

ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ  
ҒЫЛЫМ ЖӘНЕ ЖОҒАРЫ БІЛІМ МИНИСТРАЛІГІ  
ҒЫЛЫМ КОМИТЕТІ  
Ш.Ш. УӘЛИХАНОВ АТЫНДАҒЫ ТАРИХ ЖӘНЕ ЭТНОЛОГИЯ ИНСТИТУТЫ



«EDU.E-HISTORY.KZ»  
ЭЛЕКТРОНДЫҚ ҒЫЛЫМИ ЖУРНАЛЫ



2024.11 (1)  
қаңтар-наурыз

ISSN 2710-3994

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

*Құрылтайшысы және баспагері:* Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитеті Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Ғылыми журнал Қазақстан Республикасы Инвестициялар және даму министрлігінің Байланыс, ақпараттандыру және ақпарат комитетінде 2014 ж. 29 қазанында тіркелген. Тіркеу нөмірі № 14602-ИА. Жылына 4 рет жарияланады (электронды нұсқада).

Журналда тарих ғылымының *келесі бағыттары* бойынша ғылыми жұмыстар жарияланады: тарих (дүниежүзі және Қазақстан тарихы), деректану және тарихнама, археология, этнология, антропология.

*Жарияланым тілдері:* қазақ, орыс, ағылшын.

*Редакция мен баспаның мекен-жайы:*

050010 Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй

ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Тел.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

Е-mail: [edu.history@bk.ru](mailto:edu.history@bk.ru)

Журнал сайты: <https://edu.e-history.kz>

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы  
Тарих және этнология институты 2024  
© Авторлар ұжымы, 2024

**БАС РЕДАКТОР**

**Қабылдинов Зиябек Ермұқанұлы** — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА корр.-мүшесі, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒКШ.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының бас директоры. (Қазақстан)

**РЕДАКЦИЯЛЫҚ АЛҚА**

**Аяған Бүркітбай Ғелманұлы** — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Мемлекет тарихы институты директорының орынбасары. (Қазақстан)

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

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

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

**Голден Кэти Стромайл (Kathie Stromile Golden)** — PhD, Миссисипи өңірлік мемлекеттік университеті (Mississippi Valley State University). (АҚШ)

**Кәрібаев Берекет Бақытжанұлы** — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Өл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, «Қазақстан тарихы» кафедрасының меңгерушісі. (Қазақстан)

**Қожамжарова Дария Пернешқызы** — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университетінің ректоры. (Қазақстан)

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

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

**Көкебаева Гүлжауһар Какенқызы** — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті. (Қазақстан)

**Көмеков Болат Ешмұхамедұлы** — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Өл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті Халықаралық қышпақтану институтының директоры, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің профессоры. (Қазақстан)

**Матыжанов Кенжехан Ісләмжанұлы** — филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА корр.-мүшесі, М.О. Әуезов атындағы әдебиет және өнер институтының директоры. (Қазақстан)

**Моррисон Александр (Morrison Alexander)** — PhD, Оксфорд университетінің профессоры. (Ұлыбритания)

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

**Римантас Желвис (Želvys Rimantas)** — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Вильнюс педагогикалық университеті. (Литва)

**Самашев Зайнолла Самашұлы** — археолог, тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Герман археология институтының корр.-мүшесі. ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Ө. Марғұлан атындағы Археология институты. (Қазақстан)

**Смағұлов Оразақ Смағұлұлы** — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР 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. (Қазақстан)

**Сыдықов Ерлан Бәтташұлы** — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ректоры. (Қазақстан)

**Таймағамбетов Жәкен Қожахметұлы** — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, ҚР Ұлттық музейі. (Қазақстан)

**ЖАУАПТЫ РЕДАКТОР**

**Қаипбаева Айнагүл Толғанбайқызы** — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының жетекші ғылыми қызметкері. (Қазақстан)

**ҒЫЛЫМИ РЕДАКТОРЛАР**

**Қозыбаева Махаббат Мәлікқызы** — PhD, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының Астана қаласындағы филиалының директоры. (Қазақстан)

**Қапаева Айжан Тоқанқызы** — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының Бас ғылыми қызметкері. (Қазақстан)

**Кубеев Рустем Жаулыбайұлы** — Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының ғылыми қызметкері. (Қазақстан)

**ТЕХНИКАЛЫҚ ХАТШЫ**

**Копеева Сания Жуматайқызы** — Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының қызметкері. (Қазақстан).

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

*Учредитель и издатель:* РГП на ПХВ «Институт истории и этнологии им.Ч.Ч. Валиханова»  
Комитета науки Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан

Научный журнал зарегистрирован в Комитете связи, информатизации и информации  
Министерства по инвестициям и развитию Республики Казахстан, свидетельство  
о регистрации:

№ 14602-ИА от 29.10.2014 г. Публикуется 4 раза в год (в электронном формате).

В журнале публикуются научные работы *по следующим направлениям* исторической науки:  
история (всемирная история и история Казахстана), источниковедение и историография,  
археология, этнология, антропология.

*Языки публикации:* казахский, русский, английский.

*Адрес редакции и издательства:*

050010 Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы, ул. Шевченко, д. 28

РГП на ПХВ Институт истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова КН МНВО РК

Тел.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

Е-mail: [edu.history@bk.ru](mailto:edu.history@bk.ru)

Сайт журнала: <https://edu.e-history.kz>

© Институт истории и этнологии  
имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2024  
© Коллектив авторов, 2024

**ГЛАВНЫЙ РЕДАКТОР**

**Кабульдинов Зиябек Ермуханович** — доктор исторических наук, профессор, чл.-корр. НАН РК, генеральный директор Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова КН МНВО РК. (Казахстан)

**РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ**

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

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

**Аяган Буркитбай Гелманович** — доктор исторических наук, профессор, заместитель директора Института истории государства КН МНВО РК. (Казахстан)

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

**Голден Кэтти Стромилл (Kathie Stromile Golden)** — PhD, Государственный университет долины Миссисипи (Mississippi Valley State University). (США)

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

**Исмагулов Оразак Исмагулович** — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН 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)

**Карibaев Берекет Бахытжанович** — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, заведующий кафедрой истории Казахстана, Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби. (Казахстан)

**Кожамжарова Дария Пернешовна** — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, ректор Южно-Казахстанского университета им. М. Ауэзова. (Казахстан)

**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 педагогического университета имени Абая. (Казахстан)

**Кумеков Болат Ешмухамбетович** — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, директор Международного института кипчаковедения Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби, профессор Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева. (Казахстан)

**Матыжанов Кенжехан Слямжанович** — доктор филологических наук, профессор, чл.-корр. НАН РК, директор Института литературы и искусства им. М. Ауэзова. (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)

**Римантас Желвис (Zelvys Rimantas)** — доктор педагогических наук, профессор, Вильнюсский педагогический университет. (Литва)

**Самашев Зайнолла Самашевич** — археолог, доктор исторических наук, профессор, чл.-корр. Германского археологического института. Институт археологии им. А. Маргулана КН МНВО РК. (Казахстан)

**Сыдыков Ерлан Батташевич** — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, ректор Евразийского национального университета им. Л.Н. Гумилева. (Казахстан)

**Таймагамбетов Жакен Кожакметович** — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, Национальный музей РК. (Казахстан)

**ОТВЕТСТВЕННЫЙ РЕДАКТОР**

**Каипбаева Айнагуль Толганбаевна** — кандидат исторических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

**НАУЧНЫЕ РЕДАКТОРЫ**

**Козыбаева Махаббат Маликовна** — PhD, директор филиала в г. Астана Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

**Капаева Айжан Токановна** — доктор исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

**Кубеев Рустем Джаулыбайулы** — научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

**ТЕХНИЧЕСКИЙ СЕКРЕТАРЬ**

**Копеева Сания Жуматаевна** — сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

*Founder and publisher:* RSE on REM “Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology” of the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan

The scientific journal is registered at the Committee for Communications, Informatization and Information of the Ministry for Investments and Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan, registration certificate: No. 14602-IA dated October 29, 2014. The journal is published 4 times a year (in electronic format).

The journal publishes scientific works in the *following areas* of historical science: history (world history and history of Kazakhstan), source studies and historiography, archeology, ethnology, anthropology.

*Publication languages:* Kazakh, Russian, English.

