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Кваліфікаційна робота складається з сімдесяти трьох сторінок, базується на матеріалах сорока двох позицій першоджерел, тридцяти позицій монографічних досліджень і наукових статей.

**Об’єктом дослідження** є гайдамацький рух в Україні та рух хунхузів у Маньчжурії (Китай).

**Предметом дослідження** є вивчення та порівняння цих двох соціальних рухів, з’ясування їх типологічної подібності попри відмінності в просторово-часовій складовій історичного буття.

**Хронологічні межі дослідження**. Хронологічно дослідження охоплює період від початку XVIII століття і до початку ХХ століття. Нижня хронологічна межа співпадає із часом перших згадок про дії гайдамаків із числа запорозьких козаків на польсько-турецько-російському потрійному кордоні, а верхня хронологічна межа пов’язана із припиненням діяльності хунхузів, внаслідок репресивних дій урядів Росії (згодом – СРСР), Китаю (також Маньчжурії) та Японії.

**Територіальні межі** **дослідження** поширюються на історико-географічні області Євразії, які впродовж XVIII – початку ХХ століття були місцем перебування та діяльності носіїв традиції гайдамаків (Північне Причорномор’я та Правобережна Україна) і хунхузів (Приамур’я, по обидва боки російсько-китайського кордону, та Уссурійський край).

**Наукова новизна одержаних результатів** полягає в тому, що соціальні рухи українського та китайського народів, як свідомі колективні дії з відновлення державних устрою, соціального порядку, особливо їхня націоналістична складова, вперше стали предметом історичної компаративістики. Практичне значення тексту роботи полягає в тому, що її матеріали можуть бути використані при викладанні навчальних курсів, які лежать у площині як всесвітньої історії Нового Часу, так і в більш вузьких – українському та китайському – дискурсивних контекстах.

**Перший розділ** знайомить із ситуацією дослідження гайдамаків та хунхузів та методами дослідження, які використовувалися у цій роботі.

Специфіка джерельної бази полягає в тому, що обидва рухів – гайдамаків і хунхузів – носили егалітарний, простонародний характер, а том рівень освіти і тих, і інших був низький, тому тексти, що презентують власне їх, представлені майже виключно фольклором. Комплекс історичних джерел цієї роботи переважно складають офіційна документація урядів тих країн, на території яких розгорталися соціальні рухи – Російської імперії, Китаю та Речі Посполитої, мемуарними записами та листами контрагентів-антагоністів. Певний шар інформації з досліджуваної проблеми містять у собі періодична преса кінця ХІХ – початку ХХ століття.

Методи дослідження, використані при написанні роботи, зумовлені поставленими метою та завданнями: робота базується на загальнонаукових та історичних методах дослідження. Методологічною основою дисертації став міждисциплінарний підхід у вивченні актуалізованого комплексу джерел з історії соціальних рухів українських гайдамаків та китайських хунхузів у XVIII – на початку ХХ століття. Всебічне дослідження об’єкту спирається на базові принципи історичної науки та гуманітарного знання, серед яких чільне місце посідає компаративний аналіз історичних явищ.

**Другий розділ** присвячено розглядові історичного розвитку рухів гайдамаків та хунхузів.

Було з’ясовано, що гайдамацький рух серед запорозьких козаків виник у другому десятилітті XVIII ст. і був викликаний, з одного боку, переходом Війська Запорозького Низового під протекцію Османської імперії (та Кримського ханства), а з іншого – ліквідацією козацтва, його прав і вольностей у Речі Посполитій після 1712-1713 рр., соціально-економічного гноблення українського населення з боку польської шляхти. Додатковою причиною активізації повстанського руху стало ускладнення релігійної ситуації на Правобережній Україні, що полягало у розвитку протистояння між католицькою та православною церквами.

У зоні зближення кордонів трьох країн – Російської та Турецької імперій і Речі Посполитої, де вони, до того ж, накладалися на зони зіткнення трьох субцивілізацій – православної, ісламської та католицької – населення було в стані перманентної війни один з одним. Регіон дозволяв необмежене маневрування у своєму оперативному просторі. Саме на ці землі відбувався вихід із Запорожжя представників традиційної течії козацтва — гайдамаків.

Спроби російського уряду уніфікувати всі сторони життя і діяльності Війська Запорозького Низового, як і інших козацьких військ імперії, призвели до невдоволення січової бідноти. У пошуках практично непідконтрольної урядам Росії, Туреччини та Польщі території вона в 1750-х роках завоювала нижню течію Південного Бугу, перетворивши її на постійне місце перебування, утримуючи їх практично до останньої декади XVIII століття.

Китайські хунхузи безпосередньо відноситься до повстанців (згідно іншої точки зору – бандитів), які діяли на землях Маньчжурії (Китай) та прилеглих російських володіннях. Подібно до реалій Північного Причорномор’я, освоєння Північно-Східного Китаю відбувалося відносно пізно, територія була великою, а населення маленьким. Особливий гірський заліснений рельєф Маньчжурії визначав її як місце, що можна було використовувати як ідеальне для повстанської та кримінальної діяльності. Водночас подібні географічні умови робили багатий на природні ресурси регіон Маньчжурії привабливим для виживання простих людей – китайських втікачів-селян, у соціальному хаосі пізньої династії Цін. Адже, після першої «Опіумної війни» 1840 року Китай поступово перетворився на відстале напівколоніальне феодальне суспільство. Цей соціальний характер призвів до появи великої кількості знедолених у китайському суспільстві. Гноблення народу правителями ставало дедалі сильнішим, а іноземні загарбники прийняли Китай як колонію і включили його до своєї економічної системи. Це призвело до краху традиційної сільськогосподарської економічної системи Китаю: селяни втрачали свою землю і змушено ставали біженцями. Коли ж вони втрачали усі законні способи заробітку на прожиття, то часто стають хунхузами, аби просто вижити.

**Третій розділ** присвячений знайомству з організаційною структурою та культурою представників обох соціальних рухів – українських гайдамаків і китайських хунхузів.

В часи свого виникнення термін «гайдамак» не вживався для оцінки визвольної боротьби козацтва та селянства Правобережної України, означаючи виключно здобичницькі рейди запорожців на польську територію. З другої половини XVIII ст. він поширюється на будь-який елемент, вороже налаштований по відношенню до поляків. Об’єктом нападів гайдамаків, як правило, були іновірці – поляки-католики (також українці-уніати) та євреї-іудеї. Основою для такого вибору ворогів була напруженість у відносинах між цими трьома основними групами населення Правобережної України.

Гайдамацький промисел мав чіткий сезонний характер, активізуючись у теплий час, та практично припиняючись взимку. Середній вік членів гайдамацьких ватаг коливався від 16 до 40 років. Соціальний склад – бідні козаки (т.зв. «сірома»). Вистачало серед гайдамаків й вихідців з більш привілейованих соціальних верств – до них приставали й старшини, й російські солдати офіцери й навіть представники польської шляхти та єврейства.

Життя на прикордонні диктувало правила поведінки всередині козацької гайдамацької ватаги. У процесі перманентної війни краще їм треба було завжди мати надійного друга поруч. Це сприяло збереженню традиціної для запорожців практики побратимства. Належність до єдиного «братства» домінувала, виходила на перший план.

Хунхузи, як маргінальна група тогочасного суспільства, перебували у серйозній опозиції як до китайського уряду, так і до своїх прямих ворогів. Цей факт суттєво коригував необхідність випрацювання оптимальних засад внутрішньої організації. Для того, щоб будь-яка соціальна група досягла довгострокового розвитку, вона має сформувати певну організаційну структуру і водночас використовувати правила дисципліни для регулювання поведінки своїх членів. Китайські повстанські угруповання не були винятком. Хунхузи наслідували традиційну китайську феодально-патріархальну кланову систему. Її основні характеристики ґрунтуються на кревній спорідненості, збереженні відносин патронажу між людьми.

Тому, хоча більшість членів хунхузьких не були пов'язані родинними відносинами, під впливом патріархального ладу вони називали один одного «братами», відтворюючи в загонах традиційну для китайців сімейну атмосферу. При цьому така «сімейна прихильність» мала яскраво виражений ієрархічний відтінок. Хунхузи з більш високим статусом мали більшу владу, тоді як звичайні члени з низьким статусом могли лише виконувати їх накази. Хунхузи мали відносно сувору організаційну структуру. Взагалі, група хунхузів складалася з лідерів (вождів), керівників загонів та звичайних членів.

Попри декларування власної «китайськості», переважна більшість учасників руху хунхузів були індиферентними традиційних релігійних вірувань і культових практик. Їх місце зайняли особливі переконання, щоби підтримувати такі «сімейні» стосунки – система вірувань-забобонів, магічних практик, які мали вплинути на успішність їх нападів на ворогів. Вони були спрямовані на те, щоб стандартизувати поведінку членів усередині, щоб посилити згуртованість групи; забезпечити ментальну впевненість у успішності її існування. Завдяки постійному розвитку та вдосконаленню хунхузи розвинули своєрідну традиційну «бандитську культуру», багато в чому збагативши її регіональними особливостями Маньчжурії у плані фольклорних і обрядових запозичень.

**Четвертий розділ** знайомить з розвитком і занепадом соціальних рухів гайдамаків і хунхузів, підкреслює характер їхніх стосунків із владою держав регіонів, що були місцем їх діяльності, та, водночас, демонструє їхню егалітарну сутність і національно-визвольне спрямування.

Гайдамацький рух, очолюваний саме запорозькими козаками, став фактором, який суттєво послабив польське панування на загарбаних українських землях. Січовики стали очільниками масових гайдамацьких повстань 1734, 1750 і 1768 рр. Не в змозі самостійно придушити протести гайдамаків, Річ Посполита постійно зверталася до Російської імперії за військовою допомогою. З середини XVIII століття активізується військова співпраця між російською, турецькою та польською владою для запобігання набігам козаків на землі Речі Посполитої та Кримського ханства. Водночас зростав вплив Росії на внутрішню політику Запорозької Січі, адже саме козаки були головними організаторами гайдамацьких загонів.

Після ліквідації урядом Катерини ІІ Війська Запорозького Низового, значна частина козаків перейшла на турецькі землі, під владу османських султанів. Упродовж другої половини 1770-х – початку 1790-х років гайдамацькі напади здійснюються проти поляків і росіян із центрів оселення турецьких запорожців у околицях м. Очаків. Остаточне завоювання Російською імперією всього Північного Причорномор’я, створення нею з колишніх запорожців Чорноморського козацького війська та переселення його на Кубань, підірвали соціальну базу гайдамацького руху та його мотивацію.

Станом на другу половину ХІХ століття Російській імперії був конче потрібен стратегічний порт на Далекому Сході. Під загрозою застосування сили з боку царської Росії уряд імперії Цін поступився великою територією, аби тільки зберегти своє панування. Але прості люди на кордоні стихійно організували антиросійський рух, щоб протистояти загарбникам. Починаючи з 1870-х років всі сили, які реально протистояли правлінню росіян на загарбаному ними Далекому Сході та напівзалежній від них Маньчжурії, були саме хунхузами. До них приєднувалося багато цінських солдатів, простих селян і ремісників. Рух хунхузів проти російської анексії краю в цей період був більшим із виявів патріотичних настроїв простих людей, адже саме їх росіяни виселяли з старих місць мешкання за новий кордон. Тактика виступів у цей час носила стихійний характер, по формі нагадуючи прояви звичайного бандитизму.

Зміна форми спротиву відбулася після початку російсько-японської війни 1904 – 1905 рр. Обидві протидіючі сторони – й царська Росія, й імператорська Японія – намагалися використати хунхузів у своїх інтересах. Завдяки діяльності своїх емісарів-розвідників, й ті, й інші, вступали в переговори з ватажками різних угрупувань хунхузів, надавали їм гроші та зброю, аби ті вчиняли диверсійні рейди в тилах супротивників. Фактично, з цього часу і до 1920-х років частина хунхузів втрачає чіткі антиколоніальні спонуки свої боротьби, перетворюючись на звичайних найманців. Ситуацію змінює пряма агресія японців проти Маньчжурії та Китаю на початку 1920-х років, коли хунхузькі загони стають частиною загально-китайського партизанського руху, керованого КПК.

**Висновки** до роботи в цілому є наступними.

Гайдамацький рух запорозьких козаків на польсько-російсько-турецькому кордоні протягом усього XVIII століття багато в чому був зумовлений традиціями т.зв. «здобичництва», що склалися в попередні історичні епохи. Інституціалізація гайдамацтва, як окремого вектора військово-політичних виправ, відбулася під час перебування Війська Запорозького Низового в кримській протекції і має зв'язок із практиками татаро-ногайської здобичі. Дії гайдамаків, з одного боку, були зумовлені національними, релігійними та класовими (соціальними) мотивами, з іншого ж, були різновидом соціального бандитизму. У окремих випадках, як-от під час Коліївщини 1768 р., гайдамацький рух запорозьких козаків накладався на загальноукраїнський визвольний рух на Правобережній Україні із залученням ширших верств населення - селянства і міщан (буржуазії). Закріплення наприкінці XVIII століття державних кордонів Османської та Російської імперій, запровадження карантинної служби та паспортної системи на кордоні, ліквідація державності Речі Посполитої та поділ її володінь, поставили гайдамацтво поза законом і сприяли його поступовому зникненню.

Активізація руху хунхузів у Маньчжурії (Китай) почалася з середині ХІХ століття. Він став результатом нестабільності китайського суспільства, руйнування традиційних економічних моделей і вторгнення іноземних загарбників-колонізаторів – японських, російських, англійських та інших. Повстанці-хунхузи стали захисниками інтересів і потреб дрібного китайського селянства та міщанства, змушеного шукати можливості виживання в суворих умовах життя.

Відтак, рух хунхузів набув характеру національного руху проти імперіалізму, що відображає пробудження особистої гідності та національної свідомості усього китайського народу. Наприклад, під час т.зв. «повстання боксерів» у 1900 р., ополчення, організоване хунхузами, виступило проти сил Російської імперії в Маньчжурії, особливо проти анклавів російської військової та економічної присутності – лісових концесій, залізниці, військово-морських баз тощо. А на тлі впадіння Китаю в повномасштабну кризу після 1930 року, саме хунхузи одними з перших чинили опір різним формам японської агресії.

В тактичному сенсі військова складова повстанців-хунхузів постійно розвивалася та вдосконалювалася: від маленьких партизанських груп, на ранній стадії розвитку, до пізніших масових виступів, на чолі із кадровими армійськими полководцями. Подібна розмаїтість була причиною того, що виникла нечіткість у розумінні понять «армія» та «банда», в оцінці не тільки контрагентів-супротивників, але й сучасників-китайців.

Оскільки саме довгострокова політична та економічна відсталість феодального Китаю, його напівколоніальна залежність від потужних геополітичних сил у другій половині ХІХ – першій половині ХХ століть – світових колоніальних імперій та Японії – не могла гарантувати найосновніші потреби китайського народу у існуванні та безпеці життя, припинити цю ситуацію змогло лише встановлення по справжньому національної влади в Китаї, вигнання з його території усіх іноземних загарбників. Зі встановленням стабільного народного режиму (1949) рух хунхузів втратив зовнішні фактори-подразники, а також і внутрішню соціальну мотивацію для свого розвитку та швидко зійшов із історичної арени.

Проведений порівняльний аналіз історичного розвитку засвідчив наступне.

Обидва суспільні рухи – гайдамаки та хунхузи – отримали неоднозначні відгуки як від сучасників, так і від пізніших дослідників. Водночас їм вдалося сформувати своєрідну військову культуру, яка допомогла їм стати на шлях опору феодальному гніту та іноземним загарбникам — польським (для гайдамаків) і російським, англійським і японським (для хунхузів).

Хоча ці дві групи були географічно і навіть часово віддалені одна від одної, чинники, що викликали їх до життя, прикметні особливості їхнього історичного буття, мають багато спільного, з точки зору соціального характеру, способу життя та кінцевої мети їхньої діяльності.

У процесі порівняльного зіставлення історії цих двох громад ми визначили такі об’єднуючі маркери, як:

1) національно-визвольна та антифеодальна спрямованість;

2) периферійний характер рухів – розвиток на прикордонні Речі Посполитої, Російської та Османської імперій (гайдамаки) та володінь імперій Цін, Японії та Росії (хунхузи);

3) строкатий соціальний та етнічний склад учасників;

4) використання грабіжницької тактики та повстанської стратегії.

Детальне вивчення історії та мотивації обох соціальних рухів дозволило зробити загальний висновок про те, що їх слід розглядати як військово-політичну реакцію українського та китайського народів на іноземне панування, за відсутності власної державності чи слабких державних інституцій.

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS OF UKRAINIAN HAYDAMAKS AND CHINESE HONGHUZI (XVIII-XX ст.)**
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The qualification work consists of seventy-three pages, contains forty-two sources, thirty monographs.

**The object** is the Haydamak movement in Ukraine and the Honghuzi movement in Manchuria, China.

**The subject** is to study and compare two social movements that occur in different time and space.

**The aim of the study** isanalyzing the formation background, development process, and conditions of Haydamak and Honghuzi social movements, compare the causes of their occurrence under different social and cultural backgrounds and thus expose their historical significance and influence.

**The scientific novelty** is that social movements as conscious and planned collective actions to rebuild social order, especially those with resistance and nationalist social movements under special backgrounds, have attracted more and more attention in recent years. The research on social movements not only has special scientificity but also has practical significance.

