

Kh.A. Aubakirova 

Saken Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University, Astana, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: hadishaaubakirova@mail.ru)

Military art of Kazakhs in the period of Kenesary Kasymov's movement

This article studies the history of military art of Kazakhs in the period of national liberation movement under the leadership of khan Kenesary Kasymov. The protest of the Kazakh people under the leadership of Sultans Sarzhan (1824–1836) and Kenesary (1837–1847) Kasymovs is one of the most large-scale military and political events of the first half of the XIX century not only in the history of Kazakhstan, but also in the whole Eurasia. In this movement, which lasted for more than 20 years (1824–1847), the military talent of Kenesary, the grandson of Abylai Khan, was especially bright. Military art and weaponry are of great interest, as they reflect not only the level of technical achievements, but also the specifics of socio-economic and socio-political development of society, its military-theoretical thoughts. This article studies the topic of armament and military equipment of the Kazakhs, some tactics used by the rebels are also considered. Further, the article analyzes the peculiarities of the military art of the Kazakh people in the first half of the 19th century. By means of studying the armament and tactics of Kazakh warriors it is possible to trace the peculiarities of the state system and its structure. The paper shows the main events of military actions in the period from 1824 to 1847 in chronological sequence and military traditions. The appeal to military history and art has important scientific and practical significance. From time immemorial, our ancestors defended their native land at the cost of their lives, defended the independence and territorial integrity of our state. They bequeathed us a rich legacy that we are obliged to cherish and protect. In protecting our independence, we must ensure the national and military security of the country. Therefore, an appeal to the experience of the military art of our ancestors, its research is necessary for the formation of a scientifically based approach to the study of military history, ideological and patriotic education of the younger generation. The study of the historical experience of the military past of the Kazakhs in the XIX century shows that the nomads had a high level of military art. This statement is proved by the fact that the struggle of the tsarist troops against the Kazakh sultans of Sarzhan (1824–1836) Kenesary (1837–1847) Kasymovs did not achieve the main goal — the capture of the Kazakh sultans. Sarzhan Kasymov died at the hands of the ruler of Kokand, and Kenesary — Kyrgyz manaps. Numerous well-armed punitive detachments were sent against the rebels, but none of them managed to capture the leaders of the uprising and stop the rebellion. Excellent possession of weapons, knowledge and use of their own military tactics, strict discipline demonstrate the high level of military art of the nomads.

Keywords: military art, military organization, military history, military tactics, armament, military campaigns, military traditions, Kenesary Khan, Sarzhan Kasymov, national liberation movement, rebellion.

Introduction

The study of military art and equipment of Kazakhs of the first half of the XIX century can be considered among the poorly studied topics. Many historical studies have data on the armament, equipment and number of military groups, features of military art. However, the problem of the experience of armed art of Kazakhs during the national liberation movement and the uprising of Sultans Sarzhan and Kenesary Kasymov was not the subject of a special scientific study.

The relevance of the topic is determined by several factors. The realities of the XXI century with its global threats actualize the reference to the past in the military-historical aspect. The XXI century puts forward new requirements to the assessment of military history of military art. Today, in the conditions of growing military conflicts in the world, the study of the evolution of military affairs, equipment and military tactics requires further in-depth study. Military history is under active research and is one of the popular trends in modern historical science. It has distinguished itself as an independent scientific direction, so the appeal to the topic of military art, its reinterpretation has an essential scientific and practical significance.

These issues are also of great importance for the actualization of the development of military organization, ensuring military security. Nowadays, any country strives to strengthen its defense capability and to develop military art. Therefore, reference to the history of military art will help to ensure that the military sphere meets the world standards, taking into account national interests.

* Corresponding author's e-mail: hadishaaubakirova@mail.ru

Materials and Research Methods

A comprehensive study of the military art of the Kazakhs in the 19th century requires reference to different types of sources and materials. Diverse materials contribute to the creation of a complete picture of the period under study. Source materials include, first of all, official documents. In this article the main materials were archival sources of the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The documents of two fonds were used: 4 — it contains materials of the Orenburg border commission and 338, where the documentation of the Omsk regional administration is concentrated. The files of these fonds contain valuable factual material on military art, peculiarities of the organization of military affairs.

