This article discloses the process of changing the requirements expected by the Russian authorities from representatives of the Kazakh elite during appointment to positions (sultan-rulers, distance and local chiefs, translators, writers, volost sultans, etc.). This requirements were created during the administrative reform of the Steppe in the 19th century. At the first stage, the most important measure for co-opting representatives of the Kazakh people into service was “loyalty to Russian power”, “diligence” and “assiduity” on serves. Gradually, the regional administration began to compile lists of representatives of influential Kazakhs who had the ability to hold positions in the local government system. Since the second half of the 19th century, along with the above requirements, the Russian authorities began to take into account the real merits of the applicant for the position, namely education, managerial abilities, administrative experience, but not belonging to the clan. At the same time, the article examines the process of gradual change in the Kazakhs perception of service of tribesman during the 19th century. The article is based on archival documents, extracted from funds TsGA RK and published documents.
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Introduction

The content of policy of the Russian Empire in the Kazakh steppe in the XVIII-XIX century included a creation of a single political-administrative and territorial structure (province, county, volost), and the involvement of representatives of the Kazakh elite (sultans, biys, elders) to serve Emperor.

The strategy of policy of the Russian government in this area included the following measures:

– the creation of posts in the regional administration for the representatives of the Kazakh population (assessors of the Orenburg Boundary Commission, Border governance of Siberian Kazakhs, sultan – rulers, the chief of a distance, local chiefs, the rulers of a volost, aul elders etc.)

– expansion on the Kazakh nomadic society “The Table of Ranks”, in which a mechanism for obtaining the rank and career promotion was established (Medushevsky, 1994);

– awards of the orders and medals of Russian Empire (Shepelev, 1991);

– the appointment of a certain salary and pension;

– inclusion of Kazakhs into a single system of registration of employees at all levels of the Russian State, namely the formation of formulary list (service records) of Kazakh officials;

– Kazakh officials received symbolic signs of power – a flag with the imperial emblem, golden swords and special instructions (for the sultan-rulers) special bronze signs (for heads of the volost), stamp (for distance and local chiefs).

As a result, the Kazakh officials had all the attributes of the state apparatus of the Empire: ranks, medals, stamps.

In turn, representatives of the Kazakh elite, being on the service of the Empire, had the opportunity to keep their influence on tribesmen and a privileged position in nomad society, but under the control of the Russian administration.

In modern historical literature practically unexplored the problem of formation of the Kazakh officials in XIX century. More attention was paid to the process of formation of the Kazakh intelligentsia, their socio-political or scientific activities, rather than to their work as officials.

The aim of my article is to reveal the interaction between Russian authorities and Kazakh officials in the 19th century through a mechanism of appointment of the Kazakhs on posts, via control of service and implementation of duties. What kind of goals the Russian authorities had in the process of recruiting of the Kazakh population representatives to the structure of the Russian bureaucracy?

How did the Russian officials assess the activities of Kazakh officials? How did native population itself perceive new Kazakh officials? How did the process of formation of administrative apparatus in the Steppes, expansion of lows of the Empire, the categories of State thought contributed to the changing of perception of the Kazakhs themselves?
Methodology and sources

The complexity of the actions of the Russian administration was determined by the fact that population occupying this territory, in particular the Bashkirs (from mid-16th century), Volga Kalmuks (from the middle of the 17th century), Kazakhs (30s XVIII century.) differed in economic-cultural type from the Slavs-Finn-Ugric and most of the Turkic (Kazan Tatars, Mishchari, Chuvash) peoples of the Empire. These differences, in the first place, were nomadic cattle breeding, which they and for the Russian administration it was more difficult to build a line of cooperation with the nomadic culture, whose way of life was determined by traditions of tribal (clan) system and was significantly different from the settled population. (Martin: 2001.) The explanation of this question showed that the different starting points for the process of including nomadic peoples into political system of the Russian Empire contributed to the fact that the principles of imperial practice were originally tested on the Bashkirs (Steindwedel, 2007: 94-125: Tagirova, 2012) Kalmuks (Maksimov, 2002; Kamordzhaev, 2003), and then rather in a transformed form began to be introduced into the social space of the Kazakh steppe.