*Editorial and publisher address:*

28 Shevchenko Str., 050010, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

RSE on REM Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology CS MSHE of the Republic of Kazakhstan

Tel.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

E-mail: [edu.history@bk.ru](mailto:edu.history@bk.ru)

Journal website: <https://edu.e-history.kz>

© Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute  
of History and Ethnology, 2024  
© Group of authors, 2024

#### EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

**Kabuldinov Ziabek Ermukhanovich** — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, General Director of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology SC MSHE RK. (Kazakhstan)

#### EDITORIAL BOARD

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

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

**Ayagan Burkitbai Gelmanovich** — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Deputy Director of the Institute of History of the State SCMSHE RK. (Kazakhstan)

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

**Golden Kathie Stromile** — PhD, Mississippi Valley State University. (USA)

**Ismagulov Orazak Ismagulovich** — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 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)

**Karibayev Bereket Bakhytzhonovich** — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Head of the Department of History of Kazakhstan, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University. (Kazakhstan)

**Kozhamzharova Daria Perneshovna** — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the NAS of the Republic of Kazakhstan, rector of the M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University. (Kazakhstan)

**Kozhirova Svetlana Bassieva** — 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)

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

**Kokebayeva Gulzhaukhar Kakenovna** — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University. (Kazakhstan)

**Kumekov Bolat Eshmukhambetovich** — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Director of the International Institute of Kipchak Studies of the Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Professor at L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. (Kazakhstan)

**Matyghanov Kenzhekhan Slyamzhanovich** — Doctor of Philology, Professor, Corresponding Member of the NAS RK, Director of M. Auezov Institute of Literature and Art. (Kazakhstan)

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

**Muminov Ashirbek Kurbanovich** — 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). (Turkey)

**Rimantas Želvys** — Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Vilnius Pedagogical University. (Lithuania)

**Samashev Zainolla Samashevich** — archaeologist, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of German Archaeological Institute. A. Marghulan Institute of Archeology SC MSHE RK. (Kazakhstan)

**Sydykov Erlan Battashevich** — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Rector of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. (Kazakhstan)

**Taimagambetov Zhaken Kozhakhmetovich** — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, National Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (Kazakhstan)

#### EXECUTIVE EDITOR

**Kaipbayeva Ainagul Tolganbayevna** — Candidate of Historical Sciences, leading researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology (Kazakhstan).

#### ACADEMIC EDITOR

**Kozybayeva Makhabbat Malikovna** — PhD, Director of Astana branch of the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

**Kapaeva Aizhan Tokanovna** — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

**Kubeyev Rustem Dzhaulybayuly** — researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

#### TECHNICAL SECRETARY

**Kopeyeva Saniya Zhumataevna** — researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)


## ТАРИХ / ИСТОРИЯ / HISTORY

Published in the Republic of Kazakhstan  
 Edu.e-history.kz  
 Has been issued as a journal since 2014  
 ISSN 2710-3994.  
 Vol. 10. Is. 4, pp. 142–153, 2023  
 Journal homepage: <https://edu.e-history.kz>

FTAXP / МПНТИ / IRSTI 03.20.  
[https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994\\_2023\\_36\\_4\\_142-153](https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994_2023_36_4_142-153)

## RUSSIFICATION POLICY OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION (EARLY 20th CENTURY)

*Aizhan Konyrova*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Al-Farabi Kazakh National University  
 (71, Al-Farabi Ave., 050040 Almaty, Kazakhstan)  
 Doctoral Student  
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1587-5806>. E-mail: [konyrovaazhan@gmail.com](mailto:konyrovaazhan@gmail.com)

© Ch.Ch. Valikhanov IHE, 2024  
 © Konyrova A., 2024

**Abstract.** *Introduction.* This article considers the course of the Russian Empire's Russification policy of the socio-political and cultural life of the Kazakhs in the early twentieth century and its colonial character is analyzed. *Goals and objectives* are to assess the negative impact of the colonial policy of the Russian Empire on socio-political and cultural life. Special attention has been given to strengthening the worldview and spiritual foundations that have developed over the years, without considering the interests of the Kazakh people and adapting them to the policy of Russification. *Results.* There were beliefs that forming a group from among Kazakhs, honestly serving Russian interests, gives many advantages. To achieve this, such actions were taken as increasing the efficiency of governance of the Kazakh people through Kazakhs who received Russian education; education of Kazakh people fluent in Russian; providing the opportunity to have privileged rights and a better life for Kazakhs loyal to the Russian Empire and thus simplifying the work of Russian officials. *Conclusions.* The Russification policy of the early 20th century aim to determine ways to effectively conduct it among Kazakhs by studying information about the language and traditions, worldview and beliefs of the Kazakh people by officials, but was based on the direction of depriving its national identity and assimilation with the Russian nation.

**Keywords:** Rule, resettlement policy, colonization, socio-cultural life, madrasah school, Russian correction school, education

**For citation:** Konyrova A. Russification policy of the Russian empire in the field of education (early 20th century) // Electronic scientific journal "edu.e-history.kz". 2024. Vol. 11. No. 1. Pp. 142–153. (In Eng.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994\_2024\_11\_1\_142-153



## РЕСЕЙ ИМПЕРИЯСЫНЫҢ БІЛІМ БЕРУ САЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ОРЫСТАНДЫРУ САЯСАТЫ (XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАСЫ)

Айжан Мауленовна Қонырова<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті  
(71-үй, әл-Фараби даңғылы, 050040 Алматы, Қазақстан)

Докторант

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1587-5806>. E-mail: [konyrovaazhan@gmail.com](mailto:konyrovaazhan@gmail.com)

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы ТЭИ, 2024

© Қонырова А.М., 2024

**Аңдатпа.** *Kіріспе.* XX ғасырдың басындағы ресей империясының қазақтардың әлеуметтік-саяси және мәдени өмірін орыстандыру саясатының барысы мен оның отарлық сипаты талданады. *Зерттеудің мақсаты және міндеттері* – Ресей империясының отарлық саясатының әлеуметтік-саяси және мәдени өміріне тигізген әсеріне баға береді. Қазақ халқының мүддесімен санаспастан сан жылдар бойына қалыптасқан дүниетанымы мен рухани негіздерін күштеп, орыстандыру саясатына ыңғайластыруына ерекше мән берілді. *Нәтижелер.* Қазақтар арасынан орыс мүддесіне адал қызмет ететін топты қалыптастыру көп артықшылық беретіндігіне сенімді болды. Ол үшін қазақтың оқығандары арқылы қазақ халқын басқарудың тиімділігі; қазақтардың арасынан орыс тілін еркін меңгерген адамдарды тәрбиелеу өзге қазақтарға жақсы өмір сүру мен өзге де құқықты иеленудің мүмкіндігінің бар екендігін көрсету; орыс шенеуніктерінің жұмысын жеңілдету сынды әрекеттерге жол берді. *Қорытынды.* Шенеуніктер қазақ халқының тілі мен дәстүрін, дүниетанымы мен сенімі туралы ақпаратты зерттеп білу арқылы қазақтар арасында орыстандыру саясатын тиімді жүргізудің жолдарын анықтауды мақсат етті. XX ғасыр басындағы орыстандыру саясаты ұлттық болмысынан айырып, орыс ұлтына сіңіру бағытына негізделді.

**Түйін сөздер:** Ереже, қоныс аудару саясаты, отарлау, әлеуметтік-мәдени өмір, мектеп- медресе, орыс-түземдік мектеп, білім

**Дәйексөз үшін:** Қонырова А.М. Ресей империясының білім беру саласындағы орыстандыру саясаты (xx ғасырдың басы) // «Edu.e-history.kz» электрондық ғылыми журналы. 2024. Т. 11. № 1. 142–153 бб. (Ағылш.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994\_2024\_11\_1\_142-153

## ПОЛИТИКА РУСИФИКАЦИИ РОССИЙСКОЙ ИМПЕРИИ В СФЕРЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ (НАЧАЛО XX ВЕКА)

Айжан Мауленовна Қонырова<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Казахский Национальный Университет им. ал-Фараби  
(д. 71, проспект аль-Фараби, 050040 Алматы, Республика Казахстан)

Докторант

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1587-5806>. E-mail: [konyrovaazhan@gmail.com](mailto:konyrovaazhan@gmail.com)

© ИИЭ имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2024

© Қонырова А.М., 2024

**Аннотация.** *Введение.* Анализируется политика Российской империи по русификации социально-политической и культурной жизни казахов начала XX века и ее колониальный характер. *Цель и задачи исследования* – оценить влияние колониальной политики Российской империи на социально-политическую и культурную жизнь казахского народа. Особое внимание

было уделено политике русификации мировоззрений и духовных основ, сложившихся на протяжении многих лет, без учета интересов казахского народа. *Результаты.* Имели место убеждения, что формирование группы из числа казахов, честно служащей русским интересам, дает много преимуществ. Для этого были предприняты такие действия, как повышение эффективности управления казахским народом посредством казахов, получивших русское образование; воспитание людей из числа казахов, свободно владеющих русским языком; предоставление возможности иметь привилегированные права и лучшую жизнь преданным Российской империи казахам и таким образом упрощение работы русских чиновников. *Выводы.* Политика русификации начала XX века стремились определить способы эффективного проведения русификационной политики среди казахов путем изучения чиновниками информации о языке и традициях, мировоззрении и убеждениях казахского народа, а основывалась на направлении лишения ее национальной идентичности и ассимиляции с русской нацией.