As for the movement of the Haidamaks, Shevchenko in his poems praised these Cossacks with a free soul. They were not afraid of the oppression of society and showed great courage in the fight against the oppressors. However, there was also such a social grouping in the far north of China. It can be said that their assessments are ambiguous. However, they did indeed form a unique regional culture and embarked on the path of confronting feudal oppression and confronting foreign invaders. These were the Honghuzes who operated in Northeast China from the 18th to the 20th century.

Although the two groups are geographically far apart, their social environment, in which they find themselves, has a lot in common. And it also shows why the two groups had a lot in common in terms of staff composition, lifestyle, and activities. In the process of analyzing these two groups, their common basis will be revealed: their peripherality and desire for freedom.

As a comparative study, it analyzes the changes and development of social movements in Ukraine and China and understands the reasons for common ground in the differences. As two countries with huge differences in geographic location and cultural background, China and Ukraine have deepened their understanding of each other along with the course of globalization. In the context of deepening strategic cooperation between China and Ukraine and discussing the construction of the Belt and Road together, the importance of mutual understanding in history and culture has also been highlighted in the new era.

As different social groups are born under different backgrounds, in the process of revealing the development and activities, a common foundation has been found. As a trending topic in recent years, social movements have attracted more and more public interest. The answer to the origin and motivation of social movements are still incomplete. Therefore, the comparative study of it can bring more important practical significance, that is, the essence of social movement.
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# INTRODUCTION

**The relevance of the research** is that social movements as conscious and planned collective actions to rebuild social order, especially those with resistance and nationalist social movements under special backgrounds, have attracted more and more attention in recent years. The research on social movements not only has special scientificity but also has practical significance.

As a comparative study, it analyzes the changes and development of social movements in Ukraine and China and understands the reasons for common ground in the differences, which further enhances the relevance. As two countries with huge differences in geographic location and cultural background, China and Ukraine have deepened their understanding of each other along with the course of globalization. In the context of deepening strategic cooperation between China and Ukraine and discussing the construction of the Belt and Road together, the importance of mutual understanding in history and culture has also been highlighted in the new era.

At the same time, as different social groups are born under different backgrounds, in the process of revealing the development and activities, a common foundation has been found. As a trending topic in recent years, social movements have attracted more and more public interest. The answer to the origin and motivation of social movements are still incomplete. Therefore, the comparative study of it can bring more important practical significance, that is, the essence of social movement.

**The object** is the Haydamak movement in Ukraine and the Honghuzi movement in Manchuria, China.

**The subject** is to study and compare two social movements that occur in different time and space.

**The purpose** is to analyze the formation background, development process and conditions of Haydamak and Honghuzi social movements, compare the causes of their occurrence under different social and cultural backgrounds, and thus expose their historical significance and influence.

**In order to achieve the goals, the following plans have been formulated:**

-Analyze the origin of the Haydamak movement and Honghuzi movement, and give the definition of the concept;

-Analyze the social, political and economic conditions of development;

-Describe the development process of the two and their evolution in the process;

-Explain the internal structure of the two and the reasons for the formation of the structure;

-Summarize the historical significance of the two social movements and point out their limitations.

**The scientific novelty of the study** is that research on the activities of marginalized groups in society is relatively rare. The research helps to further understand the real-life conditions of the upper and lower classes in the history of China and Ukraine. Judging from the current information, there are few records about the internal situation of the lower-level groups. Due to the particularity of his life, the collection of original data is more difficult. Therefore, further exploration is needed.

**The structure is** subordinated to the purpose and objectives of the study. Qualification work consists of an introduction, four sections (eight subsections), conclusions, a list of used sources and literature (seventy-two items). The volume of the main part of the work is seventy-three pages of computer text, the total volume of the master's work is eight-sixpages.

# CHAPTER 1

# SOURCE BASE, HISTORIOGRAPHY AND RESEARCH METHODS

## 1.1. Scientific development of the research

The research on Haydamak and Honghuzi movement involves a wide range of political, military, social, and cultural fields. As a marginalized group, and considering the poor level of study of the political and social history of the 17th century still does not allow to unambiguously and completely answer the question of the origins of the Haydamak movement in Zaporizhzhia during the New Sich era. This topic remains poorly developed.

At the same time, the "critical mass" of sources on the history of the Zaporizhzhia Cossacks, found in the archives of the Russian Federation, Poland, and Ukraine and introduced by us into scientific circulation, their information content, allow us to highlight certain aspects of the activities of a part of the Zaporizhzhia Cossacks, known under the generalized name of "Haydamaks", throughout the 1710s - 1780s[4,204].

One of them is the question of the social essence and motivation of the Haydamaks since it is quite obvious that in many documented cases, the pragmatic "mining" (aimed at seizing prey) motive openly and demonstratively dominated over the factors of national, religious and class. The study of primary sources leads, in the end, the researcher to the idea that this "predatory" direction in the Haydamak movement was perceived by his contemporaries, people living in the 18th century, as a manifestation of the "mining" activity of the Zaporizhzhia Cossacks[4,205].

It is no coincidence that the first written mentions of Haidamachism appeared in the first quarter of the 18th century. - the time of large-scale measures by the Polish, Russian and Turkish governments to delimit borders, establish a system of border guards and passport control in the vastness of the Northern Black Sea region (1700 - 1705, 1711 - 1714). Under such conditions, the traditional "valiant" (ie, "mining") actions of the subjects of each of the parties inevitably begin to be viewed not just as an act of aggression against the neighboring state, but also as a manifestation of disobedience towards the authorities of the country to which they were subjects.

Starting the consideration of this plot, cannot ignore the issue of the time of appearance and the initial semantic load of the terms:

1) "Haydamaks", which denoted as proper representatives of certain social groups within the Sich Cossacks;

2) "Haidamaschestvo", which, in a broader sense, denoted not only a social phenomenon, but also an entire epoch in the history of Ukraine.

Both of them came into use only at the beginning of the 18th century, although in previous centuries a similar activity of the Zaporizhzhia Cossacks on the Polish-Turkish border was widely represented. As early as the middle of the 16th century, to define the actions of the Zaporizhzhia "miners", according to the form corresponding to Haydamak, the Polish side basically used the term "łotrstwo", derived from the word "łotr", which in Polish means "thief; robber; brigand[2, 413-415, 445-451]. "It is in this sense that we meet him in the correspondence between the Turkish Sultan Suleiman and the Polish king Sigismund II Augustus in the summer of 1563: the sultan put forward claims to the Poles about the robbery by the Cossacks of Prince Dmitry Vishnevetsky of Turkish and Crimean merchants in the vicinity of Ochakov.

It retains its distribution throughout almost the entire XVI and XVII centuries, being used in diplomatic documentation with accents like "łotrstwo kozackie" (Cossack robbery) and the like (for example, in a letter from the Ochakov governor Mehmed Pasha to the Polish king Sigismund III (1618 g.) [2,434], or in a message from the Turkish Sultan Murad IV to the Polish king Vladislav IV (1635) The use of the phrase "swawolne kupy" (rebellious rabble) in relation to the detachments of Zaporozhian "miners" who, despite the decisions of the Polish government, "Walked" (ie plundered) on the steppe to Bessarabia (land between the lower reaches of the Dniester and Danube rivers) inclusive, we find among the materials of the Polish-Crimean diplomatic correspondence of the first half of the 17th century (letter from the Polish king Vladislav IV to the brother of Khan Bahadyr- Giray (between 1637 and 1641)) [2, 413-415, 445-451].

The promotion in all spheres of life of the term "Haydamak", but not a phenomenon as such, since it existed before, occurs during the time of the Cossacks' stay in the citizenship of the Crimean khans (1709/11 - 1734). This can be traced in the materials of official correspondence of Polish officials.

The earliest news about the "Haydamak" of the Cossacks in Polish possessions is dated in a letter from Colonel de Boyen from the city of Belaya Tserkov to the crown hetman A.-N. Seniavsky on June 3, 1714: informing about the circumstances of the attack and robbery by the Zaporizhzhia detachment of Uman and Steblov, he noted the negligence of the local garrisons, which: "... daly sobią napaść y 30 kony ukraść od Haydamakow ..." (allowed the Haydamaks to attack themselves and steal 30 horses) [3,33]. A year later, in 1715, a certain officer Bernatovich wrote from the town of Ivankov to the same Senyavsky in letters dated April 9 and 15 that he: "... poslal przytym trzech Haydamakow ..." - "miners" captured). The main content of these two letters concerned the attacks of the Zaporizhzhia gangs (the Haydamak detachments) led by their atamans Golovko, Grebenchuk and Maslak on the Polish possessions in the Right-Bank Ukraine, as well as on the Crimean Tatars (in particular, the Khan's ambassador was robbed by the gang of Golovko, who was traveling to the Russian field marshal B. Sheremetyev).

The attacks of the Cossacks on the Polish border area at that time had the character of regular, well-organized raids. For example, at the beginning of 1720, the Polish envoy in Turkey advised King Augustus to send several experienced commissars to the Polish-Turkish border along the Dniester River, who would organize the eradication of “kup exorbitantow "(Criminal gatherings), so that, according to his description, from such" sparks that smolder between the borders, the fire does not break out "(report of the Polish envoy to King Augustus of Jassy, dated January 13, 1720) [4,205-207, 209-210].

Diplomatic correspondence is an important reference for this work, because the problem of border conflicts contributed to the frequent diplomatic relations between Poland, Turkey and Russia. Obviously, the exchange of correspondence led to the fact that the Türkic word-verb "Haydamak", which meant an act of robbery, consonant with the Türkic word-noun "Cossack" by its origin, and which at that time had long been used in Ukrainian, Polish, Russian and other languages, entered into everyday use to define the phenomenon of border mining in general[5,492]. This version has full grounds for its existence since it can be clearly traced in the materials of the Polish-Turkish diplomatic correspondence about the raids of the Cossacks on Polish possessions in order to seize prey and slaves - the so-called. "Yasyrya". For example, in a letter from Seraskir (governor) Budjak to the great hetman crown, in 1720, among other things, it was indicated that the Cossacks "... haydamak raifasi negione raji olduklari ..." (Turkish; transliterated in Latin) - i.e. "They committed robberies of the peasants." [5,492]

At the time of its origin - in the second decade of the 18th century. - the term "Haydamak" and its derivatives, for example "Haydamak", were not used to denote the anti-Polish struggle in the Right-Bank Ukraine as a whole, meaning exclusively mining raids of the Cossacks on Polish territory. Moreover, the attitude of the local Ukrainian population towards them was negative after all, they themselves were often the target of Haydamak's attacks[4, 209-210].

The Honghuzi movement, on the other hand, was also the content of social history research.

The severe social turmoil and frequent natural disasters in the late Qing Dynasty in China prevented the people from having a normal life, and the Honghuzi movement in this case also grew stronger. Like Haymak’s development history, the earliest record of Honghuzi can be traced back to the “Northeast Bandits” [30,28] in the late Ming Dynasty, but at this time it was far from a social movement, but a small criminal armed group. Until the end of the Qing Dynasty, the Honghuzi group became larger. With the rise of the Boxer Rebellion, Honghuzi also ushered in a climax of development. At this time, in addition to the Qing government's use and suppression of Honghuzi's activities, the Russian tsarist government and the Japanese government began to pay more attention to the Honghuzi movement because of the need to compete for the interests of Manchuria. During this period, many official records about "Manchurian bandits" appeared. These records are also an important source of information for this work.

Like the Haydamak movement, the official records of Honghuzi are mostly the destruction of social order by their activities. Honghuzis generally have a low level of literacy, so there are few written materials of their own. The historical data basis of this work is mainly the records in newspapers and government working documents. The description is not detailed, and the types of materials are relatively single. This situation continued until the founding of New China in the early 20th century[57,18].

Based on the full collection of historical data on the local history of Northeast China and the evolution of Chinese bandits, the differentiation of Honghuzi after 1930 was studied. The events happened in Northeast China, as the concentrated and active area of Honghuzi, had a deep influence on the political situation during the Republic of China period. Therefore, to study the historical activities of Honhugzi during this period, it is necessary to study the history of the Japanese Volunteers and Manchukuo. Because after the differentiation of Honhugzi, whether it was surrendering to Japan or choosing to resist Japan, it had close ties with the Manchukuo controlled by Japan. Relevant historical materials in this area include newspapers, magazines and oral history during the Republic of China[57,16].

It is precisely because there are fewer introductions to the culture and history of Honghuzi, which makes this work also involve the aspect of folklore history. Through the historical research of cultural beliefs, customs and dialects in Northeast China can derive a basic concept of Honghuzi's culture. The research in this work in this area is mainly based on the works of folklorist Cao Baoming[57,16].

Summarizing the characteristics of the materials used, it can be found that the results of direct research on these two social movements are relatively rare. The content of the two activities mainly comes from various letters and newspapers, and is usually described by the official, that is, the opposite of Honghuzi and Haydamak.

Therefore, based on all the existing research results, this work compares the two social movements by collecting and sorting out data. Systemically expound the origin, development and results of the two social movements, and explore their impact. From this conclude the essence of them. Since the object of the study is people from the lower classes of society, how to restore their true motives from these materials is an important task of this work.

## 1.2. Source base and research methods

The presence of openly predatory motives in the Haydamak activity of the Cossacks was noted by Ukrainian historians of the 19th and 20th centuries. At the same time, they were either absolutized as in the study of A. Skalkovsky[70,39], or they were just ascertained, without detailed consideration, as in the studies of D. Mordovtsev[68,43] and V. Antonovich[69,13]. In the works of historians of the Soviet period, the problem of the predatory trend in Haydamakism was not considered, since it did not quite fit into the concepts of the class and national liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people adopted at that time (here we mention only the main works of the most authoritative Soviet historians devoted to the Haydamak problem) [67,123]. Only in the Ukrainian diaspora (USA, Canada) [61,78] and modern Ukrainian[72] historiography can one find assessments of Haidamachism as “social banditry”, which arose under the influence of the works of the British neo-Marxist historian E. Hobsbawm[59]. It is indicative that all the above-mentioned researchers perceived Haydamak a phenomenon that arose in the depths of the Ukrainian ethno-socialism quite late - at the beginning of the 18th century, and whose appearance was directly connected with the dramatic events of the Polish-Ukrainian confrontation, in particular, with the struggle of the peasant- Cossack masses of Right-Bank Ukraine against foreign domination, away from the traditional for the Cossacks "mining activity"[66].

Regarding Honhuzi, in the 19th century, China's social control continued to decline. At the same time, the rural crisis and the national crisis began to develop rapidly. The Honghuzi movement in Manchuria region became more and more intense. This has attracted the attention of scholars at home and abroad. Among them, the works of Japanese scholar He Xiya[58,97] and Chinese scholar Yan Jingyao[62,3] are representative. Their research reveals the living conditions and internal structure of Honghuzi, but lacks a rational analysis of the nature of sports. Since the founding of New China, Chinese historians have paid more attention to the study of the history of the Chinese revolution and the history of Chinese peasant wars. The study of lower social phenomena such as Honghuzi did not develop until the mid-1980s. British scholar Billingsley Phil's monograph "Bandits in the Republic of China" in 1988 is a relatively complete study on the issue of Chinese bandits. Later, the study of Honghuzi and Chinese banditry gradually became a new hot spot in the study of modern Chinese history. The scholars who focus on the study of Honghuzi problem include Cao Baoming[45], Wang Yuannian[73] and others. The Honghuzi movement is actually a response to the characteristics of the modern Chinese era. Studying this issue can provide a new perspective for observing society.

**Research methods.** The work is based on the use of the principles of scientific knowledge: historicism, multifactorial, comprehensive, and objective knowledge. Comparative-historical, system-structural, problem-chronological, historical periodization, and retrospective methods were used in the research.

The comparative-historical method is the main method used in this work. By comparing the similarities and differences in the background, structure, origin, and development, not only can better understand the origins of Haydamak and Honhuzi but also can summarize the essential problems of social movements.

The system-structural method allowed us to consider the phenomenon Haydamak and Honghuzi movements as two social movements with a complete structure. This allowed us to consider structural changes in the interconnectedness and to ensure the integrity and systematicity of the analysis.

The problem-chronological method allows a detailed study of the origin, development, climax, and end of Honghuzi and Haydamak social movements in chronological order and summarizes the complete development context.

The historical periodization method helps to reveal the difference between the Haydamak and Honghuzi movements in different periods and stages.

The retrospective method helped to reproduce the methods and forms of the social movements based on preserved sources.

# CHAPTER 2

# THE ORIGIN OF THE HAYDAMAK MOVEMENT AND THE HONGHUZI MOVEMENT

## 2. 1. Special geographical location

The poor level of study of the political and social history of the 17th century still does not allow us to unambiguously and completely answer the question of the origins of the Haydamak movement in Zaporizhzhia during the New Sich era. This topic remains poorly developed. At the same time, the "critical mass" of sources on the history of the Zaporizhzhia Cossacks, found in the archives of the Russian Federation, Poland and Ukraine and introduced by us into scientific circulation, their information content, allow us to highlight certain aspects of the activities of a part of the Zaporizhzhia Cossacks, known under the generalized name of "Haydamaks", throughout the 1710s - 1780s[22,16].