Catherine II in 1784-1792 years in decrees of the Simbirsk and Ufa governor Osip Igelstrom on the establishment of the first administrative institutions in the Steppe (Frontier Court, Border Regulation) proposed ways to “voluntarily induce” the representatives of the Kazakh elite “into the service here”, “caress the most dissatisfied” and finally “tie them” to the Empire by empowering them with ranks and determine salary (PSZ: 1830,950). The social institutions of Kazakh khans, sultans, biys and elders turned out to be in the sphere of interests of the Russian authorities, since involvement them to the service of the sovereign and the ruling dynasty gave direct channel of on the rest of the local population, in particular the Kazakhs of the Steppe. In fact, these were lists of the Kazakhs, who would be “… deserved to serve” and useful “… for the execution of the government’s orders on Horde affairs.” (TsGA of the RK, 2512,22) Officials approached to the compilation of these lists with the most caution and included only those persons who would be “… deserved to serve” and useful “… for the execution of the government’s orders on Horde affairs.” (Zhanaev:2006,94) in case of “wrong assessment, especially from undeserved good side” do not involve “authorities into mistake “and as the consequent” important implications “in the appointment (Zhanaev, 2006: 167). All the Russian officials who made up these lists, featured an excellent knowledge of the Kazakh language, culture and customs of the Kazakh people.

Despite the fact that in Kazakhstan historiography the structure of the administrative system of the Kazakh Steppe in the 19th century has been fully developed (Zimanov: 1960; Abdrahmanova: 1998), the issue of co-opting of Kazakh representatives to the Russian bureaucracy, the formation of the personnel policy of regional and central authorities in the process of integrating the Kazakh nomadic society into the single administrative and legal space of the Empire was almost completely ignored. Kazakhstan historiography paid more attention to the process of spreading the secular education and forming the Kazakh intelligentsia (Sozakbaev, 1985, Kenzhetaev, 1996), their scientific and socio-political activities (Simanov, 1989), although many of them were in the service of regional government bodies (Orenburg, West-Siberian and Turkestan general-governorship). Only in recent decades there have been works on the formation of the Kazakh bureaucracy of the Orenburg department (Kasymbaev, 200, Sultangalieva, 2009), local government in the Turkestan region (Abashin, 2001), when the legitimacy of the power of the Kazakh elite began to be determined by the Russian authorities, and not by the traditions of communal self-government.

Historical sources for the report were the following documents from Central State Archives of RK:

1. Alphabetical lists of the most honorable and influential individuals of Horde, which were made by Russian officials (councilors of general-governor, officials on special assignments, interpreters, guardians, etc.) involved in all administrative activities in the Steppe. In fact, these were lists of the Kazakhs, who would be “… deserved to serve” and useful “… for the execution of the government’s orders on Horde affairs.” (TsGA of the RK, 2512,22) Officials approached to the compilation of these lists with the most caution and included only those persons who were personally known and “were carefully observed during their service,” (Zhanaev:2006,94) in case of “wrong assessment, especially from undeserved good side” do not involve “authorities into mistake “and as the consequent” important implications “in the appointment (Zhanaev, 2006: 167). All the Russian officials who made up these lists, featured an excellent knowledge of the Kazakh language, culture and customs of the Kazakh people.

2. A definite contribution to the study of the Kazakh officialdom of the Russian Empire is made by the collection of documents “On the most honorable and influential Kazakhs of Horde”, accumulating the service and form lists of the Kazakhs of the Orenburg, Siberian regions, Turkestan and Steppe General Governorship from the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The published lists showed that all-Russian standards of record keeping were distributed to Kazakh officials. These documents made it possible to see the participation
of sultans, elders, and biys in important events of the all-Russian and local scale in the process of reforming the Steppe and carrying out various assignments of the regional administration, awarding orders, medals, and salary benefits for the performance of their duties (Zhanaev, 2006).

