IRSTI 03.20/03.91

Sultangalieva G.S.[1], Koizhigitova Zh.B.[2].

[1]Prof. Dr., e-mail: sultangalievagulmira@gmail.com
[2]Master student, e-mail: zhamilka_89@mail.ru
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

CENTRAL ASIAN UPRISING OF 1916 IN MODERN FOREIGN HISTORIOGRAPHY

The article considers the uprising of 1916 in Central Asia and its study in modern foreign historiography. The aim of the article is to determine the main directions and methods used by foreign scientists in studying uprising of 1916 in Central Asia. The study is aimed identifying the approaches of foreign scientists in explaining the causes of uprising of 1916, revealing the scale of the uprising and their consequences. Authors A.Morrison, T.Kotyukova, T.Uyama, M.Olkott, X.Hallez, I.Ohayon and others have defined possibilities of further studying of an uprising of 1916 in a historical science. The results of this article can be used in the content of elective courses in the subsequent educational process and in the development of scientific articles.

Key words: uprising of 1916, foreign historiography, Central Asia, mobilization, research.

Сұлтангалиева Г.С.[1], Қойжігітова Ж.Б.[2]

[1]профессор, e-mail: sultangalievagulmira@gmail.ru
[2]магистрант, e-mail: zhamilka_89@mail.ru
әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

Орталық Азиядағы 1916 жылғы көтеріліс туралы қазіргі таңдағы шет ел тарихнамасы

Мақалада Орталық Азиядағы 1916 жылғы көтеріліс және оның қазіргі заманғы шетелдік тарихнамасы қарастырылған. Мақаланың мақсаты Орталық Азиядағы 1916 жылғы көтерілісті зерттеуде шетел ғалымдарының пайдаланған негізгі бағыттары мен әдістерін анықтау болып табылады. Зерттеу шетелдік ғалымдардың 1916 жылғы көтерілістің себебін түсіндіруге, көтерілістің масштабын және олардың салдарын айқындайтын тәсілдерді анықтауға бағытталған. Авторлар А. Моррисон, Т. Котюкова, Т. Уяма, М. Олкот, К. Аллэз, И. Оайон және басқалары 1916 жылғы көтерілісті одан әрі зерттеу үшін басқа мүмкіндіктерді тарихи ғылымда анықтап берді. Бұл мақаланың нәтижелерін кейінгі оқыту үрдісіндегі элективтік курстардың мазмұнында және ғылыми мақалаларды дайындауда пайдалануы мүмкін.

Түйін сөздер: 1916 жылғы көтеріліс, шетелдік тарихнама, Орталық Азия, мобилизация, зерттеу.

Султангалиева Г.С.[1], Койжигитова Ж.Б.[2]

[1]профессор, e-mail: sultangalievagulmira@gmail.ru
[2]магистрант, e-mail: zhamilka_89@mail.ru
Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы

Восстание 1916 года в Центральной Азии в современной зарубежной историографии

В статье рассматривается восстание 1916 года в Центральной Азии и ее изучение в современной зарубежной историографии. Целью работы является определение основных направлений и методов, используемых зарубежными учеными при изучении восстания 1916 года в Центральной Азии. Исследование направлено на выявление подходов зарубежных ученых

при объяснении причин восстания 1916 года, раскрытие масштаба восстания и их последствий. А. Моррисон, Т. Котюкова, Т. Уяма, М. Олкот, К. Аллэз, И. Оайон и другие определили возможности дальнейшего изучения восстания 1916 г. в исторической науке. Результаты этой работы могут быть использованы в содержании элективных курсов в последующем учебном процессе и в разработке научных статей.

Ключевые слова: восстание 1916 года, зарубежная историография, Центральная Азия, мобилизация.

Introduction

Historical events, which took part in the beginning of the XX century, which is called Central Asian uprising of 1916 have different points of view and were in the center of discussions all the time, even after 100 years. In this article, we want to discuss problems of studying the Central Asian uprising of 1916 in modern foreign historiography, different foreign approaches of studying, opinions about reasons and causes of uprising; nevertheless, it is an outside view.