It is no coincidence that the first written mentions of Haidamachism appeared in the first quarter of the 18th century. - the time of large-scale measures by the Polish, Russian and Turkish governments to delimit borders, establish a system of border guards and passport control in the vastness of the Northern Black Sea region (1700 - 1705, 1711 - 1714). Under such conditions, the traditional "valiant" (ie, "mining") actions of the subjects of each of the parties inevitably begin to be viewed not just as an act of aggression against the neighboring state, but also as a manifestation of disobedience towards the authorities of the country to which they were subjects[22,18-19].

The Haydamak Cossacks, as a marginalized group of people, conduct "mining" activities on the borders of Russia, Poland, and Turkey. This unique geographical location provides a breeding ground for the development of Haydamak movement. The conflict on the border has contributed to frequent diplomatic relations between the three countries. This also allows us to define Haydamak's activities in historical materials. [57,16]

It is precisely for the needs of activities on the border that the Cossacks’ castles are often build in places with the most convenient transportation and at the same time ensuring safety. For example, Zaporizhzhia Sich during the Nova Sich period. It is located on the right bank of the Dnieper, at the confluence of the Podpolnaya. This is a rather vast river peninsula. The area was submerged by the Kakhovsky Reservoir in 1955 and is located in the waters east of Pokrovsky, a modern village in the Nikopol District of Dnepropetrovsk Oblast[57,18].

The Cossacks were very successful in choosing this place: the settlement is located in an area inaccessible to the enemy, and the wide Dnieper River is protected by numerous channels and swamps. Many deciduous forests grow from the continental part of the peninsula, forming an additional natural line of defense. Therefore, under the cover of rivers, floodplains, and canyons, the fort is completely safe.

However, the unpredictable hydraulic conditions of the Dnieper River, especially during the spring floods, caused many problems: for example, in 1740, a flood washed away River banks and caused major damage to fortifications and residential structures. In addition, low-lying areas adversely affect the quality of drinking water used by the Cossacks and inevitably become annoying mosquito-infested communities. All of these have significantly reduced the average age of most residents of Sich.

It should also be noted that the Nova Zaporizhia Sich was located at the crossroads of land and water: the road leads from here to the north, leading to the small fortress on the Dnieper River, located at Cape Misulin, Perevolohnaya, And the Samara River (now Novomoskovsk, the regional center of the Dnepropetrovsk region), to the south to the Turkish fortresses Gazikermen and Ochakov, to the west to the town of Zaporizhzhia Gard-na-Bug and Russia St. Elisabeth’s Fortress (now the city of Kropivnitsky), the regional center of Ukraine). In addition, along the Dnieper River, Sich established ties with the fortified cities of Crimea and Turkey along the Black Sea, and, more generally, with the trade center of the entire Eastern Mediterranean[14,2-3].

In the east, a century later, in the mid-19th century the word Honghuzi appeared. Honghuzi refers specifically to bandits activated in Manchuria, China in 19-20 centuries. Since the Qing Dynasty, the Honghuzi has been called the "horse thief" in official documents. The name "Honghuzi" means "red beard". There are three theories about the origin of this term.

One is that in the early stages of its development, the bandits mostly used self-made firearms. They often put a plug on the muzzle and tied a red scarf. It looks like a red beard from a distance.

The second type was that when bandits were engaged in criminal activities, they often wore fake beards to conceal their faces, which also served as a deterrent.

And the third is that Manchuria was a place of exile in Russia at that time, and criminals were often active here. Because the Russians have unusual red beards, they get their name.

Manchuria is the birthplace of the Manchu, the ruler of the Qing Dynasty. The Qing government, therefore, imposed a seclusion policy on it during its rule. Therefore, the development of Northeast China is relatively late, the area is vast and the population is sparse.

The special mountain forest terrain here determines that this place can be used as a perfect location for criminal activities. Especially in Ningguta, Hunchun, and other places in the east of Jilin Province, China, as well as the Songhua River Basin and Changbai Mountain. The area is mountainous terrain with dense woods. At the same time, the Songhua River Basin spans entire Northeast China. The upper reaches of the river pass through high mountains and valleys, the river is narrow, and the current is rapid. “There are dense mountains and forests in the northeast, and it is easy to hide in. When the soldiers arrive, they hide in the mountains and forests. When the soldiers retired, they continued to run rampant on the road. Their whereabouts are unpredictable and extremely difficult to capture” [31,187]. After completing their criminal activities, Honghuzi only need to hide in the forest and no trace can be found.

In Manchuria, although the geographical conditions are very complicated, such conditions also make the region very rich in natural resources, “The land is wide and fertile, famous for its rich ginseng and gold mines” [32,2]. Abundant products and vast land make Manchuria an ideal place for people to survive in times of chaos. The Heilongjiang River Basin and the Ussuri River Basin border Russia. As early as the middle of the 1870s, the Chinese began to engage in gold mining in the border area[49,67].

Although it has such abundant natural resources, natural disasters occur frequently in China. Not only in the Northeast, but throughout China, natural disasters occurred quite frequently at the end of the Qing Dynasty. According to statistics from Cen Zhongmian’s "History of the Yellow River", there were 56 times of breaches in the Yellow River in the late Qing Dynasty. Among them, there were 33 times of breaches between 1861 and 1895, which were more than half of the total. The floods in the Yellow River basin affected the hydrology of the entire northern part of China. The frequent occurrence of floods has increased the burden of people's survival. At the end of the Qing Dynasty, the political situation deteriorated, and natural disasters could not be effectively managed. After losing their land due to natural disasters, farmers became refugees. To survive, they have no choice but to commit criminal acts.

## 2.2. Unique historical background

The Haydamak and the Honghuzi movement have gained so much influence because they were both born in a specific time and space background. The impact of social reality on personal destiny is very obvious in the participants of these two movements[15,16].

On April 6, 1752, the Russian Ruling Senate issued another decree, which was intended to calm down the scale of Haidamism. According to him, all those who took part in the raids on Polish Ukraine and were captured first had to be punished in the presence of Polish commissars and then sent to life in hard labor in the Rogervik fortress under construction on the Baltic Sea[15,16].

Since the Cossacks usually went from the Sich to the Haydamak trade in small groups - up to 5 people, such units often became easy prey for the Russian border guards or teams of hetman Cossacks. The procedural readout of the captured Haydamaks in such cases makes it possible to trace the totality of social connections within the mob of Cossack miners, to highlight the incentives for their actions.

Matvey Obertas was 32 years old. He was born in 1718 in the village of Dergachi of the Kharkiv Cossack Regiment. He lived there until 1740, when his father died (he lost his mother in childhood). After the death of his parent, he went to the Sich, where he lived in Nezamayevsky Kuren, as an employee of the Cossack Vasily Wart. After two years of farm laborers (1740 - 1742), he became a Chumak and went to the Crimea for salt for six years in a row (until 1748), and then fished for another two years on the spits of the Sea of Azov. The usual course of life was over at the end of July 1750, when, being at the Sich, he joined a gang of seven Cossacks, which was going to the Haydamak trade in Polish Ukraine[15,18].

In the town of Chechelnik, in the Uman region, they stole a horse each, but the local Cossack militia rushed after them. During the battle, the ataman of the gang, Grigory Keleberdyants, and two more Cossacks was killed. The rest were able to break away and cross the border to the Russian side. Matvey took over the functions of the chieftain and led his three comrades to Gard-na-Bug. There they sold their horses and stayed for a walk. The experience of the first campaign seemed successful to Obertas. He decided to once again act as the leader and convinced five other Cossacks to go with him. When the gang, led by Obertas, reached Novomirgorod, they met another gang of Zaporozhian-Haydamaks, but not as amateurish as theirs - 30 well-armed Cossacks on horseback. The latter invited Matvey to join them and even gave them a horse. As part of this party, Obertas and his friends crossed the border. Near the village of Telepinogo, the Haydamaks drove off a herd of 200 cows and transported it to the Russian side, to Novomirgorod. However, here they were overtaken by a detachment of three hundred hetman Cossacks[15,19].

Obertas, together with five other Cossacks, retreated along with the horses, believing that they had already "worked them out", and again moved to Gard. The further scheme of their actions was already known: the horses were sold, and the proceeds were drunk in taverns. As soon as the money ran out, there was a need to go to robbery again. This time Obertas persuades the three Cossacks mentioned above and leads them along a path already well known to him. However, when they crossed the border river Vis, snow fell. Realizing that in the footsteps, and even without horses, they can easily be caught, Obertas led his gang back to the Russian side. To dry off after crossing the river ford, they lit a fire, which was seen by a detachment of Russian cavalry. And after that was the arrest, interrogation, prison[20,7].

The second of those interrogated was Rumyanchenko Trofim, Rodionov's son, 30 years old, who was born in 1720 in the town of Galich of the Pereyaslavl Cossack regiment. His mother died when he was still an infant. My father hired himself as a farm laborer to people in different villages of the regiment, and he helped him. This continued until Trohim was twenty years old. In 1740 he left the village of Litvinov of the Lubensky regiment for Zaporizhzhia. In the Seth, he lived for two years (1740 - 1742) in the Shkurinsky kuren, hired by the Cossack Vasily Kolyada. For the next eight years of his life (1742 - 1750), he fished for other Cossacks for half the catch. At the end of August 1750, in Garda, he met Matevj Obertas, who persuaded him to go "fishing." The first campaign turned out to be the last for him: not having time to get anything, he fell into the hands of the Russian guards[20,8].

According to his testimony, the fate of twenty-year-old Lavrin Klimenko was very similar. He was born in 1730, in the village of Fedorovka of the Mirgorod Cossack regiment, where he lived until 1744. After his father's death, he left for the Sich. There he lived with various Cossacks in the Nezamayevsky kuren and fished for half (1744 - 1747). After that, for three more years he lived in Korenevsky kuren (1746 - 1750) as a mercenary (he served military service for a fee instead of another Cossack). In the spring of 1750, he went to work at a fish factory in the willow tract on the river. Ingul, where he lived. At the end of August, he joined Obertas, who recruited the Cossacks into his mob. Not even having time to go to Poland "on business", he was captured[20,9].

Gubchenko Petr, Andreev's son, 30 years old, was the same newcomer in the Haidamak business. He was born in 1720 in the town of Romny of the Lubensky Cossack Regiment, where he lived until 1738. When he turned 18, he joined the Cossack Ivan Trigub and left for the Sich. He spent a year at Trigub in the Rogovskiy kuren, and then moved to Sergeevskiy kuren, where he lived "for a friend" (companion) between the Cossacks and for six years in a row (1740 - 1746) fished on the Bugo-Dnieper estuary. Later he gave up fishing and became a chumak, which he did for the next four years (1746 - 1750). In the spring of 1750, he went fishing on the river. Ingul, and in August, to his misfortune, attempted to become part of Matvey Obertas's mob [20,9].

These four Cossacks all had the experience of losing their parents, working, and joining Haydamak. Their lives were broadly similar. Their socialization in childhood and adolescence took place in single-parent families or in the absence of both parents. All of them did not have a certain social status and a solid economic condition in Zaporizhzhia and considered the Haydamak trade as an opportunity to break out of the vicious circle of life circumstances in which they found themselves.

Each of them had their own reason to join the Haydamak gang. However, the deep psychological motivation for this act is undoubtedly identical, very similar. Here will point out the internal psychological discomfort caused by changes in the usual way of life. The mass dissatisfaction with their own social status and property condition, often inherent in the Cossacks and peasants of that time. To this should be added the absence of strong social ties with the environment in which the initial socialization of the individual took place. Often, the latter circumstance was caused by both the death of relatives and the lack of conditions or desire to create their own family.

The Cossacks' involvement in Haydamak was not entirely due to personal factors. What needs to be explained is that Haydamak, as a social movement, is more social than racial. This can be exemplified by the participation of non-Ukrainians in the southern part of Ukraine in Haydamakism[65,3].

From the second half of the 1750s, the Haydamak actions on the borderline "Zadneprovye" entered a qualitatively new phase.The activities of the Haydamak Cossacks became a complete system. The man who managed to put under control a significant number of Haydamak atamans, direct their energy in the direction he needed, was the chief commander of the Novoserbsk corps, Lieutenant-General Ivan Horvat[71, 480-490].

The involvement of this highest-ranking officer in the Haydamak was not immediately proven. The investigation against him was started only after Catherine II became the Russian empress. The scale of the criminal activity of the aforementioned general is evidenced by the “Investigation case on the abuse of Lieutenant-General I. Horvat. 1763 - 1764 ". The case materials contain dozens of proven facts not only of buying stolen goods, deliberate non-persecution of the Haydamaks for the share of the booty received from them, but also of Horvath's own organization of Haydamak detachments from the Cossacks and sending them "to fish" in Polish possessions.

For the first time, the facts of the patronage of the Haydamak detachments by Horvath and other senior officers of the Novoserbsk corps were revealed in the fall of 1757, when, with a report from Major General Ivan Glebov, the Senate received a copy of the interrogation protocol of Vasily Vinnichenko, a Russian citizen, captured by the Poles, Haydamak. They immediately became the subject of closed hearings at the Senate's Secret Expedition (department).

It turned out that the twenty-year-old Vinnichenko was a native of the Palievo Ozero settlement, who in the spring of 1757 was hired in the city of Novomirgorod, which was the administrative center of New Serbia, to work at a brick factory owned by Vasily Akatsatov, head of the Novoserbsk corps office. For three months in a row, Vynnychenko worked, earning 5 kopecks. a day, until the time when the employer summoned him for a frank conversation. He asked if he was tired of "work like a mad" at the factory if can get rich easily and quickly[17, 62].

The same question was asked to two other young workers. Having received an approving answer, the owner gave them a horse, firearms, and edged weapons, and ordered them to go to the estate of Ivan Khorvat - Generalka's settlement, which was located near Novomirgorod. It was there that the Haydamak group was being formed. Its ataman was a certain Zaporozhian Shram, who belonged to the Lychkovsky kuren in the Sich. Several other Sichs, from the same kuren, formed the core of the mob. The rest were the same newcomers as Vynnychenko's companions. Basically, they were natives of Ukrainian villages located on both sides of the Russian-Polish border - Whiskey, Braided Tashlyk, Lisyanka, and others[17, 62-63].

In total there were 21 people in the detachment. During July-September 1757, the gang led by Schram went to plunder in Polish Ukraine several times. They robbed whoever they had to - Jewish inns, ordinary peasants, even an Orthodox priest, who had previously had one of the Haydamaks as a worker, Orthodox and Uniate churches, Catholic churches. Having carried out another raid, the gang returned to Russian territory with their spoils. On the border, in the Petroostrovsky trench (a small fortress), she had her own "window" - a warrant officer-border guard of Novoserbsk. For an appropriate share of the loot, he not only freely let the gang through but also provided the Haydamaks with his farm for rest. The share of the booty agreed upon in advance, immediately after the return, was given to Horvat, V. Akatsatov, and other officers, members of the concession[17, 64-69].

Over time, new facts began to be added that confirmed the connection of the Horvath with the Haydamaks. At the end of March 1758, during the pursuit of one of their detachments, which was returning from Polish Ukraine, one Haydamak was wounded and captured by an outpost team of the Hetman Cossacks. To their great surprise, during the interrogation, it turned out that this was the centurion of the Novoslobodsk Cossack regiment, Yuri Tabanets. No less striking was the imagination and the main composition of the mob, which did manage to break away from the pursuit: the centurion of the same regiment Movchanovsky, warrant officers of the Croatian hussar regiment Bulatsel and Ivanov, non-commissioned officers and privates of the same regiment. They all went to robbery with the knowledge of their commander Ivan Horvat, who did join in the mining[17, 46-52].

However, mining was by no means always the ultimate goal: the Haydamak detachments in the hands of General Horvath are becoming a convenient tool for "resolving" border conflicts with the Polish side. So, in the spring of 1758, he formed a gang exclusively of the Cossacks (80 Cossacks), which was supposed to attack the estates of the Polish governors in the cities of Balta and Kruty. Such an attack was supposed to be revenge for the detention by the latter of several hundred families of Romanians from the Walachian principality, who went to settle in New Serbia, but was forcibly "planted" on the ground" in the estates of the aforementioned governors[17,197].

Feeding "their" Zaporizhzhia detachments of miners with one hand, the second leadership of Serbia waged a tough struggle to eradicate the Haydamak element, which was not under its control. Thus, in the summer of 1760, General Croatia personally led a punitive expedition against two Haydamak gangs, which settled in the Chuta forest[18,540-541].

Note that, according to documentary evidence, Serbian settlers were directly involved in the Haydamak actions of the Cossacks and during the events of 1768 - the Koleevshchina uprising: in the first half of December of the year, Russian teams that persecuted the Haydamaks in the area of the towns of Smila and Zhabotin defeated one from their detachments. Much to the surprise of the persecutors, among the Zaporizhia Cossacks, of whom the gang mainly consisted, was the captain of the Black Hussar Regiment, a Serb by nationality Stankovic and about ten hussars of his regiment, who were sent by their commanders to Poland with a specific mission in the fall, but deviated from the route and decided to enrich themselves by joining the Zaporozhian Haydamaks[12,1].

If the New Serbian officers of the highest rank did not disdain Haydamak then what can people say about it? Ordinary inhabitants of the border zone - peasants and burghers willingly resorted to this trade. For them, it was an opportunity to get hold of livestock, inventory, money. Neighbors, relatives, godfathers - members of such gangs were usually connected with each other by a number of diverse social and kinship relations.

Therefore, Haydamak-mining was a well-oiled and organized trade, from which not only the Cossacks were benefiting. It fed many poor lower-class people. Obviously, this explains its popularity among the widest layers of the Zaporizhia Cossacks throughout the 18th century, the ability to adapt and survive in the most unfavorable conditions for occupation[17,58].