3. The collection of documents (materials of business correspondence, personal documents, periodical materials, etc.), reports of Kazakh officials (sultan-rulers, chiefs of the distance, rulers of the volost) and petition on the appointment of salaries, pensions, change of service conditions were gathered in the collection “Kazakh officials in the service of the Russian Empire” (Sultangalieva, 2015)

**Recruiting of the Kazakhs on the service Russian Empire**

What were the qualities Kazakh officials needed to have on the opinion of the Russian authorities? This issue was important to the regional administration in the first half of XIX century. The success on «activities undertaken by the Russian government» was depended on those who would be co-opted from the Kazakhs to the service of the Empire and from their «skill and tact».

Russian officials as representatives of the estate State believed that the election on service to Emperor could be only candidates who belonged to privilege groups, for example sultans, biys and elders. An official on special assignments Vasily Lazarevsky recommended to the regional administration to consider only the sultans, as individuals able to take a post. For example, he stressed that it would be fair to assign on the post descendants of Sultan Karaty, in particular Biysaly Karataev as one «of the wisest and best of the descendants». (Zhanaev, 2006: 129-130)

Regional administration considered that the candidate for a post in the Steppe should have «all useful qualities that official was required to have», namely, the ability to persuade, to explain of his «will and energy» for execution of orders on time. Thus, the regional administration believed that «... the skill of speech on public assemblies and in other cases,» helped in performing the duties of Alimbay Bayguzin, the chief of 48th distance. (TsGA of the RK, 4413.2)

According to report of Orenburg Boundary Commission Konstantin Kaminsky emphasized “strong influence” of Murtazagali Uzbekgaliev, chief of 1st distance because “ his instructions were listened even by Kazakhs, who were not under his subordination.” (Zhanaev, 2006: 84-85) Thereby the regional administration emphasized the scale of influence of a candidate: clan, tribe, the Horde.

According to report of Russian officials reasons of “significant influence” of Kazakh nobilities on their tribesmen were personal virtue, clear mind, justice. The presence of post and prosperity were next reasons for impact. In addition, Russian officials have emphasized literacy as in Russian and Tatar language, as one of the factors of influence. Russian authorities believed that these qualities of the Kazakh leaders can be successfully “used in a favor of the government,” (TsGA of the RK, 2512.25) and help them in their future tactical actions in passing deep into the Steppes. These qualities helped to Kazakh officials to “watch over the violations” at the boundary line and assisted for the “quick delivery of data about all what happened “in the Steppe and for “execution of authority’s orders”. For example, regional administration refused to approve Kulmuhamed Baimukhamedov, (son of the Sultan -ruler of Baymuhammer Aychuakov) on the post of Chief of the 31st distance only because he didn’t have management experience, neither trust from his tribesmen, even though Baimukhamedov’s family was known to the Russian authorities for their loyalty to the ruling dynasty. (Zhanaev, 2006: 78-79)

The next quality that was supposed to have a candidate for the post – “diligence in carrying out their duties and devotion to the Emperor.” In this case, the regional authority noted different degrees of loyalty of the Kazakh officials to ruling dynasty: “devoted diligently” (the local chief Qaumi Aldiyarov), “devoted well” (Chief of 26th distance Kokbash Dautbekov), “fully devoted” (Chief of 20th distance Maten Chutanov, the local chief Yata Utyaganov).