Today the Central Asian uprising of 1916 is one of the most unexplored topics of Central Asian history. For a hundred years, native and foreign historians have not been able to come up with common terms and concepts and could not determine the characteristics of events. For example, there is a broad terminological range – «rebellion,» «insurrection,» «events,» «disturbances,» «riots,» «protest movement» (Mazhitov, 2006) and «uprising.» With the establishment of Soviet power, the term «uprising» is increasingly used and finally approved and is used up to the present time both in Russian, Central Asian and foreign historiography.

Thus, a lot of obscure moments were noted by native and foreign historians. It is clear that neither in the scientific works of the last century, nor in the studies of our time, there are precise information on the number of deaths during the uprising, there is no reliable statistics on the participants of the uprising that fled to China, and there is no information on the number of people, who returned back to their homelands and other unclear moments.

Methodology and sources

The main sources of this research paper was based on a wide range of written sources, articles of Alexander Morrison, Tomohiko Uyama, Xavier Hallez and Tatyana Kotyukova, books written by Jörn Happel and Martha Olcott, and other written archival sources and collections of works.

As a conceptual base in the article taken views and opinions developed in the works of foreign scientists T.Uyama, A.Morrison, T. Kotyukova. In addition, the authors used comparative-historical method, as well as general methods of scientific knowledge: analysis and synthesis. Also, was considered collection of documents and materials: The Uprising of 1916 in Turkestan: documentary evidences of general tragedy, which was complied by Tatyana Kotyukova in 2016.

In the Soviet historiography the reasons and character of the uprising of 1916 were differently considered depending on the authority and closely reflected the policy of the authorities in Central Asia, was directly connected and varied depending on the political situation, and ultimately subordinated to the specific needs of the Soviet leadership of a particular period. If in the beginning historians and scientists were afraid of repressions and punishments, according political atmosphere of that time, they could not do surveys from the participants and eyewitnesses of the uprising, had not full access to the materials connected uprising. Then different approaches and thesis appeared, sometimes unbelievable. In short, Soviet historiography which was based on Marxist-Lenin approach could not answer to all questions and could not give full picture of the uprising, so in the first half of the XX century there were no monographies connecting uprising of 1916. Only in the second half of the XX century they appeared. And today a big quantity of scientists pay attention and study this topic, moreover, foreign scientists do their inputs in studying this problem.

Motives and causes of uprising of 1916 in foreign historiography

The overall economic situation in the steppe was deteriorating rapidly in the years immediately prior to World War I. Of course, some Kazakhs received assistance, but most of the population felt the impact of the continuing land seizures, which by that time were concentrated in Syr Darya and Semirechye regions. (Olcott, 1995: 118). According to Martha Olcott life conditions of Kazakh people began to deteriorate before 1916, the biggest problem was land seizure for peasants from Russia and Ukraine.

Economic situation was exacerbated by the war conditions. The war devoured a huge amount of raw materials, food, livestock and other materials. Kazakhs were requested to provide with horses and meat as a help for the Russian Empire.

The immediate cause for the uprising was the Emperor's Decree of June 25, 1916, on the mobilization of «indigenous population» of Kazakhstan, Central Asia and in part of Siberia, aged from 19 to 43 years old to rear works during the First World War was the direct reason for mass protests. Precisely, it was a motive. Besides, the decree used the word not «mobilization», but «requisition», as it was about the requisition of cattle. From Kazakhstan and Central Asia, 400,000 people should be requisitioned, including more than 100,000 from the steppe regions of Kazakhstan, and 87,000 rubles from Semirechye.

The main reasons for the revolt were socio-economic and political factors: the intensification of colonial oppression, the seizure of lands, the growing taxes, the exploitation of workers, the policy of russification carried out by tsarism against the Kazakh and other nations, the sharp deterioration of the position of the broad masses in connection with the war.