The actual factors for the birth of Manchuria Honghuzi were also related to war and poverty. After the Opium War in 1840, China gradually became a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. This social nature has caused a large number of unemployed people in Chinese society.

At the same time, Manchuria experienced the Sino-Japanese War, the Boxer Movement, and the Russo-Japanese War. After the wars destroyed social production, peasants lost their land and became refugees. "The residents in the disaster area have no land to cultivate, no houses to live, so they are displaced by roads, and those who go to the three eastern provinces, no fewer than a million people[33]." A large number of unemployed people poured into Manchuria. These people can only choose to commit crimes in order to survive. As a result, the bandit forces in the area have developed rapidly.

To prove this, there is almost no need to look for special cases. In the war years, the fate of China's poor population was determined almost from birth. Ma Zhanshan, born in 1885, was a famous general in the Northeast. His early life was very difficult. Grandparents fled to Manchuria and settled. Ma Zhanshan's mother died of illness very early. When there was no land at home, Ma Zhanshan grazed for the rich of Manchuria to make a living.

In 1903, Ma decided to join Honghuzi. This decision was made because he had no other choice: A horse was lost, the landowner accused him of selling the horse and sent him to the police. The Father of Ma Zhanshan spent all the money for compensation, but the lost horse one day ran back. But the landowner refused to pay the money back. Ma's family has since fallen into extreme poverty. Ma Zhanshan, therefore, decided to join the ranks of Honghuzi[64,45].

On the other side, if start to talk about Honghuzi, the Chinese academic circles generally hold a negative attitude towards the evaluation of them. First of all, Honghuzi is defined as a bandit group, which activated in Manchuria. The definition of bandit is the people refers to those individuals or groups in old China who used violent and terrorist methods such as murder, arson, robbery, kidnapping, etc., to snatch others' property to satisfy personal desires, thereby endangering society, undermining production, and hindering the advancement of history [62,17]. Historian Shao Yong believes that bandits refer to “armed individuals or groups that are not subject to any legal restrictions, use violent means, and have great destructive effects on the existing social order”. Regarding the characterization of Honghuzi, they are considered to be "a secret terrorist group that is armed, collectivized, and professionalized by thieves." Regardless of the purpose, the use of violence is always the core point of defining banditry.

The Honghuzi movement in Manchuria was the result of the interaction of many conditions. After the First Opium War in 1840, China gradually became a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. This social nature has caused a large number of unemployed people in Chinese society. After the Opium War, Manchuria experienced the First Sino-Japanese War, the Boxer Movement and the Russo-Japanese War. After wars destroyed social production, farmers lost their land and became refugees. "The residents in the disaster area have no land to cultivate, no houses to live, so they are displaced by roads, and those who have gone to the three eastern provinces, no less than a million people." A large number of unemployed people poured into Manchuria. These people can only choose to commit crimes in order to survive. As a result, the bandit forces in the area have developed rapidly.

In addition to the war factor, the birth of Honghuzi was closely related to the traditional agricultural economic background of ancient China. In an agricultural society, the relationship between peasants and land was very close. The vast number of peasants were under constant oppression, and their lives falt into poverty. But China's small-peasant economy has tied people to the land since ancient times. At the end of the Qing Dynasty, the ruler's oppression of the people became heavier, and foreign invaders took China as a colony and incorporated it into their economic system. A series of factors led to the collapse of China's traditional agricultural economic system. Farmers lost their land and became refugees. When the refugees lose all legitimate ways of making a living, they often choose to become bandits in order to survive. In fact, farmers who lost their land are the source of banditry[47, 23].

Under the influence of such realistic factors and the background of the times, some people were dissatisfied with the social reality and choose to become bandits. It should be noted that China has had a tradition of "green forest heroes" since ancient times. The term comes from the "Hanshu"(The book of Han): "...…起兵云社绿林，号曰下江兵，众皆万余人" It refers to the people who gathered in the mountains and forests to resist the feudal ruling class. In the subsequent development, the heroes or bandits who use violence to resist violent rule were called the green forest heroes. This tradition has brought a kind of heroic temperament to the bandits, making it seems that all criminal activities have justified meaning under this name. At the same time, the life of the bandits has a sense of mystery. A song circulated in In Manchuria among Honghuzi: " Be a Xiangma(bandit), be happier, ride a horse, grab wine and drink, enter the house and hug a woman". This impression of freedom and debauchery is somewhat seductive. Many people had joined bandit organizations in search of excitement in life. In short, in the last time of the Qing Dynasty, Honghuzi had become a serious social problem. According to the memories of the Russians at the time: “If the train derailed, it was said that there was a red beard; if there was a murder and the murderer was not caught, he would naturally be a Huzi; ...In short, one step in Manchuria would not be possible without the Honghuzi. [50,32]”

If Haydamak has formed a complete chain of interests, Honghuzi's situation was relatively more chaotic. The Manchuria region was located on the border of China and Russia, as well as Japan. But in essence, Manchuria was China's territory, but the Qing government and later the Republic of China government did not control the place inadequately. Although both were motivated by the pursuit of interests, the chaos caused by Honghuzi refered to the instability caused by political struggle, and this instability was the result of being used by different forces in Manchuria.

A stark example is the relationship between the Honghuzi movement and the regular army. The relationship between the army and the bandits is generally antagonistic, but for Honghuzi, it is a relationship of coexistence. This can be seen from the experience of Li L.K. In the age of warlords' struggles, there will be soldiers left behind in every war. Li was a soldier of the Northeast Army. In 1928, the Fengtian clique was defeated in Datong City, and Li was abanded. There were many other soldiers who were also discarded. They had no money or belongings, and all their property was guns. Li became a member of the Honghuzi criminal gang. His own defense was: "There are only two places where guns can be used. Since I can't be a soldier, I can only become a bandit" [61,22].

Poverty and chaos made Chinese peasants at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century did not regard being a soldier as a disaster, but an important way to earn a living. After being dismissed or left in the war, these soldiers had no other way out, only to be bandits.

The coexistence relationship between Honghuzi and the regular army can also be observed from another angle. Not only soldiers can become Honghuzi, but Honghuzi can also become soldiers, even high-ranking generals.

In many of Honghuzi's thoughts at the time, there was no essential difference between being a bandit and being a soldier—both fighting for survival. "It's nothing more than cooperating between soldiers and bandits. Become a soldier in a while and become a bandit after a while. In order to use them, the government gives them rewards (money or military rank). People were oppressed and dare not say. This has become an accepted cognition and a fixed habit, so many people think that being a gangster is a shortcut to becoming an official[34,67].

Zhang Zuolin, known as the "King of the Northeast", was the last ruler of the Beiyang government. The great power he possessed in his later years makes it difficult to associate him with Honghuzi. When he was 19 years old, the Sino-Japanese War broke out and he joined the army of the Qing Dynasty. Later, he returned to his hometown of Haicheng (now Panjin City, Liaoning Province) to become a veterinarian. Because of this job, he often treated sick horses. In China in the late 19th century, the people who could own horses were "people with power", that was, officers and soldiers or bandits. In this way, in 1895, he met Feng Linge, who had become Honghuzi, and the latter led him to join the gang.

Later, as Zhang Zuolin's prestige in Honghuzi increased, he began to have his own team. Zhang Zuolin's Honghuzi life is not typical bandit life. In 1900, during the Russo-Japanese War, after four years of life as a bandit, he decided to lead the team and start to "live a proper life." According to his son Zhang Xueliang's recollection: "My father had never been a bandit like a robbery. What was he? He was with his friends, there were more than a dozen people on the security team. What was the security team? That's what we said-sitting on the ground and sharing the spoils. It is your village I will protect you, your village I will protect you, how much do you give me every month. If bandits come to hit you and anyone else passes by here, I will be responsible for hitting you, but you get the money. That's it!" [62,29]

From this history can see that the "proper life" of Zhang Zuolin was that he established an armed organization and began to take charge of maintaining public order nearby. That is, nearby villages pay them, and they are responsible for protecting the safety of the people. During this time, Zhang Zuolin's team was the best among all similar organizations. His jurisdiction is well protected. After his management ability and military strength were fully manifested, in 1902, Zhang Zuolin's team was recruited by the imperial court Xinminfu, and became the Xinminfu patrol guerrilla team on the front road. Zhang Zuolin was appointed as an assistant (deputy battalion commander). In July 1903, Zhang Zuolin's troops and the Xinmin Street Patrol Team merged into a guerrilla patrol team, and Zhang Zuolin was promoted to the band (battalion commander). This adapted team moved to Xinmin Mansion and was responsible for local security and suppression of bandits[62,4].

Zhang's early life from soldier to bandit and then to officer and soldiers showed the behavior motives of the Chinese lower class becoming Honghuzi at the end of the 19th century. Like the Haydamak movement, the Honghuzi movement is social since both of these are well-functioning and organized activities, and countless poor people have benefited from such activities, which also reveals why becoming bandits was prevalent at the time. And these kinds of benefits brought about by chaos and violent conflict undoubtedly occurred under the special background of the times.

# CHAPTER 3

# SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND LIFE CUSTOMS OF THE HAYDAMAK COSSACKS AND HONGHUZI

## 3.1. Social structure

For any group to achieve long-term development, it must form a certain organizational structure, and at the same time use disciplines to regulate the behavior of its members. Criminal gangs are no exception.

Although the Sich's poverty of this sort was a constant "pain in the neck" not only for the Poles or Tatars but also for the leadership of the WZN, under certain circumstances they were quite successfully used by the latter to perform various "dirty work", which the prosperous Cossacks tried to avoid. Pursuing the Haidamasks, the military foreman, nevertheless, was often herself a secret organizer of the Haydamak gangs, and solely for selfish reasons. So, at the end of October 1750 in the Belevskaya fortress (now in the Kharkiv region), the administrative center of the Ukrainian line, the Cossack of the Kharkiv regiment Vlas Titarenko, who was returning from the Sich, showed behind him “word and deed” (a term meaning awareness of someone committed that crime). According to him, once he was in the winter house of one of the Kuren atamans, Grigory Lobury. During a gathering, he heard that two former Atamans (Vasily Sych and Peredrii) allowed the Cossacks, especially the poor, to arm themselves and go to the Black Forest, and from there to the Polish Ukraine for prey. At the same time, part of the booty went to the chieftains[19,79].

It will not be superfluous to show the reader the veracity of our conclusions with specific examples. Interesting in this respect is the protocol of interrogation of the captured Turkish Zaporozhian (“butkal”) Nikifor Karagul, who was sent to Prince GA. Potemkin-Tavrichesky May 10, 1784 The life of this man is quite indicative. He was born in 1734, in the town of Keleberde of the Poltava regiment, in a Cossack family. After the death of his parents, at the age of twenty, a young Cossack moved to Zaporizhzhia. Here he earned his living by fishing, traded in salt and fish. During the Russian-Turkish war of 1768 - 1774. Nikifor served in the Zaporizhzhia naval flotilla, fought on the rivers Dnieper, Danube and the Black Sea. At the same time, he saved up certain funds - obviously, at the expense of military booty (trophies). He used this money after the liquidation of the Sich (1775), acquiring a farm on the river. Ingule (modern Nikolaev region of Ukraine). He had enough livestock, hired workers, in a word, he was a strong and prosperous owner. This went on for six years, after which Karagul suddenly sold all his property and began to drink (he does not indicate the reasons for such a sharp change in his life priorities). When he ran out of money, he went over to the Turkish side, where he joined the Haydamak gang of Butkals, led by Ataman Tyagun. It was based on the coast of the Tiligul estuary (now on the border of the Nikolaev and Odessa regions). From there, Karagul, together with other Haydamaks, went on robberies in the Polish and Russian possessions, until in the spring of 1784 he was captured by the Russian border guards from the Don Cossacks [7,34].

Note that N. Karagul, whose life path was considered by us, was an exception due to his mature age - 50 years old. The average age of the overwhelming majority of the members of the Haydamak gangs throughout the 18th century, as evidenced by the data of forensic documents, fluctuated in the range of 20-30[28]. In terms of social composition, the Zaporizhzhia poor predominated, who, in addition to working in fishing factories or farming on the farms of more wealthy Cossacks, did not disdain easier ways of obtaining funds[7,35].

There are cases when, with the permission of the top leadership, groups of poor Cossacks were sent to the Tatar steppes to rob. It often happened that when they crossed the Russian-Turkish border, or directly on the Sich itself, these Haydamaks were arrested and, without delay, executed (usually by hanging). The horses driven by them were sent further for sale to the inner regions of the country, or directly to the winter houses (farms) of the authorities. This was the way how well-known Zaporizhzhia elders-rich, such as Pyotr Kalnyshevsky, Nikolai Kasap, Ivan Globa, Ivan Chuguevets, and Vasily Pishmich, accumulated significant primary capital[36]. However, sometimes, although infrequently, the imperial authorities initiated criminal cases against the foreman herself, who was the organizer of the Haydamak trade. For example, in 1751, the Kuren atamans, Aleksey Lyakh, and Esaul Kondrat Beda[37] were sentenced to death, with the subsequent replacement of it with life imprisonment. And at the beginning of 1756, a similar activity of the Bugogard colonel Taran was suppressed and he was also captured: the Haydamaks sent by him were seized. From them, the things were stolen from the New Serbs lieutenant Konstantinov were found[16,34].

The supreme power in Zaporizhzhia, its headquarters - Kosh, actively used the Haydamaks for more serious actions, for example, to defend the lands of the Army from the self-employed settlers. This was about the "raids" of the Cossacks on the villages of the Novorossiysk province, which took place in the 1760s - 1770s. So, after the liquidation of the Sich, in 1775 - 1776. the new Russian administration investigated the events of ten years ago, namely, the attack of the Zaporizhzhia team of 250 Cossacks, led by foremen Gelekh, Paralyz, Kulik and Garadzhey, on the suburb of the Alekseevskaya fortress, which is on the Ukrainian fortified line, looting the property of its residents and killing two people. Initially, this action was planned by Kosh exclusively to drive non-Zaporozhians from the lands inhabited by them. However, at a certain stage, the foremen, who were entrusted with its implementation, could not keep the situation under control. The Cossack poor, who outnumbered them, came out of obedience. The accused foremen themselves testified the following: "in this fight, the murders occurred from the crowd of vagabonds who were then, who arbitrarily did not recognize any authority and were striving for robbery, from which no one could restrain them." Their rather mild punishment - a reference to "obedience" (atonement for sin in prayers) in the Orthodox monasteries of the Belgorod province for three of them, and the acquittal of Colonel Garadzhi, testify to the fact that quite often the Cossack foreman was simply not able to lead the "Seromas"[11,134].

At the same time, it is wrong to imagine the Zaporizhzhia Haydamak as a phenomenon caused by exclusively mining activities of the Cossack lower classes - lumpen, who were only capable of robbing Nogai uluses and noble estates in Polish Ukraine. As a "party" within the Sich community, the Haydamaks undoubtedly had not only direct defendants, but also their ideologies, including the Kuren and military foremen, as well as prestigious "grandfathers" - elderly respected Cossacks. The so-called "grandfathers" have great importance in the management and internal life of Zaporizhzhia. They are normally honored Cossacks (former atamans and foremen), who lived out their days in Kurens. With their authority, the grandfathers influenced the decision of the Sich and Kuren councils. In the Sich they enjoyed indisputable authority and played a significant role, both in the education of young people and in political life. They zealously guarded the old traditions and the immutability of unwritten laws. Even the highest military leaders had to listen to the opinion of the grandfathers. The position of the grandfathers in the Sich was equated with the military sergeant major and the Koshev chieftain, and in the unspoken hierarchy, they were even higher than the current Kuren chieftains. Kosh was forced to reckon with his grandfathers since it was the latter who was always followed by the bulk of the Cossacks. Not a single decision of Kosh, not approved by the grandfathers, could be implemented[11,137-139].

As mentioned earlier, the motivation for men to become Cossacks was often due to changes in their families. Therefore, joining a Cossack group was an act of finding a new family environment. After arriving at Sich and being assigned to Kuren, any newcomer must get up to seven years of training to become a real Cossack. Strength and heroism were indispensable elements in the behavior of young Cossacks. Dangerous hunting in the depths of the enemy's territory, driving away their horses and livestock, and harvesting trophies-all these actions were very necessary, without them, it is impossible to hope to be fully recognized by the Kuren brothers. In addition, confirmation of this can be found in the documents of the research era, not just in the later folklore: in many places, it is mentioned that Sich’s young people participated in the Haydamak team’s actions. They looted the territories of Poland and Crimea[17,198]. Only after such training can young people be considered as true sichs and have the right to change their hairstyles-"seled" (herrings) hairstyles. This hairstyle means officially becoming a member of the Kuren Cossack. The category of Cossack “knights” prevailed over all others among the population of the Sich. Only they had the right to participate in elections, to be elected Kuren atamans or military foremen, only they, over time, have the chance to become the Sich “grandfathers”.

Honghuzi, on the other side, followed the traditional Chinese feudal patriarchal system. The patriarchal clan system is based on clan. Its characteristic is based on blood relationships, maintaining the affection between people. Therefore, although there is no blood relationship between the members, under the influence of the patriarchal system, the bandits call each other brothers, then creating a family atmosphere. However, this kind of "family affection" has a strong hierarchical color. High-status bandits have more power, while low-status ordinary members can only follow orders.