According to report of official for special assignments V. Lazarevsky one of the features of devotion of the Kazakh officials was “the ability to maintain a relationship with Russians and Russian authorities.” Thus, characterizing Murtazagali Uzbekgaliev, the chief of 1st distance, Vasily Lazarevsky wrote that more than any other kazaks of Horde s Murtazagali “loved and supported acquaintance with Russians, therefore we can conclude that he devoted more than others.” (Zhanaev, 2006: 127)

There were some of Kazakh officials, which were mentioned as “devoted to the Emperor from
The level of education wasn’t determinative in the appointment in 20-40’s years of XIX century. However, according to Russian officials knowledge of Russian language promoted for the timely execution of tasks. So, the chairman of Orenburg Boundary Commission wrote about the sultan-ruler of Eastern part of Orenburg kazakhs Ahmed Dzhan-tyurin that he “fluently using Russian language, both spoken and written,” “understood all orders of the Boundary Commission on management.” At the same time they noted that the sultan-ruler of Middle part of Orenburg kazakhs, Arslan Dzhan-tyurin had “significant difficulty” in execution of the government orders, “because of illiteracy.” (Zhanaev, 2006:67)

Regional administration believed that the fact whether the Kazakh was accused didn’t play any role in the appointment to the post. Chairman of the Orenburg Boundary Commission Vasily Grigor’ev (1816-1881) wrote to Orenburg general-governor V.A. Perovskiy in 1855 year, that “if obstructed by this circumstances in the service appointments of Horde representatives ,than we would have to determine the most candidates as incapable. Kazakhs smart and powerful can not live without getting lost in any intrigue” and could be accused. (TsGA of the RK, 2745,1-2)

An important factor in the appointment for the post was the presence of ruling experience. Chairman of the Orenburg Boundary Commission V.V. Grigor’ev, representing Muhamedzhan Baymuhammedov for the post of the sultan- ruler of the Middle part of Orenburg kazakhs, wrote about him as already formed official who “knows our office work,” and the most important thing, “familiar to the ruling,” successfully carrying out affairs of Orenburg administration. (TsGA of the RK, 2745:1-2) M. Baimukhamedov at the beginning of his post the sultan-ruler (1855) already had a 14 – year ruling experience as a chief of the 8th distance, then assistant of sultan-ruler of the Middle part of Orenburg kazakhs (Zhanaev, 2006: 368-374)

Assessment of activity was different and depended from the post rank of Kazakh officials. Sultan – ruler was considered official who was put at the head of the local government, he received the rank of major of Russian service (rank VIII class). The essence of the duties of the sultans – governors included: monitoring the behavior of the Kazakh population, “keep them in discipline and devotion and obedience to government”, collection of “reliable information about Kazakhs, the number of tents and livestock,” and exact “execution of orders of the regional administration” (GAORo:13,3).

Regional authorities based on these duties emphasized important quality that sultan-rulers were supposed to have. First it was diligence. For example, an official for special assignments Vasily Lazarevskiy wrote to the chairman of the Orenburg Boundary Commission M. V/ Ladyzhensky that for the sultan-ruler of Western part of Orenburg kazakhs Muhamedgali Tyaukin “the best pleasure and a constant desire to execute any orders of authorities.” (Zhanaev, 2006: 125)

According to the chairman of the Orenburg Border Commission G.F. Gens, a service of the sultan-ruler of the Western part of Orenburg kazakhs, Baimukhamed Aychuvakov during 15 years was marked by “noticeable service to the government,” proof of his devotion and diligence to the service (Zhanaev, 2006: 67)

The regional administration noted that the sultan-rulers, who began to serve of Eastern, Middle and Western parts of the Orenburg Kazakhs from mid 30’s of XIX century” were not seen weak in their duties of service,” and most importantly, “didn’t allow the disturbances between subordinates” (TSGA of the RK:2318,4)

The next element in the ruling of Kazakhs of the Orenburg region were chiefs of distance, who stood at the head of the new territorial-administrative structures – distances (administrative areas between the two fortresses) introduced in 1831 year. Moreover, inside the distances in front of each fortposts or between fortresses fractional administrative-territorial unit was formed, headed by local chiefs from “honor” Kazakhs. If by 1847 year the number of chiefs of “distance” was 52, than “local” chiefs was 206. Unfortunately, in the textbooks of History of Kazakhstan this aspect practically is not covered. The main function of distance and local chiefs were collection of kibits taxes from the Kazakh population. Regional governments understood that the only individuals who knew the nomadic way of life and locations of tribes can give correct information about the number of taxpayers. Thus, about the local chief near Novoiletsk Statitsa was written that he informed data on taxes on time and earlier than other local chiefs. (Zhanaev, 2006: 273)

