

THE MAIN CONCEPTS OF THE HISTORICAL PAST OF THE KAZAKH PEOPLE IN SOVIET HISTORIOGRAPHY

Abstract

This article comprehensively examines the influence of Soviet historiography on the study of Kazakh history. Historical research conducted during the Soviet period is analysed within four main stages: the mid-1930s to 1950s, the 1950s to 1960s, the 1960s to 1980s, and the post-1980s Perestroika period. The study explores the unique characteristics of each stage, the ideological constraints, and the censorship imposed on scholarly works. It has been established that Soviet historiographical policies resulted in distortions in studies related to Kazakh history. The article places special emphasis on the impact of Soviet rule on historical research. During the Soviet era, historical science was based on communist ideology, which imposed limitations on the objective study of historical data. The colonisation policies of the Russian Empire in the Kazakh Steppe, as well as Kazakh national liberation movements, were misrepresented in Soviet historiography. Ideological restrictions that undermined the national identity of the Kazakh people were institutionalised, leading to a biased official historical narrative.

The primary objective of this study is to analyze the impact of Soviet historiography on the study of Kazakh history and to identify the censorship and ideological constraints imposed on historical works. The study explores how research on Kazakh history was conducted in different periods and what changes took place in historiography. Additionally, the role of J.Stalin and L.Brezhnev's political policies in shaping historical discourse is examined.

The study demonstrates that Soviet historiography was dominated by socialist ideology, which hindered the objective study of Kazakh history. Soviet authorities justified processes of cultural assimilation and Russification, pushing national history into the background. Contemporary research emphasises the need to reevaluate these issues, critically analyze the influence of Soviet historiography, and implement new methodological approaches and comprehensive research methods.

Keywords: Soviet historiography, Kazakh history, ideology, historical perspective, cultural assimilation.

Introduction

One of the defining characteristics of contemporary Kazakhstani historical science is the separation of historiography from general historical studies, transforming it into an independent academic field. The history and historiography of Kazakhstan were long considered an integral part of Soviet and Russian history, resulting in domestic historians being compelled, in many cases, to echo and uphold the conclusions drawn by researchers from the "center."

Today, with the country's acquisition of independence, it is crucial to revisit and historiographically analyze under-researched or entirely unexplored issues that were distorted under the influence of the prevailing ideology.

The Kazakh people, who were part of the Soviet Union for 70 years, faced the loss of their own history and also language, religion, and culture. The primary goal of Russia's cultural policy in Kazakhstan was to ensure that the Turkic peoples conformed to Russian administration. This could only be achieved through Russification. Key figures in implementing this policy were missionaries such as N.Ilminsky, A.E. Alektorov, and N.P. Ostroumov. The Russian government supported the policy of assimilation, applying it across all spheres of cultural life through the use of repressive measures.

During this period, greater attention was given to the influence of Russia, revolutionary events, and socialist development. Kazakh khans, biys, batyrs, and khanates were portrayed as remnants of the feudal era. As part of the policies of internationalism and russification, national history and culture were pushed to the background, giving way to the history of the USSR. The nation's self-awareness, including many elements of traditional history and culture, was deemed insignificant or incompatible with official Soviet ideology. All of this was aimed at erasing the significance of the Kazakh Khanate as an independent state.

Since the establishment of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party placed particular emphasis on rewriting history to align with its ideological objectives. On December 8, 1930, the head of the Institute of History at the Communist Academy, Pokrovsky, stated: "The struggle in the field of history is the struggle for the main course of the party... There is an inseparable connection between these two fronts of struggle. History is a very powerful weapon in political struggle. Compared to other sciences, it is considered an extremely important political science. There is a connection between past political history and today's political history. It is impossible to separate history from politics," he noted [1].

The history of Kazakhstan during the Soviet era was significantly influenced by Marxist historiography, where the struggle against the "exploiting classes" became an important theme. This approach led to many traditional figures of Kazakh history being portrayed as antagonists of progress, and the roles and achievements of Kazakh rulers were undervalued. Among them were figures such as Qoblandy Batyr, Ablai Khan, and Kenesary Khan, who were overshadowed. Even some of them were negatively evaluated for their opposition to Russian colonization. Scholars who wrote works about them faced persecution. One such scholar was Yermukhan Bekmakhanov, who was sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment for his work "Kazakhstan in the 20s-40s of the 19th century."

The primary objective of this research is to identify the main conclusions drawn about Kazakhstan's past during the Soviet period.

The study employed historical and historiographical methods. An analysis and historiographical examination of the works of Soviet and foreign researchers from the 20th century were conducted.

The theoretical and methodological foundation of historical science during the Soviet period, which was expected to adhere to ideas known as Marxist-Leninist, was historical materialism. According to this approach, human historical activity was viewed in close connection with the study of social and economic structures, which, it was argued, allowed for the identification of general patterns and the main directions of historical development. This methodological approach was considered the only correct way to uncover the truth. All other methodological approaches were declared bourgeois, reactionary, and one-sided, and their use was prohibited [2].