**Ключевые слова:** Правила, миграционная политика, колонизация, социально-культурная жизнь, школа-медресе, русско-туземная школа, образование

**Для цитирования:** Коньрова А.М. Политика русификации Российской империи в сфере образования (начало XX века) // Электронный научный журнал «edu.e-history.kz». 2024. Т. 11. № 1. С. 142–153. (На Англ.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994\_2024\_11\_1\_142-153

### Introduction

After Tsarist Russia incorporated the territory of today's Kazakhstan, it actively intervened in the political, social and economic life of the traditional Kazakh society and introduced radical changes. The task of interfering in the spiritual life of the Kazakh people is seen behind such changes. Kazakhs changed the worldview and spiritual foundations that had developed over the years by force and adapted them to the policy of Russification. The policy of Russification was not limited to establishing the dominance of the Russian language only. It was intended to bring their religious beliefs closer to the Christian religion, traditions and customs to the Russian people. Of course, any colonizing country does not want its subordinate colonial state to be spiritually strong and constantly fight for freedom. For this reason, it was important to have the same attitude and position as themselves. This is also the essence and purpose of pursuing a Russification policy.

### Materials and research methods

A number of scientific methods and principles were employed during the research work. The study began with the collection of data and fundamental works related to this topic. Due to the content features of many published materials and data related to the considered topic, methods of grouping and classification were primarily used. In order to systematically conduct research work, we have divided the data into separate groups, taking into account the internal content features of the research work. The research work was organized following the principles of history and objectivity. Therefore, we conducted an analysis evaluating the features of different times, paying special attention to the social nature of the emerging data and the fundamental works. In any question, guided by the principle of credibility, the positive and negative sides of the topic were highlighted. In the course of research work, the comparative analysis of data was the basis for achieving specific results.

### Discussion

There are a number of data and research works on the topic of the Russian Empire's policy of the Russification of Kazakh society in the early 20th century and its colonial significance. Of course, many works provide indirect data, although they are not directly related to the problem. Among the data used in the course of research work is the adoption of a special program and plan for the spiritual colonization of non-Russian nationalities in the Russian Empire since the second half of the 19th century.

It is said that it is necessary to be involved in religion in order to unite firmly with the Russian people (Sbornik, 1869: 6–10). In addition, we can mention the collection of information about new rules concerning the field of education, such as the limitation of classes in the native language (Inorodcheskaya shkola, 1916: 19). The fact that the policy of baptism of Kazakhs was carried out by missionaries is known from the reports on the number of people sent to the Kazakh steppe (Vedomost, 1905: 44).

Researcher Sadvokasova's work on the special importance of baptism in the Russification policy of the Tsarist government has its own value (Sadvokasova, 2015: 33). Researcher Nurgalieva's research work shows that baptized Kazakhs were taken under the special care of the state and given a new social status (Nurgalieva, 2007: 34). The work of national intellectuals who expressed their own opinions about the issue of “new method” schools and their start to work in the Kazakh land was enormous (Aiqap, 1911:3). At the same time, several important issues are preserved in the funds of the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan. 15<sup>th</sup> fund documents and 393<sup>th</sup> fund documents were used concerning this issue. Among the collections of used documents, we mention the work called “Report on the state of missionary courses in the city of Kazan for the 1904–1905 school year”. In addition, there is a collection of documents and articles called “Foreign school. Collection of articles and materials on foreign school issues” by G. Tumima, V.A. Zelenko.

In the course of the article, we have used a number of works of documentary importance related to the topic. Among them are the works by V.V. Barthold “The history of cultural life of Turkestan”, G.A. Falbork and V.I. Charnaluksky “Desktop book on national education: laws, regulations, rules, instructions”, M. Seralin “The city of Troitsk, February 1911”. On the topic under consideration, there is a work by K.E. Bendrikov “Essays on the history of people's education in Turkestan (1865–1924)”. Additional information related to the research concern is also found in the works of domestic researchers. Among them we should mention “From liberation ideas to the Soviet state in Bukhara and Khiva” by S.Z. Zimanov, “National political elite. Activity and fate (XVIII–XX centuries). Research.” by M.K. Koigeldiev, “Spiritual pedestal of Alash” by D. Kamzabekovich, “Consequences of the spiritual colonization policy of the Tsarist Russia and Soviet empires in Kazakhstan (70–80s of the XIX–early XXI century) by S.M. Mashimbayev and G.S. Mashimbayeva, “Training of pedagogical personnel in Step and Turkestan regions in the Russian Empire” by A.K. Sadykova and S.S. Saifulmalikova. We also note the importance of the work “Formation system of school education of the Kazakh population of central Kazakhstan in the second half of the XIX – beginning of XX centuries” by B.T. Tuleuova, L.K. Shotbakova, G.M. Smagulova.

## Results

The tsarist government sought to form its reliable support for the Russification policy in the Kazakh land. This foundation was to begin with the education of Kazakhs who were fluent in Russian and loyal to the tsarist government. By opening Russian correction schools, we can also say that the task of forming a social group among Kazakhs serving Russian interests has been realized to a certain extent. The formation of a group of Kazakhs who faithfully serve Russian interests would give a lot of advantages. First of all, the effectiveness of managing the Kazakh people through the Kazakhs education. Secondly, the education of people fluent in the Russian language among Kazakhs is to show other Kazakhs that there is an opportunity to live well and have rights. Thirdly, to facilitate the work of Russian officials. Given the fact that the officials at the head of the policy of colonization and Russification of the Kazakh steppe did not know the Kazakh language, there is reason to believe that the third task was implemented in practice. Tsarist officials did not aim to find ways to effectively conduct the Russification policy among the Kazakhs by studying the language and traditions, worldview and beliefs of the Kazakh people. That is why the policy of Russification at the beginning of the 20th century was based on such wild ways as intimidation and oppression (Nurgalieva, 2007: 36–37).

One of the reasons for the strengthening of the Russification policy in the Kazakh steppes at the beginning of the 20th century was the adoption of a special program and plan for the spiritual colonization of non-Russian nationalities in the Russian Empire from the second half of the 19th century. In the “Collection of documents and articles on the issue of education for foreign nationalities” from St. Petersburg in 1869, it is noted that in the peripheral regions of European Russia, the influence of Tatar Muslims is higher than that of Russian Christians. Tatar Muslims take all their religious relatives under their influence. Therefore, protecting non-Russian nationalities from the ignorance of Tatar Muslims shows that Russian-Christian educational work should be firmly established in the colonial regions. It was noted that there should be no debate on this issue. Russian missionaries believed that a state such as the Russian Empire should be dominated by the Russian worldview, which was distinguished in numbers and by the advanced development of its culture. The church and schools were given great responsibility for the fulfilment of such important tasks. It is clearly stated that the main purpose of the schools being opened is to convert non-Russian children to the Christian religion and their Russification. Of course, among those who played a special role in the policy of Russification of non-Russian peoples was Professor of Kazan University N.I. Ilminsky. One of his assistants was the baptized Tatar V.T. Zolotnitsky. As for what matters in the Russification of peoples, Zolotnitsky expresses the following opinion: “To firmly unite non-Russians with the Russian people, it is not enough just to teach the Russian language. They need to be converted to Christianity. Non-Russians should understand the high moral value of the Russian people after the language and religion” (Sbornik, 1869: 6–10). Such initiatives started in the second half of the 19th century and began to give their real results at the beginning of the 20th century. The influence of the Russification policy was felt in Russian correction schools, where Kazakh children studied, and in everyday life as well. Not only the Russian language and Christianity but also the way of life of the Russian people, laws and other values of Russian culture were deeply propagated. The tsarist government was well aware that the effectiveness of the Russification policy would be beneficial primarily to the empire. It was noted that only through the full Russification of the Kazakh people there will be more chances for full ownership of the giant territory.

The Russification policy in socio-cultural life at the beginning of the 20th century was manifested primarily in education. In conducting its policies through schools, the Tsarist administration was guided by four main tasks. They are:

- Documents and regulations of the Empire regarding education: the use of schools for non-Russian peoples only for the implementation of the policy of Russification;
  - Centralization of public education. Limitation of local administration and its competence to educate the local population;
  - Eliminating the backwardness of education. Making educational schools compulsory for the public and making education free of charge;
  - Campaigning against the mother tongue of local people in schools for non-Russian people.
- Ignoring the national cultural characteristics of non-Russian peoples (Inorodcheskaya shkola, 916: 28–29).