Jörn Happel shows in his book about Uprising «Nomadische Lebenswelten Und Zarische Politik: Der Aufstand in Zentralasien 1916» which was published in 2010, that this was a chaotic event of enormous proportions resulting in 250,000 nomads escaping to the China and Khiva and the death of 20,000 Russians and between 100,000-200,000 nomads. Locally, the Uprising is referred to as «Urkun» , which means exodus. For Happel, the Uprising 1916 symbolized the end of the Russian colonial policies and the beginning of the end of the empire (p. 56), just as the Uprising 1898 in Andijan was a symptom of the collapse of the imperial center.

The Urkun, or exodus, is a trauma that runs deep in Kyrgyz culture to this day. In the aftermath of the revolt, Turkestan's governor general, Aleksey Kuropatkin, issued a notorious decree that land was to be seized for settlement «wherever Russian blood was shed.» He proposed creating an ethnically-cleansed zone for Russian settlement on the best land in the region around Issyk-Kul, with Kyrgyz forcibly relocated to mountainous areas near Naryn. In effect, Kuropatkin wanted to impose what would have been a system of apartheid. (Morrison, 2017: 144-145).

Thus, Russian colonial regime wanted to punish in this way and they succeeded in it. Because really a big amount of people were moved from their pasturable and arable lands and relocated to small or absolutely unsuitable for housekeeping desert and mountainous areas.

There is a question, were the events of 1916 a genocide, as some Kazakh and Kyrgyz historians and opposition politicians maintain? In Morrison's opinion, the answer is «no.» The term «genocide» has a very clear legal definition. There is no clear evidence that the Russian colonial regime would have the «intention to destroy, in whole or in part,» the Kirghiz and the Kazakhs as a «national, ethnic, racial or religious group». In January of 1917. Kuropatkin even planned to take measures to achieve the returning Kyrgyz and Kazakh, although his actions are explained more likely by the fact that the empire needs these people as a work force (Morrison, 2017: 145).

The bitter consequences of colonialism cannot and should not be ignored or denied, as is often the case in Russia, but the policy of cultural purity is a dead end. In this respect, Central Asia is not so different from Western Europe or North America, as Morrison concludes.

One more interesting article was written by Tomohiko Uyama, where he asks a question «Why did a major uprising take place only in Central Asia?». Actually, as we know, order of mobilization was also declared among the «indigenous» of Siberia, the Caucasus and Kalmykia. He tried to answer this question by analyzing and comparing some of the institutional and practical features of the administration in the Central Asia in the colonial period.

It is clear that decree about mobilization was just a motive, the real causes were precisely in those deep economic and political contradictions that were created as a result of the unrestrained colonial exploitation of the Russian Empire of Central Asia during 50 years of its dominance. It was formulation in Soviet historiography, because it corresponds to a Marxist approach that attached greater importance to the socio-economic roots of historical events than their probable causes. We must admit that it is useful for understanding insurrection in Semirechye, where the discontent of the Kyrgyz with land issue in connection with the resettlement of Russian peasants. Nevertheless, it retains its decisive importance along with itself call for rear work as an occasion for an uprising. (Uyama, 2017).

As he wrote earlier (Uyama, 2001: 80-83), the decree about mobilization was one of the significant causes of the uprising. It was prepared in a hurry, without discussion in the State and without consultation with the governors. Moreover, the order on involving the population «for work on the

construction of defensive structures and military communications in the army» without explaining the specific content of these works provoked the dissemination of false rumors about the deadly danger of work, allegedly conducted under fire. The absence of instructions in the order and mobilization process created the possibility of its manipulation by officials and local administrators, which gave rise to the discontent of people.

If the advertisement about mobilization was one of the main causes, there appears a question about other regions of Empire. Why did a major uprising take place only in Central Asia?