Materials and methods of research

Researcher Zh. Zhappasov notes that the key feature of characterisation in this field lies not in examining historical facts from the perspective of their quantitative or qualitative properties, but in describing the dynamics that change over time. As a result, this description becomes an account of historical events, referred to as a "narrative." For this reason, the "event-based narrative" is considered the traditional form of the classical research model in this field. There are several requirements here. First, it is necessary to rely only on accurate evidence. Second, the connections between facts are not subjected to separate analysis, which lends objectivity. Third, the historian must remain as neutral as possible and write in a language that is understandable to a broad audience.

According to the scholar, the theory of socio-economic formations was adopted and used during the Soviet period as the "only" approach. It explains history from a materialist perspective. Most contemporary researchers who support this theory believe that Karl Marx's methodology requires updating and further development.

At present, new proposals and methodological ideas are being introduced through the application of synergetics. This method offers a fresh perspective on issues of historical development, such as possibility and reality, tradition and innovation, past and present, alternatives and choice, all within the framework of the self-organisation of society as a unified system [3].

At different periods of the Soviet era, Kazakh historiography was evaluated in various ways. A scholar divided and characterized the stages of historiography. For example, he states:

"The widespread harsh criticism of 'bourgeois' historiography and the firm establishment of Marxist-Leninist methodological principles in Soviet historical science in the early 1920s-1930s was the main result of historiographical inquiry focusing on these issues." The following facts illustrate this: in 1928, after the training of specialists aligned with Soviet ideology, pressure was exerted on the older generation of historians. Some of them faced criticism at the Main Conference of Marxist Historians of the Soviet Union, held from December 28, 1928, to January 4, 1929. One of the topics discussed at the conference was "The Struggle Against Bourgeois and Petty-Bourgeois Historians," marking the beginning of the ideological battle in Soviet historical science. Reports were presented at the conference, including M.N.Pokrovsky's "Leninism and the History of Russia" and V. Rakhmetov's "The Emergence of the Menshevik Concept of the Historical Process in Russia," which advocated for a new perspective on history and criticized previous approaches. In April 1929, in a speech at the general meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR, Stalin noted that the rise of the bourgeois intelligentsia posed a serious threat to socialism. Thus began the effort to neutralize the older generation of Moscow historians. As a result, many of them were imprisoned, exiled to Siberia, or sentenced to death in 1929-1930 [4].

The first textbook on the history of Kazakhstan and the Kazakh people was written by military doctor S. Asfendiyarov. From the onset of the October Revolution, S. Asfendiyarov supported the Bolsheviks and actively participated in the upper ranks of the Soviet administration established in Turkestan. In the latter half of the 1920s, he was appointed director of the Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies and lectured at Moscow University. In 1927, he was awarded the title of professor. In 1935, he published the first textbook on the history of Kazakhstan, titled *Essays on the History of Kazakhstan*. The 115-page book covered the history of Kazakhstan from ancient times up to the October Revolution of 1917. Although the textbook was written in line with Marxist-Leninist views and the theory of class struggle, Moscow did not approve it and did not support Asfendiyarov's efforts to introduce it into the school curriculum. The first Kazakh historian of the Soviet period, S. Asfendiyarov, was arrested in 1937 as an "enemy of the people" and sentenced to death in 1938. His book was banned from use [5].

In 1948, meetings dedicated to Y. Bekmakhanov's book were held at historical institutes in Moscow and Almaty. Critics argued that the Kenesary movement, as claimed by the author, was not a feudal or national movement driven by personal interests. Historians such as T. Shoiynbayev, M. Zhiznevsky, Kh. Aidarova, and S. Tolybekov stated that the work was politically harmful. However, some Russian scholars supported Bekmakhanov's viewpoint and affirmed that the book was a scholarly work rather than a political one. As a result, the Higher Attestation Commission of the USSR upheld the decision to award Bekmakhanov a doctoral degree [6].

During the Soviet period, numerous works in Kazakh historiography were written by researchers such as G.F. Dakhshleyger, D.I. Dulatova, and K. Nurpeis [7]. O. Mukhatova highlighted several reasons for the lag in domestic historiography. The first reason was that written sources related to Kazakh history had not been sufficiently studied or introduced into academic circulation. The second reason was the strict control of domestic research by communist ideology, which prevented independent opinions on Kazakh history from being expressed in written works. Furthermore, the scientific works of the Soviet totalitarian system were dominated by similar, one-sided, and formulaic conclusions, without bold new concepts. For this reason, there was neither interest nor ambition to analyze or assess such works, which hindered the development of historiographical research.

During this period, due to the lack of textbooks in the Kazakh language dedicated to this field, domestic historians were unable to gain a deep understanding of historiography, and the subject was presented in a narrow and one-sided manner. This led to significant shortcomings

and difficulties in writing historical and historiographical studies, which ultimately affected the quality and standard of scholarly works.

If we delve further into the importance of the principle of historicism, its role in studying the causes and prerequisites for the "persistence" of false and erroneous ideas, and sometimes conclusions, in historical science becomes critically important. For instance, the autochthonous theory that the Kazakhs are one of the most ancient peoples, with the Saka, Usuns, Kangly, and Huns as their ancestors, has recently gained more convincing evidence. Moreover, new data confirms that the resistances led by Syrym, Kenesary, Zhankozha, and others against Russia's violent colonial policies were of a national liberation nature. Scientific conclusions regarding the popular and liberating character of these uprisings are increasingly reflected in historiography [8].