It would be ideal to pursue a Russification policy and introduce the Russian language and Christianity through schools. Because young children, whose worldview is being formed, quickly absorb any new details. Taking into account that school-aged children have not yet formed their religious concepts and beliefs, there is a high possibility of getting interested in a new religion. Although it was possible to teach Russian to adults who had already graduated from a traditional confessional school, it was very difficult to change their religious views. For this reason, officials of the Tsarist government insisted on paying special attention to the education of teenage children. Although the influence of the propaganda of the Russian language and Christianity through the school was slow, it was the most proper direction. Taking this fact into account, the missionaries and the Tsarist administration attached

great importance to the work in this field. There is every reason to believe that such an approach, which began in the second half of the 19th century, fully covered all regions of the Kazakh steppe at the beginning of the 20th century. One of the important points to note is that the policy of Russification of the Kazakhs was not a new direction and approach for the Tsarist administration. The Tsarist administration had already accumulated rich experience in the policy of Russification. The policy of Russification of ethnic minorities in the Volga region and Siberia within the Russian Empire began earlier. The main achievements of the Russification policy in those places began with the work of the school. In 1905, the Ministry of Public Education approved a new regulation for the non-Russian peoples in the East. Changes were made to Ilminsky's methods in the 70s of the 19th century. Orthodox-missionary tasks were now replaced by the task of bringing the non-Russian peoples closer to the Russians. Although new tasks appeared, the methods of achieving them remained unchanged. Those methods were aimed at restricting classes in the mother tongue and teaching all subjects in Russian (Inorodcheskaya shkola, 1916: 19). Of course, teaching obscure subjects such as arithmetic in a language that one does not understand created difficulties. Therefore, there is no reason to say that such subjects were been fully mastered.

Due to the presence of elements of Russification in schools, Kazakhs did not entrust their children to Russian correction schools and started to oppose their education. At the beginning of the 20th century, as an alternative to Russian correction schools, schools of the “new method” appeared and started to work. I. Gasprinsky's schools of “new method” corresponded to the secular education system of those years. The reason why these schools were in demand by Kazakhs was that they were firmly based on the Islamic religion. These schools were in particular demand among the Turkic peoples who lived in the Russian Empire. The beginning of the “new method” schools in the Kazakh steppe brought Kazakhs closer to the basics of developed European education. Gasprinsky's initiative was especially supported by national intellectuals at the beginning of the 20th century. For example, M. Seralin, who served as the editor-in-chief of the “Aiqap” magazine, praised Gasprinsky, who invented the “new method” school, as “the teacher of more than 20 million people in Russia”. This high assessment of Gasprinsky shows the high benefits of a new type of schools for Kazakh children (Aiqap, 1911: 3). Along with M. Seralin, other national figures embraced the opening of the schools with “new method” and expressed their opinions. Jadidist figures gathered next to the magazine “Aiqap”, where M. Seralin was the editor. M. Shokai and Zh. Seydalin can be mentioned among them (Zimanov, 1976: 55). Akhmet Baitursynov was among the initiators of I. Gasprinsky's initiative in the Kazakh land. In 1912, he gave birth to the newspaper “Qazaq”, which promoted Jadid ideas through the “Shortcut Alphabet” created by him, and they were supported by Kazakh nationalists.

In the Russian Empire, at the beginning of the twentieth century, when the ideology of national liberation among the Turkic peoples did not take shape, the pro-Russian movement against colonial oppression first took place within the framework of the general Islamic Movement. Its guiding center was the Muslim faction within the State Duma (Koigeldiev, 2004: 219).

The Tsarist government tried to limit the work of the traditional madrasah schools, along with the “new method” schools, which negatively affected the Russification policy. There are several reasons for this. First of all, the “new method” schools gave preference to the educational content recognized at the European level. At the same time, traditional madrasah schools were based on the values of the Islamic religion. Therefore, these educational institutions were far from Russian culture. In addition, the author of the “new method” school was considered foreign, and the teaching methodology belonged not to Russia, but to European countries.

In general, Kazakh jaditarians looked at Europe, which reached the twentieth century as a giant of education and art, both with hope and suspicion. The hope was that science, education, and culture, which systematized the West, would benefit humanity and enlighten the dark spots of the world. Suspicion was fear of Western colonialism, wariness, insensitivity. However, if one just sits back in fear,

hope will disappear. So one has to take risks. Because the future was on this road (Kamzabekuly, 2003: 124–125). Following the Russification policy, the main priority should be given to the Russian language in educational institutions. From this point of view, these schools did not meet the requirements. Based on these issues, the work of these institutions began to be limited.

The fact that Kazakhs do not express much demand for Russian correction schools is probably due to the widespread use of the Russian language in the educational process. Speaking Kazakh was not allowed in private schools even. At the All-Russian Congress of Public Education, held in December 1913 in Petrograd, the question of using medieval methods in teaching non-Russians was raised. It was said that children who spoke their own language were not served lunch. Zelenko publishes an article entitled “Что такое инородческая школа” (What is a foreign school) in a collection of articles on the schools of non-Russian peoples published in 1916. In the course of the article, “children of non-Russian people have to start their lives again when they come to Russian schools. Their former life is gone. They are forbidden to use their mother tongue. Such children should be adapted according to the established rules” (Inorodcheskaya shkola, 1916: 9). It seems that the lack of interest of local Kazakhs in Russian language schools has material reasons. Since the financial situation of Russian-style schools was dire. In comparison, as for the number of funds allocated for education in the empire, the funds allocated to the Moscow region amounted to 1,418,000 som (som is a Kazakh name of the Soviet ruble), while only 253,000 som were allocated to the Turkestan region, including the Kazakh-Uzbek territory, to maintain Russian-style schools (Sadvokasova, 2008: 90–94). We see that the volume of these funds increased significantly at the beginning of the 20th century. The costs of Russian correction schools were borne by the *zemstvo* (district council). According to statistical indicators for 1908, 67, 627 som were allocated for the expenses of Russian correction schools in the Syrdarya region alone. Additionally 26, 492 som were collected from the local population (Bendrikov, 1960: 327). In 1911, the number of Russian correction schools in the region was about 89. Russian correction schools organized the Russification policy assigned to them to a certain extent. Low results were recorded in the Turkestan region. M. Virsky, in turn, reports that among the graduates of the Russian correction school in the mentioned region, there are very few, if not none, who can read and write Russian. In his work, V. Barthold argued that the Muslim population did not benefit from Russian correction schools. The period of study in such schools was too long. Therefore, many residents say that their children were expelled until their graduation. The researcher also concludes that teachers of many Russian correction schools did not understand the language of the local population (Barthold, 1927: 134).

In 1905, two-year Russian correction secondary schools were opened. The purpose was to re-educate those graduates who, as we mentioned above, did not master the Russian language well even though they graduated from Russian correction schools. Arithmetic, geography, history and natural science were taught in Russian correction secondary schools. The only difference is that almost all of the mentioned subjects were taught in Russian. This, in turn, was one of the main indicators of the fact that the influence of Tsarist Russia in the East was once again strengthened and the Russification policy continued further. It also shows that the sphere of education had an important role in the Russification policy. We notice that the colonial government began to change its position due to the decrease of trust in the Russian correction schools, which were conducting the Russification policy. For example, in 1904, on the personal instructions of Tsar Nicholas II, a member of the Council of Ministers A.S. Budilovich came to the region. After getting acquainted with the situation, in 1906, a new Regulation of education for non-Russian peoples was developed. According to the rules, the teaching of non-Russian peoples in their native language was resumed in schools. Although the rules initially allowed reading in the native language, over time it had to be adapted to the Russian language. It is planned to replace the Arabic font with the Russian one. The requirements of this regulation have been severely criticized by the local population. Interestingly, this protest was not persecuted by the Tsarist government. The Tsarist administration took into account the demands of the local

population, and in particular, the case of replacing the Arabic font, which caused protests, was temporarily suspended. Of course, the Tsarist administration agreed on such a deal, first of all, under the influence of the first Russian revolution taking place in the centre of Russia. It was decided to slow down the Russification policy, with the idea that subordinate countries would not join the revolutionary movement, and would not encourage the emergence of new centers of protest. In 1907, the draft law was discussed again, and the use of literature that had not been censored was prohibited. At the same time, it was demanded that the teacher in the schools for non-Russian people should be a representative of that nationality or a Russian (Falbork, 1911: 611). This, of course, was aimed at preventing the Kazakhs from falling under the influence of the “new method” schools, which were widespread at that time. At the same time, the chances of the formation of pan-Turkism were high. Therefore, textbooks from the Turkic countries were not used in the educational process. The measure taken against the Kazan Tatars working in the Kazakh steppes, although significant, did not stop the development of the “new method” schools, which was called *jadidism*. Although it was said not to interfere in the work of madrasah schools, these traditional educational institutions were still left under the supervision of the Ministry of Public Education.

In his work, the scientist S.M. Mashimbayev reports that education in Muslim schools is being checked by Russian observers. One of them said that “Students educated in Kazakh schools have good manners, morals, respect for ancestral traditions, discipline, and enthusiasm for education, and the main shortcomings of schools are that only Kazakh children study here and they do not know Russian” (Mashimbayev, 2013: 29).