Joseph Osmolovsky marked out that Yusuf Bikbulatov (chief of 22th distance) from all chiefs of the distance of Eastern part of Orenburg kazakhs was one of “active, efficient, prompt” employees. Suyunchali Dzhanburin, chief of the 26th distance
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was characterized as “a great ruler”, whose territory was distinguished with “strict discipline”. He demonstrated “amazing care and diligence” in ruling. (Zhanaev, 2006: 147-148)

However, the regional administration understood that some chiefs were “executive when they saw the benefit,” (Zhanaev, 2006:125,143) didn’t always want to “settle peace and quiet between subordinates”, “they neglected by order of Russian authorities” and most importantly “didn’t have humility”. All these qualities were the reason of removal of Kazakhs from positions.

Conclusion

Destruction of traditional system of ruling in the Kazakh steppe, the emergence of new system of ruling and new officials changed Kazakhs’ perceptions of image of ruler in the Steppe and the understanding of themselves, their clans in this new system, and their relationship with the Russian power. If in XVII-XVIII centuries head of the tribes had such important qualities as courage, bravery and ability to defend own territory, than in XIX century were important such qualities as «flexibility to interact with Russian authorities for protecting interests of tribes» and «ability to transmit all orders of the Government.» (TSGA of the RK:4413,59)

For the Kazakh elite getting post meant the opportunity to preserve their power and influence, because their position in XIX century in nomad society started to define not by attachment to certain clan, but loyalty «to the tsar», personal skills and ability to involve your tribe on the service of the empire. Moreover Kazakh official perceived his service until the middle of the XIX century as post that can be inherited. Especially it can be traced at appointment of distance or local chiefs. As a result by 60’s years of XIX century was created dynasty of sultan-rulers, distance and local chiefs.

Perception in the Steppe about Kazakhs, who studied in Russian school changed during XIX century. According to report of Isengazy Babain, the chief of 34th distance kazaks of Orenburg region, his subordinate population, perceived him as Russian and stranger in 1862 year, because he graduated from the Orenburg cadet corpus. After 30 years, namely 90-th year of XIXc. Kazakhs could work on service in local ruling if they knew Russian literacy, were graduates of Russian-Kazakh schools or other schools.

Sultan-rulers gave to the regional administration List of Horde officials (chiefs of distance, local chiefs, head of the tribe) who demonstrated “diligence” and were “famous for their achievements”. This document is interesting for showing us how the sultan-rulers perceived officials who were subordinate to them. Moreover sultan-rulers characterized them using the vocabulary of Russian authorities, namely the “known to the government for the post”, “long-lasting devotion to the ruling dynasty,” and “the constant diligence in service and excellent behavior. “ Almost all sultan-rulers, wrote that Kazakh officials had good, kind and gentle character, and stressed their willingness “to execute their assignments”.

At the same time the process of forming a new relationship between Kazakh officials was complex. Thus, Isengazy Babain, chief of the 34th distance reported that his subordinates “instead of the proper obedience”, he saw “no submission or avoidance from his instructions” and moreover, they could sabotage his orders. (TSGA of the RK;4413, 383-386)

Thus, the creation of new administrative structures in the Steppe, new posts (sultan-rulers, chief of the distance, local chiefs, head of tribes and other officials) gives new challenges not only in studying of imperial practices of ruling in the region, but also raises a new names of individuals in the history of Kazakhstan, rises questions to explore new models of behavior as a Kazakh officials, so and the population in the Steppe.

Мақала «Ұлы Дала тарихы мен мәдениеті» мақсатты бағдарламасы аясында орындалды.
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