Scholarly opinions that the October Revolution and the establishment of Soviet power in Kazakhstan were externally imposed processes are also reflected in the new historical paradigm. These views are based on works published in the 1920s and 1930s by authors such as G. Safarov, M. Shokay, A. Baitursynov, T. Ryskulov, and F.I. Goloshchekin [9].

Until the late 1950s, historical conclusions were often distorted and subjected to censorship. Although certain censorship was imposed during the Soviet period regarding information about the past of the peoples within the USSR, in some cases, more open data can also be found. For example, L.G. Morgan divided the development of human society into stages of savagery, barbarism, and civilization. However, the scholar Gabdolgaziz Musagaliyev, taking into account the specific development of different peoples, modified this classification. Instead of barbarism, he introduced the concept of pastoralism, designating it as a distinct stage. He also noted that pastoral peoples were not entirely isolated from civilized nations but adopted some of their achievements. In order to avoid falling behind and being subjected to enslavement, they needed to transition to agriculture. Thus, he emphasized the need for the Kazakh aul to adapt to a progressive economic system and transition toward a capitalist path [10].

In his work "Historiography of Kazakhstan" (18th century — early 20th century), M.Q. Kozybayev notes that Soviet historiographers portrayed the colonization of Kazakhstan as an "annexation" to Russia. Some authors, who approached the issue superficially without examining the economic and political aspects, assessed this annexation as a random event. Meanwhile, another group openly promoted imperial ideas, denied the centuries-old cultural heritage of the Kazakh people, and depicted them solely as barbarians.

In his work, the scholar also notes that the national liberation uprising of 1916-1917 received a fairly comprehensive evaluation. However, researchers did not reach this conclusion immediately. This was facilitated by discussions in 1926-1927 and 1953-1954, memoirs of the uprising's participants, conferences held in the Central Asian states, as well as the Joint Scientific Session on this topic in Tashkent in 1954.

After years of discussions, research on the events of 1916 was published in the five-volume "History of the Kazakh SSR," which was dedicated to the history of the Central Asian republics, and a unified concept was adopted. In the third volume, section 3, alongside M. Kozybayev, the opinions of scholars such as A. Bisenbaeva, K. Nurpeisov, M. Koigeldiev, and others on this issue were published:

1. The event of 1916 was referred to both as a "uprising" and a "liberation movement." The authors believe that the national liberation movement took the form of an uprising. They base their view on V. Dal's definition, who describes an uprising as a "rebellion, disturbance." The 1916 event was both, and on a large scale [11].

2. The authors of the five-volume "History of the Kazakh SSR" reduced the national liberation movement to only the Marxist-Leninist stage of the liberation movement and ideologized the 1916 event.

The thinker of the national movement, J. Nehru, stated: "Even if there is no outright war between two opposing sides, hidden conflicts and clashes are inevitable between opposing

interests. In a state where power belongs to the citizens of another country, internal conflict is inevitable, as they attempt to influence and distort the thoughts and actions of the local population. The military way of life never fully disappears" [12].

It was precisely this "military way of life," which over time evolved from a "hidden war" into an open conflict, that existed between the metropolis and the Asian colony since 1731. In essence, the 1916 event represents a new stage of the Kazakh people's national liberation movement, which had not ceased for a single day since their incorporation into the empire. It is no coincidence that T. Ryskulov stated that the 1916 event "demonstrates the open war of the metropolis against the rebellious masses."

3. In the five-volume "History of the Kazakh SSR", the 1916 event was presented as an integral part of the broader Russian process. It can also be viewed as a continuation of the centuries-long national liberation struggle of the peoples of the Asian East.

4. The authors of the work conclude that the movement had an anti-feudal character, as it was also directed against the local feudal authorities.

Despite the tragedy of this event, 1916 should be regarded as a great victory for the peoples who realized their potential as a force capable of armed resistance against the empire. This awareness of national interests expanded the boundaries of Kazakhstan. It also led to an understanding of the unity among the colonized peoples of the East.

5. In the five-volume "History of the Kazakh SSR", it is asserted that "the movement came as a surprise to both the tsarist administration and the local feudal authorities". This statement seems illogical. For a long time in Soviet historiography, the social base of the national liberation movement was artificially narrowed through a class-based approach, leading to the conclusion that the uprising's leadership and its leaders came from the lower social strata.

Results and its discussion

In historiography, the conflicting opinions of the national intelligentsia regarding the 1916 movement are evaluated. As early as the late 1970s, academician S. Zimanov emphasized the need for a deeper understanding of the complex role of the national intelligentsia and its leaders in the national liberation movement, as well as in the awakening of the Kazakh people's national consciousness.