Honghuzi has a relatively tight organizational structure. "It gathers most greedy, cruel and vicious people to engage in the life of looting, killing and plundering. If they are unorganized, they will be laxity and indiscipline; if they are undisciplined, they will follow the rule of jungle and kill each other. It is inevitable that the bandits are organized and disciplined"[58,32]. Honghuzi were normally living in the group. The average member from dozens of people to hundreds of people. Generally speaking, the organizational structure of Honghuzi is composed of the bandit leader "*大当家*(Dadangjia, he big boss)", the leading organization "*四梁八柱*(Siliangbazhu, four beams and eight pillars)" and the ordinary bandit "*崽子*(Zaizi, kid)" [45,26].

Dadangjia was the leader of the Honghuzi bandit gang. He was often called the "the big boss" and "big brother" internally. And if there were a large number of people in a gang, there will be a "second brohter", that was, the second leader. The leader of the bandits had a high status among the bandits. He or they often have the absolute right to speak and determine the direction and method of the entire gang's activities. Representing bandit groups externally and negotiating with other bandits or the government or army; at the same time, they have the right to enforce rules internally, and can even order the execution of other members of lower status. There was a description of the status of the bandit leader: “(The Honghuzi leader) said anything, hundred people agreed; gave orders and directed advances, just like a king” [58,42-43]. The emergence of the bandit leader is the result of violent democracy. Becoming a bandit leader is by no means easy. They must first have convincing skills. Honghuzi was generally using self-made firearms, so marksmanship was a basic condition for becoming a bandit leader and establishing authority. Second, leading the entire gang to survive and develop in a chaotic situation requires the leader to have a strong political vision and military knowledge. At the same time, becoming a leader does not only mean having great authority, it also means taking on more responsibilities. While being courageous and strategic, the bandit also needs to care about the relationship between the members of the gang like a parent and be psychologically superior to the other members. Only in this way will members willingly accept the leadership.

Below the bandit leader is the "Siliangbazhu". Compared with the bandit leader, they have a more detailed division of labor and are the internal management organization of the Honghuzi. This name originally referred to an ancient Chinese traditional architectural structure：The whole building is supported by four beams and eight pillars, which is the main structure. Honghuzi cited this term as the division of labor in their own organization, which later evolved into the division of bandits' functions. According to the research of Chinese folklorist Cao Baoming, the composition of the "*四梁八栋*" is as follows: as the core of the gang, they have *托天梁Tuotianliang* (adviser), *顶天梁Dingtianliang* (the sharpshooter, responsible for leading the team to charge and command), and*应天梁 Yingtianliang* (responsible for allocating guard tasks), *顺天梁Shuntianliang* (manages food reserves, responsible for logistics personnel) [58,27].

As an adviser of the organization, Tuotianliang needs not only a certain degree of military knowledge, but also an understanding of astronomy, geography, and divination. The criminal process was full of dangers, so Bodhidharma worship and superstitious belief were popular among the red-beard group, which makes it necessary to conduct divination to formulate strategies before organizing any major actions.

Dintianliang, also known as "the cannon". They were usually sharpshooters leading the battle. Whenever they went out for kidnapping and robbery, they acted as the forward to direct the battle, and when they flee, they took charge of cover. This kind of task that requires courage and the spirit of not being afraid of death makes them have a high position among the bandits, second only to the leader.

Yingtianliang was responsible for guarding, in order to protect the safety of the bandits. This position was also called "*水香Shuixiang*(water and fragrant)" [58,68]. It has the meaning of "time". The traditional Chinese method of timekeeping uses clepsydra. The clepsydra is engraved with a scale. When water drips into the pot and the time is estimated by the amount of water. And "fragrant" comes from the Chinese saying "the duration of a burning joss stick". This concept originated from Chinese Buddhism. The monks use the burning of incense as a method of timing. Honghuzi guard station adopts a shift system, and "Shui Xiang" was responsible for the dispatch of the guard to prevent attacks[58,39].

Shuntianzhu was responsible for the logistics tasks. Manchuria is also known as the "*林海雪原linhaixueyuan（A sea of white woods）*". The winter is long and cold, and there is only one harvest season a year. Therefore, the issue of food reserves for Honghuzi was very important. Especially among a large number of bandits, "Shuntianzhu" needs to manage the food and accommodation of hundreds of people. Therefore, this position was usually held by someone who is familiar with farming and is trusted by the members.

Eight pillars were the mainstay members of the four beams. They have Qingsaozhu (debt collection), Henxinzhu (management of prisons, torturing prisoners), Fangwaizhu (public relations functions, communication with hostages’ families), and Baiyuzhu (responsible for managing vehicles and horses), Fubaozhu(bodyguards), Chaqianzhu (spying for news), Dixingzhu (passing and posting messages) and Fangmenzhu (managing text exchanges) [58,35].

The main activity of Honghuzi was to kidnap hostages for extortion. Therefore, many functions in the "Eight Pillars" were about this work. “Bandits are rampant in various counties, and the villagers are unbearable... The grain farmers are so wide that they are tied up by the bandit. The price of the case was one hundred thousand and a gun. On the same day, the eldest man named Liu was kidnapped... asked for a price of eighty thousand and three guns[35]”.

To carry out a kidnapping activity, must first detect and then implement the kidnapping. At the same time, the hostages need to be guarded in the cell and tortured. Also, the information about the kidnapped can be obtained through various methods, so as to ask for more money. Then a blackmail letter in the tone of the kidnapped person will be written. It was also necessary to communicate with the family of hostages so as to obtain more benefits. This was the daily life of the "Eight Pillars", which mainly involves complete kidnapping and extortion activities. Their work was an important source of income for the Honghuzi bandit, so their status is higher than that of ordinary members.

Although the specific job titles can be different, their functions in the organization were roughly the same. Small bandit gangs often have one person concurrently holding several positions. But in any case, the "four beams and eight pillars" are the mainstays of the Honghuzi gang, responsible for the daily management of the organization.

And under the "four beams and eight pillars" there were ordinary bandits "Zaizi (whelp, kid)". They account for the vast majority of members and need to obey orders absolutely[58,26]. The banditry was full of danger and uncertainty, so the mobility of bandits was also high. Without special abilities, it was impossible for ordinary members to become leaders. New members had a lower status than old members, so they were more responsible for tasks that were more dangerous or laborious. In the battle, they are responsible for the charge, and can only allocate the least resources when sharing the spoils.

Through the research on the social structure of Haydamak and Honhugzi, it can be noticed that there is a relatively strict hierarchical structure in both. Class reflects the differences between individuals within the group. At the same time, each individual in the group formed the same identity group (Cossack and Honghuzi) in pursuit of a sense of belonging and identity[58,28].

## 3.2. Culture and beliefs

Haydamak and Honghuzi, as armed violent groups against the real social system and ruling, operate outside the normal social order. It is precise because of this that they have formed a subculture that is different from the normal social culture.

The samples of Haydamak folklore have shown us the life of the Cossacks. Characteristic in this respect is the song "Lament of Haydamak in Prison", recorded in the middle of the 19th century. The author was the famous researcher of the history of the Zaporizhzhia Cossacks and Haidamasstvo - A.A. Skalkovsky. Its plot was based on a very popular and well-known history: a young Zaporizhia-Haydamak, who went for a "walk” in Poland, but was captured and thrown into prison (obviously Polish, since he was provided a quick and fierce execution, which the Russian authorities did not take such measures). Since the second half of the 1750s, the actions of the Haydamaks on the border "Dnieper" entered a qualitatively new phase, acquiring the features of the craft, which was managed by a skillful ruler who proved himself well. Comprehending his short life path, he sadly states - " Stop being a Cossack for me / Stop flying like a bird in the field." That is, the concepts of "Haydamakst" and "Cossack" are completely synonymous. However, the completely illegal, criminal nature of such a "Cossack" was obviously not a secret for himself, since a little below he drew a line that can be considered as a kind of moral assessment of his own actions, in fact, a sentence passed on to himself - " The very reason for this, / That I die such a death[29,3]."

The fact that most of the robberies of neighbors - Poles, Turks, and Tatars - from the Zaporizhzhia side came from an element not controlled by Kosh. Numerous gangs of "migrant workers" (temporary hired workers), who went to the Crimea to work in salt or other industries, sometimes did not disdain the mining. That means a high concentration of migrant workers contributed to the development of Haydamak[7,55].

The purely mining motivation of the Haydamak deeds was traced in folklore sources, as, for example, in another Haydamak song (recording by the same A.A. Skalkovsky, conclude - "it's enough for us to fish/let's go to fire Jews and Poles." At the same time, the words "Burlak" - "Seroma" - "Haydamak" are used in the song and are perceived by its authors and listeners synonymously [29,9].

The autobiographical materials of the famous Haydamak leader Mark Mamai allow looking behind the curtain of the activities of not “amateur” ones like the aforementioned of Matvey Obertas, but large military detachments of Zaporozhian miners, controlled by the Zaporizhzhia foremen. They were based on the "Extrakt ( a summary of the criminal case) composed in the Kyiv provincial chancellery from the interrogations of a thief and a robber by the nickname Mamai, who was interrogated in the Zaporizhzhia Sich under the Landmill's team.

The folklore tradition of the population of the "three-border zone" in the lower reaches of the Southern Bug River, where Russian, Polish, and Crimean (Turkish) lands converged, associated with the name "Mamaev" several localities. Also, people stubbornly associated his face with folk images depicting a Cossack-bandurist, widely known since the middle of the 18th century [43,34].

The legendary Mamai was born in 1710. He lived and grew up in the centenary town of Potoki of the Mirgorod regiment. Being 19 years old, Mamai got married, but pretty soon left his young wife and moved from the Hetmanate to Zaporizhzhia. In 1730, when the Sich was still under the protection of the Crimean khans, he joined the Zaporozhets Mite, who lived in a winter house behind the river. Subsequently, when the Cossacks returned to Russian citizenship, Mamai moved to another farmer, Karas, who lived near the Sich. Then he became a real Zaporozhian, was admitted to the Shcherbinovsky Kuren, and received the nickname Ogyr (Russian Stallion). Mamai mainly hunted and fished, giving preference to these particular activities over others. Another 10 years passed in this way. After that, Mamai moved to the Zadneprovschina (modern Kropyvnytskyi region), to his own uncle Ivan Kul, who lived in the town of Tsybulev and even decided to settle down a little. Having found his wife, whom he had not seen for more than 15 years, he again got in touch with her. The couple moved to the village of Ukhovka, where they settled down, and Marko was elected community ataman for 2 years in a row[21,4].

In 1748, the usual course of life was disrupted. Mamai was visited by his brother Grigory and with him five more Cossacks. Having agreed with two of them - the Cossacks of the Myshastovsky Kuren, Ivan Death, and Yakim Gurtov, Mamai went to the neighboring village of Ratsevo, on the Polish side, to plunder. Although this raid was not particularly successful, this "adventure" stirred up him, in which the spirit of adventurism was reawakened. Mamai left his wife and household and again moved to the Sich, to his native Shcherbinovsky Kuren. Here he again tries to "find himself" in fish factories, but not for long. Having tasted "Cossack bread" once, it was already difficult for Mamai to forget its taste. In the spring of 1750, Mamai was leading his gang to the Black Forest (a large forest in the Kropyvnytskyi and Cherkasy regions), he added several more residents of the town of Tsybulev, from among his acquaintances, to it. The mob, which already numbered 14 people, went over to the Polish side[21,4].

In his Haydamak life, Mamai and his people joined the team of Cossack Yakov Komlychka from Baturinskiy Kuren. Soon several dozen more Zaporozhians from different Kurens joined the Komlychka gang of Haydamaks, as a result of which their number increased to 90 people. Haydamaks attacked the courtyard of the Uniate (Greek Catholic) monastery, and, although they faced armed resistance, they managed to rob the monks. Retreating to the Dnieper, the gang soon found a horse herd of 50 heads, which they drove away, after which they divided into two parts. One of them, in 40 Cossacks, in which there were mainly wounded Cossacks, plunged into pre-prepared canoes (large boats), and set off by the river to the Sich, while the other (50 Cossacks) went along the coast with horses. Having descended to the town of Kalantayevka, where there was a Russian border outpost, both groups of Haydamaks reunited and crossed the border. The commander of the Russian guard was presented with a good horse and he "closed his eyes" to the crossing of the mob. [21,5-6]

Having penetrated several tens of kilometers into the depths of Russian territory, the Haydamaks again settled in the Black Forest. The traditional division of production began. In its midst, new guests from the Sich arrived at the camp - a band of miners of 150 Cossacks, led by the chieftain of the Irkleevsky Kuren Gabriel Lysy. Both squads merged. Several more times the Haydamaks went to Polish territory, having the forests of Yaskovtsy and Trushkovtsy as a base, and returning with a lot of mining. For Mamai himself, the Haydamak season of that year was interrupted when in August he was seized by the Cossacks from Gordey Poloz's team, sent from the Sich to the border area specifically to fight the Zaporizhzhia Haydamaks[63,32]. However, Mamai eventually managed to escape from custody and for several more years "walk" with his gang in Zaporizhzhia, and Polish Ukraine, eventually becoming one of the favorite characters of folklore prose and folk painting.

Stating the fact that the Ukrainian population often suffered from the attacks of the Haydamaks, it should be recognized that their main targets were those who professed the Jewish religion, as well as Catholicism (including the Uniates): "for the murders and robberies of Jews and Poles committed in Polish possessions." - this is the standard formulation of sentences for the Cossacks convicted of Haydamak (data taken from the "Lists" of convicts sent from the Hetmanate and Zaporizhzhia to hard labor in the Rogervik fortress on the Baltic Sea (1751, 1752, 1755)) [22,23].

In fact, the basis for the selection of potential victims was the complex conflicts in interethnic relations between the Ukrainian and Jewish populations of Polish Ukraine. It is clear that the anti-Jewish sentiments that gripped the aforementioned lands had a very real basis and smoldered since the time of the War of Independence under the leadership of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, flaring up every time at a suitable time.

However, it is not worthwhile to make the religious component absolute. Quite often, the victims of the Haydamaks were their Orthodox fellow believers, who, however, belonged to other ethnic groups - Bulgarians, Moldovans, Serbs, Russians. It is perhaps worth agreeing that xenophobia, in general, was still one of the determining factors when choosing a potential target for an attack, even in the case when the attacker did not have personal motives for committing a crime.

Due to the great difference in cultural background and ideology, Honhuzi's culture and beliefs have inherited Chinese traditions. The difference between East and West can be clearly reflected from this perspective[45,47].

There was small quantity of research on Honghuzi’s culture, because Honghuzi, as a secret gang on the fringe of society, was in serious opposition to the government. They were the targets of the government at the time, and ordinary people were full of contempt for them. Therefore, in historical documents and official archives, Honghuzi’s specific activities were only the most important events or simple records of suppression. At the same time, because their overall cultural level is low and was active in the mountains, there was almost no record of its internal structure and spiritual and cultural forms. Most of the handed-down was oral history or left in Manchu customs.

Honghuzi had no regular religious beliefs and activities. But as marginalized people in society, they need special beliefs to maintain this kind of internal relationship, standardize the behavior of members internally to enhance the cohesion of the group; externally show the reason and value of its existence. In the continuous development and improvement, Huhuzi have developed a bandit culture with Manchu regional characteristics[45,48-49].

The main beliefs of Honghuzi were the worship of Bodhidharma and the eighteen arhats. Bodhidharma is the founder of Chinese Buddhist. More importantly, Bodhidharma is the master of Shaolin. “Bodhidharma traveled from the west to China. He was the master of Zen Buddhism” [36,54]. Therefore, people who are engaged in martial arts regard Bodhidharma as their "Patriarch", which is the meaning of pioneer and teacher. The reasons for Honghuzi's worship of Bodhidharma are as follows: First is to use Bodhidharma's reputation to justify their behavior, uses him as an ancestor to gain historical and cultural recognition; the second, folklore that is widely circulated in China claims that Bodhidharma is the founder of the Shaolin martial arts and is a symbol of wisdom and courage. Honghuzi's main mode of subsistence is armed robbery. Therefore, individual strength is the key to survival under the historical conditions at that time. They need a strong martial arts person as a protector; Third, Honghuzi hoped to use Bodhidharma's prestige to help maintain reputation and order. The external environment was very sinister, and close internal cooperation was particularly needed. Therefore, having a common belief is conducive to the formation of cohesion within the organization.

There are ethnic minorities in the Northeast such as Manchu, Evenks, and Oroqen in Manchuria. These people still believe in the ancient natural religion-Shamanism. The term shaman comes from the Siberian Manchu-Tungus language “Saman”. "Sa" means to know. According to the literal sense, saman is “he who knows”, so calling the knower means that shamanism is a way of obtaining knowledge. Shamanism has a deep-rooted influence among the various ethnic groups in northern China. Its theoretical foundation is animism. The Manchus and various ethnic minorities in the northeast lived by hunting. Shamanism has thus formed a belief in animal worship. The Manchus in the forest area use tigers as mountain gods. “In Shaman mythology, the myth that the tiger god brings prey to hunters was preserved. They call the tiger 'Borukan', which means God, but calling the tiger by this name cannot be allowed[44,12].”