At the same time, the military valor of Kazakh batyrs became the subject of a special study in many works of Kazakh historians. For example, scientific studies by such authors as Tasbulatov A., Kushkumbaev A., Kabuldinov Z., Zhumadil A., Bekmakhanov E., Shayakhmetov B. show data on the evolution and development of military affairs of nomads. In scientific works of authors Mukhamadeev T., Mukhamadeeva I., Turgunbaev E., Bobrov L., Kushkumbaev A. the questions of military tactics of Kazakhs, types of armament, their classification are studied. Thus, the study of this topic is based on archival materials and on scientific research, including modern scientific methods and data.

When working on this study, general scientific methods such as analysis and synthesis, logical method were applied. The main methods of research were also methods of systematization, generalization, induction and deduction. To study the issue related to the study of the history of military art of the Kazakh people, the methods of description of armament, tactics; complex-system analysis and analogy were also used. The descriptive method was used in the general characterization of the armament of Kazakhs, disclosure of their peculiarities. In the study of the problem of continuity of fighting traditions of Kazakhs from their ancestors — Turks, the comparative method was used. This method allowed to reveal many similarities in the military art of Kazakh sultans Sarzhan and Kenesary Kasymovs with Genghis Khan. The study of the military history of nomads of the Great Steppe in the civilizational context predetermined the expediency of the civilizational approach. The methodological basis of the study is the principles of historicism, objectivity, unity of national and universal values. When working on the article, the main concepts and provision were used in the works of researchers who contributed to the development of methodological basis of research and evaluation of problems of military history of the Kazakh region of the new time, such as: E. Bekmakhanov, A. Tasbulatov, A. Kushkumbaev, L. Bobrov, T. Mukhamadeev, B. Shayakhmetov, A. Zhumadil.

Discussion and Results

The first half of the XIX century is one of the complex and dramatic in the history of Kazakhstan. It is the time of transformation of social and political relations, the time of confrontation of Kazakh society with Russian colonial policy, the period of dramatic struggle with Central Asian khanates. The armament of Kazakhs and military art in the first half of the XIX century is an integral part of socio-political and socio-economic history and is closely connected with their inheritance of fighting traditions from their ancestors — Turks. It embodies the most important technical achievements, which were used earlier in the period of antiquity and the Middle Ages. The sets of means of both attack and defense reflected the main directions of trade and military contacts, as the completeness of the assortment of available military-technical means directly depended on the very fact of existence of a certain group.

The basis of the military organization of the Kazakhs was a permanent army and militia. During military confrontations with the external enemy, the people's militia could be gathered. Therefore, as a rule, the gathering of militia was spontaneous and short-term. Its formation was based on the principle of tribal organization, i.e., it was composed of kin and headed by one of the representatives of the family or by the sultan in charge of a particular ulus. The general leadership of all militias was entrusted to the khan himself or one of the khans of the three zhuzes. As a rule, he was elected at the highest military meeting. The main criterion was the authority, military and political merits, and influence [1].

At the same time, as the researcher of the military art of Kazakhs Professor A.K. Kushkumbaev notes in his work "Military Affairs of Kazakhs in the XVII–XVIII centuries", there were cases when in separate campaigns there was no common single commander-in-chief. The division of power between several commanders complicated the general army management. Another negative point in the system of military organization of traditional Kazakh society was the lack of strict discipline and order [2; 105].

However, this deficiency was eliminated by Kenesary, who, on the contrary, established strict discipline. Violation of discipline by soldiers was penalized by death sentence. For example, Kenesary personally

ordered the execution of a guard who had fallen asleep to serve as a lesson to others. In addition to the death penalty there was another type of severe punishment called “chik”. This is the infliction of a knife or dagger injury in the form of a cut on the head of the perpetrator. The person who received it was considered dishonorable, and he was suspended from all affairs until Kenesary forgave him. Such measures strengthened order in the army [3; 295].

Discipline was so high that at the first demand at any time the soldiers were on horseback, armed and ready to march. From this follows the conclusion that the army of Khan Kene was constantly in a state of full combat readiness, which could both repel an attack and take the fight.

Kenesary not only punished for misdeeds, but also used measures of encouragement. He encouraged warriors who distinguished themselves in service regardless of their origin and status, just as his ancestor Genghis Khan had done. Thus, ordinary Kazakhs could become Hesauls. Also, as a reward, warriors could be given weapons.

Thus, in the organization of military art Kenesary Kasymov kept the traditions of his ancestor — Genghis Khan. The division of the army into thousands and hundreds was preserved, accordingly they were managed by military leaders, who were called zhuzbashi and mynbashy.

Despite the continuity of military traditions, Kenesary introduced innovations in the system of organization of military art. As A. Zhumadil notes, the history of military art of the last Kazakh khan is well researched [4; 193–195]. However, the study of this topic has not lost its relevance and requires further rethinking due to the interest of modern servicemen in military history, especially in the issues of tactics, strategies, weapons, equipment, and their evolution.

The number of Kenesary’s army reached 20 thousand men. He was an outstanding commander, whose talent was based on the military art and discipline formed by centuries of Central Asian peoples [5; 65]. The Military Council was formed, where important issues related to military strategy and war plans were discussed. The general command of the whole army was entrusted to Kenesary himself. Together with the main detachment there were special mobile troops, which were commanded by his relatives and batyrs. These were: brother Nauryzbai, sister Bopai, batyrs Zholaman, Zheke. These detachments made raids in the rear of the enemy. They also punished the sultans and bays who refused to support the rebels, depriving them of livestock and property.

Khan Kene understood well that in campaigns his warriors experienced both physical and moral-psychological loads and were exposed to physical and climatic conditions. Therefore, in the sphere of military affairs of nomads a significant place was occupied by provision and equipping of the troops. These issues were solved at a high level: each warrior had a tent and supplies. On the way of detachments, they were provided with pre-prepared campsites. There, the nomads replaced horses and stocked up on supplies. These camps played the role of military bases and had to satisfy both economic and combat needs.

For nomadic Kazakhs, military service was considered a special kind of public service, so Kenesary paid great attention to training the young in military affairs. As E. Bekmakhanov notes, there was a permanent military camp, where a thousand dzhigits were trained in shooting, the art of wielding a pike [3; 294-295].

Warriors also possessed the basics of formation training, which was an integral part of combat preparation. Formation training was significant for several reasons: firstly, it was necessary to prepare warriors for joint combat operations. Secondly, it formed the habit of warriors to understand and clearly follow the commands of the leader. Thirdly, it contributed to the formation of such skills as agility, accuracy, speed. Kenesary’s detachments, both cavalry and on foot, were usually arranged in two rows, representing an organized armed group.

Through fugitive Russian and Bashkir soldiers, the Kazakhs were trained in weaponry, namely to fire a cannon, formation training and soldierly manners. Fugitive Bashkirs were also intermediaries who secretly prepared various weapons [3; 297].

The weapons consisted of the traditional complex of arms of the Kazakh warrior “Bes karu”, which included: nayza — spear, spade, stabbing weapon, sadak — bow, throwing weapon, kylysh — saber, cutting weapon, shokpar — mace, striking weapon, aibalta — battle axe, axe, chopping weapon. Fighting axes were widespread in the system of armament of Kazakhs of the New Age [6; 255–262].

Naiza — a spear or pika — was also one of the most common weapons of Kenesary’s rebels [7]. The length of the spear among Kazakhs in the XIX century reached 190–195 centimeters [8; 35-36].

All types of weapons, as a rule, were prepared by local gunsmiths or captured as trophies during battles. Often in military attacks and actions the rebels took weapons from the enemy. Thus, during the attack on the

Tlenchat picket in the summer of 1838, the nomads attacked the Siberian Cossacks who were there and took away their carbines and pistols [9].

The warriors wore a kalkan — a shield, an armament to protect them from blows. There were also firearms in the form of wick guns.

It is impossible to establish the exact number of available weapons, as there is no specific information. However, in the last battle of Khan Kene he had 500 guns and one cannon [10; 25].

There were craftsmen in Kenesary's headquarters who made items of armament. Thus, according to the report of September 18, 1844 of the Orenburg border commission's spies Umbet Chimbulatov and Minbai Tlyakin about the situation in Kenesary's headquarters, there were two craftsmen in his aul that made both cold and firearms [11; 31–34].

At the same time, archival documents show that some of the weapons Kenesary Khan acquired from outside, from Central Asian khanates. In the reports of other spies: Ilemes Yusufov and Jumur Yuzmukhamedov also in 1844, it was reported that the rebels sent envoys for weapons to the Khanate of Khiva [11; 242–253].

Firearms were of different types: double-barrelled, single-barrelled, breech-loading, screw guns [8; 35].

One way the nomads fought against tsarism was to attack military transport with ammunition and food supplies of the Cossacks [12; 8-9]. These raids blocked the movement of tsarist detachments, preventing them from pursuing the nomads.

Khan Kene himself was a lover of weapons. His yurt was hung with all kinds of weapons, and it was impossible to get into it without special permission. In one of the funds of the Museum of History and Local Lore in the city of Omsk today there is a gun of the Kazakh khan [13].

Unfortunately, for the present day it could not be returned to Kazakhstan. Also now it is not clear and the exact location of the skull of the last Kazakh khan Kene, despite the great search work done in this direction during the last years.

Kenesary's military tactics deserve special attention. He, as well as his elder brother Sarzhan Kasymov, was an outstanding commander, perfectly mastered the techniques of steppe warfare, thanks to which for a long time they managed to escape from punitive detachments.

Sarzhan and Kenesary widely used the tactics of maneuvering. This tactic was one of the leading ones in the conditions of steppe warfare. Kazakh warriors were well-acquainted with their terrain, enabling them to easily evade the enemy and escape pursuit by the Cossacks. Then they bypassed the terrain and attacked the enemy from the rear, which the enemy did not expect. The tactics of maneuvering were easily mastered by Kazakh dzhigits, as nomads were trained in horseback riding from childhood and became skilled riders.

One of the leading combat units in the military affairs of Kazakhs was cavalry. As it is known from new archeological researches, the horse was domesticated on the steppe territory of Kazakhstan in deep antiquity. Therefore, it was the cavalry that constituted the main type of nomadic army. Kazakh cavalry was divided into two types: light and heavy. Light cavalry was armed with light armament — bow and arrows. Its tasks were of reconnaissance nature. This cavalry by means of bow and arrows started the battle thus disorganizing the ranks of the enemy. Heavy cavalry was equipped with strong armor, contact weapons. This cavalry conducted combat operations against the main forces of the enemy [14; 53].

The tactical technique “Zhandy kamal” — “Living fortress” was widely used in the military art of Kazakhs. It should be noted that its use was also widespread in other Asian nations. This technique was often used during defensive military actions on foot by nomadic Kazakhs in the late medieval and modern times. Its essence was that the defensive position was constructed by means of animals: horses and camels. Two types of “living fortresses” were known: “Zhylky shenberi”, “Zhylky kamaly” — in literal translation from the Kazakh language means “Horse fortress” or a circle formed from horses placed on the ground. The second kind is similar from camels — “Camel circle” or “Camel fortress”.

In case of necessity of defense, nomads hobbled animals and made a circle of them, in which they took shelter. Sometimes animals were covered with felt, bales, shields. The number of animals used for this tactic was different, ranging from several dozens to several thousand animals. In such “living fortresses” nomads sheltered archers and riflemen, thus creating conditions for their defense and cover. Sometimes dead camels and horses were used together with live ones [15; 116-117].

It was often difficult for the enemy to break through the defenses of the “Living Fortress”. First, it was necessary to pass an open space, attacked by bullets and arrows, fired from all sides. Then to climb inside the circle, overcoming the obstacle in the form of alive and dead animals. This scene was a huge challenge for

both sides, as the roar of wounded camels, the loud roaring of horses, the smells and feces of the animals were a ghastly sight.

At the same time, for the nomads, this method of defense was effective as it gave an advantage to those inside as they had some shelter. Leaving aside the moral side of this tactic, it had several advantages. First, the nomads could take refuge in the “living fortress” and keep the defense there for several days if there were supplies of provisions and ammunition. Secondly, the advantage in the conditions of steppe warfare was the rate of its construction. Thirdly, there was no need to equip additional construction materials, transportation of which could have weakened the Kazakhs. Fourthly, one can note the high combat effectiveness of this method in military clashes with the enemy.

The military tactics of “Zhandy kamal” gradually lost its relevance after the use of artillery weapons against nomads. Thus, the use of light field artillery “lengthened” the arms and the ability of the punishers to reach the nomads, and increased the military equipment of the Cossacks. Being at a safe distance allowed the tsarist troops to overcome the onslaught of arrows of bows and bullets of rifles. Thus, the assault with cannons gradually nullified the tactics of “Zhanda Kamal”. According to the scholar L. Bobrov, the popularity of this military tactic was also due to its accessibility: the availability of camel and horse fleets made it possible to build defense positions in a short period of time [15; 118].

A separate tactic was used by Kenesary’s rebels during the offensive. When attacking the fortress, the rebels acted in a scattered row, which then interlocked. The nomads surrounded the fortress from all sides and began military operations. This tactic confused the enemy, created an impression of fearlessness of the attackers and forced them to disperse their forces. This tactic also prevailed in the military art of Kazakhs of the late medieval and modern times.

Separate tactics were used by Kazakh warriors during retreat. The main method was disorientation, when the enemy was sent on a false step, maneuvering in different ways [3; 300]. Detachments organized false nomads, stopping in one place and at night going in a completely different direction. This allowed Kazakh auls to escape from the punishers.

In order to delay the punishers, Kazakh warriors set fire to the steppe and destroyed wells. The rebels, avoiding the pursuit of the Cossacks, often retreated to deserted, arid and barren territories. This deprived the enemy of provisions and drinking water supplies, thus complicating their further movement.

These tactics were characteristic of the steppe war, when the rebellious Kazakhs led by Sarzhan and Kenesary Kasymov used the natural-geographical factor. Often places with natural shelters in the form of hills and vegetation were chosen for ambushes. Hiding in such places, nomads often attacked the punishers suddenly, thus turning them into flight. If, on the contrary, the enemy was hiding in such shelters, the Kazakhs attacked them with bulletproof means. These military actions were swift and decisive, often predetermining the success of Kazakh warriors. Probably due to their own tactical methods Kazakhs during the national liberation movement of Sultans Kasymovs: Sarzhan and Kenesary, managed to resist the Cossack troops armed with the latest technology for almost a quarter of a century, from 1824 to 1847.

There were also peaceful tactical methods. Often Kenesary sent parliamentarians to the enemy’s camp. Parliamenters were special messengers who negotiated between the parties at war. Parliamentarians were entrusted with announcing the issues related to the truce, capitulation, ceasefire. Kenesary’s parliamentarians often tried to carry out agitation work to lure people to the side of the khan.

Kenesary Kasymov was a very shrewd man. Khan Kene placed great importance on reconnaissance work. In almost every aul, he had trusted individuals who reported information about the situation in the steppe and the mood of the Kazakhs. At the same time there were special people who collected information about the punishers, their number and armament, routes of movement. For example, there is known a scout named Tulebay, who provided the Kazakhs with information about the actions of the Cossacks against the rebels [3; 298]. Khan himself also did not lose vigilance and placed special people in places of potential attack, who traveled within a certain territorial radius and monitored the situation.

Kenesary was the commander-in-chief of all armed forces, but in military actions relied on batyrs. The title of batyr was honorable in Kazakh society and meant a person who distinguished himself by bravery, honor and courage. A batyr could be both a descendant of ak suyek — white bone, i.e. aristocrats, and kara suyek — black bone, i.e. ordinary people. This title was not inherited, it was acquired by personal qualities. Famous batyr associates of Kenesary Kasymov were: Agybai from the Shubyrtpaly family, Angal from the Atygai family, Zhanaidar from the Suindyk family, Jeke from the Argyn family, Iman from the Kypshak family, Zholaman from the Tabyn family and others [3; 184–189].

In general, during the reign of Kenesary Kasymov the military reform, started under his grandfather Abylai Khan, was completed. The army was organized on the basis of the updated decimal system. The basis of military art of the last Kazakh khan was severe discipline and systematic combat training of soldiers [16; 60].

Conclusions

In summary, Kenesary Kasymov is a key figure in the history of Kazakhstan. The national liberation movement of the Kazakh people under the leadership of Kenesary Kasymov, unlike others, had a special character. The personality of the leader was characterized by an outstanding military talent. Thus, Kenesary was a prominent military leader. Under him, the armed forces of the traditional Kazakh society reached their highest level of development. His military art preserved the continuity of the fighting traditions of his ancestors. At the same time, it had specific features and met the requirements of the time. Military tactics, methods were in close connection with natural and geographical conditions.

The peculiarities of the battle tactics used by Kenesary Kasymov, its novelty and advantages allowed the Kazakh khan to wage an unequal struggle with the punishers for a whole decade. At the same time, there were specific techniques of fighting with a spear, fencing with a pike, fighting on foot. In general, the system of organizing the leadership of troops and movement was clearly defined, and the art of nomadic Kazakhs is of great importance not only in the pan-Eurasian, but also in the global context.

References

- 1 Тасбулатов А.Б. Военная история Казахстана: очерки / А.Б. Тасбулатов, К.Р. Аманжолов. — Алматы: Рауан, 1999. — 176 с.
- 2 Кушкумбаев А.К. Военное дело казахов в XVII–XVIII веках (Казахстанские востоковедные исследования) / А.К. Кушкумбаев. — Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2001. — 172 с.
- 3 Бекмаханов Е.Б. Казахстан в 20–40-е годы XIX в. / Е.Б. Бекмаханов. — Алма-Ата: Қазақ университеті, 1992. — 400 с.
- 4 Жумадил А.К. Военное дело кочевников Евразии: историографический анализ: моногр. / А.К. Жумадил. — Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 2014. — 272 с.
- 5 Касымбаев Ж.К. Кенесары хан / Ж.К. Касымбаев. — Алматы: Қазақстан, 1993. — 112 с.
- 6 Бобров Л.А. Казахские боевые топоры в изобразительных источниках XVIII–XIX веков / Л.А. Бобров, А.О. Пронин // Вестник Новосибирского государственного университета. Серия: История. Филология. — 2014. — Т. 13. — № 5. — С. 255–262.
- 7 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 4. — Оп. 1. — Д. 3396. — Л. 23–33.
- 8 Шаяхметов Б.Ш. Военное искусство казахов / Б.Ш. Шаяхметов // Путь науки. — Волгоград, 2015. — № 8. — С. 33–36
- 9 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 338. — Оп. 1. — Д. 1. — Л. 160 об.
- 10 Кенесарин А. Султаны Кенесара и Сыздык: Биографические очерки / А. Кенесарин. — Алма-Ата: Жалын, 1992. — 144 с.
- 11 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 4. — Оп. 1. — Д. 385. — Л. 242–253 об.
- 12 ЦГА РК. — Ф. 338. — Оп. 1. — Д. 4. — Л. 8–9.
- 13 Сайт Института истории и этнологии имени Ч. Валиханова. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://iie.kz/?p=25606&lang=ru>.
- 14 Мухамадеев Т.М. Военно-исторические очерки / Т.М. Мухамадеев, И.А. Мухамадеева, Е.А. Тургунбаев. — Кокшетау: Кокшетауский университет имени А. Мырзахметова, 2018. — 264 с.
- 15 Бобров Л.А. Казахская тактика ведения боя в пешем строю в последней трети XVI-середины XIX веков / Л.А. Бобров // Война и оружие: новые исследования и материалы. Труды III Международной научно-практической конференции. — СПб., 2012. — Часть I. — С. 105–135.
- 16 Бобров Л.А. Военная организация кочевников от Абулхаира до Кенесары (XVIII-первая половина XIX вв.) / Л.А. Бобров // Средневековые тюрко-татарские государства. — Институт истории им. Ш.Марджани АН РТ. — 2015. — № 7. — С. 54–61.

Х.А. Аубакирова

Кенесары Қасымовтың қозғалысы кезіндегі қазақтардың әскери өнері

Мақалада хан Кенесары Қасымов бастаған ұлт-азаттық қозғалыс кезіндегі қазақ халқының әскери өнері тарихын зерттеуге әрекет жасалған. Саржан (1824–1836 жж.) және Кенесары (1837–1847 жж.) Қасымовтар бастаған қазақ халқының наразылығы XIX ғасырдың бірінші жартысындағы Қазақстан тарихындағы ғана емес, бүкіл Еуразиядағы ең ауқымды әскери-саяси оқиғалардың бірі. 1824–1847 жылдары 20 жылдан астам уақытқа созылған бұл қозғалыста Абылай ханның немересі Кенесарының қолбасшылық таланты ерекше көрінді. Әскери өнер мен қару-жарақ өнері үлкен қызығушылық тудырады, өйткені олар тек техникалық жетістіктердің деңгейін ғана емес, сонымен бірге қоғамның әлеуметтік-экономикалық және қоғамдық-саяси дамуының ерекшеліктерін, оның әскери-теориялық ойларын көрсетеді. Қазақ жауынгерлерінің қару-жарағы мен тактикасын зерделеу арқылы мемлекеттік құрылымның, оның дамуындағы ерекшеліктерін байқауға болады. Автор қазақтардың қару-жарақ пен әскери жабдықталуы мәселелерін зерттеген, бүлікшілердің кейбір қолданылған тактикасын қарастырған. Сонымен қатар XIX ғасырдың бірінші жартысында қазақ халқының әскери өнерінің ерекшеліктерін талдауға әрекет жасалды. Мақалада 1824–1847 жылдар аралығындағы әскери іс-қимылдардың негізгі оқиғалары хронологиялық дәйектілікпен, әскери дәстүрлері көрсетілген. Әскери тарих пен өнерге жүгінудің маңызды ғылыми және практикалық маңызы бар. Біздің ата-бабаларымыз ғасырлар бойы батылдықпен туған жерін, мемлекетіміздің тәуелсіздігі мен территориялық тұтастығын қорғады. Олар бізге бай мұра қалдырды, біз оны сақтауымыз қажет. Тәуелсіздігімізді қорғау ісінде біз елдің ұлттық және әскери қауіпсіздігін қамтамасыз етуіміз керек. Сондықтан біздің ата-бабаларымыздың әскери өнерінің тәжірибесіне жүгіну, оны зерттеу әскери тарихты зерттеудің ғылыми-әдістемелік негізін, жас ұрпақты идеялық-патриоттық тұрғыда тәрбиелеуді қалыптастыру үшін қажет. XIX ғасырдағы қазақтардың әскери өткенінің тарихи тәжірибесін зерделеу көшпенділердің әскери өнердің жоғары деңгейіне ие болғандығын көрсетеді. Бұл мәлімдеме патша әскерлерінің қазақ сұлтандары Саржанға (1824–1836) Кенесары (1837–1847) Қасымовтарға қарсы күресі қазақ сұлтандарын басып алудың негізгі мақсатына жете алмағандығымен дәлелденді. Саржан Қасымов Қоқан билеушісінің, ал Кенесары — кыргыз манаптарының қолынан қаза тапты. Көтерілісшілерге қарсы көптеген жақсы қаруланған жазалаушы отрядтар жіберілді, бірақ олардың ешқайсысы көтеріліс басшыларын басып алып, бүлікті тоқтата алмады. Қару-жарақты жақсы меңгеру, өзінің әскери тактикасын білу және пайдалану, қатаң тәртіп көшпенділердің әскери өнерінің жоғары деңгейін көрсетеді.

Кілт сөздер: әскери өнер, әскери ұйым, әскери тарих, әскери тактика, қару-жарақ, әскери жорықтар, әскери дәстүрлер, Кенесары хан, Саржан Қасымов, ұлт-азаттық қозғалыс, көтеріліс.

Х.А. Аубакирова

Военное искусство казахов в период движения Кенесары Касымова

В настоящей статье предпринята попытка исследования истории военного искусства казахов в период национально-освободительного движения под предводительством хана Кенесары Касымова. Протест казахского народа под предводительством султанов Саржана (1824-1836 гг.) и Кенесары (1837-1847 гг.) Касымовых является одним из самых масштабных военно-политических событий первой половины XIX века не только в истории Казахстана, но и всей Евразии. В этом движении, которое длилось на протяжении более чем 20 лет (1824-1847 гг.), особенно ярко проявился полководческий талант Кенесары, внука Абылай хана. Военное искусство и вооружение представляют большой интерес, так как отражают не только уровень технических достижений, но и специфику социально-экономического и общественно-политического развития общества, его военно-теоретическую мысль. Предпринята попытка анализа особенностей военного искусства казахского народа в первой половине XIX столетия. Автором изучены вопросы вооружения и военного оснащения казахов, рассмотрены некоторые применявшиеся тактики повстанцев. Посредством изучения вооружения и тактики казахских воинов можно проследить особенности государственного устройства и его структуры. В работе показаны основные события военных действий в период с 1824 по 1847 годы в хронологической последовательности, а также военные традиции. Обращение к военной истории и искусству имеет важную научную и практическую значимость. Наши предки испокон веков ценой своей жизни защищали родную землю, отстаивали независимость и территориальную целостность нашего государства. Они завещали нам богатое наследие, которое мы обязаны беречь и защищать. В деле защиты нашей независимости мы должны обеспечить национальную и военную безопасность страны. Поэтому обращение к опыту военного искусства наших предков, его исследование необходимо для формирования научно-обоснованного подхода к изучению военной истории и идейно-патриотического воспитания молодого поколения. Изучение исторического опыта военного прошлого казахов в XIX столетии показывает, что кочевники имели высокий уровень военного искусства. Это утверждение доказано тем, что борьба царских войск против казахских султанов Саржана (1824-1836) и Кенесары (1837-1847) Касымовых

не достигла основной цели — поимки казахских султанов. Саржан Касымов погиб от руки правителя Коканда, а Кенесары — от кыргызских манапов. Против мятежников были высланы многочисленные хорошо вооруженные карательные отряды, но ни один из них не сумел захватить предводителей восстания и прекратить мятеж. Прекрасное владение оружием, знание и использование собственных военных тактик, строгая дисциплина демонстрируют высокий уровень военного искусства кочевников.

Ключевые слова: военное искусство, военная организация, военная история, военная тактика, вооружение, военные походы, военные традиции, хан Кенесары, Саржан Касымов, национально-освободительное движение, восстание.

References

- 1 Tasbulatov, A.B. & Amanzholov, K.R. (1999). *Voennaia istoriia Kazakhstana: ocherki [Military history of Kazakhstan: essays]*. Almaty: Rauan [in Russian].
- 2 Kushkumbaev, A.K. (2001). *Voennoe delo kazakhov v XVII–XVIII vekakh (Kazakhstanskii vostokovednye issledovaniia) [Military affairs of the Kazakhs in the XVII–XVIII centuries (Kazakhstan Oriental Studies)]*. Almaty: Daik-Press [in Russian].
- 3 Bekmakhhanov, E.B. (1992). *Kazakhstan v 20–40-e gody XIX veka [Kazakhstan in the 20–40 years of the XIX century]*. Alma-Ata: Kazak universiteti [in Russian].
- 4 Zhumadil, A.K. (2014). *Voennoe delo kochevnikov Evrazii: istoriograficheskii analiz: monografiia [The military affairs of the nomads of Eurasia: A historiographical analysis: monograph]*. Almaty: Qazaq universiteti [in Russian].
- 5 Kasymbaev, Zh. (1993). *Kenesary khan [Kenesary khan]*. Almaty: Kazakhstan [in Russian].
- 6 Bobrov, L.A. & Pronin, A.O. (2014). Kazakhskie boevye topory v izobrazitelnykh istochnikakh XVIII–XIX vekov [Kazakh battle axes in graphic sources of the 18th–19th centuries]. *Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Istoriia, filologiya — Bulletin of the Bulletin of Novosibirsk State University. Series: History, Philology*, 13, 5, 255–262 [in Russian].
- 7 CGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 47. — Op. 1. — D. 3396. — L. 23–33 [in Russian].
- 8 Shayakhmetov, B.Sh. (2015). Voennoe iskusstvo kazakhov [Military art of the Kazakhs]. *Put nauki — The path of science*, 8, 33–36. Volgograd [in Russian].
- 9 CGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 338. — Op. 1. — D. 1. — L. 160 [in Russian].
- 10 Kenesarin, A. (1992). *Sulany Kenesara i Syzdyk: Biograficheskie ocherki [Sultans of Kenesara and Syzdyk: Biographical sketches]*. Alma-Ata: Zhalyn [in Russian].
- 11 CGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 4. — Op 1. — D. 385. — L. 242–253 [in Russian].
- 12 CGA RK [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 338. — Op 1. — D. 4. — L. 8–9 [in Russian].
- 13 [Sait Instituta istorii i etnologii imeni Ch. Valikhanova \[Website of the Institute of History and Ethnology named after Ch. Valikhanov\]](https://iie.kz/?p=25606&lang=ru). Retrieved from <https://iie.kz/?p=25606&lang=ru> [in Russian].
- 14 Mukhamadeev, T.M., Mukhamadeeva I.A., & Turgunbaev E.A. (2018). *Voенно-istoricheskie ocherki [Military historical essays]*. Kokshetau: Kokshetauskii univeristet imeni A. Myrzakhmetova [in Russian].
- 15 Bobrov, L.A. (2012). Kazakhskaia taktika vedeniia boia v peshem stroiu v poslednei treti XVI — seredine XIX vekov [Kazakh tactics of fighting on foot in the last third of the XVIth — mid XVIth centuries]. *Voина i oruzhie: novye issledovaniia i materialy. Trudy III mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii — War and weapons: new research and materials. Proceedings of the III International Scientific and Practical Conference* (pp. 105–135) [in Russian].
- 16 Bobrov, L.A. (2015). Voennaia organizatsiia kochevnikov ot Abulkhaira do Kenesary (XVIII — pervaiia polovina XIX vv.) [Military organization of nomads from Abulkhair to Kenesary (XVIII — first half of the XX centuries)]. *Srednevekove tiurkotatarskie gosudarstva: Institut istorii imeni Sh. Mardzhani Akademii Nauk Respubliki Tatarstan — Medieval Turkic-Tatar states: Institute of History. Sh. Marjani of Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan*, 7, 54–61 [in Russian].

Information about the author

Aubakirova Khadisha — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Saken Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University, Astana, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9133-6471>