The contradictions within the national intelligentsia were connected to their position in society. According to the academician, first, being predominantly from the wealthy strata of Kazakh society, they served the colonial system and held certain privileges. Second, unlike the Russian intelligentsia, the Kazakh intelligentsia lacked a business elite: there were no bank directors, managers, legal advisors to joint-stock companies, industrialists, or financiers among them. Their worldview was shaped under the strong influence of Enlightenment ideas. Despite their position within the colonial system, they became the ideologists of the anti-colonial struggle [13].

It was only in the early 1960s that the realization of the need to revise the outdated dogmas of historical materialism, the weakening of ideological control, and the expanded access to foreign literature and archival documents led to the necessity of rethinking historiographical issues in Soviet historical science. However, the reassessment of historiographical problems in the 1960s occurred in a context of, on the one hand, purifying and defending the Marxist theory of socio-economic formations within the framework of Leninist theory, and on the other hand, amid demands to resist new interpretations of Marxism.

In the 1970s, no significant new perspectives on the theory of Marxist-Leninist historical understanding were introduced. Its core principles—objectivity, partisanship, and historicism – were considered unchangeable, and discussions on specific issues related to the methodology of historical science were limited by a uniform set of views. As a result, many researchers who showed an interest in methodological questions of historical knowledge shifted their focus to source studies, which were not as heavily influenced by party-ideological control.

In the 1970s and 1980s, hundreds of articles and dozens of monographs on the methodological problems of history were published in the USSR. Some adhered to fundamentalist Marxist views, while others included elements of methodological innovations.

In practice, Marxist methodology attempted to integrate innovations such as the idea of the multiplicity of historical processes, the issues of “the individual in history” and “history in the individual”, questions of cultural studies in historical understanding, the use of quantitative methods, and historical modelling in research.

As a result, by the late 1980s, the dogma of the Marxist monistic view of history had fractured, and the ideas of methodological pluralism and the possibility of pluralistic interpretation of history gained recognition.

Some researchers also noted that the conclusions of studies on agrarian topics during the Soviet period were not always accurate. In D.Ya. Friesen's article, it is mentioned that Kazakh historiography of that time should not be viewed solely in a negative light. When examining works on this subject, authors often conclude about the period under review but fail to explain how subsequent events were connected to the period being studied. For example, much is said about the negative impact of the tsarist government's resettlement policy on the development of the nomadic economy, emphasizing that the expropriation of lands hindered the nomadic people from successfully developing their economy, and this serves as the main conclusion. It is not mentioned that, as a result of the agrarian reforms of the tsarist government, the economic development of Kazakhstan accelerated, and that the resettlement policy brought mainly experienced farmers, agronomists, and other specialists to Kazakh lands. The main problems in historical research are the fragmentation, lack of consistency, and one-sidedness, especially when studying the history of agrarian relations in Western Kazakhstan at the end of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

In domestic studies on the history of agrarian relations in Kazakhstan at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, another feature is observed. Scholars often place emphasis on spiritual factors in their conclusions. More specifically, works on agrarian topics examine economic aspects such as animal husbandry, agriculture, trade, and economic relations, among others. However, conclusions are frequently based on spiritual factors, such as Russification, Christianization, the decline of the nomadic population, and so on. As a result, the conclusions lack logical consistency, as there is often a sudden shift from economic aspects to spiritual and moral issues. In the research, agrarian issues are discussed, but the conclusions focus on spiritual aspects, psychology, and mentality. This discrepancy between the problems and the conclusions does not, of course, contribute to an objective study of the issue; rather, it adds further confusion. This closed cycle persists, with no noticeable shift toward objectivity. The well-known Kazakh scholar N. Masanov once noted that the ethnic factor is always given top priority, with other factors considered only afterward. Domestic researchers tend to emphasize discussions about mentality, psychology, and the origins of their people, while economic factors are often sidelined [14].

The historiography of Kazakhstan during Stalin's rule was under pressure and censorship, which prevented scholars from providing an objective assessment of many events. However, it would be a mistake to claim that all Kazakh historiography of that time was subject to censorship and viewed solely from a negative perspective. This is confirmed by the research of Sh.A.Ilyasov and K.T. Bodeev, who studied the issues of Soviet historiography during the Stalinist period and divided Soviet historiography into four stages:

The first stage (1930s — mid-1950s). Historical works from this period were constrained by political censorship and had a strong ideological focus. In studies praising Stalin and his achievements, repressions were portrayed as a fight against “conspiracies,” and there was a complete absence of critical analysis of the events taking place.

In the works of P.G. Galuzo, special attention is given to Y.B.Bekmakhanov's study “The accession of Kazakhstan to Russia” (1957). P.Galuzo, comparing Y.Bekmakhanov's views with

those of M.P. Kim, highlights the differences in their core opinions on the impact of colonial rule on Kazakhstan. Kim argued that the colonial governance of the Russian Empire "objectively contributed" to the development of Kazakhstan, while Bekmakhanov disagreed, emphasizing that progressive changes occurred "despite local colonial oppression" [15].

Galuzo highly praised Bekmakhanov's works as studies that effectively presented the facts about the colonial situation in Kazakhstan. Bekmakhanov's dissertation became a significant step forward in the study of Kazakh history, following the works of M.P. Kim.