The area where Honghuzi was active is adjacent to the aforementioned Northeast ethnic minorities, and their beliefs were influenced by Shamanism. Among Honghuzi, the word “tiger” was often used in titles, compliments and idioms. for example, at the ceremony where new members join the bandit, they will say "呼啸(animals make high and long sounds)落座，各个英雄色"[45,97]. Meng Enyuan, the red beard leader known as “General Tiger”: “Until the end of his days he remained illiterate, But he knew how to write 4 hieroglyphs - his name and the sign of tiger(Hu)” [46,228-239]. Honghuzi compare themselves to fearless tigers, show their power and prestige, and think this is a behavior as "hero". If the leader dreams of a tiger, he shall not attack because the tiger's appearance in the dream symbolizes that there will be a strong opponent, and the attack will fail.

Chinese civilians regard the tiger as a representative of an irresistible and evil force but Honghuzi worships tigers. This is not only the influence of Shamanism. They described their ballad as saying: The first group in the world, everyone owns our money. If we are kind he will not pay, if we are evil the money will be ours [45,97]. Honghuzi took advantage of ordinary people's fear of tigers to make people as scared as they see tigers.

In the cultural system of Honghuzi, Liangshan heroes (108 heroes from Liangshan appeared in Shi Naian's novel '"Shui Hu Zhuan" in the Ming Dynasty, mainly about the Northern Song Dynasty Huizong period, due to the imperial court and the traitorous ministers. The people were oppressed by the government and people decided to rise up against the government.) and the legend of three brothers Liu, Guan, and Zhang (a story recorded in the 14th-century novel "San Guo Yan Yi", Zhang Fei and the three have the goal of accomplishing a great cause. They decided to become brothers of each other in a splendid garden in spring. Decided for better or worse, they will support each other) are their important objects of worship[47,140].

From the perspective of traditional Chinese philosophy, the personified “*天*tian(sky)” is not a specific creator, but the highest manifestation of the laws of natural and social development. In the field of ethics and philosophy, sky is often regarded as a symbol of justice that conforms to the law of historical development. In the morality of Honghuzi, the corruption of the government made it impossible to achieve fairness and justice. In this case, a "hero" was needed to fight inequality and achieve justice with special armed methods.

# CHAPTER 4

# DEVELOPMENT OF THE HAYDAMAK AND THE HONGHUZI MOVEMENT

## 4.1. Free Cossack

### 4.1.1. Haydamak with Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth

While Polish nobles and their Jewish housekeepers in Ukraine abused their power and forced corvee, the dissatisfaction of the common people also increased. Serfs, other farmers, poor Cossacks, artisans, and small freemen fled from their oppressors into the grassland or forest of agricultural colonists, and they formed a group of Haydamaks. Since the second half of the 18th century, the era of the most extensive and free use of the word "Haydamak" by Polish authorities has begun. Broadly speaking, they call everyone who is directly or potentially hostile to them "Haydamaks". Contact with Zaporizhia's Nitov army was especially forbidden. In the gentry (noble) society of Poland, the terms "Zaporizhia" and "Haydamak" were regarded as synonyms or at least related in connotation. In this respect, there was a later episode-1787-1788, when Prince Alexander of Balta, the manor ruler of Joseph Lubomirski, accused 25 Haidamks of robbing their property and even sold some of them to Turks. The basis for accusing them of "Haydamaks" was that they served in Zaporozovi's army (until 1775) and the revived Black Sea Cossack army (since 1787). It seems appropriate to quote the document here (ataman Zakhar Chepega of the Cossack Army of the Black Sea reported to Prince G. Potemkin-Tavrichesky on November 9, 1788): "Noble Kolinda, extend the meaning of the word "Haydamak" to them and rob them innocently. [25,41]" That is to say, the social context of this word is more than the ethnic content.

Haydamak's detachment attacked deep into Polish territory. An incident in mid-November 1737 clearly illustrated the scale and nature of attacks on the Polish border. More than 100 "urban" cossacks (Ukrainian cossacks serving the Poles) marched along the Russian-Polish border under the command of the noble Korzhev, chasing a group of Haydamaks. When they catch up, it was found that Haydamaks had managed to get in touch with another Zaporizhia detachment. Cossacks outnumber Polish militia, and resistance was useless. The militia was ordered to dismount and stay away from horses, and then they were shot with rifles and pistols. Only a few people managed to escape. Those who escaped reported the incident: they met the Haydamak gang with 5,000 people. These people wandered around the Letychiv town (now Vinnytsia area) for several weeks and managed robbery[6,65].

At the same time, cossacks not only invaded Poland in the form of large detachments but also set up seasonal camps there, sometimes with extremely tight fortifications. In 1743, nearly 300 Cossacks settled in the lower reaches of the river, where Berezovo Island was. This island was in Tyasmina (the right tributary of Dnieper River), near Vedmedovka village. Due to the small number of Polish troops in this area, it was impossible to drive them out of the island. Throughout the summer, there was communication between the diplomatic departments of Russia and Poland. However, this did not produce any results-Cossacks still exist. With the coming of cold winter, Cossacks left the island by themselves, leaving only the fortifications they destroyed before leaving[21, 1-8].

The Polish government had taken many actions to curb Haydamachism. According to the results of the work of the Polish-Russian Joint Border Committee in January 1751, some suggestions were made for the civil and military headquarters of border provinces (regions), especially Bratslavski. They were issued as instructions,the purpose is "to ensure the security of Poland's border from Sich, Garda and other places from Zaporizhia". The main measure was to issue a general law prohibiting all residents of Bratzlav, Podol, and Kyiv provinces from going to Sich and Gard-na-Bug to buy things stolen by local Haydamak. The reason why businessmen from Zaporizhia were prohibited from trading is directly related to Haydamachism. Merchants who bring salted fish from Zaporizhia for sale can only trade in border towns, and under no circumstances can they go deeper into Polish territory for more than a mile. After all, while trade was going on, these businessmen will notice the wealth of gentlemen (nobles) or other rich people and can act as an informant for Haydamaks. If anyone found people who don't have passports in the motorcade, they needed to keep searching and hand them over to the headquarters of the nearest fortress. The heads of villages and towns should also ensure that there were no Orthodox monks wandering around in their settlements, who were unreasonably regarded as potential scouts of Haydamak.

To imagine the general atmosphere of the end of 1750, which saw perhaps the largest surge of Haydamak activity during the time of Novaya Sich, let us turn to the information provided by two Russian intelligence officers from the Cossack Lubensky regiment (Left-Bank Ukraine) - clerk Nikita Grigorovich and a "military comrade »Mikhail Lazorevich. In the last days of October of that year, they visited Uman, Ladyzhin, Bratslav, Vinnitsa, Yanov, Yamy, Sokolovtsy and many other towns in Polish Ukraine. They saw that the local authorities were using tough measures to fight the Haydamak detachments that were crossing from the Russian side. In large settlements there were pledges of 300-700 soldiers from the Cossack militias of large feudal lords. On the borderlands, Lipkan detachments (Lipkans, or Lipki - Polish Tatars), which were considered the most effective in this kind of business, were engaged in the pursuit of the Haydamaks. In general, the extermination of the Haydamaks was distinguished by particular cruelty: the Bratslav governor, furious with the murder of his two brothers, in their own estate in Sokolovtsy, arranged a "trial" near the town. On a large forest clearing, along the road, he built gallows and installed stakes, on which several hundred Zaporozhians were executed, or even just local residents suspected of sympathizing with the Haydamaks[20, 20-22].

The Polish authorities believe that Haydamachism had such a large scale, mainly because the passport control system in the border areas was not strict enough. Therefore, in early 1752, Geithmann Blanicky sent a proposal to the Russian Embassy in Warsaw and issued a declaration to all subjects of the Russian Empire. Which emphasizes the necessity of issuing cross-border passport. In their absence, the Polish border commander reserves the right to punish all those who do not have passports. Poles have taken particularly severe actions against Cossacks. If they were detained, they will be executed[15, 2-5] even if there was no evidence of their participation in the Haydamak gang. This harsh criminal law naturally aggravates the tense situation.

After 1768, the Haydamak uprising in Poland declined. Haydamakas and their uprisings are preserved in the form of collective memories of legends and folk songs. Haydamakas, especially the Koliivshchyna rebellion, is presented as a national hero in the works of Taras Shevchenko and members of the Ukrainian school of Polish literature.

### 

### 4.1.2. Haydamak with Tsar Russia

In the early 1720s, the word "Haydamak" was adopted not only by the Poles but also by the Russian side. Since the attacks of Cossacks in the territory of Crimean khanate began to disturb the southern and eastern suburbs of Ukraine-Emirates and Slobozanshina. So that to prevent the attack of Zaporizhia "bandits" or "Haydamak" (in the documents at that time, these two names were used synonymously), a new fortress was being built on the border, inhabited by Ukrainian Cossacks who were Russian citizens. At the same time, the attack of "Haydamak" was not an abstract military action against the Russian army on Ukrainian soil. The Ukrainian people were usually their victims[23, 179-181].

There were many records to confirm this. The earliest of them can be traced back to 1711 to 1713. The following examples were even very typical. In May 1713, Cossacks fyodor Volosenko, Yakov Lisi, Alexei KraSi Nuo Viychenko and Yakov Bezruchenko were arrested during the robbery. Two years ago, the same group of young people, originally from the Russian border towns of Orel, Kishenka, and Kitayigorod, fled to the territory of Crimea, which was then located in the Aliosh base area. They lived there for about two years, fished in Dnieper River and the Black Sea with other Cossacks, and took part in Crimea's military action against the North Caucasus. However, all this didn't bring what they wanted. The desire for wealth was their motivation to change their lifestyle. After all, it is difficult to find any other reasonable motivation to explain their behavior except the usual greed for profits. As Cossacks of Zaporizhia, they did not plunder foreign lands in Poland or Crimea but came to the land of Ukraine. They joined the Haydamak gang to rob, and plunder here. It is impossible to classify their actions as a "national liberation struggle", especially when they were even countered by Ukraine Cossacks who led by Hetman[27,78].

During the period of Novasich (1734-1775), the war, cossacks needed to take joint action with the Russian army under the command of Russian military leaders. This made it almost impossible to obtain traditional "Cossack bread". Cossack bread was referring to cattle, money, belongings and so on captured by Cossacks. Of course, at the same time, Cossack had the opportunity to take part in planned sabotage attacks against the rear of the Turkish army and gained rich spoils. For example, from June 22 to June 26, 1739, under the command of Colonel V. Kapnist, 1,000 Zaporizhia Cossacks raided the Moldavia city of Sorocca. Captured thousands of horses, cattle, and sheep, a lot of wine, grain, weapons, fur, and jewelry. However, when these Cossacks decided on their own to start "plundering Jews" in neighboring Polish territory, "some Zaporizhia Cossacks who robbed in Poland were executed and their instigators were hanged" (taken from the "log" kept in the headquarters of Field Marshal B.-H. von Minich on August 11th, 1739) [24,140].

In peacetime, the situation of Haydamak was not good either. Cossacks were still active on the Turkish border. However, in 1739, after signing another peace treaty with the Turks, the Russian authorities identified these incidents as "theft and robbery" and called them "Haidamachestvo". On this point, Queen Elizabeth Petrovna's three letters to Zaporizhia's lowland army were representative. These three letters were written on April 14th, February 3rd, and April 8th, 1746, respectively. Among them, the czar ordered Cossack to stop attacking the territory of Turkey-Crimea and Poland and ordered Kosh to pursue Haydamak more actively. In this case, Haidamachestvo not only means attacking Poland and Ukraine (right bank) but also included plundering Tatars. This fact can be seen from the following instructions to the army: "Operation on the Turkish border needs to be quiet, bring documents and no weapons. No one dares to pretend to be Zaporizhia Cossacks and commit the crime of Haydamak in their name "[24,142]. In addition, Robbery in Zaporizhia itself belonged to Haidamachestvo: for example, in early 1771, Mikhail Berezhnoy (Vovk), a 25-year-old Zaporizhia native. He was sentenced to life imprisonment in Siberia for "stealing horses, cattle, and property of the residents of Zaporizhia winter cottage nine times".

On April 6th, 1752, the Russian Senate issued another decree aimed at reducing the scale of Haydamak. This meant that all the people who participated in the attack on Poland, Ukraine and were captured must first be punished in the presence of Polish political commissar, and then they will be exiled to Rogervik fortress under construction in the Baltic Sea to serve their lifetime."Punishment" includes whipping, branding and picking out nostrils[15,290].

Before 1751-1752, the Zadneprovschina area was mainly used as the base of the Haydamak detachment. Then, after the Russian government established New Serbia there, the Ukrainian population was forced to move to the land in the South, bordering Turkey. These lands themselves were the stage of bloody confrontation. At the same time, the existence of the characteristics of "national liberation struggle" in this conflict was only in individual cases. The farm of the new Fort Worth officer became the target of Haydamak's attack. In the first three years after the establishment of New Serbia, more than 20 local officials were robbed by Haydamak. On November 20th, 1755, 49 chiefs of officers of the New Fort Worth Army convened a council to discuss the eradication of Haydamak. As a result of this meeting, a "judgment" document was drawn up, which analyzed the reasons for the spread of this phenomenon in New Serbia. They believed that between 1751 and 1753, former Ukrainian residents were forced to move south and to the village of the newly established Cossack Group in New Los Botzky. Many of them had to join in Haydamak's actions. These people were familiar with the terrain, security situation, and even many officers of New Serbia, so their attacks were very efficient. The Newserbs can only organize a team of 300 people from the army to constantly search and hunt down the Haydamak in New Serbia[15,229-231].

"Volnitsa" formed the base of the Gaidamatchina in the Ukrainian South even after the liquidation of the Zaporozhye Sich by the Russian government (1775). Investigating the possibility of an uprising of the former Cossacks, the Russian command of the Azov province in the spring of 1776 noted that the least dangerous for him were the "sedate" Cossacks, who had previously served in the military, had a household and families. The greatest danger could arise from homelessness, which traditionally hibernates in farms, working for nothing but food, and in the spring gathers in mobs in the surrounding forests and goes to plunder in Polish or Tatar possessions. An indicative fact is that such gatherings were feared not only by the Russian command, but also by the sedentary Zaporizhzhia population, who noted that it would be nice to continue the practice of dispersing such gatherings of lumpen, begun by Kosh, during the Sich. In the same spring, the married Cossacks of the Barvinkostenkovsky district, through their deputies, expressed concern to the governor about the lack of military teams that could resist the Haydamaks, since in the summer of 1775 the authorities confiscated all their weapons from them, which made it impossible for them to cope with this misfortune.

The plundering raids of the "Turkish" Cossacks (Butkals), which took place during the first years after the liquidation of the Sich, extended not only to Russian, but also to Polish lands. So, at the very beginning of 1778, the Zaporozhye gangs significantly "battered" the town of Letychiv, killing about a hundred of its Jewish and Polish residents and robbing their property. It is significant that the main culprits of this incident in the then government documents, as well as at the beginning of the 18th century, continue to be called "haydamaks", regardless of their nationality and origin.

The number of the Haydamak detachments of the Turkish Cossacks, who carried out raids on Russian territory, usually fluctuated between 20-30 people. The social composition is the poor, who, in addition to working in the surrounding fishing factories, did not hesitate to use easier criminal methods of obtaining funds. Thus, the report of Lieutenant-General Peter Tekeliy to Prince Grigory Potemkin dated August 14, 1785, reported on the circumstances of the robbery of the merchant Faber, whose house was attacked at night by 25 haydamaks. They wounded several servants, tortured the wife and mother-in-law of this merchant, and stole property worth 5,000 rubles. The attackers were identified with the former workers of the fishing factory, the former Zaporozhian Cossacks, who had fled to the Turks shortly before[23,82].

Among these people, the traditions of mining lasted longer than among the same Black Sea residents. The features of the "Frontier" (border territory), which were fully preserved by the Danube delta throughout the first quarter of the 19th century, the weakness of centralized control by the Turkish government, the state of permanent war with the Nekrasovites (descendants of the Don Cossacks-Old Believers), together created a breeding ground for conservation of such practices. Indicative in this respect is the message from the Bug military chancellery to the ataman of the Black Sea army Bursak, dated March 4, 1808: the Turkish Cossack-butkal Peter Tsimbal, who, along with others, went over to the Russian side, was detained for an investigation into the facts of his haydamism in the Moldavian principality - but was accused of robbery and theft[23,82].

The revival, at the initiative of Prince Potemkin-Tavrichesky, of the Troops of the loyal Zaporozhye Cossacks (Black Sea troops) caused concern among many Polish dignitaries, who saw in this the danger of intensifying the Haydamak attacks on the lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This is confirmed by the worried tone of the letters of the Polish king Stanislav-August to Potemkin (November 1789)[10,32].

Indeed, the Haydamak gangs, spontaneously created by the Black Sea Cossacks, as in the times of the Sich, created extraordinary tension in the relations between the administration of their troops and their neighbors. At the same time, fellow believers - Orthodox Christians - also appear as victims. As an example, let us give a letter to the military judge Anton Golovaty from a certain Moldavian boyar, dated June 20, 1790: in the forest, near the village of Stetskany, which belonged to him, a gang of seven Black Sea deserters settled, which pestered the population with their constant robberies.

For their part, Russian officials made every effort to completely eradicate the spirit of "mischief", resorting not only to repressive actions, but also to the means of ideological influence, in particular to pastoral teachings. So, when the Black Sea residents were granted land in the Kuban, in their central settlement (Kosh) on the Dniester - in Slobodzeya, on August 15, 1792, a meeting of all Cossacks and settlers was held to publish the imperial letter and thanksgiving service. The solemn service was personally conducted by the Yekaterinoslav Archbishop Ambrose[9,57], who entered Kosh, greeted with a cannon salute. Trying to use the traditional religiosity of the Zaporozhye Cossacks, this clergyman in his sermon, among other things, tried to distract the hearts of the Black Sea people from their view of the robbery of neighbors as an occupation worthy of knights.