The educational process in the native language in Russian correction schools was opposed by officials pursuing a Russification policy. Their arguments concluded that the teaching of certain subjects in the Kazakh language is problematic, and Ilminsky's method of transition from Kazakh to Russian does not work either. Therefore, S.M. Garmenitsky, a member of the pedagogical Council for the Turkestan region, said that classes in schools of the non-Russian people should be conducted immediately in Russian, and if we allow them to teach in their native language, all the work that has begun will be wasted. F.M. Kerensky, who was the Chief Inspector of secondary schools, also supported this position. Therefore, after a long discussion, in 1910–1911, the council adopted the rule that the schools of the non-Russian peoples should work only in Russian. In addition, the requirement that the school teacher should know the language of the local people was removed (Inorodcheskaya shkola, 1916: 117–157).

In comparison, Russian correction schools in the Kazakh steppe did not fully pursue the Russification policy and did not achieve effective results. For example, the Russification policy of Kazakhs included Kalmyk, Chuvash, and other nationalities. He said that the Russification policy of Nations was carried out even more harshly at the beginning of the 20th century. If in Russian Correction schools of the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries, there were any attempts to punish or promote Christianity, the National intellectuals were resolutely criticized. In turn, in Russian schools for Kalmyks, children who spoke only Russian and spoke their native language had a note around their necks called the “Kalmyk ticket”. Various punitive measures were also applied against such children. However, Russian correction schools in the Kazakh steppe have formed a rich experience of Russification of Kazakhs. One of the main reasons for the failure of Russian correction schools to achieve high results was that after the death of the Governor-General of Turkestan Kaufman, each of the governors-general from 1883 to 1908 had different views and positions on the work of Russian correction schools in the Kazakh steppes. Therefore, there was no regularity in the work toward Russification. In addition, Kazakhs living in the territory of Steppe and Turkestan General Governorate engaged in nomadic livestock farming. It was not even possible to continue the work of Russian correction schools due to constant migration. Seasonal work did not make the work in the direction of Russification more complete. The scale of the Kazakh steppe also hindered the work in this

direction. It was noticed that it was difficult to supervise the work of Russian Correction schools. The lack of specialists was also clearly felt. To a certain extent, the training of necessary specialists for Russian-correctional schools opened in Kazakh territory was carried out. For example, teacher training among Kazakh youth took place in several large cities. Among them are the Omsk Teachers' Seminary, the Turkestan Teachers' Seminary, and the Orenburg Teachers' Seminary. One-year and two-year schools were also opened near the seminaries. From the beginning of the 20th century, teacher training seminaries were opened in cities such as Semey, Aktobe, Ural, Verny, Akmola (Sadykova, Saifulmalikova 2019: 716). Even after the October Revolution, solving the shortage of specialists was one of the most important issues for the Bolsheviks. The same can be said about the lack of funds. As we mentioned above, compared to the central regions of Russia, the funds allocated for the maintenance of Russian Correction schools in the Kazakh steppe were small. The composition of subjects taught in Russian Correction schools has also undergone many changes. The introduction of the secular education system and the conditions of Muslim education into one curriculum had a negative impact on the widespread progress of works in the direction of Russification. The quality of education was not properly monitored. To a certain extent, Kazakhs themselves became interested in Russian correction schools, and the demand for their children's education in these schools increased. For example, in 1910, Russian correction schools in the Syrdarya region could not accept more children due to the sufficient number of children. However, the increase in the number of such children was only seasonal. With the transition of Kazakhs to winter, the number of children decreased again, and the work of learning the Russian language was postponed as usual. We do not deny the contribution of Russian correction schools to the Russification policy. Kazakh children were able to firmly form the first concepts of not only the Russian language but also the Russian culture. Russian correction schools created conditions for Kazakh children to learn the Russian language, even superficially. At the same time, we conclude that it made us clearly feel the need for the Russian language in public life and feel the need to master the Russian language in the future. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the head of the Directorate of people's schools of Akmola and Semipalatinsk regions A.E. Alektorov wrote a letter to the military governor of Akmola region. In his letter, he argued that the short-term existence of Russian Correctional schools did not provide a full-fledged educational content, and the Kazakhs themselves were against this type of Education (Tuleuova et al., 2018: 1618). Therefore, the work of Russian-Correctional schools at the beginning of the twentieth century still required regularity.

The Russification policy of the Tsarist government was also observed in other socio-cultural spheres of society's life. One of the most important components of the policy of Russification was the promotion of Christianity and the baptism of the Kazakhs. The policy of baptism of Kazakhs was carried out by missionaries. In 1863, the Kazan Central Baptist-Tatar School was opened and became a missionary centre for baptized Tatars. In 1889, the All-Russian Missionary Course was opened in Kazan. This course became a major centre for organizing the policy of baptism of the non-Russian peoples, subordinate to Russia. Missionaries who completed this preparatory course were sent to the Kazakh steppes. In 1899 alone, 124 people were trained at this educational institution. Between 1889 and 1914, 854 people studied at the course, and 481 of them successfully completed their studies. Most of them were educated in the Tatar department. Their total volume was 59%. Graduates of the Tatar department adapted to baptizing Kazakhs. In 1900, I. Khokhlov was sent to the Torgay region and Orenburg province, and in 1902, I. Kramarenko was sent to Bokey Horde (Report, 1905: 44). It is clear that baptism had a special importance in the Russification policy of the Tsarist government. The Tsarist colonial government was aimed at covering not only the Kazakhs but also the entire territory of the Russian Empire. In her research work, researcher Z.T. Sadvokasova described the scope of the baptism policy as “from Orenburg to Tashkent, from Verny to Omsk. Further, the cross of Christianity should appear in the vast land of Central Asia” (Sadvokasova, 2015: 33). Of course, to promote Christianity among the Kazakhs, it was envisaged to provide all possible benefits. For example, Kazakhs



who converted to Christianity received permission to move to their homeland or Russian settlements. Also, Christian Kazakhs had the right to become residents of the city without permission. The goal of bringing Kazakhs closer to Christianity by providing such material benefits was obvious. Of course, it is doubtful that the religious faith adopted for material benefits and privileges will take root in the hearts of full-fledged Kazakhs. In May 1907, at the Council of the Steppe governor-general on the need for Kazakhs, this issue was specifically considered. As a result, the work of missionaries responsible for the baptism of Kazakhs was severely tested. Missionaries discredited the Islamic religion in the process of promoting Christianity. It was very difficult for Kazakhs, who believed in Islam for centuries, to listen to and accept such propaganda. In order to attract Kazakhs to them, they also gave material benefits. On the contrary, one of the important tasks set before the missionaries was to baptize the Kazakhs only through propaganda. It was considered that the Kazakhs should understand the superiority of the Christian religion of their own free will and should be baptized with all their hearts. It was recognized that it was wrong to be interested in material goods, and missionaries were instructed to achieve new qualitative indicators. At the same time, it is worth noting that radical changes began to occur in the daily life of Kazakhs who converted to Christianity. In particular, Muslim manners and culture were lost, and Russian drunkenness began to occur. Of course, we can only evaluate this as imbibing the customs of baptized Russians without fully understanding the Christian religion. In order to systematically propagate Christianity and increase the number of truly baptized people among Kazakhs, various brotherhoods were also created. For example, the Turkestan Diocesan Brotherhood of Kazan appeared, and later it was changed to the Zhetysu Brotherhood. The main task of these brotherhoods was to promote Christianity among Kazakhs and baptize as many Kazakhs as possible. For this purpose, more than 300 books were distributed to residents of the Zhetysu region, and more than 1,000 crosses, the main symbol of Christianity, were distributed (CSA RK. F. 15. I. 1. C. 401. P. 550). Books were translated into Kazakh because the vast majority of Kazakhs did not know the Russian language well even at the beginning of the 20th century. At the same time, the contribution of the Omsk Brotherhood to the Russification policy and the Baptism of Kazakhs is high. They wrote special textbooks and provided textbooks covering features of church work, and religious and moral education (CSA RK. F. 393. I. 1. C. 12. P. 23). It would not be enough to spread books promoting the values of Christianity and crosses that were the symbol of Christianity, and to build new churches. In order for the policy of full-fledged baptism and Russification to be effective, the task was to firmly base the consciousness of the Kazakhs on Russian culture and language, religion and worldview.