The second stage (mid-1950s — mid-1960s). After Stalin's death, changes began to take place, and responsibility for past actions was directly placed on Stalin. Research became more open, although a systematic study of Stalinist repressions was not conducted. During this period, works by scholars such as M. Kozybayev, A. Bisenbaev, K. Nurpeisov, and M. Koigeldiev were written, providing a clear assessment of the national liberation uprising of 1916.

In addition, during the Stalinist period, materials on the Great Patriotic War were perceived as a collective victory of the Party. However, in the 1960s, works began to emerge that highlighted the heroism of Kazakhs and Kazakh women during the Great Patriotic War. One of the first comprehensive studies was G.A. Abishev's doctoral dissertation "Kazakhstan in the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union (1941-1945)." It was first published as a monograph in 1958. However, in the review, it was noted: "There is a lack of critical approach in evaluating events and a softened presentation of the hardships of the war years." Nevertheless, this work made a significant contribution to the history of the Kazakhs. In another publication by the author, titled "Kazakhstan in the Defence of the Socialist Motherland," data was presented on the heroic actions of Kazakhstanians during the war, as well as the feats of women both at the front and on the home front [16].

The third stage (mid-1960s — mid-1980s). A critical view of Stalin was limited due to the characteristics of Brezhnev's policies. The issues of repression were not openly addressed, and historical scholarship remained within the bounds of official ideology.

The fourth stage (since the mid-1980s). During the period of perestroika under Gorbachev, active criticism of the Stalinist model of development began. Repressions became an independent subject of study, although their evaluation was often emotional and unprofessional. This stage includes the works of scholars such as M. Kozybayev, Zh. Abylkhozhin, and M. Tatimov. Thanks to their scientific efforts, the events of the 1930s became widely known. M. Kozybayev was one of the first researchers to make a significant contribution to addressing the "white spots" in the history of Kazakhstan. His works and studies introduced new approaches and conceptual rethinking. Zh. Abylkhozhin, M. Kozybayev, and M. Tatimov examined the tragedy that befell the Kazakh people in the 1930s, bringing public attention to this issue. S. Mazhitov made important contributions to the study of contemporary aspects of Kazakhstan's history.

During the Soviet period, the history of the Kazakh people was rewritten from a socialist perspective. In F.I. Goloshchekin's work "Ten years passed and upcoming tasks," the socio-economic situation in Kazakhstan was described. He highlighted the absence of industry and a proletariat, as well as the dominance of clans and semi-feudalism in rural areas. This was one of the ideological views of the Soviet period.

Goloshchekin's perspective reflected a negative assessment of the social structure of Kazakh society and a critical view of the influence of bourgeois national parties. This conclusion was shaped by Soviet ideology. Based on this, it can be concluded that there is a need for a new methodology for contemporary researchers. Specifically, it is necessary to reassess aspects of history that were not studied due to the influence of Soviet ideology and to propose new research directions that combine economic and spiritual factors, using comprehensive research methods.

Conclusion

Summarising the results and discussion, it can be noted that despite the one-sided portrayal of historical periods of the Kazakh people in Soviet historiography, modern researchers are

addressing these gaps. Soviet ideology left a significant imprint on historical science and the study of the Kazakh people's past. This influence manifested in the following aspects:

1. **Dominance of Socialist Ideology:** In Soviet historiography, all events and figures were viewed through the lens of socialist ideology. When studying the history of the Kazakh people, the nomadic way of life and traditional economy were portrayed as incompatible with the "Soviet path of socialist development." The nomadic society was depicted as backward and outdated, while socialist construction was considered the highest stage of progress.

2. **Justification of Colonial Policy:** Soviet historians often portrayed the colonial policy of tsarist Russia in a positive light, presenting it as a progressive force that contributed to the economic and cultural development of the Kazakhs. The conquest of Kazakh lands by Russia was interpreted as a "historical necessity" and viewed as a beneficial influence of tsarist rule.

3. **Distortion of National Movements and Figures:** National liberation movements and the activities of national leaders were evaluated negatively within the framework of Soviet ideology. For example, although the Alash movement and its leaders fought for the interests of the Kazakh people, they were portrayed as "bourgeois nationalists" or "counterrevolutionaries."

4. **Justification of Russification and Cultural Assimilation:** In Soviet historiography, the policy of Russification – where the Kazakh language and culture were displaced by the dominance of the Russian language and culture – was portrayed as a progressive step. It was believed that this policy contributed to the formation of a unified socialist culture of the "Soviet people," which was presented as a positive development.

5. **The Myth of the Friendship of Peoples:** In Soviet ideology, the idea of the friendship of peoples held a special place. This myth aimed to smooth over the complex moments in the relationship between the Kazakh people and Russia, while ignoring historical contradictions. The conflicts and hardships experienced by the Kazakh people under tsarist rule were downplayed, and the unity of the Soviet peoples was idealized.

6. **Idealisation of Agrarian Reforms:** in Soviet historiography, the agrarian reforms of tsarist Russia, including land redistribution and the transition to a sedentary economy, were consistently portrayed as progressive. The negative consequences, such as the expropriation of land from the Kazakhs and the destruction of their traditional economic system, were ignored or given insufficient attention.