After the destruction of the Sich, a significant part of the Cossacks ended up in Turkish territory. Here, many of those who were not inclined towards Haydamak, again took up their usual business. At the same time, the object of their attacks, most often, became border villages on the Russian side, regardless of the ethnic or confessional identity of their inhabitants. Since the third half of the 1770s, not only the Russian, but also the Turkish administration, which sincerely tried to eliminate this factor of tension in relations with neighbors, was concerned about the prevention of Haydamak raids since the third half of the 1770s. This is evidenced by the report of Major General Yakov Repnin to Prince Grigory Potemkin-Tavrichesky dated March 1, 1786, which retells a test letter to him from the governor of the Turkish city of Ochakov, outlining plans for joint actions against the Haydamaks[13,29].

### 

### 4.1.3 The destruction of Haydamak

The gradual destruction of Haydamak occurred after Sich was destroyed. In 1765, the idea of the elimination of the Zaporizhzhya Lower Troops together with its capital Sich, and the founding of the administrative center of the Dnieper province was recommended. The author of such a project was the Russian Major General von Shtofeln. He often visited the Sich, and was well acquainted with the peculiarities of the Zaporizhzhia life and decided, taking this opportunity, to put an end to the Cossack "disorder". Also, he wished to get a grain place Governor on the territory of Zaporizhzhia province of the Russian Empire[48,23]. The plan of General K. Shtofeln was not implemented only because it was not yet ripe for 1765. Although that year the Russian government abandoned radical steps towards the Zaporizhzhya Lower Troops, information was collected at various levels about the social structure of Zaporizhzhia, its economic and military might, which could be used at any time in the elimination of Cossack autonomy.

The question of the need to destroy the Sich, or at least arrest its top leadership, once again arose on the agenda in May 1774, when at several meetings before the Empress they expressed the need to "act decisively on this matter[28]." The queen refused, focusing on the faithful service of the Zaporizhzhia Nizovoy Troops in the last war with the Turks (1768 - 1774). The situation changed radically in April 1775. At the meeting of the Council on April 27, 1775, the question was posed very harshly: to invite Koshevoy to the capital. If he comes - he did not plan treason, if he does not come - he is guilty. P. Kalnyshevsky, due to some circumstances, did not want to go to St. Petersburg. Despite this, the Russian governor of the Left-Bank Ukraine (Little Russia) P. Rumyantsev was urgently summoned by the capital, and at a regular meeting of the Council on May 7, 1775, it was decided to occupy the entire territory of Zaporizhzhia with troops, arrest the entire Sich sergeant major, and in the long term, and generally dissolve the Zaporizhzhya Lower Troops.

The real authors of the plan for the liquidation of the Zaporizhzhya Sich should be considered the Chancellor of the Empire Nikita Panin and the all-powerful General Grigory Potemkin. This is convincingly evidenced by their signatures in the protocol of that, fatal for Zaporizhzhia, meeting of the Council at the Imperial Court. The final decision-verdict of the Council in the case of the Zaporizhzhya Nizovoy Troops was formulated as follows: "... The Council recognized it necessary to destroy the Kosh of these Cossacks, like a nest of their arbitrariness, and bridging them to establish command over them ..." [8,14].

Thus, the fate of the Zaporizhzhya Sich was decided. On June 5, 1775, the Cossacks in Sich had sworn in allegiance to Empress Catherine II century. A similar picture was observed in other settlements of Zaporizhzhia. In general, the final absorption of Zaporizhzhia Liberties by the empire took place without the use of military force.

The plundering raids of the "Turkish" Cossacks (Butkals), which took place during the first years after the liquidation of the Sich, extended not only to Russian but also to Polish lands. At the very beginning of 1778, the Zaporizhzhia gangs significantly "battered" the town of Letychiv, killing about a hundred of its Jewish and Polish residents and robbing their property. It is significant that the main culprits of this incident in the then government documents, as well as at the beginning of the 18th century, continue to be called "Haydamaks", regardless of their nationality and origin[8,1-7].

The number of the Haydamak detachments of the Turkish Cossacks, who carried out raids on Russian territory, usually fluctuated between 20-30 people. The social composition is the poor, who, in addition to working in the surrounding fishing factories, did not hesitate to use easier criminal methods of obtaining funds. Thus, the report of Lieutenant-General Peter Tekeliy to Prince Grigory Potemkin dated August 14, 1785, reported on the circumstances of the robbery of the merchant Faber, whose house was attacked at night by 25 Haydamaks. They wounded several servants, tortured the wife and mother-in-law of this merchant, and stole property worth 5,000 rubles. The attackers were identified with the former workers of the fishing factory, the former Zaporozhian Cossacks, who had fled to the Turks shortly before[26,82].

Among the Butkals, the traditions of mining lasted longer than among the same Black Sea residents. The features of the "Frontier" (border territory), which were fully preserved by the Danube delta throughout the first quarter of the 19th century, the weakness of centralized control by the Turkish government, the state of permanent war with the Nekrasovites (descendants of the Don Cossacks-Old Believers), together created a breeding ground for conservation of such practices. Indicative in this respect is the message from the Bug military chancellery to the ataman of the Black Sea army Bursak, dated March 4, 1808: the Turkish Cossack-Butkal Peter Tsimbal, who, along with others, went over to the Russian side, was detained for an investigation into the facts of his haydamism in the Moldavian principality - but was accused of robbery and theft[9,32].

The revival, at the initiative of Prince Potemkin-Tavrichesky, of the Troops of the loyal Zaporizhzhia Cossacks (Black Sea troops), caused concern among many Polish dignitaries, who saw in this the danger of intensifying the Haydamak attacks on the lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This is confirmed by the worried tone of the letters of the Polish king Stanislav-August to Potemkin (November 1789)[1, 152].

Indeed, the Haydamak gangs, spontaneously created by the Black Sea Cossacks, as in the times of the Sich, created extraordinary tension in the relations between the administration of their troops and their neighbors. At the same time, fellow believers - Orthodox Christians - also appear as victims. As an example, let us give a letter to the military judge Anton Golovaty from a certain Moldavian boyar, dated June 20, 1790: in the forest, near the village of Stetskany, which belonged to him, a gang of seven Black Sea deserters settled, which pestered the population with their constant robberies[10, 57].

For their part, Russian officials made every effort to completely eradicate the spirit of "mischief", resorting not only to repressive actions but also to the means of ideological influence, in particular to pastoral teachings. So, when the Black Sea residents were granted land in the Kuban, in their central settlement (Kosh) on the Dniester - in Slobodzeya, on August 15, 1792, a meeting of all Cossacks and settlers was held to publish the imperial letter and thanksgiving service. The solemn service was personally conducted by the Yekaterinoslav Archbishop Ambrose[86], who entered Kosh, greeted with a cannon salute. Trying to use the traditional religiosity of the Zaporizhzhia Cossacks, this clergyman in his sermon, among other things, tried to distract the hearts of the Black Sea people from their view of the robbery of neighbors as an occupation worthy of knights[14,1-2].

The gradual extinction of the Haidamast spread not only over the entire last quarter of the 18th century but also at the very beginning of the 19th century. Both the Russian and Turkish governments, in whose sphere of influence the two largest of the post-Sich Zaporizhzhia communities - the Black Sea and Transdanubian - fell, had to make a lot of efforts to eradicate the traditions of mining in the Cossack environment, reorienting it exclusively to military-service functions.

## 4.2. Unregulated Honghuzi

### 4.2.1 Honghuzi with Tsarist Russia

The Russian Empire regarded Northeast China as its sphere of influence as early as the 19th century. Russia's plan to expand into the Far East began in the 1950s. In 1848, Muraviev became the governor of Siberia. This Russian officer, known as the "adventurer", led a team into Chinese territory in 1854. Led geographers and cartographers to complete the first drifting on the amur river, with the aim of encroaching on the Amur region. Muraviev also found out that the Qing government was unable to control the Far East border areas in fact. "Contrary to St. Petersburg's fear, there are no Chinese in this" Chinese territory[49,4]".

Qing government had a laisser-faire attitude towards ceding territory. "Such a large-scale invasion didn't get a full response from the Chinese regular army". However, many civilians managed to organize some resistance activities in different areas of Manchuria[50, 201-211]. Among those who rebelled against Tsarist Russia, there were many "Honghuzi".

From the perspective of the Russian Empire, they were organized criminal groups, stealing, robbing villages, and destroying railways in the Manchuria area. D.V. Ershov described this group of people in his works. From the perspective of the Russian Empire, Ershov found that the composition of the Honghuzi was quite complex, including criminals, exiles and deserters, as well as hunters and craftsmen. This was a great challenge to the influence of Russia in the Far East. N. D. Kuzmin served as the political commissar of the border defense of South Ussuri in 1912. In his management, he encountered unprecedented difficulties: “The border is full of chaos. This area is Honghuzi's territory, and they steal horses and cattle…… The main way for the gangsters to leave is through Hunchun, where there is a post. They can't block the bypass route in time to catch the gangsters[51, 206-217].”

Honghuzi's power once expanded to the territory of Russia. Before and after the Russo-Japanese War, Manchurian Honghuzi appeared in Vladivostok and its surrounding areas. The Petersburg newspaper reported that there were more than 700 Honghuzi in the local area. Once they were caught by locals, they will be sent to a military court for hanging. On October 3rd, 1906, two gangsters were hanged in the courtyard of Vladivostok prison. They were the first Honghuzi to be executed by the Russians. The charge was "armed robbery". After that, two gangsters were executed for pillaging. The Russians said that Honghuzi, who was executed, showed no fear in the face of death but only indifference. "By the end of the nineteenth century, unconsciously fear engulfed people. Some people began to understand Honghuzi as "any suspicious person" in the Russian sense... In other words, an undocumented Huzi is equivalent to It is based on concepts such as wanderers, thieves, robbers, murderers, etc."

The Russian government called all the forces opposing its rule in Manchuria "Honghuzi" and "Bandits", but their activities were not purely out of the pursuit of interests. The intensification of contradictions began with the Boxer Movement.

At the beginning of 1900, the Boxer Movement developed to the northeast. This gave Tsarist Russia the opportunity to embezzle Manchuria territory.

On June 20th, 1900, In a report to the czar, Russian Army Minister Kulopatkin requested "to declare in wartime", and two days later, he began to "enlist reserve officers and horses according to the No.5 mobilization order" in Blagoveshchensk. At that time, there were about 40,000 residents in this city. The Treaty of Aihui stipulated that Chinese people can "live permanently" on this land. But in July, in Blagoveshchensk happened a massacre against the Chinese. "In the village, armed Cossack residents joined the motorcade under the leadership of their chief The amur river here is over 200 meters wide and over four meters deep, with strong water flow. When the first person who entered the water drowned almost immediately, the rest refused to go to the river…… first with a whip, then at close range. Half an hour later, a large number of bodies appeared on the shore”[52,5].

In addition, in Irkutsk, Nebuchadnezzar Chu, Vladivostok, Shuangchengzi, Sakhalin Island and other areas north of Heilongjiang and east of Wusuli River, Russia launched the same massacre against local Chinese residents. According to Chinese historical records, the number of Chinese residents killed exceeded 200,000[37,353].

Honghuzi's activities during this period were organized. On June 28, 1990, the Boxer Rebellion against the Russian army reached its highest point. Their goal was to destroy the Middle East Railway, which began construction in August 1898, because this railway was considered an invasion of Chinese territory by Tsarist Russia. They first surrounded the entire city. Honghuzi cooperated with Qing soldiers and destroyed Harbin's transportation facilities and railway bridges. Subsequently, several teams crossed the Songhua River from several directions, attacked the docks occupied by the Russian army, and entered the city of Harbin. Then they attacked the railway station occupied by the Russian army and destroyed all the trains. The main leaders of the operation, Liu Yonghe and Yang Yulin, are Honghuzi. Their armed group already had a considerable scale in 1900, with nearly 10,000 members, slogans (to defend against Russian invaders and restore the country’s territory), discipline, and combat plan. They made a lot of efforts against the Russian army during the boxing campaign. Effective resistance. Obviously, this cannot be achieved by scattered armed forces.

The behavior of the Russian invaders aroused the strong anger of the local people. They organized militia to resist Russian aggression, and even patriotic officers of the Qing army stationed near Aihui joined the people's struggle against Russia. In Russian literature, "Honghuzi" does not refer to Bandit. It was used to refer to all people who violently resist the rule of Russia in Manchuria. From this point of view, the Honghuzi Movement is actually nationalistic and anti-imperialist. Under the background of Russia's occupation of Manchuria, ordinary people in Northeast China, such as farmers, hunters and workers, also became gang members because of their livelihood[52,6].

During the Boxer Movement, the Russian invaders became the object of resistance of the Northeast Boxer-the Loyalty Army. One of the most famous generals was Yang Yulin, who was once a member of the Honghuzi.

He was a bandit who used to be active in Jilin Province. In August 1900, the Russian army invaded Ninguta. After the capture of it, Yang Yulin was elected as the leader of the Honghuzi group and continued to lead the team to resist Russia. Yang and the other two Honghuzi leaders united to fight against the Russian army. In February 1901, the Russian army, led by its capitals Chalbisik and Golibals, attacked the two cities of Tonghua and Hailong, intending to eliminate the Loyalty Army in one fell swoop. Yang Yulin led the team to defend New Bimbo, relying on the strength of hundreds of Honghuzi to defeat the Russian army.

The change of situation took place after the beginning of the Russo-Japanese War. Honghuzi was no longer a simple object that needs to be obliterated. For the czar, Japan became a more important enemy in Manchuria. At this time, using Honghuzi was more useful than sweeping them off. The Russian army recruited Honghuzi to work for it in Northeast China, with the main purpose of fighting against the Japanese army and bandits recruited by the Japanese army. This unit was also known as the "*花膀子队Colored Arms Team*" because it marked the team by wrapping white cloth around its arms or shoulders. In "Huaide County Chronicle", it was recorded that Zhao Lanting, a Honghuzi in the Huaide area, was captured by Russian troops. Knowing that he was a good fighter, the Russian army asked him to lead 200 Honghuzi to help the Russian army protect the railway. In May of 1905, Russian troops led these bandits into Huaide City. After they entered the city, "robbing money and shops, the situation in the city is very critical [38,52] ". After they left, "horses along the road were robbed, and bandits in the whole territory were rampant".

Zhang Zongchang also had the experience of serving the Russian army. He later became an important general of the Republic of China. He worked as lumberjack, railway worker, and handyman in Russia. Later with other workers, he became a Honghuzi. Because of his proficiency in Russian, Zhang Zongchang was highly valued by Russian troops during the Russo-Japanese War. Russian troops gave him horses, guns and ammunition. Zhang Zongchang's team gradually expanded to a thousand people. It can be said that Zhang later became a great warlord of the Republic of China, which was closely related to the support of the early Russians. It is sure because of the struggle between Russia and Japan in Manchuria that Honghuzi became more and more rampant in Manchuria. Countless civilians joined the Honghuzi, which caused great harm to the social security in Manchuria[62,113].

### 4.2.2 Honghuzi with the Japanese Empire

While Russia intends to invade Manchuria, Japan, as an emerging Asian power, hoped to realize its "mainland policy". And monopolizing Manchuria was a necessary step. The conflict between Japan and Russia in Manchuria was inevitable. In this case, Honghuzi became part of the interests of Japan and Russia in Manchuria.

During the Russo-Japanese War, Japan invested a lot of manpower and money in Manchuria to win over the bandits in Manchuria and make them cooperate with the war. In February 1904, the military attache of the Japanese Embassy in China, Colonel Nobuzumi Aoki, gathered "mainland intellectuals" scattered in Manchuria. In fact, they were bandits. With their familiarity with the terrain and the situation, they investigated the military situation, destroyed the traffic lines, and interfered with the actions of the Russian army. In October 1904, "Japanese troops were resisted by Russian troops in Liaoyang, they used the bandits led by Feng Linge and Jin Shoushan to fight against the Russians… The Russian army had to abandon Shoushan and retreat to the north. The Russian army was defeated, and the situation of the Russo-Japanese War was thus determined[53,83]." Unlike Russia, which regards Honghuzi as" yellow peril ", Japan has understood from the very beginning that if it wanted to occupy Manchuria, it must make use of Honghuzi. "The bandits in Manchuria have a long history, and anyone who neglects them has no right to discuss Manchuria", "If we can control their leaders, it will not be difficult to have a great achievement in Manchuria[54,68]. " Using Chinese against Chinese" was Japan's means to control Northeast China. Japan always had a conciliatory attitude towards Honghuzi, and lure them with money and official positions.

The most famous Honghuzi leaders in the early years of the Republic of China, such as Feng Linge, Zhang Zuolin, and others, all experienced from Honghuzi leaders to officers, and their experience had a strong ideological influence on the bandits in Manchuria. “You can't be an official if you don't be a bandit" was a saying which once was popular in Manchuria. During the Russo-Japanese War, Feng Linge made contributions to Japan. After the war, Japan put pressure on Manchuria authorities and incorporated him into the regular troop. In 1916, he was appointed as Deputy Military Affairs Officer of Fengtian. Zhang Zuolin's experience from Red Beard to "Northeast King" was also an example. As mentioned earlier, he began to develop his own power in 1900 when Russia invaded Northeast China, and then gradually formed a Honghuzi armed group headed by him. His subordinates Zhang Zuoxiang, Zhang Jinghui, and Tang Yulin finally became generals of the army.