The most violent insurgency found itself in a region with a large number of peasant settlers and high competition for land and water resources (Semirechye), suggests the existence of deeper internal conflicts, generated by colonization and released in 1916. Recent studies show that such judgments, in spite of their retrospective character, contain a considerable part of truth. Bloodshed and enmity between immigrants and nomads was not uncommon, but, rather, a common occurrence in the years preceding 1916 (Happel, 2016). Report of K. K. Palen on the official audit of the administration of the Turkestan Krai for 1910 warns that uncontrolled peasant colonization «lays the seeds of ethnic strife in the foreign land» (Palen, 1910: 406. Morrison, 2017: 147).

Overall, attempts to escape the call to work were widely spread, and locally there was also local resistance, but nowhere except Central Asia were mass and prolonged uprisings. Caucasus and Yakutia differed from Central Asia that the order about compulsory call to work was abolished in these regions. It was voluntarily. The similar measures could stop the escalation of the uprising in the Central Asia: Ferghana region had caused unrest in many cities and villages from 9 to 16 July, but did not overgrow in major bloody confrontations. They ceased immediately after the governor Alexander Gippius had arbitrarily announced a recruitment of volunteers to work (Uyama, 2017: 105).

The difference in the situation can be partially explained by the peculiarities of other regions. Thus, it can be assumed that Kalmyks and Buryats were relatively well familiar with the work connected with the Russian army, since part of their ancestors served in the Don, Orenburg and Trans-Baikal Cossacks troops. And the Russian authorities in the North Caucasus, that had lots of uprisings and riots since the nineteenth century, tried to be cautious about innovations in order not to provoke the local population. The same situation could influence the above behavior of the governor of the Fergana region, which was considered the most troubled region in Central Asia. Furthermore, Uyama draws attention to the institutional difference in the administration between Central Asia and other regions.

There were no metric books in Central Asia, and family lists often were inaccurate or lost. When the call for rear works was announced, local («native») administrators had to draw up a list of individuals, subject to mobilization, without specific data. Rich people and administrations often manipulated the list (or suspected to be manipulated) and changed the age so that the undesirable ones were mobilized, and their sons were not. Although the forms of resistance were different, the most common behavior at the initial stage of the uprising in Central Asia were attacks to the local administration and seizure of family lists or lists of conscripts.

As for Turkestan, Russian authorities did not set up a spiritual meeting. Orenburg Kazakhs and Siberian departments (i.e. the territory of present Kazakhstan except for its southern part) were quite formally subordinated to the Orenburg Mohammedan spiritual assembly, but were withdrawn from its jurisdiction in 1868. Subsequently, the authorities ignored Kazakhs numerous petitions about their return to the Orenburg spiritual assembly or the organization of a special spiritual management for them (Uyama, 2008: 143-148).

The only region where metric books were conducted was the Inner Kazakh (Bukeyev) horde, which was a part of Astrakhan province and remained under jurisdiction of the Orenburg spiritual assembly (Turemuratov, 2012). Therefore, it is quite natural that in 1916 there was no any uprisings.

The lack of metric documents and accurate family lists was a consequence of priest expulsion from administrative affairs and poor supervision of local administration work, which was a manifestation of the segregation character of Russian authorities in Central Asia that was not deeply involved in local community problems. Although Russian officials had enormous power, they were little, they did not know the local languages, and were not almost familiar with the local life. Russian government could enlist help of local elites by including them in the category of Russian nobility, as it did before with respect to Tatars, Bashkirs and people of the Caucasus. That, with rare exceptions, had not been done in Central Asia, due to contempt for nomadic people and fears against Muslims, which intensified by the time of Turkestan conquest.

Till the last 20 years Russian historians did not pay enough attention to this revolt. One of the

first who started research and started writing about uprising was V. Buldakov. But, he wrote that in the movement of the «local people» were present not only religious features but also russophobic, and the actions of the insurgents, without giving any examples, equated to «the bloody ritual» (Buldakov, 1995: 23). At the same time, he pointed out that the massacre carried out by the government troops took «the features of the genocide – the largest one after the Armenian massacres in Turkey in 1915» (Ibid, 23). In another article, the author acknowledged that the responsibility for escalating violence lies on Russian immigrants and the local administration.