7. **Exaggerating the importance of revolutionary events:** the history of the Kazakh people is associated with the October revolution of 1917 and describing its results as "saviour". The period before the revolution was presented as a period of backwardness and class contradictions of the Kazakh society. It was shown that after the revolution, Kazakhs entered the path of socialist development.

Thus, the Soviet ideology was based on distorting the history of the Kazakh people, portraying it through socialist ideals and ignoring national peculiarities and problems.

Financing information. This research is funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. AP23489355 - Modernization of popular narratives in the history of Kazakhstan using public history methods).

REFERENCES

1. Агаев Е. Историография и историческое образование Тюркских республик в рамках советской идеологии: пример Азербайджана, (неопубликованная докторская диссертация). - 2006. - 84 с.
2. Диалектикалық және тарихи материализм. - Алматы: Қазақстан, 1972. - Б.184-186.
3. Жаппасов Ж. XVI-XVIII ғғ. қазақ-орыс қарым-қатынастарының тарихнамасы. - Алматы, 2019. – 233 б.
4. Махат Д. Лениндік-сталиндік ұлт саясаты және қазақ зиялыларын қуғындау тарихынан. Тәуелсіз Қазақстанның тарихын зерттеудің өзекті мәселелері ғылыми-танымдық мақалалар жинағы. – Астана: Полиграфия, 2011. - 123 б.

5. Такенов А. Профессор Санжар Асфендияров (1889-1938). - Алматы: Sanat Publishing House, 1994. - Б. 116-118.
6. Омарбеков Т. Қазақстан тарихына және тарихнамасына ұлттық көзқарас. - Алматы: Қазақ Университеті, 2004. - 357 б.
7. Дахшлейгер Г.Ф. Историография советского Казахстана. - Алма-Ата., 1969. - 192 с.; Дулатова Д.И. Историография дореволюционного Казахстана. - Алма-Ата, 1983. - 190 с.; Дахшлейгер Г.Ф., Нурпеисов К. История крестьянства советского Казахстана. - Алма-Ата., 1985. - 247 с.
8. Мұхатова О. Тарихнама ғылымы: Теориялық-методологиялық негіздері және зерттеу үлгілері. - Алматы. 2009. -41-42 бб.
9. Сафаров Г.И. Колониальная революция. Опыт Туркестана. — Москва: Государственное издательство, 1921. — 148 с.
10. Төлебаев Т. Қазақстан тарихы мен тарихнамасының өзекті мәселелері. - Алматы, 2016. - 228 б.
11. Даль В. Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка. Т.2. Москва: Русский язык, 1989. - 780 с.
12. Неру Дж. Открытие Индии. — М.: Издательство иностранной литературы, 1955. — 652, [24] с.
13. Козыбаев М.К. Избранные труды. Проблемы методологии, историографии и источниковедения истории Казахстана. - Алматы: Ғылым, 2006. - 109-112 с.
14. Фризен Д.Я. Актуальные проблемы исследования аграрных отношений в Западном Казахстане XIX – начала XX века в историографии республики Казахстан // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики: сб. науч. ст. - Тамбов, 2012. № 9 (23): в 2-х ч. Ч. I.
15. Игибаев С.К. Историография истории Казахстана. – Алматы 2013. - 358 с.
16. Сактаганова З.Г., Абдрахманова К.К. Советская и современная и Казахстанская историография проблемы «Женщины Казахстана в годы Великой Отечественной войны» // Вестник Карагандинского Университета, №3(91), 2018. - 92 с.

КЕҢЕСТІК КЕЗЕҢ ТАРИХНАМАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚТЫҢ ӨТКЕН ТАРИХЫ ТУРАЛЫ НЕГІЗГІ ТҰЖЫРЫМДАР

Аңдатпа

Бұл мақалада кеңестік тарихнаманың қазақ тарихына тигізген ықпалы жан-жақты қарастырылады. Кеңес кезеңіндегі тарихи зерттеулер төрт негізгі кезеңге бөлініп талданады: 1930-1950 жылдардың ортасы, 1950-1960 жылдар, 1960-1980 жылдар және 1980 жылдардан кейінгі қайта құру кезеңі. Зерттеуде әр кезеңнің өзіндік ерекшеліктері, идеологиялық ұстанымдары мен ғылыми еңбектерге қойылған цензура талданады. Кеңес билігі жүргізген тарихнамалық саясаттың нәтижесінде қазақ тарихына қатысты зерттеулерде бұрмалаушылықтар орын алғаны анықталады. Сонымен қатар мақалада кеңестік биліктің тарихи зерттеулерге жасаған ықпалына ерекше мән беріледі. Кеңес дәуірінде тарих ғылымы коммунистік идеологияға негізделіп, тарихи деректердің объективті зерттелуіне шектеу қойылды. Патшалық Ресейдің отарлау саясаты мен қазақ ұлт-азаттық қозғалыстарының сипаты кеңестік кезеңде бұрмаланып көрсетілген. Қазақ халқының ұлттық бірегейлігіне нұқсан келтіретін идеологиялық шектеулер енгізіліп, ресми тарихнаманың біржақты ұстанымы қалыптасты.

