senior and junior assistants and an office, which included a secretary and his two assistants, as well as a written and oral interpreter to conduct all office work. Additionally, the counties had a staff of clerks for the county congress [28; 104]. The representative of the administrative and police authorities at the local level was the district chief, whose important function was the collection of statistical information about the situation in the district. In each county, for the receipt and expenditure of amounts for military and military-people's administration, cash offices of income and expenses were established, which were directly subordinate to the Regional Treasury in the city of Verny [19; 95]. To ensure the activities of the local government apparatus, a staff was established, consisting of clerks and several messengers under the volost governors and aul elders, by decision of the local society and approval of the district chief [19; 96, 97]. On the local level, the representative of the administrative and police authorities, as before, remained the district chief [19; 94], whose main functions were essentially limited to monitoring the timely receipt of fees and the fulfillment of duties by the population [29; 138]. With the adoption of the Regulations on Public Administration on June 3, 1891, and the transfer of management functions in Cossack villages to the Military Board, the actions of the district administration in them were limited only to the affairs of the general police [24; 9].

System of institutions in Semirechye. According to archival documents in the Semirechensk region, the state administrative apparatus was represented by an extensive network of institutions covering the entire public sphere. A hierarchy of existing institutions in the region and the structure of their subordination to the relevant governing bodies were established. About 184 institutions functioned throughout the territory, of which: urban and estate self-government bodies — 5, court and prosecutorial authorities — 41, senior notary — 1, customs authorities — 3, gendarmerie and police institutions — 5, military institutions — 16, government authorities Cossack troops and military formations — 17, financial institutions — 8, land management and agricultural authorities — 5, forestry institutions — 5, postal and telegraph institutions — 16, public education institutions — 22, public, charitable and cultural and educational institutions — 12, religious institutions — 17. We believe that the number of institutions was no less than the indicated statistical data, as evidenced by the archival funds of these institutions, which today make up the National Archive Fund of Kazakhstan and concentrated in the Central State Archives in Almaty [30].

The system of institutions in Semirechye was close to the system of institutions in the metropole, subordinate to the corresponding ministries:

- Ministry of Internal Affairs — Military Governor, Regional Board, Regional Presence for Urban Affairs, Regional Presence for Military Conscription and Regional Statistical Committee.
- Ministry of Justice — Regional Court and prosecutorial supervision, Regional Prison Committee.
- Ministry of Finance — District Excise Department of the Semirechensk region.

- The Forestry Inspector of the Semirechensk region was subordinate to the Ministry of State Property.
- Ministry of Public Education Inspector of public schools of the Semirechensk region.

In addition, under the jurisdiction of the Departments of Orthodox Institutions were the Bishop of Turkestan and Tashkent, the Turkestan Spiritual Consistory, the Turkestan Diocesan School Council, the Diocesan Supervisor of Schools of the Turkestan Diocese, and the Orthodox Kazan Virgin Brotherhood of the Turkestan Diocese. The Department of Institutions of Empress Maria included the Regional Trusteeship of Children's Shelters and the Semirechensk Local Administration of the Russian Red Cross Society. The military institutions included the Commander of the Regional Troops and the Ataman of the Semirechensk Cossack Army, the Headquarters of the Semirechensk Region Troops, the Administration of the West Siberian Artillery Division, the Administration of the West Siberian Line Brigade, the Military Administration of the Semirechensk Cossack Army, the Semirechensk Engineering Distance, the Verny District Artillery Depot, Office of the Verny district military commander, officials of special assignments of the Omsk district quartermaster department, military investigators, and regional musical choir [26; 1–57]. At the beginning of the 20th century, judicial institutions — the district court, justice of the peace, district excise department, district customs department, tax inspectorate and treasury departments, which conducted banking operations of the State Bank branches, postal institutions were classified as Special Institutions. This also included institutions of the Ministry of Public Education, military institutions and religious institutions [24; 9]. As a result of the contradiction that arose by the beginning of the 1880s between two management models — the general imperial system of administrative management and the system of military management [31; 107], institutions in Semirechye had a peculiar form of subordination. Despite the direct control of the region by the military governor, the entire state apparatus was subordinate to the ministries, thereby showing that in the territory the power of the institution of governorship had limitations to a certain extent, maintaining the subordination of institutions to ministerial management. Regulatory regulation of all management issues was resolved at the ministry level, direct control in the region at the macro level was carried out by the governor-general, and at the micro level, in the region, by the military governor.

The district administration, in essence, as a local administration with the gradual settlement of settlers from the central provinces of Russia and the emergence of Russian settlements, was divided into two branches — the Russian administration in the settlements and the Kazakh (native) administration in the volosts, as well as the Taranchi administration in the border areas. As noted above, in Cossack villages control was carried out by the Military Board. By conquering Semirechye, the Russian Empire, along with expanding the territory and solving strategic problems in the border areas, also achieved a solution to the resettlement issue by turning the region into a settlement colony for Russian settlers and, in connection with this, forming a system of resettlement institutions both in the center and on the ground. One of the first proponents of this policy was G.A. Kolpakovsky, who set the task first of all to Russify the region by resettling the Russian peasantry from the central provinces and Siberia. In 1868, on his initiative, peasant settlers were brought and settled in Semirechye, and in fact, he was one of the first to implement the mass settlement of Russian peasantry in the region. Only in the period from 1868 to 1880, 36 settlements were inhabited by Russian settlers, and by the 1890s, Semirechye was already home to 101,488 Russians of both sexes [32; 26].

Institute of Governorship. Introduced in Russia in the first half of the 18th century, the institution of governorship as a form of management [33; 300] was the main institution for the management of Semirechye and the functioning of such a management apparatus could only be achieved if appropriate means and mechanisms were available. Internal management tools and personnel, officials were required. To regulate and coordinate activities at all levels of management, determining the competencies and powers of officials was a priority task. Abylkhozhin notes that although "...the imperial order was never burdened anywhere with the desire to transform the colonial periphery symmetrically or at least close to the metropole" [34; 19], it was precisely in the management issue that it was close to it. Matsuzato believes that two laws, "Institutions for the Management of Provinces of the All-Russian Empire" and "General Instructions to Governors General", did not provide systematization and conceptualization of the meaning and main function of the institution of governors general. Despite the broader disclosure of the powers of the Governor-General in the "Regulations on the Administration of the Turkestan Territory", it also lacked a conceptualization of the properties of the institution itself [10; 437]. Analyzing the institution of the General Government, Matsuzato highlights that "its transformation into a peripheral governing body required strengthening the powers of governors general", indicating three blocks of their key priority in the formation of legal norms and other activities relating to the territories entrusted to them: influence on personnel issues and priority in matters of military and security functions [10; 439, 440].