Of course, baptized Kazakhs came under the special care of the state. Still, in order to avoid various repressions from religious figures, government agencies protected them as much as possible, giving them a new social status. Based on archival documents of the Omsk region, Researcher Nurgalieva reports that until 1861, baptized Kazakhs received a new social status and were resettled outside the Kazakh steppe. For example, after a Kazakh named Turzhan was baptized and converted to Christianity, he became known as Ivan Vishnevsky. The men from his “py” (tribe), who found out that he converted to another religion, beat him to death several times and punished him. Fearing that he would be killed eventually, he was allowed to move to another region. According to the researcher, one of the things that hindered the mass baptism of Kazakhs is the separation from their relatives (Nurgalieva, 2007: 34). There are many points of truth in this opinion. Only after 1862, baptized Kazakhs had the opportunity to live among their relatives, relying on special protection. This, in turn, was caused by the need not to break family ties, which were considered important for the Kazakhs. In the period from 1880 to 1890, activities were actively carried out to support the entire Orthodox Church working in the Kazakh steppe. This, in turn, included such important areas as the construction of churches, and the interpretation of the biblical foundations in the Kazakh language. All types of religious sermons were translated into Kazakh, and in church services, the main priority was to increase the number of Kazakh children. In 1895, monasteries for girls were opened in Kostanay, and in 1900 in Turgay. Researcher Nurgalieva believes

that national worldviews and ideas have undergone profound changes due to the colonial policy in the social sphere of traditional Kazakh society. As an example, we can cite data that in the period from 1905 to 1910 97 people from the Semipalatinsk region, 24 people from Zhetysay and 2 people from Torgay, 15 people from Uralsk finally converted to Christianity. This, of course, was closely connected with the popularization of the colonial policy based on religion in the social sphere of Kazakh society.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, the policy of Russification of the socio-political and cultural life of the Kazakhs at the beginning of the twentieth century of the Russian Empire was primarily aimed at eliminating the characteristic features of traditional Kazakh society, introducing fundamental changes in the identity of the nation and the worldview and views of the Kazakh people. Describing the measures taken in this direction, we noticed that at the beginning of the twentieth century, the policy of Russification in the socio-political and cultural life of the Kazakhs was carried out in several directions. First of all, there was a wide range of possibilities for the Russian language. Russian became the main language to be used in all areas of administration, office work and education. Accordingly, the scope of application of the Kazakh language has narrowed. This was aimed at eradicating the linguistic basis of the Kazakh people, who were a minority. One of the following directions is connected with the predominance in society of the Orthodox faith, the traditional faith of Russians. This meant the policy of baptism of Kazakhs, which we mentioned above. The goal was to make changes to the traditional belief system of Kazakhs, providing various material advantages. One of the third directions is the propaganda of the worldview and mentality of the Russian people. For example, the Tsarist government forbade large-scale celebrations of holidays and religious rituals of the Kazakh people. On the contrary, there is every reason to say that it became a tradition to widely celebrate all holidays and religious rituals of the Russian calendar.

### Sources

CSA RK — Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan

### Источники

ЦГА РК — Центральный государственный архив Республики Казахстан

### References

Bartold, 1927 — *Bartold W.W. Vedomost' o chisle prosivshchikh, prinyatykh i okonchivshchikh kursucheniy na missionerskikh kursakh Kazani, s oboznacheniyem obrazovatel'nogo tsenza poslednikh* [A statement of the number of those who applied for, were accepted and completed the course of study at missionary courses in Kazan, indicating the educational qualifications of the latter] // *Otchet o sostoyanii missionerskikh kursov v g. Kazani za 1904–1905 uchebnyy god* [Report on the state of missionary courses in Kazan for the 1904–1905 academic year]. Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1927. 256 p. (In Russ.).

Bendrikov, 1960 — *Bendrikov K.E. Osherky po istoriy narodnogo obrazovaniya v Turkestane (1865–1924 gody)* [Essays on the history of public education in Turkestan (1865–1924)]. Moscow: APN RSFSR, 1960. 509 p. (In Russ.).

Falbork, Charnaulskiy, 1911 — *Falbork G.A., Charnaulskiy V.I. Nastolnaya kniga po narodnomu obrazovaniyu: zakony, rasporyzheniya, pravila, instruksiy* [Handbook on public education: laws, orders, rules, instructions]. Saint-Peterburg: Towarishestvo “Znanye”, 1911. Vol. 4. 788 p. (In Russ.).

Inorodsheskaya shkola, 1916 — *Inorodsheskaya shkola. Sbornik statey i materialov po voprosam inorodsheskoy shkoly* [Foreign school. Collection of articles and materials on foreign school issues]. Ed.: Tumima G.G., Zelenko V.A. Peterburg: Izdatelstvo Karbasinkova, 1916. 257 p. (In Russ.).

Kamzabekuly, 2008 — *Kamzabekuly D. Alashtyn ruhany tугyry* [Alash's spiritual base]. Astana: El-shezhire, 2008. 360 p. (In Kaz.).

Koigeldiev, 2004 — *Koigeldiev M.K. Ullyq sayy elite. Qyzmeti men tagtyry (XVIII–XX gg)* [National political elite. Kyzmeti men tagdri (XVIII–XX centuries). Zertteuler.]. Zertteuler. Almaty: Zhalyn baspasy, 2004. 400 p. (In Kaz.).

Mashimbayev, Mashimbayeva, 2013 — *Mashimbayev S.M., Mashimbayeva G.S. Patshalyk Resey zhane kenes imperiyalarinin Kazakstandagyruhany otarlau sayasatinin zardaptary (XIX gasyrdin 70–80 zhyldari – XXI gasyrdin basi)* [Consequences of the spiritual colonization policy of the Tsarist Russia and the Soviet empires in Kazakhstan (70s–80s of the 19th century – the beginning of the 21st century)]. Almaty: Kazak

universytety 2013. 268 p. (In Kaz.).

Nurgalieva, 2007 — *Nurgalieva A.M.* Hristiyanizatsiy i kazachskay step (XIX – nachalo XX v.) [Christianization and the Kazakh steppe (XIX – early XX centuries)]. *Sovremennyye gumanitarnyye issledovaniya*, 2007. No. 3. 210 p. (In Russ.).

Sadvokasova, 2008 — *Sadvokasova Z.T.* Rusifikatorskay politika sarizma v oblasti obrazovaniy nerusskikh narodov [Russification policy of tsarism in the field of education of non-Russian peoples]. *Otan tarihy*, 2008. No. 3. 190 p. (In Russ.).

Sadvokasova, 2016 — *Sadvokasova Z.T.* Politika samodержaviy v religioznoi sfere Kazahstana (na primere missiонерской dejatel'nosti) [The policy of autocracy in the religious sphere of Kazakhstan (using the example of missionary activity)]. // *Vestnik KazNU. Seriya religiovedeniya*. No. 1(5). 2016. 134 p. (In Russ.).

Sadykova, Saifulmalikova, 2019 — *Sadykova A.K., Saifulmalikova S.S.* Podgotovka pedagogicheskikh kadrov Stepnogo i Turkestanskogo kray v ushebnykh okrugakh Rossiskoi imperii [Preparation of pedagogical personnel of the Steppe and Turkestan regions in the educational districts of the Russian Empire]. *Bylye gody*, 2019. Vol. 52. Iss. 2. 714–725 p. (In Russ.).

Sbornik dokumentov, 1869 — *Sbornik dokumentov i statey po voprosu ob obrazovaniy inrodshchey* [Collection of documents and articles on the issue of education of foreigners]. Sankt-Peterburg: Obchestvo polza, 1869. 522 p. (In Russ.).

Seralin, 1911 — *Seralin M.* Shahar Troishik, fevral 1911 gyl [City of Troitsk, February 1911]. *Aykap*, 1911. No. 2. 24 p.

Tuleuova et al., 2018 — *Tuleuova B.T., Shotbakova L.K., Smagulova G.M.* Formirovaniye sistemi shkol'nogo oucheniy kazachskogo naseleniy Sentral'nogo Kazachstana vo vtoroy polovine XIX–nachalo XX vekov [Formation of the school education system for the Kazakh population of Central Kazakhstan in the second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries]. *Bylye gody*, 2018. Vol. 50. Is. 4. 1612–1624 p. (In Russ.).

Zimanov, 1976 — *Zimanov S.Z.* Ot osvoboditel'nykh idey k sovetskoy gosudarstvennosti v Buhare i Hive [From liberation ideas to Soviet statehood in Bukhara and Khiva]. Alma-Ata: Nauka, 1976. 218 p. (In Russ.).

#### Әдебиеттер

Бартольд, 1905 — Ведомость о числе просившихся, принятых и окончивших курс учения на миссионерских курсах Казани, с обозначением образовательного ценза последних // Отчет о состоянии миссионерских курсов в г. Казани за 1904–1905 учебный год. Казань, 1905. 127 с.

Бендриков, 1960 — *Бендриков К.Е.* Очерки по истории народного образования в Туркестане (1865–1924 годы). М.: АПН РСФСР, 1960. 509 с.

Зиманов, 1976 — *Зиманов С.З.* От освободительных идей к советской государственности в Бухаре и Хиве. Алма-Ата: Наука, 1976. 218 с

Инородческая школа, 1916 — Инородческая школа. Сборник статей и материалов по вопросам инородческой школы. Под ред.: Тумима Г.Г., Зеленко В.А. Петербург: Изд. Карбасникова, 1916. 257 с.

Қамзабекұлы, 2008 — *Қамзабекұлы Д.* Алаштың рухани тұғыры. Астана: Ел-шежіре, 2008. 360 б.