One of the directions of the Russian historiography is an imperial approach. Referring to Alexander Lokshin this direction includes the publication of the young Moscow historian A. Ganin (Ganin, 2008: 152-201). In an article in the history faculty of the Moscow State University after MV Lomonosov in 2006 (Ganin, 2006), Ganin refers the uprising of 1916 as the «Turkestan insurrection». He strongly criticizes both Soviet and Central Asian authors, while not stopping at the racist assertion and pointing out that they are all «almost exclusively immigrants from the indigenous population of Central Asia and Kazakhstan.» They are, who try to «hide primarily the ethno-confessional basis of events» and do not want to admit that «the real massacre» occurred in the summer and autumn of 1916 in Turkestan and the Steppe region, and not the national liberation uprising (Ganin, 2008, 153) , «The speech was ethno-confessional and even separatist ... character» (Lokshin, 2017).

The honor of modern Russian historiography was saved by the monography of V.Buldakov and T. Leontieva, published in 2015, «The war that gave rise to the revolution: Russia, 1914-1917.» It focuses on psychological factors, which, according to the authors, played a significant role in the collapse of the empire. In an extremely small section, «Awakening the suburbs?» historians note the aggravation of the interethnic situation in the empire during the war years. Its indicator they consider the widespread growth of anti-Semitism, the spread of anti-German, anti-Polish, anti-Muslim sentiments, widespread spies (Lokshin, 2017).

Turning to the mobilization policy, the authors point out that «the most tragic result was the events in Central Asia and Kazakhstan.» They write about the cases of adored cruelties and atrocities, the terrible consequences of the uprising: «At the Shamsa Pass, a group of Cossacks shot 1.5 thousand Kyrgyz, mostly women, old people, children. Fearing repression, up to 300 thousand Kazakhs and Kyrgyz left to China. « Buldakov and Leontyeva note that as a result of the suppression of the uprising, over 100 thousand Kazakhs and Kirghiz died» (Buldakov, Leontieva, 2015:343).

At the same time, as can be seen from the monography, the authors refused to use such terms as «bloody ritual» and «genocide», which Buldakov in 1995, as noted above, characterized the actions of government troops in suppressing the uprising.

The revolt proved to be very costly to the Kazakhs. It is impossible to find precise figures on the loss of life directly or indirectly attributable to the revolt. There is relatively good date on population decline only for Semirechye. The population of the Dzharkent uezd declined by 73 percent in the period between the onset of World War I and January 1, 1917, in Przhevalsk by 70 percent, in Lepsinsk by 47 persent, in Vernyi by 45 present, and in Pishpek by 42 present (Olcott, 1995: 125).

Xavier Hallez tells about revolt in Turgai region, by comparing uprising of 1916 with the revolt of Kenesary Kasymov. He puts legitimacy of power in the center of discussion. Abdigapar Dzhanbosynov was descendant of K.Kasymov and Amangeldi Imanov was son of Iman who was a batyr and one of the lieutenants of K.Kasymov. Dzhanbosynov and Imanov used the legitimacy of power inherited from Kenesary. Comparison of two revolt shows that the generic strategy had not changed, most people were kypchaks.(Hallez, 2016)

There are still many aspects of the Central Asian revolt of 1916 that remain very poorly researched. Isabelle Ohayon connects Uprising of 1916 with the Armed Protest during the Collectivization and Sedentarization (1929-1930). She analyzes the similarities and consequences, political language of those times, numerous figures (Bajkadam Karaldin, Mirzhakup Dulatov) who took part in both revolts and so on. According to Ohayon, they both look like to each other, especially in Turgai region, which were characterized by a high degree of organization and violence (Ohayon, 2016).

We have a lot of questions without answers, because interpretations of some events and facts are ambiguous. All forces are directed to find «enemies» and «guilty», forgetting that the study of any case that claimed thousands of human lives requires deliberation and correctness in assessments, and not the construction of a new historical myths after one century (Kotyukova, 2017: 61). Really, people need to think about future, about how to avoid such kind of tragedy in the future, but not about whom to blame in the uprising of Central Asia of 1916.

Conclusion

To sum up, modern foreign historiography is making a tangible contribution to the process of studying the 1916 uprising in Central Asia. New scientific concepts and theories were put forward on the basis of a wide range of sources introduced into historical circulation. So, what kind of outcomes we can do according to our article? First, vast amount of foreign scientists pay attention to the revolt happened in Turkestan and Semirechye regions. Second, identified different approaches that used while explaining the reasons of uprising. Third, now we know what is Urkun, or exodus, why did a major uprising take place only in Central Asia?, and that scientist like Hallez compares uprising of 1916 with the uprising of K.Kasymov or Ohayon compares with the Armed Protest during the Collectivization (1929-1930). Nevertheless, many aspects of the uprising remain controversial and need further development. Simultaneously, it is necessary to avoid politicized approaches, to abandon any confrontational arguments for proving the truth of only their position when using not entirely reliable facts. At the same time, historical science is facing the task of bringing the study of the national liberation movement of 1916 in Central Asia with the level of theoretical comprehension and determining the ways for its further study based on an analysis of published historical studies and the revealed range of new sources. Problems and questions connecting to uprising are waiting for more deeper research and answers.

References

Hallez X. (2016). Nepreryvnost' I transformasiya form vosstaniya v kazahskoi srede: sopostavlenie vosstaniya 1916 goda v Turgaiskom regione s vosstaniem Kenesary Kasymova. [Continuity and transformation of the forms of uprising in the Kazakh environment: a comparison of the uprising of 1916 in the Turgai region with the uprising of Kenesary Kasymov]. Bishkek.

Buldakov V. (1995). Imperskie etnofobii. [Imperical ethnophoby]. Rodina, № 7. s. 20-24.

Buldakov V. Leont'eva T. (2015). Voina, porodivshaya revoluciui[War, cause of revolution]: Russia, 1914-1917 gg. Moskva, s.720.

Ganin A. (2006). Orenburgskoe kazach'e voisko v konce XIX – nachale XX vv. [Orenburg Cossack army in the end of XIX – in the beginning of XX centuries] Moskva, s. 532.

Ganin A. (2008). Poslednyaya poludennaya ekspedicii imperatorskoi Rossii: Russkaya armiya na podavlenii Turkestanskogo myateja 1916-1917gg. Russkiy sbornik: Issledovaniya po istorii Rossii. [Last noon expedition of Imperial Russia: The Russian army on suppressing the Turkestan riots of 1916-1917. Russian collection: Studies on the history of Russia.] Moskva, s. 152-214.

Katukova T. (2017). Vosstanie 1916g. kak obshaya tragediya. Sbornik statei «Pereosmyslenie vosstaniya 1916 goda v Central'noi Azii» [The uprising of 1916 as a general tragedy. Collection of articles «Rethinking the 1916 Uprising in Central Asia»]. Bishkek.

Lokshin A. (2017). Iz istorii izucheniya vosstaniya v Central'noi Azii v 1916 godu v sovetskoi i rossiskoi istoriografii. Nekotorie osobennosti I harakteristiki. Sbornik statei «Pereosmyslenie vosstaniya 1916 goda v Central'noi Azii» [From the history of studying the revolt in Central Asia in 1916 in Soviet and Russian historiography. Some features and characteristics. Collection of articles «Rethinking the 1916 Uprising in Central Asia»]. Bishkek.

Mazhitov C. (2006). Protestnoe dvijenie v Kazahstane I srednei Azii v 1916 godu: problem teorii I metodologii izucheniya. [Protest movement in Kazakhstan and Central Asia in 1916: problems of theory and methodology of study.]

Morrison A. (2017). Central'naya Aziya: Tolkovanie I pamyat' o vosstanii 1916 goda. Sbornik statei «Pereosmyslenie vosstaniya 1916 goda v Central'noi Azii» [Central Asia: Interpreting and Remembering the 1916 Revolt. Collection of articles «Rethinking the 1916 Uprising in Central Asia»]. Bishkek.

Olcott M. (1995). Kazahi. California. Stanford. Huver Institution Press.

Ohayon I. (2016). Ot vosstaniya 1916 goda do Voorujennogo protesta vo vremya kollektivizasii I sedantarizacii (1929-1930): nasledie I preemstvennost' v Turgaiskom regione sredi kazahskogo obshestva. [From the 1916 Uprising to the Armed Protest during the Collectivization and Sedentarization (1929-1930): Legacy and Continuity in the Turgay Region among the Kazakh Society]. Bishkek.

Palen K. K. (1910). Otchet po revizii Turkestanskogo kraya, proizvedennoi po vysochaishemu poveleniu senatorom gormeisterom grafom K.K.Palenom. Pereselencheskoe delo v Turkestanskom krae. [Report on the audit of the Turkestan territory, made by the highest order of Senator K. K. Palen. Resettlement in the Turkestan Territory]. s.430

Turemuratov I.A. (2012). Metricheskie knigi Vnutrennei Kirgizskoi (Bukeevskoi) Ordy (VBO) v arhivah Orenburgskogo Magometanskogo Duhovnogo sobraniya. [Metric books of the Inner Kirghiz (Bukeev) Horde (EKO) in the archives of the Orenburg Mohammedan Spiritual Assembly]. <http://www.bastanovo.ru/2012/06/mk_vko/>.

Uyama T. (2001). Dve popytki postroit gosudarstvo Kazah: vosstanie 1916 goda I dvijenie Alasha. [Two attempts at building a Qazaq State: The Revolt of 1916 and the Alash Movement]. London.

Uyama T. (2004). Vzglyady carskih generalov na kochevnikov I ih voinstvennost'. Urbanizaciya I nomadism v Central'noi Azii: istoriya I problem. [The views of tsarist generals on nomads and their militancy. Urbanization and nomadism in Central Asia: history and problems.]. Almaty, s. 194-209.

Uyama T. (2008). Byla li islamskaya al'ternativa? Mesto islama v nacional'nom dvijenii kazahov nachalo XX veka. [Was there an Islamic alternative? The place of Islam in the national movement of Kazakhs of the early XXth century]. Shygis. № 2. s. 143-148.

Uyama T. (2011). Vospriyatie mejdunarodnoi obstanovki nachalo XX veka A.Bukeihanom I ego sovremennikami. «Alash murati jane Tauelsiz Kazahstan»: Halykaralyk gylymi-praktikalyk konferenciyasinin materialdarinin jinagi. [Perception of the international situation at the beginning of the XXth century by A. Bukeikhan and his contemporaries. Collection of materials of the International scientific-practical conference «Alash's heritage and independent Kazakhstan]. Astana, s. 13-19.

Uyama T. (2017). Pochemu krupnoe vosstani proizoshlo tol'ko v Central'noi Azii? Administrativno-institucional'nye predposylki vosstaniya 1916 goda. Sbornik statei «Pereosmyslenie vosstaniya 1916 goda v Central'noi Azii» [Why did a major uprising take place only in Central Asia? Administrative and institutional prerequisites for the uprising of 1916. Collection of articles «Rethinking the 1916 Uprising in Central Asia»] Bishkek.

Fedorov V.I. (2013). Yakutia v epohu voin I revolucii (1900–1919). [Yakutia in the era of wars and revolutions(1900–1919)]. Novosibirsk. s. 676.

Happel J. (2010). Mirnye jizni kochevnikov I carskaya politika: vosstanie v Central'noi Azii 1916. [Peaceful life of nomads and tsarist policy: the uprising in Central Asia 1916]. Shtudgart.