With the establishment of order in the internal provinces of Russia, the operation of the institution of the General Government would be suspended and the regulation of functions in the peripheries would be carried out in accordance with the regulation of July 22, 1866 “On the Space and Limits of the Power of the Governor”. The powers of the governor as a representative of the highest government authority in the province were expanded [19; 80, 81]. They were given the right to carry out a general and sudden audit of all institutions in the region at any time, which was their economic role. Second, resolving personnel issues from the reception, relocation of employees to their dismissal, appointment with notification of the corresponding minister. Third, to ensure the preservation of public order and state security, the governor had the power to close public places if an abuse of public order and security was detected in them, with notification to the Minister of Internal Affairs. At the county level, the county chief subordinate to the governor was responsible for all the above issues. All officials were required to obey the governor, regardless of the class of position or rank of seniority [19; 80, 81]. The military governor of the Semirechensk region also had similar rights. Based on the principle of unity of command, the military governor could submit economic, financial and judicial matters to collegial consideration and discussion of the general presence [19; 92–94].

The vice-governor of the region, as in other parts of European Russia and Siberia until 1914, carried out the duties assigned to managers of state property, communicating on particularly important issues with the governor-general through the Department of Agriculture in the city of Tashkent. From January 1, 1914, the functions of managing state property affairs were transferred in Semirechye to the head of the resettlement area [21; 148]. At the local level, the district chief, as before, remained the representative of the administrative and police authorities [19; 94].

Officials of the administrative apparatus in the region were divided into three categories: “ranks at the disposal of the governor general”, “ranks of regional presences” and “ranks of county institutions” [35; 1902]. When hired from other provinces and regions of the empire, all employees received double pay and salaries as officials assigned to serve in Siberia. Employees furloughed received payment equal to four times their monthly salary. Dismissal in this manner was authorized only by the Governor General. Employees of civil departments who served at least ten years in Semirechye could claim special pension benefits in accordance with the Regulations of 1867 [19; 34].

The vastness of the provincial territories, the lack of sufficiently trained officials in the local apparatus, and weak state control created the conditions for all sorts of abuses everywhere. Widespread embezzlement and bribery in the simplest and most varied forms became commonplace and pervasive [33; 300]. Despite having positive and negative features, the institution of governorship continued to function until the collapse of the empire.

Control mechanism. Audit as a method of control over regional management served as the main tool of the state apparatus for solving management problems. It represented a form of general and sudden inspection of the activities of institutions, and its implementation was assigned to the military governor as an important and responsible task. Based on the results of the audit, the compiled account in the form of a report was provided to a higher authority. During the audit, the diverse activities of all institutions were examined for the correct maintenance of current office documents. The level of management organization depended on the quality of record keeping. It contributed not only to the preparation of various types of documents necessary for organizing, planning and conducting business, but also to personnel management, administrative and business affairs. It is no coincidence that the well-known audit of Privy Councilor Nikolay Karlovich Girs also began with the office of the Turkestan Governor-General [36; 81]. The audit of office work was a powerful and serious tool for identifying shortcomings in the current work of each institution and was intended not only to provide comprehensive coverage of the region, but also to prepare materials for a new regulation on the management of Turkestan. However, as it turned out in practice, not a single audit could cope with this task: “the senatorial audit revealed the evil but did not eliminate the causes and conditions that gave rise to them. The system of impunity and irresponsibility of the authorities is what has fueled this grandiose epic of bribery, extortion and all kinds of crimes since 1867” [36; 188].

During the first audit of the district by the military governor Kolpakovsky in 1868, the district chief paid special attention to the establishment of communication lines of the city of Tokmak, medical and judicial units on the territory of the district, as well as the settlement of the region [37; 1–6]. The audit was of a review nature for the organization of the region and, based on its results, a list of books, journals and information was approved that should be available in all district departments [37; 23]. The examination included cash books on taxes, various types of government penalties, as well as on writs of execution from justices of

the peace, on decisions of foresters and on state property. Books, magazines, information, and inventories contained valuable information of various types, reflecting the entire sphere of social activity.

By his order of January 29, 1881, General Konstantin von Kaufmann instructed all military governors of the region to carefully review all items of expenditure "... it is necessary and quite timely, after 12 years of peaceful economic development of the region, to finally discuss improvements in the taxes and fees in the region, which cannot be considered low-income..." [38; 2]. When considering the draft of a new regulation in 1884, the Minister of Internal Affairs, Count D. Tolstoy, wrote to the Minister of War: "... the region is a rare example in history of a colony that exists at the expense of the metropole. Due to the instability... in general, the financial part, the costs of managing the region are not covered by local incomes..." [39; 2].

In Semirechye, various indirect taxes, duties and others in 1903, all departments received 1,054,576 rubles 27 kopecks, and total state revenues received 1,749,206 rubles 97 kopecks. Expenses made were 2,776,204 rubles 93 kopecks and 1,026,997 rubles 96 kopecks more, overspending was due to needs of the military department [40; 265]. Through the tax system, millions of rubles were siphoned out of the Steppe annually for the maintenance and needs of the local administrative apparatus, regular troops and other needs of the colonial administration. Annually, more than 64 thousand rubles were spent in the Orenburg department to pay for the administrative and managerial activities of colonial officials, and more than 92 thousand rubles in silver in the Siberian department [41; 188].

This problem requires special attention and research, but nevertheless, establishing the appropriate structure for collecting fees from the Kazakhs and reporting on them required clear systematic work on office work, and it was initially a priority for the empire. If the tent fee from the linear Kazakhs in 1837 was about 20,000 rubles in silver, then with its extension to the steppe Kazakhs, the income in the early 1860s was more than 200,000 rubles in silver per year. Only in 1861, the tent collection amounted to 245,865 rubles 95 kopecks in silver, that is, the collection during the 24-year period of its existence increased more than 10 times compared to the initial receipt [19; 36]. With the increase in the volume of clerical work for tax collection, an increase in office expenses was also required. And it was no coincidence that the Committee of Ministers approved on May 29, 1862, the provision on the allocation of 3,000 rubles per year to strengthen the police department's funds for record keeping [19; 35–38]. The Committee of Ministers, at the request of the Ministers of Foreign and Internal Affairs, annually allocated an amount for the successful conduct of office work regarding the Kazakhs.

Although audits revealed violations, they did not give the desired result and did not eradicate the consequences. Following an audit in 1896, a number of violations were revealed in the activities of the Regional Board. Only for the records management of the First Department, special cases were contained together with documents on various issues, the consideration of which cases was complicated by the fact that some of such cases were subject to already opened cases. Cases about different persons were also contained in one file, which should not be allowed. Correspondence on specific cases had an inappropriate title and the cases were formed incorrectly [42; 9 rev.]. Of all the violations discovered during the audit of office work, most related to non-fulfillment of documents. Over time, the identification of cases of unfulfilled documents, which gradually led to the formation of bureaucratic relations, became regular. According to the report on the progress of paperwork in the Border Office of the Regional Board in 1902, by January 1, 57 of the received applications from individuals, only one had been executed as of May 1, and of the incoming 93 letters from different institutions, not a single document had been executed [43; 2].

With respect to the Second Department in 1905, at the beginning of the year, by May 1, 66.6 % of the orders of the ministries and the Turkestan Governor-General, applications of citizens by 98 %, letters of messages from institutions by 94.5 % remained unexecuted [44; 1]. Regarding the Accounting Department, as of January 1, 1905, it was revealed that the case started on June 11, 1899, on compulsory mutual insurance of rural buildings, issued since 1898, remained as an unfulfilled case for almost 16 years among the cases carried over from year to year [45; 8]. The case that had begun on October 29, 1903, regarding the costs of office work for mutual provincial insurance, stopped due to the non-distribution among the volost clerks of 200 rubles assigned for their remuneration from the insurance capital for 1904, since information from the counties about persons worthy of the award was received only in 1905. The matter of purchasing a "Remington" typewriter for the Second Department began on January 7, 1904, which was purchased in installments for three years, was also not completed, with the last payment to be made in 1906, as a result of which the matter would be subject to completion along with the end of the calculation [45; 9, 10].

The most thorough audit can be considered the audit carried out by the vice-governor in the period from January 29 to March 9, 1904. The audit covered a total of 88 institutions — 27 county and urban, 61 rural

institutions, including 20 Russian village boards, 37 Kazakh, 3 Taranchi, 1 Dungan volost boards [46; 10]. The facts discovered during the audit concerned the abuse of official authorities by the district commanders, who gave orders when meeting with the superiors, the Kazakhs showed them respect by getting off their horses and taking off their hats. For failure to comply with this, the perpetrators were subject to punishment — arrest. For filing petitions by Kazakhs for the imposition of such penalties, the district and precinct administration gave an illegal order to impose penalties. On one day alone, December 9, 1904, 19 Kazakhs were fined 50 kopecks each for filing a petition with the governor [46; 10-10 vol.].

Moreover, the district governors subjected the volost managers and elders to a monetary fine and arrest for failing to pay taxes and failing to receive notification of it. In fact, the tax payment was made on time, and the slowdown in sending money to the Treasury was due to the fault of the post office, independent of the volost administration. The postal authorities did not accept packages with full amounts in excess of the norm [46; 10 vol. 11]. All this was connected with the fact that even at the beginning of the 20th century, postal communications were weak due to the unsatisfactory condition of communication routes. There were six postal routes in the region with a length of more than 2,000 miles with 84 stations [47; 43]. Funding provided strategic routes of communication from the city of Verny to Turkestan, Siberia and the border cities of China, and internal communication was of a secondary nature. Movement within the region, especially in spring and autumn, was fraught with great difficulties and inconveniences. In the spring, receiving mail in the city of Verny with a delay of 15 days was common [40; 232]. Although postal and telegraph offices covered the entire territory of Semirechye by the end of the 19th century, strict adherence to the time for receiving and sending mail by postal and telegraph institutions was not possible [48; 26].

Violation of legal norms by local administration employees had become common over the years. District chiefs appointed persons dismissed from such service due to negative behavior and inability to serve as volost clerks. When transferring them from one volost to another, it was difficult to count on successful office work. The lack of control on the part of the majority of county leaders over the proper expenditure of public money led to the waste of money. This picture was noticed when auditing the money books of volost managers and village elders, who did not hand over money to the treasury in a timely manner. In judicial office-work, magistrates, when summoning Kazakhs from distant volosts and counties, assigned such a short period of appearance that it was impossible for them to arrive on time, especially in winter. Volost managers did not report such difficulties, and the Kazakhs were subject to an undeserved fine imposed by justices of the peace [46; 11, 12].

However, among the indicated shortcomings one can often find the illiteracy of the clerk. For example, in 1904, during an audit of the office work of institutions in the Kopalsky district, it was discovered that the village clerk T. Nerenov turned out to be illiterate and was not familiar with the affairs, and the treasurer of the village board, Bazhenov was a drunkard and did not show up for the audit, which was why it was not possible to check the village sums, which were in his hands [49; 32 rev.]. In one volost, four clerks were dismissed during the year, their salary was 15 rubles, and nothing was allocated for office expenses, which could be explained by the absence of books [49; 43]. In the localities, because of the absence of a clerk, his functions were performed by the headman, which led to a number of recordings of inappropriate information in the books [49; 34 rev.].

Observing similar trends that had developed at various levels of government, the military governor noted in an order dated March 23, 1900, “coming across facts indicating that some of the employees allow themselves to mix purely personal relationships with their colleagues into official matters. This unfortunate phenomenon cannot be allowed to happen in the interests of the cause”. The Senate decree of July 15, 1896, reminded all employees of their duties, “to serve the cause, and not the cause of personal interests, not allowing rivalry among themselves and steadily assisting each other for the benefit of the service” [50; 61]. Eugene Schuyler was one of the first Americans to visit Semirechye, the Khanate of Kokand and the Emirate of Bukhara, compared the Tashkent government, where corruption flourished, and the authorities of the city of Verny, where Kolpakovsky actively fought corruption, and made the following conclusion: “it’s enough to stay in Semirechye even for a short time to be convinced of deep differences between the administration of this province and the management of officials in Tashkent” [51; 108].

The effectiveness of such a gigantic management apparatus depended primarily on clear planning of the organizational structure and regulation of their activities. From the first years of activity of the Regional Board, the hierarchy and functions of each management structure were not clearly regulated. Initially, “people’s government was introduced not because of the Russian Empire welcomed democracy, elections and all that. But there simply were not enough officials (local) who could manage at this level with knowledge of

local languages. Therefore, officials were mostly recruited from the local population" [14]. The duality of subordination to the ministries and the Turkestan General-Government, the lack of qualified employees with knowledge of local languages, and the indifferent attitude towards official duties everywhere gradually led to the establishment of bureaucratic relations in the system of colonial administration.

Discussion

The strategic task of the Russian Empire to conquer the Kazakh steppe included several stages. It began with the gradual introduction of an imperial control system. This process was not carried out quickly and was not fleeting, rather colonial conquest of the steppe was a long and gradual process. As Kappler notes, "although the Kazakh hordes in the 18th century were not yet considered an integral part of the Russian Empire, nevertheless, the oaths of allegiance taken by the khans, from the Russian point of view, were legal acts that substantiated Russia's claims to dominance over them" [8; 139]. In the second half of the 19th century, the Semirechye region (the territory of five regions of modern Kazakhstan), which made up a huge part of the Turkestan region, was also incorporated into the new imperial system of governance, which was alien to the local population, the Kazakhs. Semirechye as part of the Turkestan region in the 19th century was of strategic importance simultaneously for several powers, such as the Russian Empire, the Khanate of Kokand and the Qing Empire.

Especially in the 1860s, Semirechye acquired extremely pivotal importance for Russia, in connection with Russia's conquest of the Central Asian khanates. "For the Russian army, symbolic service, political declarations of the Kazakh sultans, and their provision of food and horse-drawn transport for the troops were enough... Russia wanted to master the centuries-old traditional trade routes through Semirechye to Kashgaria, Tibet and further to the East" [1; 264, 265]. Konstantin Petrovich von Kaufmann, the first Governor-General of Russian Turkestan, noting the strategic importance of the region in his report "On Trade Routes to Central Asia", pointed out to the emperor: "Our occupation of the Turkestan region has a centuries-old significance not only because we acquired a very vast area, it is also important in the sense that we finally acquired full opportunity to safely send our goods there, and settle there with their trade and produce not only in the Turkestan region, but also in the adjacent khanates" [52; 20]. Along with economic interest, Semirechye was also of strategic political interest to the Empire. The conquest of the region made it possible to accelerate the further conquest of Central Asia [2; 7].

Undoubtedly, for the Empire, one of the main tasks requiring an immediate solution was the management of the region. The Kazakhs did not realize the need to introduce a new institution of imperial administration. In this case, Valikhanov observed that, "...with peculiar concepts and customs, was subordinated for no reason at all to bureaucratic centralization with all its sophisticated authorities, attributes and clerical names, still incomprehensible not only to the Kyrgyz (Kazakhs), but also to the Russians" [4; 95]. So, a completely new system was gradually replacing the traditional Kazakh management institution based on *adat*. Carrère d'Encausse writes about this "... new customs and institutions represented for them (Kazakhs) a complete break with their traditions. This was done intentionally. Because the Russian government wanted to thereby weaken the traditional solidarity of the nomads and their ability to resist" [11; 84]. The management of the Semirechye oblast was carried out with the help of state power and the administrative apparatus, which was a gigantic structure that included a complex system of institutions with a complex hierarchy of officials. In Galuzo's assessment of the introduction of the imperial and colonial system of governance, the imperial apparatus was overwhelmingly military in which although "officials lacked knowledge of civil laws, lacked theoretical training for administrative matters, they performed excellent police functions — the functions of keeping the region in obedience" [2; 29]. Steve Sabol notes on the colonial administrative apparatus in the Steppe region the following: "Advancement began slowly, often clumsily, but accelerated during the nineteenth century without any clear goals or understanding of the people, their numbers, their societies, their history and traditions..." [9; 25].

The "Temporary Regulations on the Administration of the Semirechensk and Semipalatinsk Regions" ("Vremennoe polozhenie ob upravlenii Semirechenskoy i Semipalatinskoy oblastey") of 1867 consolidated direct military governance in the region with the military governor in charge, who was also the appointed ataman of the Semirechensk Cossack Army [19; 91, 92]. Local administration of the regions had its own specifics: the Turkestan Military District was established to manage military forces and institutions, and civil administration remained under the jurisdiction of the military governor [19; 91–111]. The choice of the form of government in the form of "military-people's government" was motivated, firstly, by the fact that the Semirechye region was under the direct and exclusive jurisdiction of the Ministry of War and all senior lead-

ership positions were occupied by military men; secondly, the “civilian” government united a small group of military officers with junior ranks and without special training [13; 6]. Consequently, “one exists for the order, and the other for protection from external attacks” [23; 16]. Even the decision of the State Commission created in 1885 boiled down to the fact that all members unanimously approved the subordination of the administration of the region to the military department and recognized the current imperial laws as timely. It was noted that “... we should not forget that the native population, from the time of the conquest, saw exclusively military force above them and was accustomed to obeying the orders of the commanders, dressed in military uniforms and who, out of habit of military discipline, demanded unconditional execution of the orders of the authorities” [53; 5].

Experienced military general Aleksey Nikolayevich Kuropatkin in 1889, sharing this approach of the authorities, wrote: “With all the peacefulness of the native population, we still do not have the right to consider the issue of the fading of the steppe over forever. Unrest in the steppe is still very likely, and may take on a character incomparably more serious than what happened in 1870-1871. The reason for this is obvious and unique — this is colonization...” [54; 1]. The final transition to an all-Russian management system began on March 25, 1891, when the “Regulations on the management of the regions of Akmola, Semipalatinsk, Semirechensk, Ural and Turgai” came into force [55; 27]. Thus, during the imperial period the development of Semirechye was under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of War, the military-people’s administration was preserved, which was characterized by the division of the highest military executive power and the people’s executive power for the local population.

Conclusion

Overall, the administration of the Semirechensk region had a unique form of military-people’s administration, based on an electoral system. A completely alien management apparatus was introduced, where initially there was an attempt to preserve the institution of traditional management and over time, due to the intensification of colonial policy, it began to acquire a completely different character, bureaucratized and oriented towards the Russification of the region. On the local level, the district chief, as before, remained the representative of administrative and police authorities. Thus, the introduction of new management system ensured the viability of an entire colonial administration apparatus that was completely alien to the Kazakh steppe. With its implementation, the Kazakhs gradually began to lose the remaining elements of the traditional management system and the ability to sustain it.

On the one hand, the reason for the introduction of military-people’s government was dictated by the colonial policy of the empire, and on the other hand, it was due to the lack of qualified-officials with knowledge of local languages, including the Kazakh language. A feature of the administration of the region was the concentration of power with division into civil and military. In the civil administration system, institutions were subordinate to five ministries. A separate institute was represented by the Departments of Orthodox institutions, institutions of Empress Maria and military institutions. In general, the methods and mechanism of governing the region corresponded to the expectations of the empire. The centralized approach to the hierarchy of the organization of the control system and the spread of general imperial laws in Semirechye contributed to the intensification of colonial administration and complete control over the local population.

A huge role in this was played by the state apparatus with an extensive network of institutions and administration work organized in them. The unified system of imperial institutions was aimed at optimizing the system of direct control of the empire by the colonies and made it possible to carry out the intended colonization policy. Social relations in all spheres of activity were regulated by general imperial laws. At all levels of management, office work served as a tool for written communication. No institution could manage its subordinate institutions without office work, where the entire process of working with documents is concentrated. Consequently, the audit of institutions, being a method of improving management, helped to identify various abuses, but did not prevent their eradication.

References

1 Хафизова К.Ш. Степные властители и их дипломатия в XVIII–XIX веках: монография / К.Ш. Хафизова. — Нур-Султан: КИСИ при Президенте РК, 2019. — 476 с.

2 Галузо П.Г. Туркестан — колония / П.Г. Галузо. — М., 1929. — 164 с.

3 Левшин А.И. Описание киргиз-казачьих или киргиз-кайсацких орд и степей: [в 3-х ч.] / А.И. Левшин. — СПб., 1832. Ч. 2. Исторические известия. — 333 с.

4 Валиханов Ч.Ч. Записки о киргизах. Собрание сочинений [в 5-ти т.] / Ч.Ч. Валиханов. — Алма-Ата, 1962. — Т. 2. — 769 с.

5 Аристов Н.А. Усуни и кыргызы или кара-кыргызы: Очерки истории и быта населения западного Тянь-Шаня и исследования по его исторической географии / Н. А. Аристов. — Бишкек: Илим, 2001. — 582 с.

6 Вельяминов-Зернов В.В. Исторические известия о Кокандском ханстве, от Мухаммеда-Али до Худояр-хана / В.В. Вельяминов-Зернов. — СПб., 1856. — 43 с.

7 Веселовский Н.И. Киргизский рассказ о русских завоеваниях в Туркестанском крае. Текст, перевод и приложения / Н.И. Веселовский. — СПб., 1894. — 125 с.

8 Каппелер А. Россия — многонациональная империя. Возникновение. История. Распад / А. Каппелер; пер. А. Пешкова. — М.: Традиция-Прогресс, 2000. — 344 с.

9 Sabol S. Russian Conquest and Administration of the Kazak Steppe. In: Russian Colonization and the Genesis of Kazak National Consciousness / S. Sabol. — Palgrave Macmillan, London [Electronic resource]. — Access mode: https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230599420_3 (Date of access: 13 March 2024).

10 Мацузато К. Генерал-губернаторства в Российской империи: от этнического к пространственному подходу / К. Мацузато // Новая имперская история постсоветского пространства: Сборник статей. Казань: «Центр Исследований Национализма и Империи», 2004. — С. 427–458.

11 Каррер д'Анкос Э. Евразийская империя: История Российской империи с 1552 г. до наших дней / Э. Каррер д'Анкос; пер. с фр. — М.: Российская политическая энциклопедия (РОССПЭН), 2007. — 367 с.

12 Asiatic Russia: Imperial Power in Regional and International Contexts. Ed. by T. Uyama. London. — 2012. — P. 320.

13 Morrison A. Military-Popular Administration and its Discontents in Tsarist Central Asia / A. Morrison [Electronic resource]. — Access mode: https://www.academia.edu/106324680/Military_Popular_Administration_and_its_Discontents_in_Tsarist_Central_Asia.

14 Абашин С.Н. Колониальный Туркестан. Об истории Туркестанского края рассказывает историк [Электронный ресурс] / С.Н. Абашин. — Режим доступа: <https://www.caa-network.org/archives/24836/kolonialnyj-turkestan>

15 Далаева Т.Т. Волостные съезды в Степном крае (кон. XIX — нач. XX вв.): практика проведения, участники и основные решения / Т.Т. Далаева // Вестник КазНПУ им. Абая. Серия «Исторические и социально-политические науки». — 2016. — № 3. — С. 32-40.

16 Удербаева С.К. Волостные управлятели Семиреченской области: круг функциональных обязанностей и общественная деятельность / С.К. Удербаева // Известия Национальной Академии наук Республики Казахстан. — 2017. — № 4. — С. 189-195.

17 Казахские чиновники на службе Российской империи: сборник документов и материалов / сост. Г.С. Султангалиева, Т.Т. Далаева, С.К. Удербаева. — Алматы: Қазақ университетi, 2014. — 418 с.

18 Законодательные акты Российской империи по истории Казахстана (XIX век). Сб. док. / Г.Е. Отепова, А.С. Ильясова. — Часть 1. (1800–1859 гг.). — Павлодар, ПГПИ. 2015. — 344 с.

19 Законодательные акты Российской империи по истории Казахстана (XIX век). Сб. док. / Г.Е. Отепова, А.С. Ильясова. — Часть 2. (1860–1885 гг.). — Павлодар, ПГПИ. 2015. — 300 с.

20 Законодательные акты Российской империи по истории Казахстана (XIX век). Сб. док. / Г.Е. Отепова, А.С. Ильясова. — Часть 3. — Павлодар, ПГПИ. 2015. — 284 с.

21 Татищев А.А. Земли и люди. В гуще переселенческого движения (1906–1921) / А.А. Татищев. — М.: Русский путь, 2001. — 376 с.

22 Гейер И.И. Русский Туркестан / И.И. Гейер. — Ташкент. 1908. — 308 с.

23 Долинский В. Об отношениях к Средне-Азиатским владениям и об устройстве Киргизской степи / В. Долинский. — С.-Петербург. 1865. — 55 с.

24 Записка о состоянии Семиреченской области в 1908 году. — Верный: Типография Семиреченского областного правления. 1908. — 44 с.

25 Центральный государственный архив Республики Казахстан (далее — ЦГА РК). — Ф. 44. — Оп. 1. — Часть 1. — Л. 4–5.

26 Адрес-календарь служащих в Семиреченской области на 1897 год. Издание Семиреченского областного статистического комитета. — Верный. Типография Семиреченского областного правления, 1897. — 91 с.

27 Семиреченские областные ведомости. — 1911. — 18 марта. — № 61.

28 Центральный Государственный архив Республики Казахстан (далее — ЦГА РК). — Ф. 2300. — Оп. 8. — Д. 1761.

29 Туркестан в имперской политике России: монография в документах / отв. ред. Т.В. Котюкова. — М.: Кучково поле, 2016. — 880 с.

30 Путеводитель по фондам Центрального государственного архива. Досоветский период / сост. И.М. Самигулин. — Алматы, 2021. — 395 с.

31 Божинская Л.В. Записка подполковника Г.А. Арандаренко «о престиже русской власти в Средней Азии» / Л.В. Божинская, С.Л. Борошко // Восточный архив. — 2023. — № 1(47). — С. 107–119.

32 Урашев С.А. Верный на рубеже XIX и XX веков. Исторические очерки / С.А. Урашев. — Алматы: КазГПУ имени Абая, 2006. — 274 с.

33 Национальные окраины Российской империи: становление и развитие системы управления / отв. ред. С.Г. Агаджанов, В.В. Трепавлов. — М.: Славянский диалог, 1998. — 416 с.

34 Абылхожин Ж.Б. К дискурсу об исторических оценках российско-имперского и советского опытов модернизации в Казахстане / Ж.Б. Абылхожин // Вестник Карагандинского университета. Серия «История. Философия». — 2020. — № 2(98). — С. 18-31.

35 Список лицам гражданского и других ведомств, служащим в Семиреченской области. — Верный: Типография Семиреченского областного правления, 1902. — 122 с.

36 Андреевич П. К ревизии Туркестанского края / П. Андреевич // Ташкентский курьер. — 1908. — № 160. — С. 81-84; Сенаторская ревизия Туркестана // Речь. — 1909. — № 8, 10, 13. — С. 185-189.

37 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 44. — Оп. 1. — Д. 14.

38 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 44. — Оп. 1. — Д. 322.

39 Логанов Г. Россия в Средней Азии / Г. Логанов. Периодический сборник. Под ред. Г.Ф. Чиркина и Н.А. Гаврилова // Вопросы колонизации. — 1909. — № 4. — С. 64-65. — Санкт-Петербург.

40 Памятная книжка и адрес-календарь Семиреченской области на 1905 год / сост. В.Е. Недзвецкий. Верный. — 1905. — 268 с.

41 Масанов Н.Э. История Казахстана: народы и культуры / Н.Э. Масанов, Ж.Б. Абылхожин, И.В. Ерофеева, А.Н. Алексеенко, Г.С. Баратова. — Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2000. — 608 с.

42 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 44. — Оп. 1. — Д. 683.

43 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 44. — Оп. 1. — Д. 1803.

44 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 44. — Оп. 1. — Д. 2156.

45 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 44. — Оп. 1. — Д. 23462.

46 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 44. — Оп. 1. — Д. 2062.

47 Статистика Российской империи. Волости и населенные места 1893 года. Семиреченская область. XXVII. Вып. 7. — С.-Петербург. 1895. — 61 с.

48 Iskakova G.Z. Communication as an integration factor of the regions: transportation in Semirechye district postal service (second half of the XIX century) / G.Z. Iskakova, E.T. Teleuova, K. Asylbekov // Bulletin of history. — 2023. — No. 2 (109). — P. 18-32.

49 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 44. — Оп. 1. — Д. 2127.

50 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 44. — Оп. 1. — Д. 1568. — Л. 61.

51 Письменные источники по истории и культуре Алматы (VIII — начало XX в.) / сост. М.Х. Абусентова, А.К. Муминов. — Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2008. — 280 с.

52 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 825. — Оп. 1. — Д. 33.

53 ЦГАРК. — Ф. 2300. — Оп. 8. — Д. 1770.

54 ЦГАРК. — Ф. 825. — Оп. 1. — Д. 64.

55 Муканов М.С. Этническая территория казахов в XVIII — начале XX веков / М.С. Муканов. — Алма-Ата: Казахстан, 1991. — 64 с.

А.С. Ысқак, Г.Б. Жұматай

XIX ғ. екінші жартысы — XX ғ. басындағы Жетісудағы империялық басқару жүйесінің жүзеге асырылуы

Макалада отандық тарихта аз зерттелген мәселелердің бірі — Ресей империясының басқару жүйесіндегі Жетісүйе аймақының мәселелері қарастырылған. Зерттеудің максаты — Жетісуда отаршылдық басқару жүйесін енгізу мәселелерін жан-жақты зерделеу. XIX ғ. екінші жартысында Ресей империясы үшін стратегиялық маңызы бар Жетісүйе аймағы империялық басқару жүйесіне тартылды. Архив құжаттары негізінде Жетісуды басқару мемлекеттік билік пен шенеуніктердің курделі иерархиясы бар мекемелердің орасан зор жүйесін құрайтын алып құрылымды қурайтын басқару аппараты арқылы жүзеге асырғаны анықталды. Әскери губернатордың тікелей басқаруындағы аймақта алып басқару аппаратының жұмысы кемшіліксіз болмады. Аумактың ауқымдылығы, жеткілікті тәжірибелі шенеуніктердің жоқтығы, бақылаудың әлсіздігі кез келген көз бояуышылыққа жағдай туғызғаны қарастырылды. Аймақты басқаруды қадағалау әдісі және мемлекеттік аппараттың әкімшілік мәселелерді шешудің негізгі құралы ретінде тексерулер (ревизия) анықтаған кемшіліктердің талдау жасалды. Десе де, бұл кемшіліктердің салдарлары жойылмады. Министрліктер мен Түркістан генерал-губернаторына кос бағыныштылық, жергілікті тілді жетік

менгерген білікті қызметкерлердің жоқтығы, қызметтегі міндеттеріне немісірдің қаруа, отаршылдық басқару жүйесінде бірте-бірте бюрократиялық қатынастардың өршүгі тәрізді жайттар кешенді түрде зерттелді және баға берілді.

Кітт сөздер: Жетісу, Ресей империясы, қазактар, басқару, губернаторлық институт, мемлекеттік аппарат, мекемелер жүйесі, іс жүргізу, шенеуніктер.

А.С. Ісқақ, Ф.Б. Жұматай

Реализация имперской системы управления в Семиречье во второй половине XIX — начале XX вв.

Статья посвящена исследованию одной из малоизученных проблем отечественной истории — Семиречья в системе управления Российской империи. Цель исследования — всестороннее изучение проблем внедрения системы колониального управления в Семиречье. Во второй половине XIX в. в имперской системе управления был привлечен регион Семиречья, имевший стратегическое значение для Российской империи. На основе обширной литературы и архивных документов установлено, что управление Семиречьем осуществлялось при помощи государственной власти и аппарата управления, который представлял собой гигантскую структуру, включавшую в себя разветвленную систему учреждений со сложной иерархией чиновников. Работа громоздкого аппарата управления в регионе под непосредственным контролем военного губернатора не была лишена недостатков. Обширность территорий, неукомплектованность аппарата достаточным количеством опытных чиновников, слабый контроль повсеместно создавали условия для всяческих злоупотреблений. Проведен анализ выявленных недостатков и злоупотреблений в деятельности региональной администрации и государственного аппарата. Хотя ревизии как метод контроля по управлению областью выявляли недостатки, но на самом деле не искореняли их последствия. Комплексно изучены такие факторы, как двойственность подчинения министерствам и Туркестанскому генерал-губернатору, нехватка квалифицированных служащих со знанием местных языков, индифферентное отношение к служебным обязанностям, что постепенно привело к становлению бюрократических отношений в системе колониального управления, и дана оценка.

Ключевые слова: Семиречье, Российская империя, казахи, управление, институт губернаторства, государственный аппарат, система учреждений, делопроизводство, чиновники.