However, after the Mukden Incident, Japan began to accelerate the pace of its invasion of China, and the ruling institutions of the Kuomintang in Manchuria collapsed one after another, resulting in chaotic ruling order. Under this background, the Honghuzi forces began to differentiate. Quite a few joined different anti-Japanese organizations out of simple patriotism and self-defense will. *高老梯子*(gaolaotizi, high ladder), a bandit leader who used to be widely active in western Liaoning, was originally named Gao Pengzhen. In late September 1931, he organized the Northeast National Salvation Army and began to call for resistance against Japan: "The purpose of this uprising is to resist Japan and save the country, and it is not a bandit like old days. Besides collecting guns and horses from the people, we cannot rob or seize them. Now that the country is ruined, what's the use of getting rich? [55,3] "

Another example was bandit leader *老北风*(laobeifeng, wind from north), formerly known as Zhang Haitian, was also a team organized by the Anti-Japanese Volunteers, which was also first a gangster and later an anti-Japanese armed force. After Japan started its full-scale invasion of China, Zhang Haitian was very indignant. "It was the plan to get rich. But now those Japanese came in and we have lost our country and our home! If we don't fight Japan, can we still call ourselves human? [56,199]". Zhang Haitian later accepted the adaptation of Northeast People's Anti-Japanese National Salvation Association, served as the army commander of the National Salvation Association. He has been active in the anti-Japanese war on the Liaohe Riverbank of Manchuria for a long time and has set up a military factory to make weapons. He persisted in resisting Japan and became a huge threat to the Japanese. He died in Peiping after being wounded in combat in 1939[56,205].

According to statistics, in the more than one year after the Mukden Incident, 20% of the leaders of the Anti-Japanese Volunteers spontaneously organized by the masses had worked as Honghuzi [39]. In fact, many Honghuzi carried out anti-Japanese activities in the early stage of Japanese aggression. However, after the heyday in 1932, these anti-Japanese organizations gradually failed and disintegrated.

Because of the attack on Manchuria, Japan was under pressure from the international community. Internationally, Japan declared that "there are many bandits in Manchuria, endangering the lives and property of foreign nationals", and sent troops to Manchuria under the pretext of protecting nationals from various countries. In December 1931, Japan proposed at the Third Council of the League of Nations, hoping to grant Japan the "right to suppress bandits" in the Northeast of China. The Japanese government not only demanded the right to suppress bandits in accessorily but also requires that they can be legitimately suppressed in places that were not within their sphere of influence.

With the gradual consolidation of Japanese rule in Manchuria, the number of Honghuzi gradually decreased in the face of the temptation of money and continuous encirclement.

Zhang Haipeng was a Honghuzi. As early as during the Russo-Japanese War, he already led his team to help the Japanese army. After 1930, Zhang's relationship with the Japanese army became closer. The Japanese army asked him to expand his team, and the necessary funds and weapons were supplied by the Japanese. On October 24, 1931, the Japanese army gave Zhang Haipeng four vehicles of weapons and one hundred thousand yen to recruit Honhugzi to serve Japan. According to records, bandits from within Manchuria came to join Zhang Haipeng's team, and Zhang Haipeng accepted all bandit teams, regardless of the size of the team[58,52]. It can be seen that the Honghuzi recruited by the Japanese army were mostly bandits who knew Manchuria. They have a certain political tendency and often attack the anti-Japanese armed forces. Zhang Haipeng once helped Japan to attack the anti-Japanese forces of the Republic of China in the Battle of Jiangqiao in November 1931. The leader of the Anti-Japanese War in this war was the aforementioned Ma Zhanshan. The battle ended with the victory of the Japanese side.

According to the statistics of the Puppet Manchukuo, by 1940, there were about 600 bandits in Manchuria, mainly entrenched in: about 250 in Binjiang Province (now southern Heilongjiang Province), 140 in Rehe Province (now the junction of Hebei Province and Liaoning Province), 80 people in Mudanjiang Province (now southeast of Heilongjiang Province), and a small amount of the others appeared in Jinzhou, Fengtian, Jilin, and Tonghua[40, 183-184].

Although the motives and reasons of Honghuzi's anti-Japanese activities were not uniform, they stepped forward in times of national crisis, and together with other anti-Japanese teams, delayed the process of the Japanese occupation of Manchuria. These positive meanings should be affirmed. At the same time, because Honghuzi was bandits, in essence, they were less disciplined than the regular army. At the same time, they were not adequately supplied. This made them gradually eliminated or incorporated in the later period of the Anti-Japanese War[52,56].

### 4.2.3 The destruction of Honghuzi

In Manchuria, the extermination of Honghuzi by various forces never stopped. Honghuzi has been in a state of confrontation with the authorities. After the victory of the Second Sino-Japanese War, Honghuzi in Northeast China has a political color in the Communist Party of China (CPC) 's description. CPC called them "political bandits" in official documents. "These Honghuzi work for the Kuomintang, accept the appointment of the Kuomintang. They armed against the Communist Party and the People's Revolutionary Army, with the political purpose of seizing the Northeast and establishing reactionary Kuomintang rule" [72,2]. In August 1946, the Bingong District Self-Defense Force found the Kuomintang flag and the seal of the "95th Division Command of the Fourth Security Army of the Northeast Security Commander's Department" in the seized documents of bandits.[41,3] This was reflected in a report of the Northeast Bureau of the CPC Central Committee in early 1947: "After Japan surrendered, the early stage of our army's entry into the Northeast was a period of general war among bandits in the Northeast. Even the Northeast, which is famous for Honghuzi, is unprecedented in history. These bandits are essentially different from Honghuzi in the past, that is, they are all connected with the Kuomintang. They are all political bandits".

In the era when China entered the second part of the civil war, a large number of the Honghuzi armed forces in Manchuria had a legal letter of appointment issued by the Nationalist Government. The end of the Sino-Japanese War meant that there was a power vacuum in Manchuria. And both the Communist Party and the Kuomintang were concentrating their efforts on developing into Manchuria. The Kuomintang army awarded the title to the puppet Manchukuo armed forces to prevent the CPC's Liberation Army from entering the Northeast. Chiang Kai-shek, the leader of the Kuomintang, once had a rather optimistic estimate of the effectiveness of this method: "There are still more than 100,000 Japanese troops who have not disarmed in Northeast China and also more than 100,000 puppet troops. More than 200,000 troops have surrendered to the central government, ……therefore, the Communist commander could not destroy the 200,000 armed troops and occupy the northeast safely in two years. "

It can be said that Honghuzi in Manchuria became a part of China's civil war. After the People's Liberation Army entered Manchuria, it was inevitable to destroy Honghuzi in order to control Manchuria. At first, the battle against the main forces of Honghuzi started. During this period, many Honghuzi who served the Kuomintang government were annihilated. Xie Wendong, who was executed in 1946, was born in a poor family in Liaoning Province in 1887. Being hunted for involvement in the kidnapping, he took his whole family moved to Heilongjiang in 1925. In 1936, Xie Wendong joined the Northeast Anti-Japanese Allied Forces[72,5]. But in 1939, without any supplies, he chose to surrender to Japan. Soon Japan was defeated. As the Honghuzi force in Manchuria, the Kuomintang decided to recruit him and appoint him as the general commander-in-chief of the 15th Northeast Army. Actually, this rank was not worthy of the name, but it allowed Xie Wendong to be justified in Manchuria. On November 20th, 1946, Xie Wendong and his son were captured by the communist army. On December 3rd, a public trial meeting was held in Boli County, and Xie Wendong was shot after it. Sun Rongjiu, Li Huatang, and Zhang Yuxin were also Honghuzi, who had similar experiences. They were all recruited by the Kuomintang because of their influence in Manchuria. Under the siege of the Communist Party, all of them were shot after the trial[72,6-9].

By the end of August 1946, CPC had annihilated and defeated nearly 10,000 large-scale Honghuzi armed forces. The remaining Honghuzi began to disperse activities. The Northeast Bureau reported to the Central Committee of CPC that the "political bandits" in Northeast China have basically been dispersed: "In the past month, nearly 10,000 bandits have been captured, surrendered, and dispersed. There are no large bandit groups now, and all bandits have dispersed into small teams. In the future, we will mainly rely on the masses and local troops to eliminate them". So from September to December 1946, the Communist Party put forward the slogan of "combining masses with political offensive", with the focus on exterminating small groups of Honghuzi.

From the second half of 1946, the Communist Party began to carry out land reform in Manchuria. Emphasize the proposition that "every farmer should have their own land". The Northeast Bureau immediately instructed all regions to launch the struggle of reducing rent and interest and dividing grain and land. After five months of this movement, farmers gained land and began to actively participate in the struggle against bandits. Farmers began to cooperate with the army to search and report Honghuzi. Some Honghuzi had to surrender. However, there were still a few bandits hiding in the mountains.

"*座山雕*Zuoshandiao", formerly known as Zhang Leshan. As an "evil Honghuzi", the process of his annihilation was adapted into the famous novel 《*林海雪原*》. Although his influence among bandits in Manchuria was not large, from his grandfather's generation his family was already Honghuzi. During the Japanese occupation of Manchuria, many attempts to capture him were unsuccessful. After the National Government entered the Northeast, Zhang Leshan took refuge in the Kuomintang army. In February 1947, Zhang Leshan was captured. According to a report from the Northeast Daily: “Six comrades including Yang Zirong, a model combatant in a regiment in Mudanjiang Subdistrict, …on February 7th. They captured Zhang Leshan, the commander of the second detachment of the second column of the Northeast, and all his 25 subordinates alive, creating a fighting example of overcoming more numerous opponents. During the battle, they destroyed the enemy’s shackes and seized 6 rifles, 640 rounds of ammunition, and more than 500 kilograms of food[42]. " It can be seen that most Honghuzi in Manchuria lost their stronghold in towns in 1947. And turn into the ravine and dense forest. Judging from the number of seized weapons and ammunition and captured, Zhang Leshan and his bandit group were actually in a rather desperate situation before being captured[72,2].

In March and April of 1947, the Northeast Democratic Allied Forces went north along Heilongjiang(Amur River) from Aihui and eliminated more than 700 bandits in four remote country towns, including Huma, Oupu, Wuyun, and Mohe. At this point, the small Honghuzi forces in Heilongjiang Province have all been eliminated.

From September 1945 to April 1947, the campaign against Honghuzi, also known as the Campaign to suppress bandits in northeast China, lasted for 20 months. As part of the Chinese civil war, the Northeast People's Liberation Army of CPC fought 1,300 times and destroyed more than 100,000 bandits. Many Honghuzi gang leaders, as well as many Huhunzi appointed by the Kuomintang Military Commission, were arrested or killed. The powerful bandit suppression and land reform destroyed the social foundation of Honghuzi, It can be said that the disappearance of Honghuzi is closely related to the CPC's control of Northeast China (Manchuria).

# CONCLUTION

Haydamak movement among the Zaporozhian Cossacks originated in the second decade of the 18th century and was caused by, on the one hand, the forced transition of the Zaporozhian Lowland Army under the protection of the Ottoman Empire, and on the other, the elimination of Cossack rights and freedoms in Poland after 1711-1712 socio-economic oppression of the Ukrainian population of the Commonwealth by the Polish nobility. An additional reason for the intensification of the insurgent movement was the complication of the religious situation in the Right Bank of Ukraine, which consisted in the development of confrontation between the Catholic and Orthodox churches.

In the area of convergence of the borders of three countries - the Russian and Turkish empires and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, where they were imposed on the zones of collision of three major sub-civilizations - Orthodox, Islamic, and Catholic - the population was in a state of permanent war with each other. The region allowed for unlimited maneuvering in its operational space. It was there that the representatives of the traditional, predatory current of the Cossacks, the Haydamaks, were "expelled" from Zaporizhia. Attempts by the Russian government to unify all aspects of life and activity of the Zaporozhian Lowland Army, like other Cossack troops of the empire, led to dissatisfaction with the Sich gray. In search of territory virtually uncontrolled by the governments of Russia, Turkey, and Poland, it conquered the lower reaches of the Southern Bug in the 1750s, turning it into a permanent location.

Unable to suppress the Haydamaks' protests on their own, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth constantly turned to the Russian Empire for military assistance, despite the fact that it was the latter's secret policy that most contemporaries from the Polish camp considered the main cause of the Haydamak uprisings. Since the middle of the 18th century, military cooperation between the Russian, Turkish and Polish authorities has been intensified to prevent raids by Cossacks on the lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Crimean Khanate. At the same time, Russia's influence on the domestic policy of the Zaporozhian Sich was growing, as it was the Cossacks who were the main organizers of the Haydamak detachments.

Aggregate analysis of the Haydamak movement allows us to draw the following conclusions:

• Haydamak movement of the Zaporozhian Cossacks on the Polish-Russian-Turkish border throughout the XVIII century was largely due to the traditions of obtaining the so-called "Cossack bread", which developed in previous historical epochs;

• the institutionalization of Haydamak as a separate vector of military-political expeditions took place during the stay of the Zaporozhian Lowland Army in the Crimean protection, and has connections with the practices of Tatar-Nogai prey;

• Haydamak actions in many episodes were deprived of national, religious, or class (social) motivations, being a kind of social banditry;

• in some cases, such as during Koliivshchyna in 1768, Haydamak movement can be considered as a direction of military-political activity of the Zaporozhian Lowland Army, which manifested itself in the liberation movement in the Right Bank Ukraine with the involvement of wider sections of the population - peasantry and bourgeoisie;

• The fixing of the state borders of Poland, the Ottoman, and Russian empires, the introduction of the quarantine service, and the passport system at the triple border outlawed the Cossacks and contributed to its gradual extinction.

The activities of Honghuzi in Manchuria, China began in the mid-19th century. In the process of gradually becoming a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, China's traditional agricultural economy has been severely damaged. The young people who lost their land and jobs came to Manchuria, where people were sparsely populated and the government has weak control. Because of the need to survive, they joined Honghuzi and opposed the rule of the government and the authorities.

Due to the special geographical location of Manchuria, the Russian Empire and the Japanese Empire in the 19th century hoped to use this place as the first step to invade China, and thus began the struggle for power in Manchuria. By the end of the 19th century, after the Russo-Japanese War, the political situation in Manchuria had undergone tremendous changes. The Qing government's control over Manchuria declined sharply. This complicated situation provided conditions for the development of Honghuzi. The leaders of various Honghuzi groups began to strengthen their own forces and developed into large-scale armed groups. During this period, out of the pursuit of interests and future, different Honhuzi groups began to cooperate with Tsarist Russia and Japan, speeding up the imperialist aggression against China.

Japan launched a plan to invade China in the 1930s. In this historical context, Honghuzi began to undergo violent internal differentiation. Although most Honghuzi still retained the nature of predation, the complete demise and enslavement of the nation had awakened the sense of national crisis among some of them as Chinese. The military and political resistance made by Honghuzi during this period delayed Japan's "Manchurian Mongolia independence" plan.

The gradual demise of Honghuzi in the 20th century was due to the acceptance of power in the Northeast (Manchuria) by the Communist Party of China and the Kuomintang after 1945. The measures taken by the regular army to incorporate and eliminate bandits have blocked the conditions for Honghuzi to continue to develop.

The analysis of Honghuzi can draw the following conclusions:

• The Honghuzi movement was the result of the instability of Chinese society in the 19th century, the destruction of traditional economic models, and the invasion of foreign enemies. It embodies the instinct of small producers to seek survival opportunities in a harsh living environment.

• The Honghuzi movement has the nature of a national movement against imperialism under certain conditions, reflecting the awakening of personal dignity and national consciousness. For example, during the Boxer Movement in 1900, the militia organized by Honhugzi rebelled against the Russian Empire. And under the background of China's falling into a full-scale crisis after 1930, Honghuzi resisted various forms of Japanese aggression.

• The concept of Honghuzi continues to expand in development. From the small armed groups in the early stage of development to the later warlords, the vagueness of the concepts of "army" and "bandit" is the epitome of political and military activities in the Republic of China.

• The root cause of Honghuzi was that in the 19th and 20th centuries, China's political and economic long-term backwardness could not guarantee the people's most basic survival needs and life safety. With the establishment of a stable regime in the middle of the 20th century, Honghuzi also lost the foundation for development.

Both social movements - the Haydamaky and the Honghuzi - have received mixed reviews, both from contemporaries and later researchers. At the same time, they managed to form a kind of military culture, which helped them to stand on the path of resistance to feudal oppression and foreign invaders - Polish (for Haidamaks) and Russian (for Honghuzi).

Although the two groups were geographically and even temporally distant from each other, the factors that brought them to life, the notable features of their existence, have much in common in terms of social character, way of life, and the ultimate goal of their activities.

In the process of comparative comparison of the history of these two communities, we identified such unifying markers as 1) national liberation and anti-feudal orientation; 2) the peripheral nature of movements - the development on the border of the Commonwealth, Russian and Ottoman empires (Haidamaki) and possessions of the empires of Japan and Russia (Honghuzi); 3) diverse social and ethnic composition of participants; 4) the use of robbery tactics and insurgent strategy.

A detailed study of the history and motivation of both social movements allowed us to draw a general conclusion that they should be considered as a military-political reaction of the Ukrainian and Chinese people to foreign rule in the absence of their own statehood or weak state institutions.
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