



"Қазақстан және Орталық Азия тарихы институты"
жауапкершілігі шектеулі серіктестігі

Scientific Journal

"CENTRAL ASIAN COURIER"

"ОРТАЛЫҚ АЗИЯ КУРЬЕРІ"

ғылыми журналды

Научный журнал

"ЦЕНТРАЛЬНО-АЗИАТСКИЙ КУРЬЕР"

1 № 1 (2025)



EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Zhumatay Samat — General Director of the Institute of History of Kazakhstan and Central Asia (Kazakhstan).

Azmukhanova Aiman — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor (Kazakhstan).

Deputy Editor-in-Chief:

Cherepanov Konstantin — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Leading Researcher, Head of the Department of the History of Kazakhstan in the 20th Century at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology, Committee of Science, Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Kazakhstan).

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Abazov Rafis — PhD, Adjunct Professor, Columbia University; Vice-Rector for International Cooperation, Kazakh National Agrarian Research University; Director, Institute for Green and Sustainable Development; Coordinator, MBA Program.

Abdyrakhmanov Tolobek — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz Republic, Zhusup Balasagyn Kyrgyz State University (Kyrgyz Republic, Bishkek).

Abil Yerkin — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Director of the Institute of History of the State CS MES RK (Kazakhstan).

Alimbay Nursan — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology (Kazakhstan).

Auanasova Alima — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University.

Diener Alexander — Doctor of Political Science, Professor, University of Kansas, (USA).

Dzhumashev Askar — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, and Head of the Department of History at the Karakalpak Scientific Research Institute of Humanities – Karakalpak Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

Ismagulov Orazak — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the NAS of the RK under the President of the RK, Corresponding Member of Bologna Academy of Sciences, winner of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Award, Honored Worker of Science and Technology, Professor of L.N. Gumilyov University (Kazakhstan).

Kabuldinov Ziyabek — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the NAS of the RK under the President of the RK, general Director of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology SC MSHE RK (Kazakhstan).

Karasayev Gani — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Institute of State History of the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana.

Kokebayeva Gulzhaukhar — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at the Al-Farabi Kazakh National University. (Kazakhstan).

Kozhirova Svetlana — Doctor of Political Science, Professor, Co-Director of the Center for the Study of China and Central Asia of Fudan University and the International Scientific Complex of the National Company "Astana", Head of the Center for Chinese and Asian Studies (Kazakhstan).

Morrison Alexander — PhD, Professor, University of Oxford (UK).

Muminov Ashirbek — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Senior Researcher at the Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture IRCICA (İslâm Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi). (Istanbul, Turkey).

Outram Alan — Doctor of Archaeological Sciences, Professor of the Department of Archaeology and History, University of Exeter (Great Britain, Exeter).

Zharken Aigul — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University.

Shaydullaev Shapulat — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Head of the Department of the History of Uzbekistan at Termez State University.

Shinji Kato — PhD, Nara National Research Institute for Cultural Properties, Japan.

Turdaliev Cholpon — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at the American University of Central Asia.

Werner Cynthia — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Texas university (USA).

Zhomart Simtikov — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Doctor of Political Sciences, Head of the Department of Political Science and Social-Philosophical Disciplines at Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University.

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Tashbaeva Kadicha — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Head of the Department of Archaeology at the B. Dzhangerchinov Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnology of the National Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz Republic.

ACADEMIC EDITOR

Utgenov Marat — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of History, Geography and Social and Humanitarian Sciences Kokshetau University named after Sh. Ualikhanov.

Mukanova Gulnar — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor, Leading Researcher of the Astana Branch of the Ch. Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology.

TECHNICAL SECRETARY

Kopeyeva Saniya — Master's degree (Kazakhstan)

Sandybayeva Dinara — Master's degree, staff member of the Institute of the History of Kazakhstan and Central Asia (Kazakhstan)

БАС РЕДАКТОР

Жұматайұлы Самат — Қазақстан және Орталық Азия тарихы институтының бас директоры (Қазақстан).

Азмұханова Айман Махсотқызы — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор (Қазақстан).

Бас редактордың орынбасары:

Черепанов Константин Владимирович — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, жетекші ғылыми қызметкер, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының ХХ ғасырдағы Қазақстан тарихы бөлімінің меңгерушісі, (Қазақстан).

РЕДАКЦИЯЛЫҚ АЛҚА

Абазов Рафис Фанисұлы — PhD, Колумбия университетінің адъюнкт-профессоры, Қазақ ұлттық аграрлық зерттеу университетінің халықаралық ынтымақтастық жөніндегі проректоры, Жасыл және тұрақты даму институтының директоры, MBA бағдарламасының үйлестірушісі.

Абдырахманов Толобек Әбілұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Қырғыз Республикасы Ұлттық ғылым академиясының корреспондент-мүшесі, Жүсіп Баласағын атындағы Қырғыз мемлекеттік университеті (Қырғыз Республикасы, Бішкек).

Ауанасова Әлима Мүсірқызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің профессоры.

Әбіл Еркін Аманжолұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР БҒМ ҒК Мемлекет тарихы институтының директоры. (Қазақстан).

Әлімбаев Нұрсан — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының бас ғылыми қызметкері (Қазақстан).

Вернер Кунгһиа (Werner, Cynthia) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Техас университеті, (АҚШ).

Дайнер Александр (Diener Alexander) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор. Канзас университеті, (АҚШ).

Джумашев Аскар Мамбетович — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Өзбекстан Республикасының Ғылым Академиясы Қарақалпақстан бөлімшесінің Қарақалпақ гуманитарлық ғылымдар зерттеу институтының Тарих бөлімі меңгерушісі.

Жаркен Айгүл Мәлікқызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия Ұлттық университетінің профессоры.

Кожирова Светлана Басиевна — саясаттану ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Фудан Университетінің Қытай және Орталық Азияны зерттеу орталығының мен «Астана» ХҒК бірлескен директоры (Қазақстан).

Көкебаева Гүлжауһар Какенқызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті. (Қазақстан).

Қабылдинов Зиябек Ермұқанұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР Президентінің жанындағы ҰҒА академигі, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының Бас директоры (Қазақстан).

Қарасаев Ғани Мұқашұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитетінің Мемлекет тарихы институтының бас ғылыми қызметкері, Астана қ.

Моррисон Александр (Morrison Alexander) — PhD, профессор Оксфордского университета (Великобритания).

Муминов Әшірбек Құрбанұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Ислам тарихы, өнер және мәдениет ғылыми-зерттеу орталығының аға ғылыми қызметкері IRCICA – İslâm Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi. (Түркия, Стамбул қ.).

Оутрам Алан — археология ғылымдарының докторы, Эксетер университетінің археология және тарих кафедрасының профессоры (Ұлыбритания, Эксетер).

Симтиков Жомарт Құдайбергенұлы — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, саясаттану ғылымдарының докторы, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университетінің саясаттану және әлеуметтік-философиялық пәндер кафедрасының меңгерушісі.

Смағұлов Оразак Смағұлұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР Президентінің жанындағы ҰҒА академигі, Балон ғылым академиясының корр.-мүшесі, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы сыйлықтың лауреаты, ғылым мен техниканың еңбек сіңірген қайраткері, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің профессоры. (Астана, Қазақстан).

Турдалиева Чолпон Жапарбекқызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Орталық Азиядағы Американ университетінің профессоры.

Шайдуллаев Шапулат — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Термез мемлекеттік университетінің Өзбекстан тарихы кафедрасының меңгерушісі.

Шинджи Като — PhD, Народағы мәдени құндылықтардың ұлттық ғылыми-зерттеу институты (Жапония, Нара).

ЖАУАПТЫ РЕДАКТОР

Ташбаева Кадича Искандарқызы — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, Қырғыз Республикасы Ұлттық ғылым академиясы Б. Жамгерчинов атындағы Тарих, археология және этнология институтының археология бөлімінің меңгерушісі.

ҒЫЛЫМИ РЕДАКТОРЛАР

Өтегенов Марат Зеннатұлы — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, «Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Көкшетау университеті» КеАҚ тарих, география және әлеуметтік-гуманитарлық пәндер кафедрасының меңгерушісі.

Мұқанова Гүлнар Қайроллақызы — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Астана қаласындағы Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты филиалының жетекші ғылыми қызметкері.

ТЕХНИКАЛЫҚ ХАТШЫ

Копеева Сания Жұматайқызы — магистр, Қазақстан мен Орталық Азия тарихы институтының қызметкері (Қазақстан)

Сандыбаева Динара Маратқызы — магистр, Қазақстан мен Орталық Азия тарихы институтының қызметкері (Қазақстан)

ГЛАВНЫЙ РЕДАКТОР

Жуматай Самат — Генеральный директор Института истории Казахстана и Центральной Азии (Казахстан)

Азмуханова Айман Махсотовна — кандидат исторических наук, ассоциированный профессор (Казахстан)

Заместитель главного редактора:

Черепанов Константин Владимирович — кандидат исторических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник, заведующий отделом истории Казахстана XX века Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. КН МНВО РК (Казахстан)

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ

Абазов Рафис Фанисович — PhD, адъюнкт-профессор Колумбийского университета, проректор по международному сотрудничеству Казахского национального аграрного исследовательского университета, директор Института зеленого и устойчивого развития, координатор программы МВА.