References

- 1 Khafizova, K.Sh. (2019). *Stepnye vlastiteli i ikh diplomatiia v XVIII–XIX vekakh* [Steppe rulers and their diplomacy in the 18th–19th centuries]. Nur-Sultan: Kazakhstanskii institut strategicheskikh issledovanii pri Prezidente Respubliki Kazakhstan [in Russian].
- 2 Galuzo, P.G. (1929). *Turkestan — koloniia* [Turkestan is a colony]. Moscow [in Russian].
- 3 Levshin, A.I. (1832). *Opisanie kirgiz-kazachikh ili kirgiz-kaisatskikh ord i stepei* [Description of the Kyrgyz-Cossack or Kyrgyz-Kaisak hordes and steppes]. (Part 1-3; Part. 2). *Istoricheskie izvestiia — Historical news*. Saint-Petersburg [in Russian].
- 4 Valikhanov, Ch.Ch. (1962). *Zapiski o kirgizakh* [Notes on the Kirghiz]. *Collected works* (Vols. 1-5; Vol. 2). Alma-Ata [in Russian].
- 5 Aristov, N.A. (2001). *Usuni i kyrgyzy ili kara-kyrgyzy: Ocherki istorii i byta naseleniia zapadnogo Tian-Shania i issledovaniia po ego istoricheskoi geografii* [Usuns and Kyrgyz or Kara-Kyrgyz: Essays on the history and life of the population of the western Tien Shan and studies on its historical geography]. Bishkek: Ilim [in Russian].
- 6 Velyaminov-Zernov, V.V. (1856). *Istoricheskie izvestiia o Kokandskom khanstve, ot Mukhammeda-Ali do Khudoiar-khana* [Historical news about the Kokand Khanate, from Muhammad Ali to Khudoyar Khan]. Saint-Petersburg [in Russian].
- 7 Veselovsky, N.I. (1894). *Kirgizskii rasskaz o russkikh zavoevaniakh v Turkestanskem krae* [Kyrgyz story about Russian conquests in the Turkestan region]. Saint-Petersburg [in Russian].
- 8 Kappeler, A. (2000). *Rossiia — mnogonatsionalnaia imperiia. Vozniknovenie. Istoryia. Raspad* [The Russian Empire: A Multi-Ethnic History]. (A. Peshkova, Trans.) Moscow: Traditsiia-Progress [in Russian].
- 9 Sabol, S. (2003). Russian Conquest and Administration of the Kazak Steppe. In: Russian Colonization and the Genesis of Kazak National Consciousness. Palgrave Macmillan, London. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230599420_3.
- 10 Matsuzato, K. (2004). General-gubernatorstva v Rossiiskoi imperii: ot etnicheskogo k prostranstvennomu podkhodu [General Governments in the Russian Empire: from an ethnic to a spatial approach]. *Novaia imperiia istoriia postsovetskogo prostranstva — New imperial history of the post-Soviet space* (pp. 427–458). Collection of articles. Kazan: «Tsentr Issledovanii Natsionalizma i Imperii» [in Russian].

11 Carrère d'Encausse, H. (2007). *Evraziiskaia imperiia: Istoryia Rossiiskoi imperii s 1552 g. do nashikh dnei* [Eurasian Empire: History of the Russian Empire from 1552 to the present day]. (Karrer l'Ankos, Trans). Moscow: Rossiiskaia politicheskia entsiklopediia (ROSSPEN) [in Russian].

12 Uyama, T. (Eds.). (2012). *Asiatic Russia: Imperial Power in Regional and International Contexts*. London.

13 Morrison, A. (2023). Military-Popular Administration and its Discontents in Tsarist Central Asia. www.academia.edu. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/106324680/Military_Popular_Administration_and_its_Discontents_in_Tsarist_Central_Asia.

14 Abashin, S.N. (2023). *Kolonialnyi Turkestan. Ob istorii Turkestanskogo kraia rasskazyvaet istorik* [Colonial Turkestan. A historian talks about the history of the Turkestan region]. www.caanetwork.org. Retrieved from <https://www.caanetwork.org/archives/24836/kolonialnyi-turkestan> [in Russian].

15 Dalaeva, T.T. (2016). *Volostnye sezdy v Stepnom krae (kon. XIX — nach. XX vv.): praktika provedeniia, uchastniki i osnovnye reshenia* [Volost congresses in the Steppe region (late 19th — early 20th centuries): practice, participants and main decisions]. *Vestnik Kazakhskogo Nationalnogo Pedagogicheskogo Universiteta imeni Abaia. Seriia «Istoricheskie i sotsialno-politicheskie nauki — Bulletin of Abay Kazakh National Pedagogical University. "Historical and socio-political sciences" Series*, 3, 32–40 [in Russian].

16 Uderbayeva, S.K. (2017). *Volostnye upraviteli Semirechenskoi oblasti: krug funktsionalnykh obiazannostei i obshchestvennaia deiatelnost* [Volost managers of the Semirechensk region: range of functional responsibilities and social activities]. *Izvestiia Natsionalnoi Akademii nauk Respubliki Kazakhstan — News of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan*, 4, 189–195 [in Russian].

17 Sultangalieva, G.S., Dalaeva, T.T., & Uderbaeva, S.K. (Comp.). (2014). *Kazakhskie chinovniki na sluzhbe Rossiiskoi imperii* [Kazakh officials in the service of the Russian Empire]. *Sbornik dokumentov i materialov — Collection of documents and materials*. Almaty: Qazaq universiteti [in Russian].

18 Otepova, G.E., & Ilyasova, A.S. (Ed). (2015a). *Zakonodatelnye akty Rossiiskoi imperii po istorii Kazakhstana (XIX vek)* [Legislative acts of the Russian Empire on the history of Kazakhstan (XIX century)]. *Sbornik dokumentov — Collection of documents. Part 1* (1800–1859). Pavlodar, PGPI [in Russian].

19 Otepova, G.E., & Ilyasova, A.S. (Ed). (2015b). *Zakonodatelnye akty Rossiiskoi imperii po istorii Kazakhstana (XIX vek)* [Legislative acts of the Russian Empire on the history of Kazakhstan (XIX century)]. *Sbornik dokumentov — Collection of documents. Part 2* (1860–1885). Pavlodar, PGPI [in Russian].

20 Otepova, G.E., & Ilyasova, A.S. (Ed). (2015c). *Zakonodatelnye akty Rossiiskoi imperii po istorii Kazakhstana (XIX vek)* [Legislative acts of the Russian Empire on the history of Kazakhstan (XIX century)]. *Sbornik dokumentov — Collection of documents. Part 3*. Pavlodar, PGPI [in Russian].

21 Tatishchev, A.A. (2001). *Zemli i liudi. V gushche pereselencheskogo dvizheniiia (1906–1921)* [Lands and people. In the thick of the resettlement movement (1906–1921)]. Moscow: Russkii put [in Russian].