Shvarc V. Gubernator «s gvozdem». [Governor «with a nail»]. Chast 2. 2016. <http://daniyarov.kg/2016/06/24/gubernator-s-gvozdyom-chast-2/>.

Литература

Аллэз К. (2016). Непрерывность и трансформация форм восстания в казахской среде: сопоставление восстания 1916 года в Тургайском регионе с восстанием Кенесары Касымова. Бишкек.

Булдаков В. (1995). Имперские этнофобии // Родина, № 7. с. 20-24.

Булдаков В., Леонтьева Т. (2015). Война, породившая революцию: Россия, 1914-1917 гг. Москва, с.720.

Ганин А. (2006). Оренбургское казачье войско в конце XIX – начале XX вв. Москва, с. 532.

Ганин А. (2008). Последняя полуденная экспедиции императорской России: Русская армия на подавлении туркестанского мятежа 1916-1917 гг. // Русский сборник: Исследования по истории России. Москва, с. 152-214.

Катюкова Т. (2017). Восстание 1916 г. как общая трагедия // Сборник статей «Переосмысление восстания 1916 года в Центральной Азии». Бишкек.

Локшин А. (2017). Из истории изучения восстания в Центральной Азии в 1916 году в советской и российской историографии. Некоторые особенности и характеристики // Сборник статей «Переосмысление восстания 1916 года в Центральной Азии». Бишкек.

Мажитов С. (2006). Протестное движение в Казахстане и средней Азии в 1916 году: проблемы теории и методологии изучения.

Моррисон А. (2017). Центральная Азия: Толкование и память о восстании 1916 года // Сборник статей «Переосмысление восстания 1916 года в Центральной Азии». Бишкек.

Олкотт М. (1995). Казахи. Калифорния. Стэнфорд. Издательство Гувера.

Оайон И. (2016). От восстания 1916 года до Вооруженного протеста во время коллективизации и седантаризации (1929-1930): наследие и преемственность в Тургайском регионе среди казахского общества. Бишкек.

Пален К. К. (1910). Отчет по ревизии Туркестанского края, произведенной по высочайшему повелению сенатором гофмейстером графом К. К. Паленом. Переселенческое дело в Туркестанском крае. с. 430.

Туремуратов И.А. (2012). Метрические книги Внутренней Киргизской (Букеевской) Орды (ВКО) в архивах Оренбургского Магометанского Духовного Собрания. <http://www.bastanovo.ru/2012/06/mk_vko/>.

Уяма Т. (2001). Две попытки построить государство Казах: восстание 1916 года и движение Алаша. Лондон.

Уяма Т. (2004). Взгляды царских генералов на кочевников и их воинственность. Урбанизация и номадизм в Центральной Азии: история и проблемы. Алматы, с. 194-209.

Уяма Т. (2008). Была ли исламская альтернатива? Место ислама в национальном движении казахов начала XX века. Шығыс. № 2. с. 143-148.

Уяма Т. (2011). Восприятие международной обстановки начала XX в. А. Букейханом и его современниками. «Алаш мұраты және тәуелсіз Қазақстан»: Халықаралық ғылыми-практикалық конференцияның материалдарының жинағы. Астана, с. 13-19.

Уяма Т. (2017). Почему крупное восстание произошло только в Центральной Азии? Административно-институциональные предпосылки восстания 1916 года // Сборник статей «Переосмысление восстания 1916 года в Центральной Азии». Бишкек.

Федоров В. И. (2013). Якутия в эпоху войн и революций (1900–1919). Новосибирск, с. 676.

Хапел Е. (2010). Мирные жизни кочевников и царская политика: восстание в Центральной Азии 1916. Штутгарт.

Шварц В. Губернатор «с гвоздём». Часть 2. 2016. <http://daniyarov.kg/2016/06/24/gubernator-s-gvozdyom-chast-2/>.