Қойгелдиев, 2004 — *Қойгелдиев М.Қ.* Ұлттық саяси элита. Қызметі мен тағдыры (XVIII–XX ғғ.). Зерттеулер. Алматы: «Жалын баспасы» ЖШС, 2004. 400 б.

Мәшімбаев, Мәшімбаева, 2013 — *Мәшімбаев С.М., Мәшімбаева Г.С.* Патшалық Ресей және Кеңес империяларының Қазақстандағы рухани отарлау саясатының зардаптары (XIX ғасырдың 70–80 жылдары – XXI ғасырдың басы). Алматы: Қазақ университеті 2013. 268 б.

Nurgalieva, 2007 — *Nurgalieva A.M.* Христианизация и казахская степь (XIX–начало XX в.). *Современные гуманитарные исследования*, 2007. № 3. 210 с.

Sadvokasova, 2008 — *Sadvokasova Z.T.* Русификаторская политика царизма в области образования нерусских народов // *Otan tarihy*, 2008. № 3. 190 б.

Sadvokasova, 2016 — *Sadvokasova Z.T.* Политика самодержавия в религиозной сфере Казахстана (на примере миссионерской деятельности) // *Вестник КазНУ. Серия религиоведения*. № 1 (5). 2016. 134 с.

Sadykova, Saifulmalikova, 2019 — *Sadykova A.K., Saifulmalikova S.S.* Подготовка педагогических кадров Степного и Туркестанского края в учебных округах Российской империи // *Былые годы*, 2019. Т. 52. Вып. 2. С. 714–725.

Сборник документов, 1869 — Сборник документов и статей по вопросу об образовании инородцев. СПб.: Обчество польза, 1869. 522 с.

Seralin, 1911 — *Seralin M.* Шаһар Троицк, февраль 1911-ші жыл. Айқап, 1911. № 2. 24 б.

Tuleuova et al., 2018 — *Tuleuova B.T., Shotbakova L.K., Smagulova G.M.* Формирование системы школьного обучения казахского населения Центрального Казахстана во второй половине XIX – начало XX веков // *Былые годы*, 2018. Том. 50. Вып. 4. 2018. 1612–1624 с.

Фальборк 1911 — Фальборк Г.А., Чарналуцкий В.И. Настольная книга по народному образованию: законы, распоряжения, правила, инструкции. Т. 4. СПб.: Товарищество «Знание», 1911. 788 с.

## МАЗМҰНЫ

### ТЕОРИЯ ЖӘНЕ ӘДІСНАМА

<b>Ахметова Ж., Эгамбердиев М., Әбікей А.</b> ТҮРКІСТАННЫҢ ҰЛТТЫҚ-ТЕРРИТОРИЯЛЫҚ ТҮРҒЫДАН МЕЖЕЛЕНУ ТАРИХЫНАН.....	7
<b>Сәтбай Т.Я., Жолдасұлы Т.</b> ҚАЗАҚСТАН КИНЕМАТОГРАФИСТЕР ОДАҒЫНЫҢ СОҒЫСТАН KEЙІНГІ ЖЫЛДАРДАҒЫ ҚЫЗМЕТІ (1946–1970).....	24

### ТАРИХ

<b>Әбдікүлова Г., Төлєнова З.</b> КҮНДЕЛІКТІ ӨМІР ТАРИХЫНЫҢ КӨЗДЕРІ: ҚАЗАҚСТАНДЫҚ ЗЕРТТЕУ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ.....	37
<b>Бейсембаева А.Р.</b> XVII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ СОҢЫ – XVIII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ ОРТАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚ-ЖОҢҒАР ҚАТЫНАСТАРДЫҢ KEЙБІР АСПЕКТІЛЕРІ: АРХИВ МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫ НЕГІЗІНДЕ.....	52
<b>Беркінбаев О.У.</b> АБЫЛАЙ ЖӘНЕ ОНЫҢ XVIII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ ОРТАСЫНДА МАНЬЧЖУР ӘУЛЕТІМЕН ҚАРЫМ-ҚАТЫНАСЫ...67	
<b>Жұматай С.</b> ӘБІЛМӘМБЕТ ПЕН АБЫЛАЙДЫҢ РЕСЕЙ ПРОТЕКТОРАТЫН ҚАБЫЛДАУ ПРИНЦИПТЕРІ МЕН БАРЫСЫ (1740 Ж.) ЖӘНЕ ОНЫҢ САЛДАРЫ.....	83
<b>Қабылдинов З.Е.</b> СҰЛТАН СҰЛТАНМАМЕТТИҢ ӨМІРІ МЕН ҚЫЗМЕТІНІҢ KEЙБІР АСПЕКТІЛЕРІ (XVIII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 30–50 ЖЫЛДАРЫ).....	94
<b>Қали А.Б.</b> XIX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ ЕКІНШІ ЖАРТЫСЫНДА ЖЕТІСУ ЖЕРІНЕ ТАТАРЛАРДЫҢ ҚОНЫСТАНУ ТАРИХЫНАН.....	111
<b>Қуанбай О.</b> АБЫЛАЙ СҰЛТАННЫҢ ШЕКАРАЛЫҚ АЙМАҚТАҒЫ ДИПЛОМАТИЯЛЫҚ САЯСАТЫ (XVIII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 30–40 жж.).....	124
<b>Қонырова А.М.</b> РЕСЕЙ ИМПЕРИЯСЫНЫҢ БІЛІМ БЕРУ САЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ОРЫСТАНДЫРУ САЯСАТЫ (XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАСЫ).....	142
<b>Рахимова Қ.Д., Батырхан Б.Ш.</b> МҰХАММЕД ӘЛИ ФОРУГИДІҢ ИРАНДА ЖАҢА ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛДЫ ОРТА ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУДАҒЫ РӨЛІ.....	154
<b>Рысқұлов Т.А.</b> ОРТА ЖҮЗ ҚАЗАҚТАРЫ МЕН РЕСЕЙ АРАСЫНДАҒЫ САУДА ҚАТЫНАСТАРЫНЫҢ ОРНАУЫ МЕН ДАМУЫНДАҒЫ АБЫЛАЙ ХАННЫҢ РӨЛІ (1730–1750 ЖЖ).....	169
<b>Тоқболат С.Т., Жүрсінбаев Б.А., Жұбаньшов Б.Т.</b> ДАЛА ЖОРЫҒЫ: 1839 ЖЫЛҒЫ РЕСЕЙ ИМПЕРИЯСЫНЫҢ ХИУА ЖОРЫҒЫНДАҒЫ КІШІ ЖҮЗ ҚАЗАҚТАРЫНЫҢ РӨЛІ.....	184
<b>Торайғыров Е.М.</b> ҚАЗАҚ-ЖОҢҒАР ДИПЛОМАТИЯЛЫҚ, ӘУЛЕТТІК ЖӘНЕ САУДА ҚАТЫНАСТАРЫ.....	202
<b>Мұхатова О.Х., Доскараева А.А., Сисенбаева А.А.</b> ОТЫНШЫ ӘЛЖАНОВТЫҢ АҒАРТУШЫЛЫҚ ҚЫЗМЕТІ ЖӘНЕ КӨЗҚАРАСТАРЫ.....	218
<b>Ноури М., Жеңіс Ж., Ализәде</b> XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 30-ЖЫЛДАРЫНДА ҚАЗАҚТАРДЫҢ МАҢҒЫСТАУ ОБЛЫСЫНАН ИРАНҒА РЕЗА ШАХТАН БАСТАП БҮГІНГІ КҮНГЕ ДЕЙІН ҚОНЫС АУДАРУЫ.....	234

### АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

<b>Досымбетов Н.А.</b> ФОЛЬКЛОРЛЫҚ ДЕРЕКТЕРДЕГІ ҚАЗАҚТАРДЫҢ ЕГІНШІЛІК МӘДЕНИЕТІ (ЭТНОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ ЗЕРТТЕУЛЕР НӘТИЖЕСІМЕН).....	247
<b>Сейтхан Ш.</b> МОҢҒОЛДАРДЫҢ ЖЫЛҚЫҒА ҚОЛДАНАТЫН ТАҢБАЛАРЫ ЖӘНЕ ТАҢБАЛАУ ДӘСТҮРЛЕРІ.....	261

## СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

## ТЕОРИЯ И МЕТОДОЛОГИИ

<b>Ахметова Ж., Эгамбердиев М., Абикей А.</b> ИЗ ИСТОРИИ НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-ТЕРРИТОРИАЛЬНОГО РАЗМЕЖЕВАНИЯ ТУРКЕСТАНА.....	7
<b>Сатбай Т.Я., Жолдасұлы Т.</b> ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ СОЮЗА КИНЕМАТОГРАФИСТОВ КАЗАХСТАНА В ПОСЛЕВОЕННЫЕ ГОДЫ (1946–1970).....	24