22 Geyer, I.I. (1908). *Russkii Turkestan* [Russian Turkestan]. Tashkent [in Russian].

23 Dolinsky, V. (1865). *Ob otnosheniakh k Sredne-Aziatskim vladeniiam i ob ustroistve Kirgiskoi stepi* [On relations to the Central Asian possessions and on the structure of the Kirghiz steppe]. Saint-Petersburg [in Russian].

24 (1908). *Zapiska o sostoiianii Semirechenskoi oblasti v 1908 godu* [Note on the state of the Semirechensk region in 1908]. Vernyi: Tipografia Semirechenskogo oblastnogo pravleniiia [in Russian].

25 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 44. — Op. 1. — D. 1. — L. 4–5 [in Russian].

26 (1897). *Adres-kalendar sluzhashchikh v Semirechenskoi oblasti na 1897 god* [Address-calendar of employees in the Semirechensk region for 1897]. Vernyi. Tipografia Semirechenskogo oblastnogo pravleniiia [in Russian].

27 (1911). *Semirechenskie oblastnye vedomosti* [Semirechenskiy regional statements]. March 18, No. 61 [in Russian].

28 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 2300. — Op. 8. — D. 1761 [in Russian].

29 (2016). *Turkestan v imperskoi politike Rossii: Monografia v dokumentakh* [Turkestan in the imperial policy of Russia]. T.V. Kotiukova. (Ed.). Moscow: Kuchkovo pole [in Russian].

30 Samigulin, I.M. (2021). *Putevoditel po fondam Tsentralnogo gosudarstvennogo arkhiva. Dosovetskii period* [Guide to the holdings of the Central State Archive. Pre-Soviet period]. Almaty [in Russian].

31 Bozhinskaia, L.V., & Boroshko, S.L. (2023). *Zapiska podpolkovnika G.A. Arandarenko «o prestizhe russkoi vlasti v Srednei Azii»* [Note from Lieutenant Colonel G.A. Arandarenko “On the Prestige of Russian Power in Central Asia”]. *Vostochnyi arkhiv — Eastern archive*, 1(47), 107–119 [in Russian].

32 Urashev, S.A. (2006). *Vernyi na rubezhe XIX i XX vekov. Istoricheskie ocherki* [Faithful at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. Historical essays]. Almaty: Kazakhskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii universitet imeni Abaia [in Russian].

33 Agadzhanyan, S.G., & Trepavlov, V.V. (Eds.). (1998). *Natsionalnye okrainy Rossiiskoi imperii: stanovlenie i razvitiye sistemy upravleniiia* [National outskirts of the Russian Empire: formation and development of the management system]. Moscow: Slavianskii dialog [in Russian].

34 Abylkhozhin, Zh.B. (2020). *K diskursu ob istoricheskikh otsenkakh rossiisko-imperskogo i sovetskogo opytor modernizatsii v Kazakhstane* [Towards a discourse on historical assessments of the Russian-imperial and Soviet experiences of modernization in Kazakhstan]. *Vestnik Karagandinskogo Universiteta. Seriia Istoryia. Filosofia*. — *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. History. Philosophy series*, 2(98), 18–31 [in Russian].

35 (1902). *Spisok litsam grazhdanskogo i drugikh vedomstv, sluzhashchim v Semirechenskoi oblasti* [List of persons of civil and other departments serving in the Semirechensk region]. Vernyi: Tipografia Semirechenskogo oblastnogo pravleniiia [in Russian].

36 Andreevich, P. (1908). K revizii Turkestanskogo kraia [On the revision of the Turkestan region]. *Tashkentskii kurer — Tashkent courier*, 160, 81–84; (1909). Senatorskaia reviziia Turkestana [Senatorial revision of Turkestan]. *Rech — Speech*, 8, 10, 13, 185–189 [in Russian].

37 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 44. — Op. 1. — D. 14 [in Russian].

38 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 44. — Op. 1. — D. 322 [in Russian].

39 Loganov, G. (1909). Voprosy kolonizatsii. Periodicheskii sbornik [Issues of colonization. Periodical collection]. Chirkin, G.F., & Gavrilov, N.A. (Eds.). *Voprosy kolonizatsii — Issues of colonization*, 4, 64, 65 [in Russian].

40 Nedzvetskii, B.E. (1905). *Pamiatnaia knizhka i adres-kalendar Semirechenskoi oblasti na 1905 god* [Memorial book and address-calendar of the Semirechensk region for 1905]. Vernyi [in Russian].

41 Masanov, N.E., Abylkhozhin, Zh.B., Erofeeva, I.V., Alekseenko, A.N., & Baratova, G.S. (2000). *Istoriia Kazakhstana: narody i kultury* [History of Kazakhstan: peoples and cultures]. Almaty: Daik-press [in Russian].

42 TsGARK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 44. — Op. 1. — D. 683 [in Russian].

43 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 44. — Op. 1. — D. 1803 [in Russian].

44 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 44. — Op. 1. — D. 2156 [in Russian].

45 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 44. — Op. 1. — D. 23462 [in Russian].

46 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 44. — Op. 1. — D. 2062 [in Russian].

47 (1895). Statistika Rossiiskoi imperii. Volosti i naseennye mesta 1893 goda. Semirechenskaia oblast [Statistics of the Russian Empire. Volosts and populated areas in 1893]. *Issue 7*. Saint-Petersburg [in Russian].

48 Iskakova, G.Z., Teleuova, E.T., & Asylbekov, K. (2023). Communication as an integration factor of the regions: transportation in Semirechye district postal service (second half of the XIX century). *Bulletin of history*, 2 (109), 18–32.

49 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 44. — Op. 1. — D. 2127 [in Russian].

50 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 44. — Op. 1. — D. 1568. — L. 61 [in Russian].

51 Abuseitova, M.Kh., & Muminov, A.K. (2008). Pismennye istochniki po istorii i kulture Almaty (VIII — nachlao XX v.) [Written sources on the history and culture of Almaty (VIII — early XX century)]. Almaty: Daik-Press [in Russian].

52 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 825. — Op. 1. — L. 33 [in Russian].

53 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 2300. — Op. 8. — L. 1770 [in Russian].

54 TsGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 825. — Op. 1. — L. 64 [in Russian].

55 Mukanov, M.S. (1991). *Etnicheskaiia territoriia kazakhov v XVIII — nachale XX vekov* [Ethnic territory of the Kazakhs in the 18th — early 20th centuries]. Alma-Ata: Kazakhstan [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Yskak Akmaral — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Narxoz University, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3998-584X>

Zhumatay Gabit — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Narxoz University, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0468-8538>