Зерттеудің негізгі мақсаты – кеңестік тарихнаманың қазақ тарихын зерттеуге ықпалын талдау және тарихи еңбектердегі цензура мен идеологиялық шектеулерді көрсету болып табылады. Әр тарихи кезеңде қазақ тарихына қатысты зерттеулер қалай жүргізілді, қандай өзгерістер орын алды деген сұрақтарға жауап беріледі. Сонымен қатар, И.Сталин мен Л.Брежнев кезеңіндегі саясаттың тарихи дискурсты қалыптастырудағы рөлі қарастырылады. Қазақ ұлт-азаттық қозғалыстарының бұрмалануы, Ресей империясының отарлық саясатының ақталуы сияқты мәселелерге ерекше назар аударылады.

Зерттеу нәтижесінде кеңестік тарихнаманың социалистік идеология үстемдік еткенін, қазақ тарихын объективті түрде зерттеуге кедергілер болғанын көруге болады. Кеңестік билік мәдени ассимиляция мен орыстандыру үдерістерін негіздеп, ұлттық тарихты екінші кезекке ығыстырды. Қазіргі заманғы зерттеулерде бұл мәселелерге жаңаша көзқарас қажет екендігі, кеңестік тарихнаманың ықпалын қайта қарастырып, жаңа методологиялар мен кешенді зерттеу әдістерін енгізу қажеттілігі атап өтіледі.

Негізгі сөздер: кеңестік тарихнама, қазақ тарихы, идеология, тарихи көзқарас, мәдени ассимиляция.

ОСНОВНЫЕ КОНЦЕПЦИИ ИСТОРИЧЕСКОГО ПРОШЛОГО КАЗАХСКОГО НАРОДА В СОВЕТСКОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ

Аннотация

В данной статье всесторонне рассматривается влияние советской историографии на изучение казахской истории. Исторические исследования советского периода анализируются в рамках четырех основных этапов: середина 1930–1950-х годов, 1950–1960-е годы, 1960–1980-е годы и период перестройки

после 1980-х годов. В исследовании рассматриваются особенности каждого периода, идеологические установки и цензура, наложенная на научные труды. Установлено, что в результате историографической политики советской власти исследования, касающиеся казахской истории, подвергались искажениям. Особое внимание в статье уделяется влиянию советской власти на исторические исследования. В советскую эпоху наука о прошлом основывалась на коммунистической идеологии, что накладывало ограничения на объективное изучение исторических данных. Политика колонизации Казахской степи со стороны Российской империи, а также казахские национально-освободительные движения в советский период были представлены в искаженном виде. Идеологические ограничения, наносящие ущерб национальной идентичности казахского народа, были узаконены, что привело к формированию однобокой официальной историографии.

Основная цель данного исследования — проанализировать влияние советской историографии на изучение казахской истории, а также выявить цензурные ограничения и идеологические установки, наложенные на исторические труды. Рассматривается, как проводились исследования казахской истории в разные периоды, какие изменения происходили в историографии. Кроме того, анализируется роль политических курсов И.Сталина и Л.Брежнева в формировании исторического дискурса. Особое внимание уделяется вопросам искажения истории казахского национально-освободительного движения и оправдания колониальной политики Российской империи.

Исследование показывает, что советская историография находилась под влиянием социалистической идеологии, что препятствовало объективному изучению казахской истории. Советская власть оправдывала процессы культурной ассимиляции и русификации, отодвигая национальную историю на второй план. В современных исследованиях подчеркивается необходимость пересмотра этих вопросов, критического анализа влияния советской историографии и внедрения новых методологических подходов и комплексных исследовательских методов.

Ключевые слова: советская историография, казахская история, идеология, историческая перспектива, культурная ассимиляция.

REFERENCES

1. Agaev E. Istoriofografiya i istoricheskoe obrazovanie Turkskih respublik v ramkah sovetsoy ideologii: primer Azerbaydjana. [Historiography and Historical Education of the Turkic Republics within the Framework of Soviet Ideology: The Case of Azerbaijan] (neopublikovannaya doktorskaya dissertatsiya). - 2006. - 84 p. [in Russian].
2. Dialektikalyq jāne tarihi materializm. [Dialectical and Historical Materialism] - Almaty: Qazaqstan, 1972. - P. 184-186. [in Kazakh].
3. Jappasov J. XVI-XVIII ğǵ. qazaq-orys qarym-qatynastarynyń tarihnaması. [Historiography of Kazakh-Russian Relations in the 16th-18th Centuries]. - Almaty, 2019. - 233 p. [in Kazakh].
4. Mahat D. Lenindik-stalindik űlt saiasaty jāne qazaq zialylaryn quǵyndau tarihy. Tǵuelsız Qazaqstannyń tarihy zertteudiń űzekti mǵseleleri ğylymi-tanyndyq maqalalar jınaǵy. [Leninist-Stalinist National Policy and the Repression of the Kazakh Intelligentsia]. - Astana Poligrafia, 2011. - 123 p. [in Kazakh].
5. Takenov A. Professor Sanjar Asfendiyarov (1889-1938). [Professor Sanjar Asfendiyarov (1889-1938)]. - Almaty: Sanat Publishing House, 1994. - P. 116-118. [in Russian].
6. Omarbekov T. Qazaqstan tarihyne jāne tarihnamasyna űlttyq kűzqaras. A National View on the History and Historiography of Kazakhstan]. - Almaty: Qazaq Universiteti, 2004. - 357 p. [in Kazakh].
7. Dahshleyger G.F. Istoriofafiya sovetsoy Kazahstana. [Historiography of Soviet Kazakhstan]. - Alma-Ata., 1969. - 192 p.; Dulatova D.I. Istoriofafiya dorevolutsionnogo Kazahstana. [Historiography of Pre-revolutionary Kazakhstan]. - Aima-Ata, 1983. - 190 p.; Dahshleyger G.F., Nurpeisov K. Istoriya krestyanstva sovetsoy Kazahstana. [History of the Peasantry in Soviet Kazakhstan]. - Alma-Ata., 1985. - 247 p. [in Russian].
8. Műhatova O. Tarihnama ğylymy: Teorialyq-metodologialyq negizderi jāne zertteu űlgileri. [Historiography as a Science: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations and Research Models]. - Almaty. 2009. - P. 41-42. [in Kazakh].
9. Cafarov G.I. Kolonialnaya revoliutsiya. Opyt Turkestana. [Colonial Revolution: The Turkestan Experience]. — Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo, 1921. - 148 p. [in Russian].
10. Tűlebaev T. Qazaqstan tarihy men tarihnamasynyń űzekti mǵseleleri. [Topical Issues in the History and Historiography of Kazakhstan]. - Almaty, 2016. - 228 p. [in Kazakh].
11. Dal V. Tolkoviy slovar zhivogo velikorusskogo yazyka. [Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language]. - T.2. - Moskva: Russkii iazyk, 1989. - 780 p. [in Russian].
12. Neru Dj. Otkrytie Indii. [The Discovery of India]. — Moskva.: Izdatelstvo inostrannoy literatury. 1955. — 652, [24] p. [in Russian].

13. Kozybaev M.K. Izbrannyye trudy. Problemyi metodologii, istoriografii i istochnikovedeniya istorii Kazakhstana. [Selected Works: Problems of Methodology, Historiography, and Source Studies of Kazakhstan's History]. - Almaty: Gylym, 2006. -109-112 p. [in Russian].

14. Frizen D.YA. Aktualnyie problemyi issledovaniya agrarnykh otnoshenii v Zapadnom Kazakhstane XIX – nachala XX veka v istoriografii respubliki Kazahstan [Current Issues in the Study of Agrarian Relations in Western Kazakhstan in the 19th – early 20th Century in the Historiography of the Republic of Kazakhstan] // Istoricheskie, filosofskie, politicheskie i uridicheskie nauki, kulturologiya i iskusstvovedenie. Voprosy teorii i praktiki: sb. nauch. st. - Tambov, 2012. № 9 (23): in 2 vol. Vol. I. [in Russian].

15. Igibaev S.K. Istoriografiya istorii Kazakhstana. [Historiography of the History of Kazakhstan] – Almaty, 2013. 358 p. [in Russian].

16. Saktaganova Z.G., Abdrahmanova K.K. Sovetskaya i sovremennaya i Kazhstanskaya istoriografiya problemyi «Jenshinyi Kazakhstana v godyi Velikoy Otechestvennoy voynyi» [Soviet and Contemporary Kazakh Historiography on the Issue of "Women of Kazakhstan during the Great Patriotic War"] // Vestnik Karagandinskogo Universiteta, №3(91), 2018. - 92 p. [in Russian].

Information about authors:

Tasilova Naziya – **corresponding author**, candidate of historical sciences, associate professor of the Department of History of Kazakhstan, Faculty of History, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan.

E-mail: tasnaz@mail.ru.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9777-1893>.

Baidavletova Madina – PhD, senior lecturer of the Department of History of Kazakhstan, Faculty of History, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan.

E-mail: madina.dosbergen@gmail.com

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3847-7758>

Информация об авторах:

Тасилова Назия Айтбаевна – **основной автор**, кандидат исторических наук, доцент кафедры история Казахстана Исторического факультета, Казахского национального университета им. аль-Фараби, г.Алматы, Республика Казахстан

E-mail: tasnaz@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9777-1893>

Байдавлетова Мадина – PhD, старший преподаватель кафедры истории Казахстана исторического факультета Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби г.Алматы, Республика Казахстан

E-mail: madina.dosbergen@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3847-7758>

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Тасилова Назия Айтбайқызы - **негізгі автор**, тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті Тарих факультеті Қазақстан тарихы кафедрасының қауымдастырылған профессоры, Алматы қ., Қазақстан Республикасы

E-mail: tasnaz@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9777-1893>

Байдавлетова Мадина – PhD, аға оқытушы, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы қ., Қазақстан Республикасы

E-mail: madina.dosbergen@gmail.com

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3847-7758>