Абдырахманов Толобек Абилович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, член-корреспондент НАН КР, Кыргызский государственный университет им. Жусупа Баласагына (Кыргызская Республика, г. Бишкек).

Абиль Еркин Аманжолович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, Институт истории государства КН МНВО РК (Казахстан).

Алимбай Нурсан — кандидат исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова КН МНВО РК (Казахстан).

Ауанасова Алима Мусировна — доктор исторических наук, профессор, Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева.

Вернер Синтия (Werner Cynthia) — доктор исторических наук, профессор. Техасский университет (США).

Дайнер Александр (Diener Alexander) — доктор исторических наук, профессор. Канзасский университет (США).

Джумашев Аскар Мамбетович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, заведующий отделом истории Каракалпакского научно-исследовательского института гуманитарных наук (Каракалпакское отделение Академии наук Республики Узбекистан).

Жаркен Айгуль Маликовна — доктор исторических наук, профессор Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилёва.

Исмагулов Оразак Исмагулович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК при Президенте РК, член-корр. Болонской академии наук, лауреат премии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова, заслуженный деятель науки и техники, профессор Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева (Казахстан).

Кабульдинов Зиябек Ермуханович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК при Президенте РК, Генеральный директор Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова КН МНВО РК (Казахстан).

Карасаев Гани Мукашевич — доктор исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории государства Комитета науки Министерство Науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан, г. Астана.

Като Синдзи (Shinji Kato) — PhD, Национальный научно-исследовательский институт культурных ценностей в Наре (Япония, г. Нара).

Кожирова Светлана Басиевна — доктор политических наук, профессор, содиректор Центра исследования Китая и Центральной Азии Фуданьского Университета и МНК «Астана», руководитель Центра китайских и азиатских исследований (Казахстан).

Кокебаева Гульжаухар Какеновна — доктор исторических наук, профессор Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби. (Казахстан).

Моррисон Александр (Morrison Alexander) — PhD, профессор Оксфордского университета (Великобритания).

Муминов Аширбек Курбанович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, старший научный сотрудник Исследовательского центра исламской истории, искусства и культуры IRCICA – İslâm Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi. (Турция, г. Стамбул).

Оутрам Алан — доктор археологических наук, профессор департамента археологии и истории университета Эксетере (Великобритания, г. Эксетер).

Симтиков Жомарт Кудайбергенович — кандидат исторических наук, доктор политических наук, заведующий кафедрой политологии и социально-философских дисциплин Казахского национального педагогического университета имени Абая.

Турдалиева Чолпон Джапарбековна — доктор исторических наук, профессор Американского университета в Центральной Азии.

Шайдуллаев Шапулат — доктор исторических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой истории Узбекистана Термезского государственного университета.

ОТВЕТСТВЕННЫЙ РЕДАКТОР

Ташбаева Кадича Искандаровна — кандидат исторических наук, Заведующая отделом археологии Института истории, археологии и этнологии им. Б. Джамгерчинова Национальной академии наук Кыргызской Республики.

НАУЧНЫЕ РЕДАКТОРЫ

Утегенов Марат Зенатович — кандидат исторических наук, ассоциированный профессор, заведующий кафедрой истории, географии и социально-гуманитарных наук НАО «Кокшетауский университет имени Ш. Уалиханова».

Муканова Гюльнар Кайроллиновна — кандидат исторических наук, профессор, ведущий научный сотрудник филиала в г. Астана Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова.

ТЕХНИЧЕСКИЙ СЕКРЕТАРЬ

Копеева Саня Жуматаевна — магистр, сотрудник Института истории Казахстана и Центральной Азии (Казахстан)

Сандыбаева Динара Маратовна — магистр, сотрудник Института истории Казахстана и Центральной Азии (Казахстан)



Published in the Republic of Kazakhstan
Scientific Journal
“Central Asian courier”
Has been issued as a journal since 2025
ISSN 3105-241X.
Vol. 1. Is. 1, pp. 139-152, 2025
Journal homepage: <https://sjcacious.com/>

FTAXP / МРПТИ / IRSTI 03.20
https://doi.org/10.64970/3105-241X_2025_1_1_139-152

THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL INTELLECTUALS IN THE POLICY OF NATIONAL TERRITORIAL DELIMITATION

*Khassanayeva L.M.*¹

¹Kazakh National University named after Al-Farabi
Almaty, Kazakhstan

Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7845-5916>. E-mail: leila.maralovna@gmail.com

© Institute of History of Kazakhstan and Central Asia, 2025

© Khassanayeva L.M., 2025

Abstract. After the final victory of the Soviet power, namely in the twenties, the attempt to achieve the liberation of a Unified Turkestan continued within the framework of the Soviet power from the part of the intellectuals of the nation. The Soviet government, which came to power after the victory in the October Revolution, declared that it would grant the Kazakh people the right to self-government, equality of nations, political and socio-economic independence. The people of the region began to look at this situation from the point of view of their freedom and create autonomy. While, the question of national-state structure was increasingly discussed, and the Bolshevik Party proclaimed the equality and sovereignty of the peoples who inhabited Russia, as well as their right to create an independent state and secede from Russia, as the main principles of national policy. However, this action had a declarative character to the creation of Soviet national republics. A convincing proof of this was that the participants of the Alash, who came up with the idea of national statehood, rejected the October Revolution and the creation of the Kazakh statehood on the Soviet basis, were subjected to resistance from the Soviet government. At the same time, in such a political environment, the struggle of leading figures continued in the name of national interests. Serving the Soviet government, they sought to turn it into the power of the local people. The struggle against the idea of national statehood started in the early twentieth century by A. Bukeikhanov, M. Shokai, and A. Baitursynov yielded results. Since the establishment of Soviet power, the struggle of T. Ryskulov, I. Mustanbayev, S. Saduakasov, S. Kozhanov, Zh. Mynbayev is considered as an activity aimed at ensuring the integrity of the Kazakh land.

Keywords: National intelligentsia, Soviet power, national policy, territorial delimitation, Alash, Kazakh autonomy

For citation: Khassanayeva L.M. The role of the national intellectuals in the policy of national territorial delimitation // Scientific Journal “Central Asian courier”. 2025. Vol. 1. No. 1. Pp. 139-152. (In Eng.). DOI: 10.64970/3105-241X_2025_1_1_139-152

ҰЛТТЫҚ ЗИЯЛЫЛАРДЫҢ ҰЛТТЫҚ-АУМАҚТЫҚ МЕЖЕЛЕУ САЯСАТЫНДАҒЫ РӨЛІ

Хасанаева Лейла Мараловна¹

¹Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті

Алматы, Қазақстан

Тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7845-5916>. E-mail: leila.maralovna@gmail.com

Аңдатпа. Кеңес өкіметінің түпкілікті жеңісінен кейін, яғни жиырманшы жылдары ұлттық зиялылар тарапынан Кеңес өкіметінің аясында Біртұтас Түркістанды азат етуге ұмтылыс жалғасты. Қазан төңкерісіндегі жеңістен кейін билікке келген Кеңес өкіметі қазақ халқына өзін-өзі басқару, ұлттардың теңдігі, саяси және әлеуметтік-экономикалық дербестік құқығын береміз деп жариялады. Аймақ халқы бұл жағдайды өз еркіндігі тұрғысынан қабылдап, автономия құруға кірісті. Осы уақытта ұлттық-мемлекеттік құрылым мәселесі жиі талқыланып, большевиктер партиясы Ресей халықтарының теңдігі мен егемендігін, сондай-ақ олардың тәуелсіз мемлекет құрып, Ресейден шығу құқығын ұлттық саясаттың басты қағидасы ретінде жариялады. Алайда бұл іс-әрекеттер кеңестік ұлттық республикалар құруда декларативті сипатта болды. Мұның айқын дәлелі – ұлттық мемлекеттік идеяны алға тартқан «Алаш» қайраткерлері Қазан төңкерісін және кеңестік негізде қазақ мемлекеттілігін құруды қабылдамай, кеңес билігінің қарсылығына тап болды. Соған қарамастан, осындай саяси жағдайда ұлттық мүдде жолындағы күрес жалғасты. Кеңес билігіне қызмет ете жүріп, олар оны жергілікті халықтың билігіне айналдыруға ұмтылды. XX ғасырдың басында А. Бөкейханов, М. Шоқай, А. Байтұрсынов бастаған ұлттық мемлекеттік идеясына қарсы күрес нәтижесін берді. Кеңес өкіметі орнағаннан кейін Т. Рысқұлов, І. Мұстанбаев, С. Сәдуақасов, С. Қожанов, Ж. Мынбаевтың қызметі қазақ жерінің тұтастығын қамтамасыз етуге бағытталған әрекет ретінде бағаланады.

Түйін сөздер: Ұлттық зиялы қауым, кеңес өкіметі, ұлттық саясат, аумақтық межелеу, Алаш, қазақ автономиясы

Дәйексөз үшін: Хасанаева Л.М. Ұлттық зиялылардың ұлттық-аумақтық межелеу саясатындағы рөлі // Scientific Journal “Central Asian courier”. 2025. Т. 1. № 1. 139-152 бб. (Ағылш.). DOI: 10.64970/3105-241X_2025_1_1_139-152

РОЛЬ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ИНТЕЛЛИГЕНЦИИ В ПОЛИТИКЕ НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-ТЕРРИТОРИАЛЬНОГО РАЗМЕЖЕВАНИЯ

Хасанаева Лейла Мараловна¹

¹Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби

Алматы, Казахстан

Кандидат исторических наук, доцент

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7845-5916>. E-mail: leila.maralovna@gmail.com

Аннотация. После окончательной победы Советской власти, а именно в двадцатые годы, в рамках советской системы продолжались попытки со стороны национальной интеллигенции добиться освобождения Единого Туркестана. Советское правительство, пришедшее к власти после победы Октябрьской революции, заявило, что предоставит казахскому народу право на самоуправление, равенство наций, политическую и социально-экономическую независимость. Население региона восприняло эту ситуацию как возможность к обретению свободы и созданию автономии. В то же время всё чаще обсуждался вопрос национально-

государственного устройства, а большевистская партия провозгласила равенство и суверенитет народов, населявших Россию, а также их право на создание независимого государства и выход из её состава в качестве главных принципов национальной политики. Однако данные декларации носили формальный характер при создании советских национальных республик. Убедительным доказательством этого стало то, что деятели «Алаша», выступившие с идеей национальной государственности, отвергли Октябрьскую революцию и создание казахской государственности на советской основе, подверглись сопротивлению со стороны советской власти. Вместе с тем в сложившейся политической среде борьба ведущих фигур продолжалась во имя национальных интересов. Служа советской власти, они стремились превратить её в власть местного народа. Борьба против идеи национальной государственности, начатая в начале XX века А. Букейхановым, М. Шокайем, А. Байтурсыновым, принесла свои результаты. С момента установления Советской власти деятельность Т. Рыскулова, И. Мустанбаева, С. Садуакасова, С. Кожанова, Ж. Мынбаева рассматривается как стремление обеспечить целостность казахской земли.

Ключевые слова: Национальная интеллигенция, советская власть, национальная политика, территориальное размежевание, Алаш, казахская автономия

Для цитирования: Хасанаева Л.М. Роль национальной интеллигенции в политике национально-территориального размежевания // Scientific Journal "Central Asian courier". 2025. Т. 1. № 1. С. 139-152. (На Англ.). DOI: 10.64970/3105-241X_2025_1_1_139-152

Introduction. The establishment of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the rank of a National secular and legal state recognized by the international community was the result of the national liberation struggle of the Kazakh people against colonialism and the totalitarian system for centuries, the struggle aimed at national statehood. In connection with the independence of Kazakhstan, it became possible to rethink and study historical events in the direction of new historical knowledge and on the basis of new data. Self-knowledge of the people in the national history is carried out in the course of studying complex state processes. As you know, this happens through the activities of the national intellectuals, which explores and illuminates the historical reality. Representatives of the advanced intellectuals have always been leaders in saving the Kazakh people from colonial oppression, in the struggle for the national liberation movement, in the struggle for independence. One of the main goals set by the Kazakh intellectuals was the issue of statehood.

Were there methods of struggle for statehood in the activities of the nation's public intellectuals, or were there methods of a different approach used by political groups in the struggle for patriotism, the national liberation movement? Finding answers to such questions is necessary for a full understanding and comprehension of the tasks facing us at the present stage, in the historical period in which we live. Such intellectuals of the nation as T. Ryskulov, S. Kozhanov, S. Saduakasov, and S. Korzhanov considered the ways of implementing the National State Idea, which ensures the civilizational development of the nation in the system of Bolshevism. Mendeshev, Zh. Mynbayev.

The main part. After the final victory of the Soviet power, namely in the twenties, the attempt to achieve the liberation of a Single Turkestan continued within the framework of the Soviet power.

The Soviet government, which came to power after the victory in the October Revolution, declared that it would grant the Kazakh people the right to self-government, equality of nations, political and socio-economic independence. The people of the region began to look at this situation from the point of view of their freedom and create autonomy. While, the question of national-state structure was increasingly discussed, and the Bolshevik Party proclaimed the equality and sovereignty of the peoples who inhabited Russia, as well as their right to create an independent state and secede from Russia, as the main principles of national policy. However, this action had a declarative character to the creation of Soviet national republics.

A convincing proof of this was that the participants of the Alash, who came up with the idea of national statehood, rejected the October Revolution and the creation of the Kazakh statehood on the Soviet basis, were subjected to resistance from the Soviet government. At the same time, in such a

political environment, the struggle of leading figures continued in the name of national interests. Serving the Soviet government, they sought to turn it into the power of the local people.

On the eve of the October Revolution, most of the Kazakh-Kyrgyz peoples who inhabited the Syrdarya, Zhetysu, Ferghana, Samarkand and Transcaspian regions were part of the Turkestan Region. The newly formed government-the Turkestan Council of People's Commissars - did not take into account the interests of local peoples, did not try to solve the problem of statehood, which had worsened in the country. In connection with this issue, G. Safarov made a report "The Colonial Revolution. (The experience of Turkestan): Already in the first days of the revolution, the Soviet power in Turkestan was established as the power of the Russian workers. The view that the only bearer of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Turkestan can only be Russian, there is still a national inequality between Europeans and Muslims" (Safarov, 1996).

Speaking at the extraordinary VIIIth Congress of Soviets of the Turkestan Republic, held in March 1919 on the national question, Extraordinary Commissioner P. A. Kobozev said: "... in the context of autonomy, 95 percent of the population here are Muslims, but the majority in the authorities are Russians", as well as in the summer of 1919, the plenipotentiary representative of the CEC of the RSFSR U. Shakirov in a letter to the Deputy People's Commissar of the RSFSR for Nationalities S. S. Pestkovsky pointed out: "the current government of Turkestan, as a result of its criminal actions against the Crimeans, subjected them to complete poverty and brought them to 60% death, which had not been heard of before" (PA RK. F. 140. Op. 1. D. 9. L. 30).

Therefore, depending on the political situation on the ground, it was necessary to create a political and state structure that protects the national interests of the peoples, there was a fair action on the part of the national elite.

In the 20-30s of the twentieth century, one of the political figures was T. Ryskulov, who became a person of the highest level in the history of the peoples of Kazakhstan and Central Asia. In the twenties, he fought for the political independence of the Turkic peoples. The activity of T. Ryskulov in the Turkestan Republic is mainly a period of the embodiment of the Turkic idea and the struggle for its implementation.

"According to the decision adopted by the First Congress of Communist organizations of the Peoples of the East and approved by the VIIIth Congress of the RCP (b), the second Conference of the RCP, held in Tashkent from March 14 to 31, 1919, decided to establish a Muslim bureau under the Central Committee of the RCP, T. Ryskulov was elected Chairman" (Nurpeisov, 1995).

The Muslim Bureau was the active supreme governing body of the Muslim organizations of the RCP (b) in the Turkestan Region. During this period, local organizations of the Musbureau were established in all regions, counties and cities of the Turkestan Republic. Along with organizing the activities of the Musbureau, T. Ryskulov was engaged in solving socio-political, socio-economic, cultural and everyday problems of the Turkestan Republic.

In the spring of 1919, in the Ferghana region of the Turkestan Republic, the solution of the national question became more complicated. This was facilitated by the fact that the Soviet government in the winter of 1918 defeated the "Kokand Autonomy" with its armed forces and those who supported it were subjected to mass brutal destruction (Izvestija TurkCIKa, 1920). After this situation, the local population, dissatisfied with the criminal actions of the new government, began to unite in the Basmach movement, which began to develop in the country. Over time, the number of participants in the movement grew, it turned into an armed army, and the movement acquired a nationwide, national liberation character.

T. Ryskulov deeply understood the essence of the Basmach movement in Ferghana. He organized a meeting at which the political and social status of the Ferghana region was discussed. T. Ryskulov visited many cities and settlements of the region, where he told the local population about the activities of the Musbureau. At the insistence of the Musbureau, on April 29, 1919, the Turkatcom appointed a new commission related to the Ferghana region and approved its composition. The commission consisted of the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the Turkestan Republic K. S. Sorokin, the chairman of the Musbureau T. Ryskulov, chairman of the Turkatkom of

the People's Commissariat for Ethnic Affairs and several representatives of the regional party committee (PA RK. F. 140. Op. 1. D. 9. L. 30).

Based on the actions of the Ferghana Commission, the city-county executive committees were abolished, and revkoms were organized instead. Muslim organizations have appeared in the Ferghana region.

T. Ryskulov, persistently defending the issues of freedom of the nation, self-flagellation, conducted propaganda work among the local Muslim peoples. He was also busy attracting their representatives to political activities, to the management of the country in the new conditions. The section in which the Musbureau united the Muslim members of the Turkestan Communist Party, by the end of 1919, began to gradually turn into a state structure. In the construction of the state, the proportion of representatives of the nation has increased.

On October 8, 1919, the central authorities, fearing the political authority of T. Ryskulov and the Musbureau headed by him, created a commission on Turkestan affairs in Turkestan to implement the great Russian chauvinist policy. It consisted of Sh.Z. Eliava, M.V. Frunze, V.V. Kuibyshev, F.M. Goloshchekin and Ya.E. Rudzutak (Izvestija TurkCIKa, 1920).

The main task of the Turkestan commission was to establish the principles of communism in Turkestan, which, regardless of the peculiarities of the living conditions of the indigenous peoples, tried to forcibly impose on the Turkestan people the communist measures carried out in Central Russia. In the question of the nation, there was no confidence in the self-determination of the representatives of the local nationality.

Under these conditions, the Musbureau headed by T. Ryskulov, in order to exercise the sovereignty of the local peoples of the Turkestan Republic, due to the fact that the majority of the population are Turkic-speaking peoples, established itself in the creation of the national state "Republic of the Turkic Peoples". At this time, T. Ryskulov considered the "Turkic idea" and fought for its concrete implementation.

On January 17, 1920, at a joint meeting of the members of the regional committee of the party, the Muslim Bureau and the Committee of Foreign Communists and the Turkcomission, a demand was put forward that the upcoming V Conference of the Communist Party and the conference of the Musbureau should resolve two main issues about the fate of the national sections of the Turkestan Autonomy and the Communist Party (Koigeldiev, 1997).

The proposal of T. Ryskulov was adopted by a majority of votes at the V Conference of the TCP and the III extraordinary conference of the Musbureau, which was held in Tashkent from January 20 to 26, 1920. The Turkestan Republic was renamed the "Turkic Soviet Republic", and political power was concentrated in the hands of the Communist Party, the only political party in the republic, but after the party was renamed the "Communist Party of the Turkic Peoples". But, although the idea of T. Ryskulov on the national question was supported by the delegates of the conference, he met with opposition from the Turkic Commission of the Central Committee of the RCP (b). At the meeting of the Turkic Commission, which was held on February 23, 1920 in full, the decisions of the V Conference of the RCP M. V. Frunze and the III Moscow Conference are considered as decisions of "pan-Turkism", "pan-Islamism" and "bourgeois nationalism" (Qongyratbaev, 1994). As a result, Turar Ryskulov's proposal to resolve the national issue was rejected.

The persistent struggle of the Turkestan Republic for the creation of a national state of the Turkic-speaking peoples and for the political and state sovereignty of the Turkestan Republic did not stop there. Turar Ryskulov continued to struggle with national problems, which became the main goal of his socio-political and state activities. He made an effort to democratically embody the party slogan of "the right of nations to self-government".

On June 29, 1920, the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the RCP(b), guided by the instructions of V. I. Lenin, adopted resolutions "on our duties in Turkestan", "on the organization of power in Turkestan, on the party structure in Turkestan" and approved the instructions of the Turkic Commission (CSA RU. F. 17. Op. 1. D. 277. L. 81).

These resolutions of the committee became known as "on the main tasks of the RCP(b) in Turkestan". In it, the delegation of the Turkestan Republic put forward the following demands: the

abolition of the Turkic Commission, the transfer of power in Turkestan to the congress of regional Councils, the Turkish CEC and the Council of People's Commissars, the sovereignty of the Turkestan Republic, the restoration of the statehood of the Turkic-speaking peoples of Turkestan, the recruitment of the national armed force by the local population, the presence of representatives of the Turkestan Republic in the government of the RSFSR.

In June 1920, Turar Ryskulov demanded the political independence of the Turkic peoples. June 16, 1920 in connection with the "initial essay of theses on the nation and colonies", dedicated to the II Congress of the Communist International of V. I. Lenin (Lenin, 1970), national figures of the Bashkir, Tatar and Kyrgyz (Kazakh) republics send a letter to V. I. Lenin, based on his proposals and comments (Lenin, 1970).

The original letter contains the signatures of T. Ryskulov and N. Khodzhaev from the Turkestan Republic, A. Baitursynov and A. Ermekov from Kazakhstan, Z. Validov and H. Yumagulov from Bashkortostan. In this document, signed by T. Ryskulov, national figures emphasize: "all this tragedy can be solved only in one case: if the workers of these puppet republics created in the east of Russia are given the opportunity to show their initiative in the party, economic and military spheres. We need help, but let there be no violence" (Lenin, 1970).

We can say that these questions raised by T. Ryskulov in 1920 echo the demands of the leaders of the Alash party and M. Shokai. He intended to create a political-state sovereign republic in Turkestan and develop a separate Basic Law of the Republic - the Constitution.

In addition, he said that all laws in the state are made on the basis of the Constitution. It was proposed to trust the representatives of the local nation, transfer the levers of power to the local population, form national armed forces that protect independence, and train national specialists. The central authorities, seeing in such proposals of T. Ryskulov "bourgeois nationalism", did not allow it to be realized. Turar Ryskulov, who failed to convey his point of view on national issues to the Central Committee of the RCP(b), relinquished all his powers on July 22, 1920. The Turkkommission, which has become the center and its issuing body, passes directly to the Administration of the Turkestan Republic. The political activities of Turar Ryskulov were accused of "nationalism", "pan-Turkism", "ryskulovism", and his views and proposals were criticized with distortion.

Events in this direction both in the Turkestan ASSR (1918) and in the Kazakh ASSR (1920) explained that the demand for the unification of the Kazakhs into a single state was the main issue on the agenda. In the source of the Central Committee of the RCP(b) On March 8, 1920, it was established that Soviet Turkestan is an autonomous republic of the main indigenous peoples: Turkmens, Uzbeks, and Kirghiz, divided into regions according to modern national groupings (Izvestija TurkCIKa, 1920).

At that time, Kazakhs made up 19.3% of the local population of the Turkestan ASSR (Aq Zhol, 1922). Many of them settled in Zhetysu and Syrdarya regions.

On June 13, 1920, V. I. Lenin presented his comments on the draft decision on the tasks of the Central Committee of the RCP (b) in Turkestan, in which he proposed, firstly, to draw up a differentiated map of Turkestan into Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan; secondly, to more fully define the conditions for including or excluding these three parts (Lenin, 1970). In addition, he later stressed that it should not be decided in advance whether to divide the republic into three parts" (Aq Zhol, 1922).

Also in the report on the "project of the Orenburg province of the RSFSR" according to the documents stored in the archival funds, the Akbulak, Sazdinsky, Astrakhan, Novo-Aleksevsky, Lunacharsky, Ashysaysky, Ileksky, Markutsky uyezds of the Aktobe province and Antonovsky, Zhitikarinsky, Adamovsky, etc. were to be included on the issue under consideration. counties of Kostanay province. Aitiev's report related to the Omsk Uyezd states that "the borders established by the Siberian chairman for the Omsk Uyezd grossly violate the establishment of borders built on the territorial principle of the KSSR" (QROrMA, F. 5, Op. 6, D. 14, L. 12).

The national political elite appreciated the approach in this direction as a way to create a national unified state. Therefore, the first conditions began to be created between Kazakhstan and the Turkestan republics in order to come to an agreement, to unity. At the end of 1917 and the beginning of 1918, the problem of statehood resumed in the renewed historical conditions. The search and study

of archival materials and data about this complex process, which has not yet been studied in depth and systematically, is the duty of historians in the future.

Along with archival documents of the period, articles published in the press can serve as a valuable source. For example, Sultanbek Kozhanov's article "Kyrgyz-Kazakh unity and politicism" states: "In 1920, a meeting of the Kyrgyz-Kazakh poor was held in Aulieata on the issue of individual unification and, taking into account the final unification of the Kyrgyz-Kazakh people on both sides, the Kyrgyz-Kazakh peasantry should conduct their respective peasant affairs in the same way; Let the Turkestan Kyrgyz-Kazakhs join Kazakhstan, but until the land reform is carried out, so that there is no unrest, the time of joining will not be openly discussed, and its decision is again published by the resolution of the general meeting of the Central Executive Committee of Kazakhstan " (Aq Zhol, 1922).

The document, which considered ways to solve this problem at that time, noted that "the division of one territory into two parts from the point of view of the common economy and industrial relations between the modern KSSR and the TSR, which divided the Single national body of the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) people, does not allow creating normal conditions for cultural and economic development" (QROrMA, F. 5, Op. 6, D. 14, L. 12).

In fact, this issue, initiated in Aulieata, was included in the agenda of the General Meeting of the Central Executive Committee of Kazakhstan, opened at the end of February 1922, and proved the need for another issue of joining the two regions to Kazakhstan. Well aware of the difficulty of this work, Sultanbek Kozhanov discusses this issue in detail in his article "Kyrgyz-Kazakh unity". "It makes no sense to talk for a long time and talk all the time about whether the two Kyrgyz-Kazakh regions should finally connect with Kazakhstan. There is a lot of evidence that the Kyrgyz-Kazakh people should unite, become one republic and enter the Russian Federation among other national states, both in terms of life, culture, language, and market. No one is arguing with this, and there is no room for excitement, (Aq Zhol, 1924) - the questions that really stand behind this: when to unite? how to unite?

One of the actual problems that worried the Kazakh intellectuals of that time. The land question and politics. Because at that time, colonialism in Kazakhstan was of an exploitative nature, and in the propaganda of the destruction of the Kazakhs, unusual methods of disguise began to be created. Mustafa Shokai, a representative of the Kazakh political elite, proved this far-sighted in his time.

In the critical analysis of large-scale socio-economic practices, such as land and water reform, localization of the state apparatus and other issues implemented by the Soviet government in Turkestan in the 20-30s, Mustafa Shokai and his publications played the most active role, as evidenced by the famous historian M. Koigeldiev in his works (Koigeldiev, 1997). This served as the basis for new research directions, as a new approach in the history of Kazakhstan.

By the decision of the Bureau of the Kazakh Regional Committee of the Party of June 10, 1925, following the instructions of I. Stalin and the Central Committee of the RCP (b), letters were sent to the provincial committees about the leadership of the national press and the procedure for using the intellectuals in it, which was absent from the National Party. Local party organizations were instructed to strengthen the activities of the propaganda departments to manage the local press.

As a result of these actions, the policy of displacement the most experienced and patriotic groups of the intellectuals from active socio-political activity, their conscious opposition to the people, and involving only those who are ready or internally willing to serve in accordance with the instructions of the center in the highest level of party and state power has intensified. This was a new stage of delusion from the historical path of the Kazakh people. Previously, the intelligentsia represented the national, general democratic interests, now this right has passed to the party, nomenklatura intellectuals, which has taken the position of the central bodies. It was at this critical hour for the fate of the republic that F. I. Goloshchekin was appointed the first head.

The appointment of F. Goloshchekin as the first secretary of the Kazakh regional party committee was not accidental. He showed in himself the highest model of the Stalinist understanding of the national question, adhering to two mutually exclusive principles: the individual division of peoples and the idea of a centralized state. The first head of Kazakhstan, who meets all the

requirements of the unified statehood being created, was tasked with creating a state apparatus in the republic that is able to promptly and strictly fulfill the wishes of the center.

On the way to this goal, the groups led by F. Goloshchekin the national intellectuals, especially those who were not members of the party and were internally opposed to it, tried to restrain their resistance. I. Stalin, often meeting with the Kazakh intellectuals, realizing its requirements for building a national state, saw in the actions of some national figures a split of the "bourgeois" intellectuals. Therefore, Stalin, believing that these "bourgeois intellectuals" should not contribute to the development of Kazakh society, set Goloshchekin the task of fighting against them. He began a campaign of mass punishment of the Kazakh intellectuals under the leadership of the party, using a hypocritical slanderous approach to finally consolidate the power of the Soviets and thereby isolate the Kazakh masses from the influence of the Alash intellectuals, to achieve this goal "sparing no effort and not stopping before the victims" (Aq Zhol, 1922).

The documentary evidence of the time clearly proves this political process. For example, the charges of the NKVD officers against national figures were as follows:" S. Mendeshov from 1918 participated in the bourgeois-nationalist organization called Alash-Orda, actively fought against the Soviet government, participated in the armed uprising on the Bukeev steppe, then joined the bourgeois-nationalist organization. The purpose of this organization is to separate Kazakhstan from the USSR".

And the accusation against Turar Ryskulov was brought in 1919 against an anti-Soviet Turkish organization called "it is It-Va-Tarraki". This organization aimed to create a bourgeois-nationalist state, separating the Turkestan region from the Soviet power.

Even worse was the accusation against I. Mustambayev: "In 1932, in Almaty, together with D. Abikeyev, who was opposed to the Soviet government, an" initiative group "of counter-revolutionary-nationalist youth (the"Initiative Group") was formed. This group, fighting against the Soviet government, set itself the task of creating an independent Kazakh democratic republic and saving the Kazakh people from the blockade by the Bolsheviks and Moscow" (QR ŪQK DA, D. 010237).

From the following such document follows the accusation against Oraz Zhandosov: "since 1928, the counter-revolutionary bourgeois-nationalist KazSSR overthrew the Soviet government and separated from the USSR and became part of the Japanese state. At the same time, in order to achieve these actions in the Chui region, he led an organization against the heads of the CPSU(b) and the Soviet government" (QR ŪQK DA, D. 04657).

It is easy to guess that F. I. Goloshchekin intended to change the "international" composition of the people of Kazakhstan. The policy of settlement of Stolypin Russia, which continued in the Soviet era, had a result. Kazakhs with a specific weight of 81.7 percent in 1897 declined to 58 percent in 1925. The backward feudal patriarchy, under the guise of an economic region, began to implement the principle of internationalism about the need for Proletarian leadership. This ideology was the basis for the promotion of the position on the Soviet Union at the legislative level in Kazakhstan of the party and Soviet leadership and representatives of other nationalities. Thus, according to incomplete data in 1925, the number of Kazakhs in the ranks of the RCP(b) was 9462 people (according to other data-6645 people), or only 34 percent of the total number of Communists in the republic (Kommunisticheskaja partija Kazahstana, 1990).

During this period, some methods of work were developed among Kazakh activists. For the head of the center, the most correct method was to ignite butt quarrels and use them logically. The inability to foresee the remoteness and weakness of the consolidating factors within the nation, the concentration of real power in the central bodies of Moscow created favorable conditions for the escalation of such a negative phenomenon.

Sultanbek Kozhanov, pointing to these circumstances, writes in his letter to Stalin: "the objective situation when a regional worker comes makes him an ordinary, heartless colonial official, and he feels himself the will of the entire center, considers himself above criticism, and also slanders, complains about higher bodies and persons, that is, in the hierarchy of leadership, so as not to hinder his "creation".

To descend from the height of one's position, to reckon with the lower organizations, the masses, to periodically check one's "presence of sin" in life, within the fundamentally permissible limits, does not even think about it" (Qongyratbaev, 1994).

Sultanbek Kozhanov showed that under these conditions, support for the escalation of the split became a legitimate approach to party work in Kazakhstan:" comrade Yezhov and Naneishvili would have talked a lot about this, because at that time all their leading influence was based primarily on taking into account the differentiation of groups and the ability to logically "unite groups" (QRPA. F. 141. Op. 1. D. 1129. L. 85–86).

Goloshchekin, although he spoke in his speeches about the need to suppress the group struggle, actually provoked it, and its outcome, firstly, for the benefit of himself and the weakening of the positions of patriotic forces against the center; secondly, as T. Ryskulov noted at the time, for pressure on any self-criticism and diverting public attention from the disclosure of numerous mistakes in politics by party organizations (QRPA. F. 141. Op. 1. D. 5792. L. 282).

The reliability of this opinion is also evidenced by historical data. From the first day of his tenure as the first head of Kazakhstan until his departure, Goloshchekin fought against the national intellectuals, primarily against its individuals, relying on this method of work.

Upon arrival in Kyzylorda in September 1928, Goloshchekin announced the existence of a group opposing him, which opposes his appointment as the head of the Kazakh regional party committee, which is headed by the second secretary of the party organization of the Republic S. Kozhanov and includes the editor-in-chief of "Enbekshi-Kazakh" Smagul Saduakasov and the chairman of the KazCEC Zhalau Mynbayev. But in fact, there was not a single opposing group of Goloshchekin among the national intelligentsia. The spread of such rumors was necessary for him, first of all, to persecute the most influential and capable figures in the leadership of the republic: with this approach, it was clear that he was using a slanderous approach to Sultanbek Kozhanov, a true supporter of the fight against colonialism, widely recognized during the land and water reform in Turkestan in 1921-1923.

F. Goloshchekin, who later arrived in Moscow as the first secretary of the Kazakh regional party committee, dismissed S. Kozhanov from his post and sent him to Moscow at the disposal of the Central Committee. Yezhov came in his place, and before moving to work in Moscow, he was the chief adviser to his first secretary. S. Kozhanov himself understood perfectly well what was hidden behind such substitutions. This was one of the methods of combating nationalist figures in the republic at that time.

From the point of view of historical justice: first, with the appointment of the first head of the representative of another nation of the Kazakh autonomy, proclaimed in the concept of the intelligentsia, this appointment was made by methods characteristic of the power order, in particular, without consent in the center and comprehensive, democratic discussion on the ground.

When he was informed about the decision of the Central Committee at a meeting of the bureau of the Kazakh Regional Party Committee, he said without turning around: "Moscow invited me, of course, not for business, but for dissolution" (QRPA, F. 141, Op. 1, D. 231, L. 231).

F. I. Goloshchekin, unaware of his violence against the Kazakh state, sent a request to Kazakhstan to send "several responsible employees for party-administrative and economic purposes". He said this at a meeting of the bureau of the Kazakh regional party committee: "One comrade has been sent for our consideration. The comrade Vakhlamov, who headed the Organizational Department in Nizhny Novgorod. I asked again to send a couple of people. However, this problem has not yet been resolved. The type of resolution adopted on this issue was as follows:

- the question of sending the remaining staff (Lurie, Pyatkin and Smirnov) to Kazakhstan should be sent to the secretariat for consideration, and the Secretariat should resolve this issue no later than within a week;

- Recommend that the Moscow Committee allocate at least three responsible party workers for Kazakhstan (QRPA, F. 141, Op. 1, D. 18, L. 230).

All these proposals were resolved at a meeting of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the RCP (b) in mid-October 1925, about which an operational letter was sent to the Kazakh Regional Committee of the party.

Thus, the Central Committee of the RCP(b) took on such an inspector as S. Kozhanov, and sent in his place several responsible employees of the "Proletarian" center. This was not an isolated incident.

In the 1920s, such figures as T. Ryskulov, A. Dosov, S. Asfendiyarov, and N. Nurmakov were sent to Moscow in various directions. And their place was taken by dozens of "responsible employees" from Russia. This form of personnel exchange, conducted under the egis of "internationalization", "strengthening" of responsible personnel, actually pursued the goal of "nationalistic" distancing among the local energetic intellectuals.

For F. Goloshchekin, a collaborator of the center, who aspired to unlimited power in Kazakhstan, the concept of the "Kazakh state" was completely absent. As the first head of the Kazakh regional party organization, he established himself as a strict executor of the instructions and decisions of the center, its general secretary. For example, commenting on the political course approved at the meeting of the Kazakh regional committee of the party, where the draft resolution of the fifth regional conference of the party was discussed, he noted: "I protest against this proposal by raising both hands. Usually, when there are no words, they say that the political course is correct, the political course is approved. I believe that the political course is the direction of the Central Committee of the party. We have no other political course than this " (QRPA. F. 141. Op. 1. D. 18. L. 532).

Of course, this was not an accidental speech, but the principled position of a political worker dependent on the party leadership in Moscow. It would also be wrong to say that during this period there was a special position of the Kazakh regional party committee on any major issue. The Kazakh regional party organization after Goloshchekin came to the leadership, becoming "reliable", not leaving the said RCP (b), became a state structure and took over all other types of state administration.

The stubborn attitude of F. Goloshchekin to the interests of the Kazakh Republic was also manifested in the territorial issue. So, in 1925, the Presidium of the RCEC, without the consent of the Kaztsik, decided to transfer the Ilek district of the Aktobe province to the Orenburg province of the RSFSR. The discussion of this issue at the meeting of the Bureau of the Committee of the Kazakh regional party organization caused a heated discussion. The decision of the RCEC was sharply criticized by the chairman of the SNC of the KASSR N. Nurmakov, the chairman of the KazCEC Zh. Mynbayev, a member of the bureau of the Kazakh regional committee of the party of S. Kozhanov and others. Thus, N. Nurmakov noted that this decision is connected with the liquidation of the Kazakh Republic, taking into account its national composition, which at the current rate of settlement is not far off, when the share of the European population will reach 70%.

Responding to Goloshchekin's remark about the need to take into account not only national motives, but also economic reasons in solving this issue, S. Kozhanov said: "Here we cannot move away from the point of view that national interests do not have any weight. In the conditions of our republic, the national cuisine is of particular importance... Now, it seems, there is a course to strengthen the settlement. The mass migration to Siberia became formal. Siberian settlers flock to our country, not stopping there. 12,000 settlers are registered. I believe that this issue should be considered from the point of view of preserving and further strengthening the Kazakh Republic as a state, and not as a region, as part of Russia... Therefore, I believed that this issue could not be worked out in detail from the point of view of preserving the Kazakh Republic as a viable state and putting its fate in the cold hands of some comrades.

Summing up the discussion, Goloshchekin condemned the Chechens for their disagreement with the party's policy, and, focusing on the issue of Ilek, noted: "If you are not satisfied with questions on certain issues, for example, on the division of the Orenburg province, etc., then this is important from the point of view of Kazakhstan. Let me remind you that it is decided from the point of view of the interests of the USSR... " (QRPA. F. 141. Op. 1. D. 18. L. 234–251).

In general, all these data indicate that Goloshchekin, as a leader, attached special importance to the interests of the center, Russia and had nothing to do with understanding the suffering of the Kazakh people on the eve of great changes in their lives. Therefore, even a simple disagreement with the center and its positions was perceived by it as a manifestation of nationalism.

F. Goloshchekin's political illiteracy was explained by ignorance of the history, culture and life of the Kazakh people, so he could not and did not want to understand the specifics of the historical period experienced by the Kazakh people. He understood his task in Kazakhstan as the establishment of mutual understanding between its peoples. However, he did not understand that this opportunity could be only as a result of meeting the natural, elementary needs of the Kazakh people (land, equality in all spheres of life, etc.), which were drowned on a colonial scale.

At the same time, it should be noted that one of the main misconceptions of the Central Committee of the party as the body that develops the strategy of national policy, Goloshchekin as the chairman of the Central Committee, was that they could not correctly understand the nature of nationalism, regarded it as a one-sided reactionary negative phenomenon and limited themselves to a crude opposition to class interests. Of course, all this is now understood as the Russian imperial, national policy.

Putting the political, ideological approach above all else, they underestimated the economic, social, psychological and other foundations of the emergence of this historical period. Speaking at the IV meeting of the Central Committee of the RCP(b) (June 9-12, 1923) with the responsible employees of the national republics and regions, T. Ryskulov emphasized the truth: "the destruction of the deviations as chauvinism and local nationalism is simply mechanically impossible, it can be done only by eliminating economic and other contradictions in the composition of the population itself. While the Kyrgyz poor in Semirechye have their own land, and the Russian kulak with 125 tithe lands and 15 heroes has split, no matter how you understand that Kyrgyz internationalism is a good world and it is necessary to obey the Soviet power, it does not understand this and represents the Soviet power only in the form of a fist." From this it is clear that only a great-power-minded person, relying on the strength of the colonial power, can neither see nor understand the state of the indigenous people's intellectuals. Pointing to this, vol. Ryskulov noted that "a communist from this environment will undoubtedly sympathize with this batyr, and if he says this, he will easily put a nationalist yoke on him" (Kazakhstan oblasnyh, 1981).

Without taking effective measures to finally destroy the colonial order, the RCP (b) did not notice that the settlers were trapped in the colonial network, retreating from their previous principles and falling into the trap of imperial politics. At the same time, it should be noted that the main weapon of the center is still the slogan of the fight against nationalism.

Proclaiming the right of nations to self-determination, the apparatus of the Central Committee of the party, as a leading and directing force, formed mainly of representatives of the Great Russian persuasion, without regard to anyone with the rights of the chief arbiter, determining the level and content of this freedom in the national republics, understood Kazakhstan as otar, bodan. Therefore, in practice, it quickly turned into a state political structure that forcibly and deliberately imposed the policy of internationalism on the peoples under the yoke of the former tsarist empire. Over time, it became clear that this policy is a new cover for the policy of the old Russification.

The principle of true national freedom as the basis of true internationalism was implemented only on paper.

Only Mustafa Shokai in exile had the opportunity to make frank conclusions about the Soviet government and the Soviet Union.

On March 22, 1922, a meeting of the Kazakh-Kyrgyz department under the Turkestan Central Executive Committee was held in Tashkent with the participation of the Kazakh intellectuals. The report of the representative of the Turkestan Central Executive Committee and the Turkestan Committee of People's Commissars in Kazakhstan, Isa Toktybayev, was heard at the meeting. The resolution adopted on the basis of the report indicated the reasons for the delay in joining the Zhetysu and Syrdarya regions to Kazakhstan. These are: 1) the completion of the land reform in Turkestan; 2) the transfer of the capital of Kazakhstan from Orenburg; 3) to achieve in Kazakhstan the broad

involvement of the local population in the work of the Council and the destruction of the remnants of colonialism (Chetvyortoe soveshchanie RKP(b) OK, 1923). It was shown that the accession of the Turkestan Kazakhs to Kazakhstan is beneficial only if such conditions are met.

While these requirements were not fully implemented, in 1924, the national - territorial division of the Central Asian republics was carried out, the Semirechensk and Syrdarya regions were converted to Kazakhstan. This situation, which led to changes in the Turkic world, was also full of disputes and contradictions. The processes of separation and merger went in different directions. On March 10, 1924, at a meeting in Tashkent, the secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkestan, A. Rakhimbayev, made a report on the topic: "On the National territorial division of Turkestan". He assessed the classification of Central Asia into national republics as the right way. He was supported by such figures as N. Aitakov, S. Asfendiyarov, K. Atabayev. And the chairman of the Central Asian Economic Council, M. S. Paskutsky and S. Kozhanov, did not agree to the land survey. They advocated the creation of a single Central Asian Federation in economic, political and administrative terms. At the plenum of the territorial commission for the surveying of the Central Asian Republics on August 17, 1924, and then at the joint Plenum of the leading organizations of the Turkestan Republic, held on September 14, 1924, S. Kozhanov reflected the requirements for a Central Asian Federation. The complexity of the problem that plagued the Kazakh intellectuals of that time was the premature readiness of the Kazakhs to border division. S. Kozhanov's article "let the dispute stop and the case will be opened" can be considered as proof of this situation. It says that "Turkestan, which until now was one that was not established on the peasant side, is now wearing out and makes up four or five states. While others created a Central Asian peasant unity, not dividing immediately, but conducting peasant affairs in unity, the Kazakh regions emerged from Central Asia. "Semirechye and Syr Darya are still connected with the states of Central Asia, and not with Kazakhstan" (Aq Zhol, 1924).

The archival documents show that at that time an important issue was the national-territorial division of the republics of Central Asia. As actual data for that period, you can see the document "on the unification of the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) territory into the Turkestan KSSR and the unification of Central Asia on the basis of the state-national question". In the data of the document specified in it:

1. despite the fact that the surveying of the territory of Central Asia on the national principle should have led to a conflict, the inclusion in the KSSR, which was unified with the division of the lands occupied by the Kirghiz in the territory of the then multi-ethnic SSR, Bukhara and Khorezm, especially at a time when the unification of the Turkish Republic, now the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) region in the KSSR, was a timely, urgent and state necessity and previously required its implementation, without waiting for a decision

2. when determining the boundaries of the future USSR, three principles were obtained in accordance with the practice established in the USSR:

- I. uniformity of the natural and historical conditions of the area.

- II. uniformity of its economic specifics.

- III. uniformity of the national-cultural and living conditions of the population. The latter principle played a leading role here.

At the same time, the first two questions when registering the national-state structure are usually considered as additional and can be of decisive importance only in the presence of extreme exceptions" (QROrMA. F. 5. Op. 6. D. 14. L. 12.).

The Kazakh intellectuals, having comprehensively analyzed the internal capabilities of Turkestan and the Republic of Kazakhstan, was looking for an answer to the question, in what conditions the Kazakh people can find a suitable way to divide Central Asia. First of all, the need to move the capital from Orenburg to the Kazakh environment was touched upon. Because "if the state does not rely on the public of the capital, then the case of the Main Department will not be in order" (QROrMA. F. 5. Op. 6. D. 14. L. 12.).

Based on the question of the capital, among the candidate cities were Aktobe, Akmola, Akmeshit, Aulieata, Semey, Shymkent. As a result, the CEC adopted a resolution on the transfer of the capital from Orenburg to Akmeshit.

The immediate management of the evacuation of the capital was carried out by S. Kozhanov himself. In April 1925, the V Extraordinary Congress of the Kazakh Central Executive Committee was held. The main agenda of the congress included the first of the most important issues for Kazakhstan at that time - the abolition of the name of the Kyrgyz, in subsequent documents-only Kazakhs, and secondly, the renaming of the capital of Akmeshit to Kyzylorda.

Thus, the territory, borders and capital of the state of Kazakhstan were determined, and the people experienced terrible suffering, but did not have their own power, and historically won a huge victory. It was in the category of countries that legally received the name of a republic with a capital, with specified borders, with a designated single territory. This was the result of the struggle of the Kazakh intellectuals of the early twentieth century, led by M. Shokai, A. Bukeikhanov, A. Baitursynov, B. Karataev, and since the establishment of Soviet power-the result of the activities of T. Ryskulov, S. Saduakasov, S. Kozhanov, Zh.Mynbayev. The foundation of the modern statehood of the independent Republic of Kazakhstan was laid in the early twentieth century.

Conclusion. The attempts of the Bolshevik leadership to create a unified state on the territory of the entire Russian Empire, designed to make small peoples economically and politically dependent, or, if necessary, to eliminate them, were opposed by the national intellectuals, which adhered to the anti-colonial ideology. The possibilities of creating a Kazakh statehood have narrowed, and this idea has acquired a completely different character. Because, having come to power, the Bolshevik party of V. I. Lenin, openly adhering to the policy of destroying small nationalities, set a course for turning Kazakhstan into one of the regions of Russia, raising the slogan of internationalism. Over time, the fact that the Soviet leaders openly suppressed national interests became more acute.

As a result, the Bolshevik ideology clearly believed that the solution of national problems follows from the solution of class problems. It could not be otherwise in the conditions of the political power of the party. The sponsor of this path was I. V. Stalin himself. In 1923, at a meeting of the Central Committee of the RCP(b) with the responsible employees of the national republics and regions, M. Sultangaliyev set the task of "turning Turkestan into a model republic" and intensified the fight against "Kyrgyz (Kazakh) nationalism".

The issue of national autonomy of the Kazakh intellectuals during the Soviet period was a demand of that time. The activities of the Kazakh intellectuals aimed at creating a national state, the activities aimed at restoring national independence based on the analysis of the pages of history paved the way for the independence that the national ideas of that time experience today.

At the end of the twentieth century, it became clear that Kazakhstan had become an independent state. In the course of the study, we were convinced that today, in solving such urgent problems as the land, the state language, the national state ideology, the national mentality, the formation of national consciousness, national democracy, the works and views of the Kazakh intelligentsia, who fought for the independence of the Kazakh statehood of the last century, are of great importance.

Sources

PA RK — Parliament Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan
 CSA RU — Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan
 CSA RK — Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan

References

Aq Zhol, 1922 (In Kaz.).
 Chetyvortoe soveshchanie RKP(b) OK, 9–12 ijunja 1923 g. [Fourth meeting of the RCP(b) CC, 9–12 June 1923]. (In Russ.).
 Izvestija TurkCIKa, 1920, 24 March. (In Russ.).
 Kazahstan oblasnyh partijnyh organizacij oblastnyh komitetov i oekomeetov. Konferencii i plenumy. Postanovlenija i reshenija [Regional party organizations of Kazakhstan: conferences and plenums of oblast and regional committees. Decisions and resolutions]. Vol. 1. 1921–1927. Alma-Ata, 1981. (In Russ.).
 Koigeldiev, 1997 — Koigeldiev M.Q. Tutas Turkistan idejasy jäne Mustafa Shoqajuly [The Idea of United Turkestan and Mustafa Shokayuly]. Almaty: Qazaq universiteti, 1997. (In Kaz.).

- Kommunisticheskaja partija Kazahstana. Spravochnik [Communist Party of Kazakhstan. Reference book]. Alma-Ata, 1990. (In Russ.).
- Lenin, 1970 — Lenin V.I. Polnoe sobranie sochinenij [Collected works]. Vol. 41. Pp. 435–436. (In Russ.).
- Lenin, 1970 — Lenin V.I. Polnoe sobranie sochinenij [Collected works]. Vol. 42. P. 178. (In Russ.).
- Nurpeisov, 1995 — Nurpeisov K. Alash häm Alashorda [Alash and Alashorda]. Almaty: Atatek, 1995. 212 p. (In Kaz.).
- Qongyratbaev, 1994 — Qongyratbaev O. Turar Rysqulov sajasi jäne memlekettik qyzmeti [Turar Ryskulov’s Political and State Service]. Almaty, 1994. 369 p. (In Kaz.).
- Safarov, 1996 — Safarov G. Kolonial’naja revoljucija (Opyt Turkestana) [Colonial Revolution (Experience of Turkestan)]. Almaty: Zhaly, 1996. 96 p. (In Russ.).

CONTENTS

Kabuldinov Z.E. CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF MASHKHUR-ZHUSSIP KOPEYULY.....	5
Doğanay A., Sambet M.A. REFLECTIONS OF THE AFTERLIFE BELIEF AMONG THE TURKS IN MAUSOLEUM CONSTRUCTION AND DECORATION.....	12
Cherepanov K. KAZAKHSTAN AS AN INDUSTRIAL AND RAW-MATERIAL BASE OF THE SOVIET UNION DURING THE LEADERSHIP OF D.A. KUNAEV (1964–1986).....	26
Azmukhanova A., Balgozhina A. ENLIGHTENMENT MOVEMENTS: JADIDISM AND MEIROKUSHA IN A HISTORICAL RETROSPECTIVE.....	39
Zhumagul S.B. FROM THE REHABILITATION HISTORY OF LITERARY HERITAGE OF THE “ALASH” FIGURES.....	53
Tashagul A., Kopeyeva S.Zh. ACTIVITIES AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MUSLIM FRACTION IN THE FIRST AND SECOND STATE DUMAS.....	64
Zhussip S.-Kh.A., Zhumatay S. THE ALL-RUSSIAN CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY AND THE HISTORY OF THE CREATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF ALASH.....	71
Kemengger K.R. HISTORICAL AND MENTAL-SYMBOLIC MEANING OF THE ARCHETYPE “ALASH” IN THE KAZAKH SOCIO-CULTURAL SOCIETY OF THE XX CENTURY.....	83
Mukanova G.K., Sarsembina K.K. MELODIES OF THE STEPPE: THE REPRESSED CULTURAL FIGURE OF KAZAKHSTAN, COMPOSER IVAN KOTSYK (1891-1938).....	93
Salmorbekova R.B., Saralaev N.K., Murzalieva Z.K. ORTHODOXY IN KYRGYZSTAN: STAGES OF FORMATION AND ROLE IN THE SPIRITUAL LIFE OF SOCIETY.....	110
Tulbassyieva S.K. FROM THE PAGES OF THE HISTORY OF THE SOVIET COLLECTIVE FARM: THE COLLECTIVE FARM “MOUNTAIN GIANT” IN THE CITY OF ALMA-ATA. THE 30S OF THE XX CENTURY.....	122
Khassanayeva L.M. THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL INTELLECTUALS IN THE POLICY OF NATIONAL TERRITORIAL DELIMITATION.....	139
Dauletkhanov A. ON THE HISTORICAL SITE OF THE CITY OF CHIGU.....	153
Zhengis E.Zh. POPPY CULTURE IN SEMIRECHYE AT THE END OF THE 19TH – BEGINNING OF THE 20TH CENTURY.....	165
Kenzhebekova Zh.K. FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MEDIATION INSTITUTE IN THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN: PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS.....	174
Sholakhov M. ANALYSIS OF THE WESTERN EUROPEAN HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE NOGAI HORDE.....	181

МАЗМҰНЫ

Қабылдинов З.Е.	
МӘШХҰР-ЖҮСІП КӨПЕЙҰЛЫНЫҢ МӘДЕНИ-АҒАРТУШЫЛЫҚ ҚЫЗМЕТІ.....	5
Доғанай А., Сәмбет М.Ә.	
ТҮРКІЛЕРДЕ АҚЫРЕТ СЕНІМІНІҢ МАЗАР ҚҰРЫЛЫСЫНДАҒЫ ЖӘНЕ ОЛАРДЫ БЕЗЕНДІРУДЕГІ КӨРІНІСТЕРІ.....	12
Черепанов К.В.	
Д.А. ҚОНАЕВ БАСШЫЛЫҚ ЕТКЕН ЖЫЛДАРЫ (1964–1986 ЖЖ.) ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ КЕҢЕС ОДАҒЫНЫҢ ИНДУСТРИЯЛЫҚ-ШИКІЗАТТЫҚ БАЗАСЫНА АЙНАЛУЫ.....	26
Азмуханова А.М., Балгожина А.А.	
АҒАРТУШЫЛЫҚ ҚОЗҒАЛЫСТАР: ЖӘДИДШІЛДІК ПЕН МЭЙРОКУСЯ ТАРИХИ РЕТРОСПЕКТИВАДА.....	39
Жұмағұл С.Б.	
«АЛАШ» ҚАЙРАТКЕРЛЕРІНІҢ ӘДЕБИ МҰРАСЫН АҚТАУ ТАРИХЫНАН.....	53
Ташағыл А., Көпеева С.Ж.	
I ЖӘНЕ II МЕМЛЕКЕТТІК ДУМАЛАРДАҒЫ МҰСЫЛМАН ФРАКЦИЯСЫНЫҢ ҚЫЗМЕТІ МЕН МАҢЫЗЫ.....	64
Жүсіп С.Х.А., Жұматай С.	
БҮКІЛРЕСЕЙЛІК ҚҰРЫЛТАЙ ЖИНАЛЫСЫ ЖӘНЕ АЛАШ РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫНЫҢ ҚҰРЫЛУ ТАРИХЫ.....	71
Кеменгер Қ.Р.	
XX ҒАСЫРДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚ ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК-МӘДЕНИ ҚОҒАМЫНДАҒЫ «АЛАШ» АРХЕТИПІНІҢ ТАРИХИ ЖӘНЕ МЕНТАЛДЫҚ-СИМВОЛДЫҚ МӘНІ.....	83
Мұқанова Г.Қ., Сәрсембина Қ.Қ.	
ДАЛА ӘУЕНДЕРІ: ҚУҒЫН-СҮРГІНГЕ ҰШЫРАҒАН ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ МӘДЕНИЕТ ҚАЙРАТКЕРІ, КОМПОЗИТОР ИВАН КОЦЫК (1891-1938).....	93
Салморбекова Р.Б., Саралаев Н.К., Мурзалиева З.К.	
ҚЫРҒЫЗСТАНДАҒЫ ПРАВОСЛАВИЕ: ҚАЛЫПТАСУ КЕЗЕҢДЕРІ МЕН РӨЛҚОҒАМНЫҢ РУХАНИ ӨМІРІНДЕ.....	110
Тулбасиева С.К.	
КЕҢЕСТІК КОЛХОЗ ТАРИХЫНЫҢ БЕТТЕРІНЕН: «ГОРНЫЙ ГИГАНТ» КОЛХОЗЫ – АЛМАТЫ ҚАЛАСЫНДА. XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 30-ЖЫЛДАРЫ.....	122
Хасанаева Л.М.	
ҰЛТТЫҚ ЗИЯЛЫЛАРДЫҢ ҰЛТТЫҚ-АУМАҚТЫҚ МЕЖЕЛЕУ САЯСАТЫНДАҒЫ РӨЛІ.....	139
Дәулетханов Ә.Д.	
ЧИГУ ҚАЛАСЫНЫҢ ТАРИХИ ОРЫНЫ ТУРАЛЫ.....	153
Жеңіс Е.Ж.	
XIX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ СОҢЫ - 20 ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАСЫНДАҒЫ ЖЕТІСУДАҒЫ КӨКНАР ЕГІНШІЛІГІ.....	165
Кенжебекова Ж.Қ.	
ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫНДАҒЫ МЕДИАЦИЯ ИНСТИТУТЫНЫҢ ҚАЛЫПТАСУЫ МЕН ДАМУЫ: МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ ЖӘНЕ ОЛАРДЫ ШЕШУ ЖОЛДАРЫ.....	174
Шолахов М.Г.	
НОҒАЙ ОРДАСЫНЫҢ БАТЫСЕУРОПАЛЫҚ ТАРИХНАМАСЫН ТАЛДАУ.....	181

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

Кабульдинов З.Е. КУЛЬТУРНО-ПРОСВЕТИТЕЛЬСКАЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ МАШХУР-ЖУСИПА КОПЕЙУЛЫ.....	5
Доганай А., Самбет М. ПРОЯВЛЕНИЯ ВЕРЫ В ЗАГРОБНУЮ ЖИЗНЬ У ТЮРКОВ В СТРОИТЕЛЬСТВЕ И УКРАШЕНИИ ГРОБНИЦ.....	12
Черепанов К.В. КАЗАХСТАН КАК ИНДУСТРИАЛЬНО-СЫРЬЕВАЯ БАЗА СОВЕТСКОГО СОЮЗА В ГОДЫ РУКОВОДСТВА Д.А. КУНАЕВА (1964–1986 ГГ.).....	26
Азмуханова А.М., Балгожина А.А. ПРОСВЕТИТЕЛЬСКИЕ ДВИЖЕНИЯ: ДЖАДИДИЗМ И МЭЙРОКУСЯ В ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЙ РЕТРОСПЕКТИВЕ.....	39
Жумагул С.Б. ИЗ ИСТОРИИ РЕАБИЛИТАЦИИ ЛИТЕРАТУРНОГО НАСЛЕДИЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЕЙ «АЛАШ».....	53
Ташагыл А., Копеева С.Ж. ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ И ЗНАЧЕНИЕ МУСУЛЬМАНСКОЙ ФРАКЦИИ В I И II ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЙ ДУМЕ.....	64
Жусип С.Х.А., Жуматай С. ВСЕРОССИЙСКОЕ УЧРЕДИТЕЛЬНОЕ СОБРАНИЕ И ИСТОРИЯ СОЗДАНИЯ РЕСПУБЛИКИ АЛАШ.....	71
Кеменгер К.Р. ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЕ И МЕНТАЛЬНО-СИМВОЛИЧЕСКОЕ ЗНАЧЕНИЕ АРХЕТИПА «АЛАШ» В КАЗАХСКОМ СОЦИОКУЛЬТУРНОМ ОБЩЕСТВЕ XX ВЕКА.....	83
Муканова Г.К., Сарсембина К.К. МЕЛОДИИ СТЕПИ: РЕПРЕССИРОВАННЫЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬ КУЛЬТУРЫ КАЗАХСТАНА, КОМПОЗИТОР ИВАН КОЦЫК (1891–1938).....	93
Салморбекова Р.Б., Саралаев Н.К., Мурзалиева З.К. ПРАВОСЛАВИЕ В КЫРГЫЗСТАНЕ: ЭТАПЫ СТАНОВЛЕНИЯ И РОЛЬ В ДУХОВНОЙ ЖИЗНИ ОБЩЕСТВА.....	110
Тулбасиева С.К. ИЗ СТРАНИЦ ИСТОРИИ СОВЕТСКОГО КОЛХОЗА: КОЛХОЗ «ГОРНЫЙ ГИГАНТ» В ГОРОДЕ АЛМА-АТЫ. 30-Е ГОДЫ XX ВЕКА.....	122
Хасанаева Л.М. РОЛЬ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ИНТЕЛЛИГЕНЦИИ В ПОЛИТИКЕ НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-ТЕРРИТОРИАЛЬНОГО РАЗМЕЖЕВАНИЯ.....	139
Даулетханов А.Д. О ИСТОРИЧЕСКОМ МЕСТЕ ГОРОДА ЧИГУ.....	153
Женис Е.Ж. КУЛЬТУРА МАКА В СЕМИРЕЧЬЕ В КОНЦЕ XIX - В НАЧАЛЕ XX ВЕКА.....	165
Кенжебекова Ж.К. ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ И РАЗВИТИЕ ИНСТИТУТА МЕДИАЦИИ В РЕСПУБЛИКЕ КАЗАХСТАН: ПРОБЛЕМЫ И ПУТИ ИХ РЕШЕНИЯ.....	174
Шолахов М.Г. АНАЛИЗ ЗАПАДНОЕВРОПЕЙСКОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ НОГАЙСКОЙ ОРДЫ.....	181

Редакцияның мекен-жайы:

010000, Қазақстан Республикасы, Астана қаласы, Қабанбай батыр даңғ., 11/5
Қазақстан және Орталық Азия тарихы институты
Scientific Journal “Central Asian courier” редакциясы

Сайтқа сілтеме: <https://sjcacourier.com/>

Тел.: +7 (776) 301-11-11 (Ұялы телефон)
+7 (775) 537-77-72 (whatsapp)

E-mail: hkca.kz@gmail.com

Журнал Қазақстан Республикасы Мәдениет және ақпарат министрлігінде
2025 ж. 20 маусымда тіркеліп, № KZ20VPY00122471 куәлігіне ие болды.

Мақалаларды қайта бастырып жариялағанда, микрофильмге және басқа да көшірмелерге
түсіргенде міндетті түрде журналға сілтеме жасау қажет.