## ИСТОРИЯ

<b>Абдыкулова Г., Толенова З.</b> МНОГОМЕРНЫЕ ИСТОЧНИКИ ИСТОРИИ ПОВСЕДНЕВНОСТИ: ОПЫТ КАЗАХСТАНСКИХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ.....	37
<b>Бейсембаева А.Р.</b> НЕКОТОРЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ КАЗАХСКО-ДЖУНГАРСКИХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ В КОНЦЕ XVII – СЕРЕДИНЕ XVIII ВЕКОВ: НА ОСНОВЕ АРХИВНЫХ МАТЕРИАЛОВ.....	52
<b>Беркинбаев О.У.</b> АБЫЛАЙ И ЕГО ВЗАИМООТНОШЕНИЯ С МАНЬЧЖУРСКОЙ ДИНАСТИЕЙ В СЕРЕДИНЕ XVIII ВЕКА.....	67
<b>Жуматай С.</b> ПРИНЦИПЫ И ХОД ПРИНЯТИЯ РОССИЙСКОГО ПРОТЕКТОРАТА АБУЛМАМБЕТОМ И АБЫЛАЕМ (1740 г.) И ЕГО ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ.....	83
<b>Кабульдинов З.Е.</b> НЕКОТОРЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ ИЗ ЖИЗНИ И ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ СУЛТАНА СУЛТАНМАМЕТА (30–50 ГОДЫ XVIII ВЕКА).....	94
<b>Кали А.Б.</b> ИЗ ИСТОРИИ ЗАСЕЛЕНИЯ ТАТАР СЕМИРЕЧЬЯ ВО ВТОРОЙ ПОЛОВИНЕ XIX ВЕКА.....	111
<b>Куанбай О.</b> ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКАЯ ПОЛИТИКА СУЛТАНА АБЛАЯ В ПРИГРАНИЧНОЙ ЗОНЕ (30–40-е годы XVIII ВЕКА).....	124
<b>Коньрова А.М.</b> ПОЛИТИКА РУСИФИКАЦИИ РОССИЙСКОЙ ИМПЕРИИ В СФЕРЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ (НАЧАЛО XX ВЕКА)....	142
<b>Рахимова К.Д., Батырхан Б.Ш.</b> РОЛЬ МУХАММЕДА АЛИ ФОРУГИ В ФОРМИРОВАНИИ НОВОЙ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛЬНОЙ СРЕДЫ В ИРАНЕ.....	154
<b>Токболат С.Т., Джурсунбаев Б.А., Жубанышов Б.Т.</b> РОЛЬ АБЫЛАЯ В УСТАНОВЛЕНИИ И РАЗВИТИИ ТОРГОВЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ КАЗАХОВ СРЕДНЕГО ЖУЗА С РОССИЕЙ В 1730–1750-Х ГГ.....	169
<b>Токболат С.Т., Джурсунбаев Б.А., Жубанышов Б.Т.</b> ПОХОД ПО СТЕПИ: РОЛЬ КАЗАХОВ МЛАДШЕГО ЖУЗА В ХИВИНСКОМ ПОХОДЕ РОССИЙСКОЙ ИМПЕРИИ 1839 ГОДА.....	184
<b>Торайгыров Е.М.</b> КАЗАХСКО-ДЖУНГАРСКИЕ ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКИЕ, ДИНАСТИЙНЫЕ И ТОРГОВЫЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ.....	202
<b>Мухатова О.Х., Доскараева А.А., Сисенбаева А.А.</b> ПРОСВЕТИТЕЛЬСКАЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ И ВЗГЛЯДЫ ОТЫНШЫ АЛЖАНОВА.....	218
<b>Ноури М., Жеңіс Ж., Ализиде</b> ИРАНСКИЕ КАЗАХИ-ПЕРЕСЕЛЕНЦЫ 1930-Х ГОДОВ С МАНГЫСТАУ: СО ВРЕМЕН РЕЗА ШАХА ДО НАШИХ ДНЕЙ.....	234

## АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

<b>Досымбетов Н.А.</b> КУЛЬТУРА ЗЕМЛЕДЕЛИЯ КАЗАХОВ В ФОЛЬКЛОРНЫХ ИСТОЧНИКАХ (ОПЫТ ЭТНОГРАФИЧЕСКОГО ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ).....	247
<b>Сейтхан Ш.</b> МОНГОЛЬСКИЕ КЛЕЙМА ДЛЯ ЛОЩАДЕЙ И ТРАДИЦИИ ДЕЛАТЬ КЛЕЙМА.....	261

## CONTENTS

## THEORY OF METHODOLOGY

<b>Akhmetova Zh., Egamberdiyev M., Abikey A.</b> FROM THE HISTORY OF NATIONAL-TERRITORIAL DEMARCATION OF TURKESTAN.....	7
<b>Satbay T., Zholdassuly T.</b> THE ACTIVITIES OF THE UNION OF CINEMATOGRAPHERS OF KAZAKHSTAN IN THE POSTWAR YEARS (1946–1970).....	24

## HISTORY

<b>Abdykulova G., Tolenova Z.</b> MULTIFACETED SOURCES OF EVERYDAY HISTORY: THE EXPERIENCE OF KAZAKHSTANI RESEARCH.....	37
<b>Beisembayeva A.R.</b> CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE KAZAKH-DZUNGAR RELATIONS IN THE LATE XVII – MIDDLE XVIII CENTURIES: BASED ON ARCHIVAL SOURCES.....	52
<b>Berkinbayev O.U.</b> ABYLAI AND HIS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MANCHU DYNASTY IN THE MIDDLE OF THE XVIII CENTURY.....	67
<b>Zhumatay S.</b> PRINCIPLES AND COURSE OF THE ADOPTION OF THE RUSSIAN PROTECTORATE BY ABULMAMBET AND ABYLAI (1740) AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.....	83
<b>Kabuldinov Z.E.</b> SOME ASPECTS OF THE LIFE AND WORK OF SULTAN SULTANMAMET (1730s–1750s).....	94
<b>Kali A.B.</b> FROM THE HISTORY OF THE TATAR SETTLEMENT TO ZHETYSU IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE XIX CENTURY.....	111
<b>Kuanbay O.</b> DIPLOMATIC POLICY OF SULTAN ABLAI IN THE BORDER AREA (1730s–1740s).....	124
<b>Konyrova A.</b> RUSSIFICATION POLICY OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION (EARLY 20th CENTURY).....	142
<b>Rakhimova K., Batyrkhan B.</b> THE ROLE OF MUHAMMAD ALI FOROUGI IN THE FORMATION OF A NEW INTELLECTUAL ENVIRONMENT IN IRAN.....	154
<b>Ryskulov T.</b> THE ROLE OF ABYLAI IN THE ESTABLISHMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE KAZAKHS OF THE MIDDLE ZHUZ AND RUSSIA IN THE 1730S–1750S.....	169
<b>Tokbolat S., Dzhursunbayev, Zhubanyshov B.</b> CAMPAIGNING ACROSS THE STEPPE: THE VITAL ROLE OF THE JUNIOR ZHUZ KAZAKHS IN IMPERIAL RUSSIA'S 1839 KHIVA CAMPAIGN.....	184
<b>Toraigyrov Y.M.</b> KAZAKH-JUNGAR DIPLOMATIC, DYNASTY AND TRADE RELATIONS.....	202
<b>Mukhatova O. Kh., Doskarayeva A.A., Sisenbayeva A.A.</b> EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND VIEWS OF OTYNSHY ALZHANOV.....	218
<b>Nouri M., Zhengis Zh., Alizade</b> THE RESETTLEMENT OF KAZAKHS FROM THE MANGISTAU REGION TO IRAN IN THE 1930-s FROM THE TIME OF REZA SHAH TO THE PRESENT DAY.....	234

## ANTHROPOLOGY

<b>Dossymbetov N.A.</b> AGRICULTURAL CULTURE OF KAZAKHS IN FOLKLORE DATA (EXPERIENCE OF ETHNOGRAPHIC RESEARCH).....	247
<b>Syeitkhan Sh.</b> TYPES OF BRANDS (TAMGA) USED BY MONGOLIANS ON HORSES AND THE BRANDING TRADITIONS.....	261

**EDU.E-HISTORY.KZ**

электрондық ғылыми

журналы 2024. 11 (1)

*Бас редактор:*  
*Қабылдинов З.Е.*

*Компьютерде беттеген:*  
Копеева С.Ж.

Жарияланған күні: 25.03.2024.  
Пішімі 70x100/16. Баспа табағы 21,125.

*Құрылтайшысы және баспагері:*  
Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым  
комитеті Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты  
ШЖҚ РМҚ

*Редакция мен баспаның мекен-жайы:*  
050010, Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй  
ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ  
РМҚ Тел.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

Е-mail: [edu.history@bk.ru](mailto:edu.history@bk.ru)  
Журнал сайты: <https://edu.e-history.kz>

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов ат. ТжЭИ басылған:  
050010 Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй