

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 (3)
шілде-қыркүйек
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

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 Гелманұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Мемлекет тарихы институты директорының орынбасары. (Қазақстан)

Әлімбай 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 қыпшақтану 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 — магистр, 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

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 Стромайл (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)

Карибаев 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 (Želvy's 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 Кожаметович — 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 — магистр, 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-IIA 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

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 Burkhitbai 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 — Master's, researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)


ТАРИХ / ИСТОРИЯ / HISTORY


Published in the Republic of Kazakhstan
 Electronic scientific journal “edu.e-history.kz”
 Has been issued as a journal since 2014
 ISSN 2710-3994.
 Vol. 11. Is. 3, pp. 626–641, 2024
 Journal homepage: <https://edu.e-history.kz>

FTAXP / MPHTI / IRSTI 03.20
https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994_2024_39_3_626-641

IDEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF “AZ I YA”: FROM CONDEMNATION TO DISCUSSION

Igor Krupko¹, Bimurad Burkhanov^{2*}

¹Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology
 (28, Shevchenko Str., 050010 Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan)
 PhD
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5349-0256>. E-mail: tengri95hismatulin@mail.ru

²Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of history and ethnology
 (28, Shevchenko Str., 050010 Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan)
 Researcher
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9004-5987>. E-mail: burkhanov.b@inbox.ru

*Correspondent author

© Ch.Ch. Valikhanov IHE, 2024
 © Krupko I.V., Burkhanov B.B., 2024

Abstract. *Introduction.* The article examines the history and reasons for the ideological condemnation and discussion of Olzhas Suleimenov's book “Az i Ya” in 1975–1976. The ideological discussion around this book turned out to be one of the most resonant in the twentieth century, and its historiosophy determined the formation of historical narratives in Kazakhstan for decades to come, overcoming the cultural trauma of “non-historicity” and gaining historical subjectivity of the post-nomadic culture of the Kazakhs, influencing not only public consciousness, but also the axiology of the academic narrative. *Goals and objectives.* To study the socio-cultural nature and ideological contradictions of the discussion caused by the book “Az i Ya” based on archival and narrative sources, as well as the memoirs of the author and his contemporaries. Based on the ideological accusations made against Olzhas Suleimenov (of pan-Turkism, Zionism and skepticism), and analyzing them in such documents as the “Note to the State Publishing House”, letters from the supreme party leadership of the USSR, materials of the discussion of the book at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, critical reviews and the course of the discussion itself, we came to the conclusion that “Az i Ya”, firstly, exposed the socio-cultural nature of the ideological consciousness of Soviet society, and secondly, vividly demonstrated the ideological contradictions between two lasting periods in the history of the USSR: post-Stalinism and the thaw. *Results:* in the first case, the discussion reflected the nature of the Soviet ideological consciousness that condemned the book of the Kazakh poet. In the second, it made obvious the cultural and ethnocentric hierarchy of Stalinism, which came into conflict with the consequences of the very short-lived but transformative liberation of the creative intelligentsia during the thaw. *Conclusions:* the materials of such ideological discussions allow us to explore how the Soviet hierarchy of cultures in the Kazakh case formed a subjectivity overcoming the trauma of post-nomadism in dialogue with world culture. The ideological leadership of the country, on the one hand, stimulated the growth of ethnonational self-awareness, and on the other, blocked manifestations of subjectivity that went beyond the permissible limits of

the prescribed status of a “younger brother” and suppressed attempts to comprehend the dramatic pages of the history of such kinship.

Keywords: History of Kazakhstan, Soviet ideological discussions, Az i Ya, Olzhas Suleimenov, historical subjectivity, historiography, narratives, nomadism, sedentarism

Acknowledgments. The article was prepared as part of the implementation of the grant financing project of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan on the topic: “Ideological discussions of the 20–50's of the 20th century and their impact on the deformation of scientific historical knowledge in the Soviet and post-Soviet times” (Registration number: AP 19680622).

For citation: Krupko I.V., Burkhanov B.B. Ideological history of “Az i Ya”: from condemnation to discussion // Electronic scientific journal "edu.e-history.kz". 2024. Vol. 11. No. 3. Pp. 626–641. (In Eng.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2024_11_3_626-641

«АЗ И Я» – ИДЕОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ ТАРИХЫ: АЙЫПТАУДАН ТАЛҚЫЛАУҒА ДЕЙІН

Игорь Крупко¹, Бимурад Бұрханов^{2*}

¹Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты
(28-үй, Шевченко көш., 050000 Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы)

PhD

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5349-0256>. E-mail: tengri95hismatulin@mail.ru

²Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты
(28-үй, Шевченко көш., 050000 Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы)

Ғылыми қызметкер

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9004-5987>. E-mail: burkhanov.b@inbox.ru

* Автор-корреспондент

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы ТЭИ, 2024

© Крупко И.В., Бұрханов Б.Б., 2024

Аңдатпа. *Kipicne.* Мақалада Олжас Сүлейменовтің 1975–1976 жылдардағы «Аз и Я» кітабын идеологиялық айыптау мен талқылаудың тарихы мен себептері зерттелген. бұл кітаптың айналасындағы идеологиялық пікірталас ХХ ғасырдағы ең резонанстық пікірталастардың бірі болып шықты, ал оның тарихнамасы Қазақстанда «тарихсыздық» мәдени жарақатын еңсеру және көшпенділіктен кейінгі тарихи субъективтілікке ие болу туралы тарихи әңгімелерді ондаған жылдар бойы қалыптастыруды анықтады. қазақ мәдениеті қоғамдық санаға ғана емес, академиялық баяндаудың аксиологиясына да әсер етті. *Мақаланың мақсаты мен міндеттері.* – «Аз и Я» кітабының мұрағаттық және баяндау дереккөздеріндегі, сондай-ақ автор мен оның замандастарының естеліктеріндегі пікірталастың әлеуметтік-мәдени табиғаты мен идеологиялық қайшылықтарын зерттеу. Олжас Сүлейменовке (пантюркизмде, сионизмде және скептицизмде) қойылған идеологиялық айыптауларға сүйене отырып және оларды «Мемкомиздатқа жазба», КСРО Жоғарғы партия басшылығының хаттары, КСРО Ғылым академиясындағы кітапты талқылау материалдары, сыни шолулар және пікірталас барысы сияқты құжаттарда талдай отырып, біз «Аз и Я», біріншіден, кеңес қоғамының идеологиялық санасының әлеуметтік-мәдени табиғатын ашты, екіншіден, КСРО тарихындағы екі кезеңнің арасындағы идеологиялық қайшылықтарды айқын көрсетті: пост-Сталинизм және еру. *Нәтижелері:* бірінші жағдайда, пікірталас қазақстандық ақынның кітабын айыптаған кеңестік идеологиялық сананың табиғатын көрсетті. Екіншісінде ол сталинизмнің мәдени және этнократиялық иерархиясын айқын көрсетті, ол еру кезеңінде шығармашылық интеллигенцияның өте қысқа, бірақ трансформациялық азаттығының салдарына қайшы келді. *Қорытындылар:* мұндай идеологиялық пікірталастардың материалдары қазақстандық жағдайда кеңестік мәдениеттер иерархиясы әлемдік мәдениетпен

диалогта пост-номадизм жаракаттарын жеңудің субъективтілігін қалай қалыптастырғанын зерттеуге мүмкіндік береді. Елдің идеологиялық басшылығы, бір жағынан, этно – ұлттық сананың өсуіне түрткі болды, ал екінші жағынан, “кіші інісі” мәртебесінің рұқсат етілген шегінен асатын субъективтіліктің көріністерін бұғаттады және осындай туыстық тарихының драмалық беттерін түсіну әрекеттерін тоқтатты.

Түйін сөздер: Қазақстан тарихы, кеңестік идеологиялық пікірталастар, Аз и Я, Олжас Сүлейменов, тарихи субъективтілік, тарихнама, нарративтер, номадизм, седентаризм


Алғыс. Мақала Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігінің «20–50 жылдардағы идеологиялық пікірталастар. XX ғ. және олардың кеңестік және посткеңестік кезеңдегі ғылыми тарихи білімнің деформациясына әсері» тақырыбындағы гранттық қаржыландыру жобасын жүзеге асыру аясында орындалды (жеке тіркеу нөмірі: АР 19680622).

Дәйексөз үшін: Крупко И.В., Бұрханов Б.Б. «Аз және Я» идеологиялық тарихы: айыптаудан талқылауға дейін // «Edu.e-history.kz» электрондық ғылыми журналы. 2024. Т. 11. № 3. 626–641 бб. (Ағылш.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2024_11_3_626-641

ИДЕОЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ ИСТОРИЯ «АЗ И Я»: ОТ ОСУЖДЕНИЯ К ОБСУЖДЕНИЮ

Игорь Крупко¹, Бимурад Бурханов^{2*}

¹Институт истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова
(д. 28, ул. Шевченко, 050000 Алматы, Республика Казахстан)
PhD

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5349-0256>. E-mail: tengri95hismatulin@mail.ru

²Институт истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова
(д. 28, ул. Шевченко, 050000 Алматы, Республика Казахстан)
Научный сотрудник

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9004-5987>. E-mail: burkhanov.b@inbox.ru

*Корреспондирующий автор

© ИИЭ имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2024

© Крупко И.В., Бурханов Б.Б., 2024

Аннотация. *Введение.* В статье исследуется история и причины идеологического осуждения и обсуждения книги Олжаса Сулейменова «Аз и Я» в 1975–1976 гг. Идеологическая дискуссия вокруг этой книги оказалась одной из самых резонансных в XX веке, а ее историософия определила на десятилетия вперед формирование в Казахстане исторических нарративов преодоления культурной травмы «внеисторичности» и обретения исторической субъектности пост-кочевой культуры казахов, повлияв не только на общественное сознание, но и на аксиологию академического нарратива. *Цель и задачи* статьи – исследование социокультурной природы и идеологических противоречий дискуссии, вызванной книгой «Аз и Я» на материалах архивных и нарративных источников, а также мемуаров автора и его современников. Исходя из идеологических обвинений, предъявленных Олжасу Сулейменову (в пантюркизме, сионизме и скептицизме), и анализируя их в таких документах как «Записка в Госкомиздат», письма высшего партийного руководства СССР, материалы обсуждения книги в Академии наук СССР, критические рецензии и сам ход дискуссии, мы пришли к выводу о том, что «Аз и Я», во-первых, обнажила социокультурную природу идеологического сознания советского общества, а во-вторых, наглядно продемонстрировала идеологические противоречия между двумя дрящимися периодами в истории СССР: пост-сталинизма и оттепели. *Результаты.* В первом случае, дискуссия отразила природу советского идеологического сознания, осудившего книгу казахстанского поэта. Во втором – сделала очевидной культурную и этнократическую иерархию сталинизма,

вошедшую в противоречие с последствиями очень недолгого, но преобразующего освобождения творческой интеллигенции в период оттепели. *Выводы.* Материалы таких идеологических дискуссий позволяют исследовать, как советская иерархия культур в казахстанском случае сформировала субъектность преодолевающую травмы пост-номадизма в диалоге с мировой культурой. Идеологическое руководство страны, с одной стороны, стимулировало рост этнонационального самосознания, а с другой – блокировало проявления субъектности, выходящей за дозволенные пределы предписанного статуса «младшего брата» и пресекало попытки осмысления драматических страниц истории такого родства.

Ключевые слова: История Казахстана, советские идеологические дискуссии, Аз и Я, Олжас Сулейменов, историческая субъектность, историография, нарративы, номадизм, седентаризм

Благодарность. Статья подготовлена в рамках реализации проекта грантового финансирования Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан на тему: «Идеологические дискуссии 20–50 гг. XX в. и их воздействие на деформацию научного исторического знания в советское и постсоветское время» (регистрационный номер: АР 19680622).

Для цитирования: Крупко И.В., Бурханов Б.Б. Верненская мужская гимназия и Жетысуские деятели движения Алаш // Электронный научный журнал «edu.e-history.kz». 2024. Т. 11. № 3. С. 626–641. (На Англ.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2024_11_3_626-641

Introduction

“...We consider it necessary to inform the Central Committee of the CPSU about the serious ideological errors made in the book by O. Suleimenov “Az i Ya. The Book of a Well-Intentioned Reader”. It was published in 1975 by the Publishing House of the Union of Writers of the Kazakh SSR “Zhazushy” (circulation – 60,000 copies). The author of the book is a famous poet who has published several collections of poetry in Kazakhstan and in Moscow, secretary of the Board of the Union of Writers of the Republic, laureate of the Lenin Komsomol Prize, the State Prize of the Kazakh SSR...” (RSAMH, F. 5., Op. 68., D. 420., P. 11.).

This is how case No. 420 begins, which is stored in the Russian State Archive of Modern History under the heading “Secret” (now declassified) documents of the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the CPSU – evidence of the unexpected interest of the ideological leadership of the USSR in the new book of the Kazakh poet, which 11 years later the American magazine “Problems of Communism” will name among the 5 works that prepared the consciousness of Soviet citizens for Perestroika (along with “The Gulag Archipelago” by A. Solzhenitsyn) (Snegirev, 2020).

The result of this interest was a shock wave of ideological condemnation and discussion of the book “Az i Ya” that swept across the Soviet Union in 1976, the echoes of which can be clearly heard even today, half a century later. New archival documents, as well as narrative sources, the study of which is devoted to our article, will help to understand the ideological and socio-cultural reasons for such attention from the “most reading country” to a work of this genre (a linguo-historiosophical detective story, where the main characters are peoples, cultures and ideologies).

(The cited note to the State Publishing House itself contains errors: 1) by the time of its submission, the circulation of the book was already 160,000 copies; 2) a spelling curiosity at the junction of two languages – in the title of the note, the Kazakh name of the publishing house “Zhazushy” was “corrected” according to the rules of Russian grammar: “zhi-shi” with an “i” – “Zhazushi”. According to the recollections of the publishers, at the condemnation of the book at the USSR Academy of Sciences on February 13, 1976, someone in the heat of the moment brought up this “mistake” as a reproach to Kazakh writers “unfamiliar” with even the elementary rules of the Russian language (Tolmachev, 2011.)

In the 20th century, several major ideological debates flared up in the USSR, which stirred up the consciousness of the majority of representatives of the thinking class of the “country of the great reader”. The discussion of the book “Az i Ya”, which overcame many scientific prohibitions canonized during the ideological debates of the 1920s–1950s and determined the narratives of gaining

historical subjectivity for the national intelligentsia of the post-Soviet world for decades to come, entered the intellectual history of the 20th century. After all, in addition to the concrete factual level, the book gave the reader, by the very style of its presentation, and somewhere even in plain text, an unattainable, but so attractive doubt of knowledge, which became the main target of subsequent accusations against the author by ideological guardians.

Thus, the Kazakh poet, in the language of philological irony and new etymology, began a discussion about the nature of historical knowledge, experiencing the “violence of the patriotic approach” and the role of ideology in science, about the “dark places” in “The word about Igor's Regiment” and in the traumatized historical memory of the peoples of the USSR, about overcoming the cultural trauma of the “extra-historicity” of post-nomadic peoples and the interdependent history of the world.

“Az i Ya” contains many plots and themes (decoding the “dark places” of “The word about Igor's Regiment” with the help of “invisible” Turkisms for a monolingual reader, exposing the paradoxes of imperial literary criticism, the semiotics of the origins of ancient cultures, the study of Tengrianism, Sumer, religious symbols, etc.), however, their detailed analysis is not included in the objectives of our article. We will focus only on those issues that will allow us to better understand the reasons and course of the ideological discussion around the only Kazakh book in history that has affected the consciousness of such a wide readership (from Soviet dissidents to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, from academics and writers to the KGB leadership and Western Sovietologists).

Materials and methods

In this article, we explore the ideological history of the acquisition of historical subjectivity by the Kazakh intelligentsia based on the materials of Olzhas Suleimenov's linguistic and poetic creativity. In particular, using the example of the book “Az i Ya”. This is a story about how the historical subjectivity of Kazakhstani society, traumatized as a result of the rupture of the foundations of its autochthonous economic and cultural type, was formed throughout the twentieth century, finding itself as one of the lines of development of world culture in the dead knot of sedentarian historiography and the cultural hierarchy of “nomadic – settled”, canonized as a result of ideological discussions of the 1920–1950s (Krupko, 2023).

The comprehension and overcoming of the cultural trauma of the “non-historical” nomadic culture of the Kazakhs was initiated by part of the scientific and creative intelligentsia of Kazakhstan in the second half of the twentieth century in search of a new historical subjectivity. Its search was carried out both in accordance with the ideological priorities of the Soviet state (for example, through the formation of archaeological contours of the cultural heritage of the national republics), and in the form of hidden intellectual protests against them. The search for subjectivity through internal dialogue with world culture united Soviet ethnocultural engineering and the production of a symbolic resource of historical legitimacy in the works of the Kazakh intelligentsia of the twentieth century, despite the fact that a significant part of it (as in Russia and other Soviet republics) in their reflections rarely rose to a level that allowed them to see more than the reasons for tribal and intra-ethnic contradictions (Suleimenov, 2023).

These factors continue to influence the corridor of opportunities and the horizon of expectations of post-Soviet societies to this day.

The decolonial methodological optics is applicable to the materials of the article. The author of postcolonial and decolonial studies Madina Tlostanova, studying “Az i Ya”, calls it, probably, the first decolonial manifesto of Kazakhstani culture in the conditions of Soviet national policy in the process of poetic and etymological overcoming of cultural hierarchies (Tlostanova, 2018: 88–109).

In our works, we also drew attention to the main factor in the emergence of such intellectual aspirations in Kazakhstani historical science (to a lesser extent) and art (to a greater extent) of the second half of the twentieth century. The cultural trauma caused by the long process of formation in the Soviet sedentarian narrative of the Kazakh national intelligentsia, who had adopted traumatic theses about the regressiveness of nomadic culture, was reflected in her works. Since the mid-20th

century, part of the national intelligentsia, the most prominent representative of which was and remains Olzhas Suleimenov, has been involved in the active process of openly overcoming these hierarchies and ideological priorities in dialogue, creative search and reinvention of images of their historical subjectivity (Krupko, 2023).

In his article “Nomads and Culture: The Kazakh Experiment,” published in 1977 in the UNESCO journal *Culture*, just a year after the ideological campaign against the book and the seizure of a significant portion of its circulation, Olzhas Suleimenov continued his attack on the sedentarian ideology of historical narratives: “Who is a nomad? For the mind educated in historical works, nomads are wandering hordes who had no concept of borders or land ownership. Cities that had the misfortune to stand in their way disappeared from the face of the earth, and everywhere they passed, there remained a desert. They were not familiar with either morality or law. And, naturally, they did not know such lofty categories as faith, honor, conscience, love...”

I speak as a condemned nomad who demands the right to have the last word after the verdict passed by historians” (Suleimenov, 1990: 38).

In “Az i Ya” the author demanded this word, having explored and outlined in the interweaving of world history the line of cultural development of nomadism, which at different periods influenced not only the military-political, but also the cultural history of the world. The poet researched the alternative to the ideological attitudes of historical narratives history of human thought, embodied, no less than in others, in the signs of the unobjectified culture of nomads. Of course, many genuine scholars, deeply engaged in the problems of Turkic nomadism, since the end of the 19th century overcame sedentarian and Eurocentric prejudices against the object of their research (Potanin, 1893; Radlov, 1989). But in the narratives of historical memory, among the general reader, in the sphere of public consciousness such a hierarchy of cultures, types of economy and historical “superiority” dominated entirely.

In our research, we relied on several groups of sources, divided into:

- 1) academic (scientific) works (from external descriptions of the historical subjectivity of the Kazakhs to internal producers of historical knowledge and cultural paradigms);
- 2) texts that make up the public narrative of memory: publications of the intelligentsia, literature in which attempts were made to understand the main problems of the historical memory of Kazakhstani society, memoirs of representatives of the intelligentsia, ego-documents;
- 3) texts of the official narrative (the language of power): some state programs and national projects reflecting and directing the emphases of historical policy.

All three categories are also represented in archival sources stored in the funds of the Central State Archive of Film, Photo, Sound Documents and Sound Recordings of the Republic of Kazakhstan (CSAFSD&SR of the RK) and the Russian State Archive of Contemporary History (RSAMH).

Discussion

Over the past half-century, many works have been written the authors of which have interpreted the “Book of the Well-Intentioned Reader” in attempts to master the heuristic and existential potential of scientific and creative freedom inherent in the paradoxes of this most outspoken work by Olzhas Suleimenov (Bobrov, 1995), (Krivoshchapova, 2016), (Əbdimanuly, Dzholdasbekova, Kakilbaeva, Kakisheva, 2016), (Snegirev, 2020).

It is amazing, how one book gave rise to a whole kaleidoscope of polar ideological interpretations both among the “civilian literary scholars” of the anti-Suleimenov campaign of 1975–1976, and in the works of later well-intentioned researchers. And if during the years of ideological persecution, the author was simultaneously accused of pan-Turkism, Zionism and skepticism, then in the late historiographic multiverse “Az i Ya” is studied as a linguo-philosophical treatise on the national self-awareness of the Turkic peoples, a spiritual autobiography of a thinker on the border of cultures, an intellectual debut of the decolonial turn of the Central Asian intelligentsia and even a manifesto of Eurasianism. Interpretations reflect the way of thinking of their authors, just as negative reviews once reflected all the phobias and “isms” of Soviet society. In “Az i Ya”, as in the mirror of

art, the reader sees himself: in the historical “Az” – the modern “I”.

In some works, the provisions of the book are considered by researchers as a continuation of the intellectual history of Eurasianism (Dolzhikov, 2019). However, in the article “Az i Ya” by Olzhas Suleimenov in the context of the Eurasian discourse” I.V. Likhomanov and V.A. Boyko question the relationship between the cultural and historical concept of its author and the Eurasian ideology of the 1920s and 1930s (Likhomanov, Boyko, 2020). Having noted a number of similar factual parallels, they nevertheless come to the conclusion about the fundamental ideological difference between the two intellectual traditions: if researchers identify the roots of the original Eurasianism of the early 20th century in the post-imperial political revanchism of a part of the Russian elite, then Suleimenov's Eurasianism is the overcoming of post-imperial hierarchies and the search by the Kazakh intelligentsia for historical subjectivity in the labyrinth of the interdependent history of Eurasia on the routes to a common human future.

According to researcher L.G. Frizman, the book was ostracized for its very attractive experience of free thought, denying ideological supervision and internal censorship: “the reprisal against it became an organic part of the total struggle against any manifestations of dissent” (Frizman, 2002: 387). And it is revealed in the book with utmost frankness, sometimes inaccessible even to modern historians. Expressing skepticism towards the “patriotic” version of the content of “The Word”, canonized by the academic community, the Kazakhstani poet deconstructed one of the most sacred texts of the Soviet and Russian ethnocentric canon of historical memory. In other words, he encroached on the “holy of holies” – the meta-text of Russian patriotism, fragments of which were memorized in schools. An aphorism from the book, later cited in numerous critical articles and denunciations: “If mathematics and physics had experienced such violence of the patriotic approach, humanity would still be riding in a cart.” (Suleimenov, 1975: 16). This is the answer to Afanasy Mamedov's question in the discussion about “Az i Ya”: “Why is a book that says nothing about dissidents, Stalin's camps and mental hospitals, a poet's book about “The Word”, included in the famous five books that prepared the perestroika of the consciousness of the Soviet person?” (Tlostanova, 2018). It embodied the author's poetics of deconstruction and reconstruction of historical principles, which in the 1970s chose the basis of self-awareness of Russian written culture as the target of its meta-irony and etymological analysis (Ram, 2001).

Likhomanov and Boyko draw attention to the fact that Olzhas Suleimenov's creative skepticism in “Az i Ya” was directed against the version of ancient Russian history that was canonized in the 1920s–1950s and dominated unchanged in the 1960s–1970s, built on the ideological maxims that shaped the humanities in the USSR. For example, the unity of the “Soviet people” as a “new historical community” was referred to the historical roots of the ethnocultural unity of Kievan Rus. All the more accurate was the definition given by the author of “Az i Ya” to the entire academic historiography on the main problem of two centuries of studying the “Word about Igor's Regiment” – the problem of the authenticity of the written monument: “There is one team on the field, and it all consists of defenders. The attackers have long since gone to the locker room. The team imitates a furious fight with bogeymen – a game of football over the telephone.” (Suleimenov, 1975: 16).

Researchers suggest that, by discovering the history of the cultural interdependence of the Slavs and Turks, the sedentary agricultural and nomadic worlds, Olzhas Suleimenov “expanded the cultural and historical basis of the unity of the Soviet people” (Likhomanov, Boyko, 2020: 141), invading the ancient Slavic unity with a reinvented Turkic nomadologist. Makhanbet Dzhusupov draws attention to the “bilingual approach to understanding the essence of the content of the “Word about Igor's Regiment”, which as a result reveals previously hidden possibilities of mutual hermeneutics of languages and epochs (Dzhusupov, 2020).

Dmitry Melnikov, in his study of strategies for searching for subjectivity embodied in Kazakh literature of the second half of the 20th century, characterizes Suleimenov's strategy of finding a voice in ideological discussions around historical problems as “a manifesto of a special type of thinking – multilingual imagination that enhances the reflexive and intuitive meta-level of the literary text” (Melnikov, 2023). Here, different, at first glance, linguistic and sign systems “meeting in one text, create its additional complex dimensions ... Languages here seem to translate each other and create a

super-language ...” (Melnikov, 2023).

However, the Soviet ideological language of the hierarchy of ethnocultural subjectivities rejected the possibility of such intercultural dialogue and influence on the ethnocentric hegemon from the “younger brothers” in the past. Especially, in the sacred chronotope of key events for historical memory.

Naomi Café, a literary scholar and researcher of Slavic languages and literature, professor (Reed College, USA) in the article “Between the First, Second, and Third Worlds: Olzhas Suleimenov and Soviet Postcolonialism” (Café, 2020) calls him the architect of postcolonial Kazakh identity. Exploring his transition from the space theme to the linguo-history “Az i Ya” in the 1970s, she writes about how the poet: “collected together a huge array of information on ancient Turkic-centric culture and linguistics, linking the Kazakh steppes and their inhabitants with such cultures as ancient Mesopotamia.” (Café, 2020). The author is right that all these phenomena cannot be considered outside the ideological context of the “sixties”, the “thaw” and the socio-cultural processes of the post-colonial world, in which Olzhas Suleimenov took an active part in the 1960–1970s as deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee of Solidarity with the Countries of Asia and Africa (Suleimenov, 2023).

According to the researchers, the subsequent reaction to the book by the country's leadership also reflects the contradictions between the late Stalinist ideological canon (ethnocentrism, imperialism, “reining in nationalities”) and the “left renaissance” of the short-lived thaw, symbolized by the 20th Congress of the CPSU (1956), support for the liberation movement in Asia and Africa, the World Youth Festival in Moscow (1957), and Yuri Gagarin's space flight (1961), celebrated in the poem “Earth, Bow Down to Man!” The process of moments of creative liberation and rapprochement of cultures was a global phenomenon, but “the Soviet variety of it had specific differences due to the persistent totalitarian nature of the political regime” (Likhomanov, Boyko, 2020: 141), (Dobrenko, 2020), (Abylkhozhin, 2020). In the era of late Stalinism (1946–1953), which turned out to be much more durable than the biological life of its demiurge, the ideological leadership of the USSR and M. Suslov, in particular (the curator of the ideological campaign against “Az i Ya”) already had experience in discussing “problematic” historical works by Kazakhstani authors. For example, in the Report of the Propaganda and Agitation Department of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) to the Secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) M.A. Suslov on controversial issues in covering the history of the peoples of Central Asia, Moscow, October 1949, it is stated that in scientific works that highlight the role of the Russian conquest of Central Asia, the bourgeois-nationalist concept of “absolute evil” or the great-power concept of “absolute good” are often manifested (Report, 1949: 182).

In 1976, at the height of the ideological campaign to condemn “Az i Ya” in the USSR Academy of Sciences, at a meeting of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, in printed and unprinted speeches, Murat Auezov's article “Overshadowed by the exhalation of Eternity”, devoted to the analysis of “The Book of a Well-Intentioned Reader”, was removed from the magazine “Prostor”. In it, the young Candidate of Philological sciences, the son of a classic of Kazakh literature and a budding public figure identified the central value nerve of the main monument of Old Russian literature, restored thanks to the intercultural reading of “Az i Ya”: “Cleared of layers, “The Word” appears as a monolithic work of high dramatic resonance. Its central, as Suleimenov convincingly shows, moral problem has universal human significance: “one's own is wrong” (!). This is a rare case in the world literature of the Middle Ages of overcoming ethnic passions, which could be done by a truly brilliant artist who loved his people as a part of the human race” (Auezov, 2006). It should be noted here that the problem of “one's own is wrong” is indeed unimaginable for the group-centrism of the agrarian-traditional consciousness, a structural modification of which was its Soviet ideological analogue (Abylkhozhin, 2020), since it was a basic derivative of the type of consciousness of the socio-demographic majority of the population of the USSR, regardless of ethnicity. This is one of the socio-cultural reasons for such a fierce condemnation of the book “Az i Ya”, which will be discussed in more detail below. Soon after the removal of Auezov's article from print, in the same way, as part of the anti-Suleimenov campaign, apparently out

of excessive precaution, a three-thousandth print run of the scientific collection “Aesthetics of Nomadism” of the Institute of Philosophy of the Kazakh SSR edited by Murat Auezov was removed and destroyed on the printing device “Guillotine”.

It is no coincidence and accurate that Afanasy Mamedov described the book, which, we are convinced, all its thinking readers would subscribe to: "I return to it every time my “I” insidiously eludes me." (Tlostanova, 2018).

Results

Olzhas Suleimenov deconstructs post-imperial hierarchies of ideologically constructed knowledge about nomadic culture simultaneously on the factually concrete (denotative) and historiosophical (connotative) levels. This can be traced even in the reconstruction of the phrase about the events of “The Word”, describing how after the defeat by the Polovtsians, Prince Igor was forced to move “from the saddle of gold to the saddle of Koshchei” (Suleimenov, 2013) and wander with the Polovtsians. The poet became interested in this example after studying the dispute between members of the Imperial Academy Korsh and Melioransky, dedicated to clarifying the origin of the term *koshchei* in “The Word”. And with the general conclusion of scientists: *koshchei*, according to academics, originated from the word *koshchi* – “slave”, brought to Ancient Russia by one of the Turkic dialects. The poet clarified the translation of the ancient phrase, proposing the etymology of the word “*koshchy*” from the archaic “*көпші*” – “nomad” (Turk.) Such a translation “moved from the saddle of gold to the saddle of a nomad” was, of course, much more logical, given that *Konchak*, into whose saddle Igor moved, was the khan and matchmaker of the prince. This turned out to be the prototype of the Old Russian name of the representative of the “Wild Field”, whose figure in the era of the “three-hundred-year yoke” acquired a fairy-tale figurativeness. Thus, the idea of an indestructible nomad was embodied in the image of *Koshchy* (*Koschei*) the Deathless, superimposed on folklore archetypes.

Denial of the definition of “slave” even at the level of translation errors of the ancient text becomes one of the ways of acquiring historical subjectivity by post-nomadic culture.

One of the hitherto unrecognized problems of this semiosis, refuted in “*Az i Ya*” and in the author’s later books, is the Sogdian theory of the genesis of Turkic writing, which took shape in the first half of the 20th century and reflects the same sedentarian view of the nomadic Turks. The Ancient Oghuz or Ancient Turkic, as it was called by researchers before the First Turkological Congress (Baku, 1926), was considered to have been borrowed in the 5th century AD from Sogdian traders, whose caravans from Central Asia reached the Mongolian steppes (despite the fact that the Sogdian and Ancient Turkic alphabets had only one coinciding letter – **М**(h)). However, within the framework of the sedentarian picture of the world, the nomadic Turks were “incapable” of inventing their own writing independently (Suleimenov, 2002). Some modern researchers confirm this doubt, drawing attention to the many descriptive-pictorial and associative-mnemonic signs that could have become the basis for the first logograms, as well as the fact that some autochthonous symbols containing generic, magical and cosmogonic semantics entered the Turkic script (Manichkin, 2023).

The materials of such ideological discussions allow us to study how the Soviet hierarchy of cultures, aimed at “teaching ethnicity”, formed a traumatized subjectivity of overcoming its “dead-end historical role” imposed by sedentarian historiography.

These examples allow us to study the dialectic of the internal boundaries of such historical subjectivity, balancing in a sedentarian trap between ideas about the primordial inability to create history (the Sogdian theory of the invention of writing, the stigmatization of nomads as primordial barbarians, etc.) and the development of the cultural heritage of the cities of Central Asia that ended up on the territory of the Kazakh SSR.

The ideological foundation of the post-imperial architecture of the first state of universal brotherhood in history was based on a hierarchy of destructive inequality with a chronometer for decades of creative unfreedom.

In the most revealing chapter of the condemned book “*Az i Ya*” entitled “The Right to Mistake”, Olzhas Suleimenov returns to the definition of a “slave” (in which one can easily see *subaltern*

studies), defining the role of a creator in the conditions of an ideocracy with utmost honesty: “...Here I do not depend on anyone, *here it is interesting to be a slave...*” (Suleimenov, 1975: 196).

The powerful campaign that unfolded in 1975–1976 testifies to how sensitively the ideological system reacted to such revelations and the natural demands of historical justice in attempts to understand its past and present, inseparable from the history of the world. The author and publishers of the book, in addition to severe reprimands, two public condemnations (the first in the USSR Academy of Sciences, the second in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan) and numerous critical publications in magazines and newspapers, were saved from more serious consequences by the active position of the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Kazakh SSR D.A. Kunayev, who enlisted the support of Brezhnev in the confrontation with the secretary of the Central Committee for ideology – M. Suslov, and saved not only the disgraced author and the team that published the book, but also himself as the leader of the most international republic, called the “the laboratory of friendship of peoples” (Kunayev, 1992), (Suleimenov, 2023).

On February 4, 1976, the Congress of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan was held in Alma-Ata, where Olzhas Suleimenov was elected as a candidate member of the Central Committee. Immediately after this election, the CPSU Central Committee could no longer apply harsh repressive measures (in order to avoid “violating party ethics”). Suslov was forced to transfer the condemnation to the level of the USSR Academy of Sciences. However, a wave of discussions had already swept over the “country of the great reader”, right up to its top leadership from a variety of professional spheres. In a note kept in the RSAMH, to the Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M.V. Zimyanin, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR V. Semenov wrote: “In fact, this is a real sortie of a nationalistic, pan-Turkic nature, directed against the line of the CPSU in the area of further strengthening the friendship of peoples and Soviet patriotism. O. Suleimenov writes that he has “followers” among the writers of Kazakhstan. Perhaps this is aimed at bringing together dissident nationalists”. (RSAMH, f.5, op.68, d.420, l.11).

In a note to the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee, the Chairman of the USSR State Publishing Committee B.I. Stukalin outlined and described in detail all of O. Suleimenov's ideological “mistakes” (dated November 26, 1975, No. 354/18). The ideologists were outraged by the fact that the author questioned the interpretation of the monument as an ancient patriotic epic and “tries to assert that patriotism is incompatible with objective scientific research” and about the “violence of the patriotic approach”), as well as about the “swamp of patriotic scientific works”. The Chairman of the State Committee for Publishing expressed concern that the book might be of interest to “various anti-Soviet centers abroad” (RSAMH, f. 5, op. 68, d. 420, l. 11), in order to critically illuminate the national policy in the USSR. The vigilant Stukalin calls the names of all those “guilty” of a positive assessment of the published book: scientific reviewers and journalists: R. Zueva, S. Shteingrud, V. Zlobin, Dzhukebaev and Vladimirov (RSAMH. F. 5. Op. 68. D. 420. L. 11), (Zueva, Shteingrud, 1975).

A separate insult, according to the Chairman of the State Committee for Publishing, was made by Olzhas Suleimenov to Karl Marx, who at one time wrote that “the essence of the poem is the calls of Russian princes for unity before the invasion of the Mongol hordes” (RSAMH. F. 5. Op. 68. D. 420. 11 p.). The poet compared this statement to a “universal master key” that generations of scientists have used since their youth to open the doors they need.

The author of this note was indignant at the assessment of historians and Turkologists given by Olzhas Suleimenov, who was convinced that they “cannot hold up their trousers without the support of devoted apprenticeship, and endlessly, deafly and blindly repeat the offensive truths of their respectable teachers” (Suleimenov, 1990: 535).

It was these people who came in a tight formation on February 13, 1976 to the building of the Social Sciences Department of the Academy on Volkhonka to condemn the scientific and ideological errors of the author – 47 academicians, corresponding members and doctors of science. The author was accompanied by Sanzhar Zhandosov, head of the science department of the Central Committee, and Gennady Tolmachev, deputy editor-in-chief of the Zhazushy publishing house.

The discussion was opened by Academician B. Rybakov: “Comrades, a furious anti-Russian book called “Az i Ya” has been published in Alma-Ata. You have all read it. Let's begin the discussion” (Suleimenov, 2023: 56)

In total, according to the Report, 17 speakers spoke. By the way, D. Likhachev, the chief specialist on “The Word”, was not present at the discussion. Perhaps, understanding the nature of the upcoming event, he did not dare to participate in it, remembering his own experience of condemnation, but sent a rather restrained review (Likhachev, 1976).

The discussion lasted from 9 am to 6 pm. When at the end the author was given the right to the “last word”, he replied that he agreed with some of the opponents' comments, but not with all of them. And he categorically does not accept the assessment given by Academician Rybakov: “My entire book is a declaration of love for “The Word”, for Russian culture, to which I myself belong for most of my upbringing and education. I regret that you did not see this in the book, dear Boris Alexandrovich. Some people are accustomed to the fact that love must be confessed – on their knees” (Suleimenov, 2023: 56).

This episode reflects the conflict around the hierarchy of an ethnocratically built state with a post-imperial center and the ideological legacy of Stalinism with its paternalistic idyll of the “elder and younger brothers”. One of the basic socio-cultural reasons that caused such a heated debate was, apparently, in the words of Abylkhodzhin Zh.B., “the inertia of stereotypes of agrarian-traditional, communal-peasant consciousness” (Abylkhodzhin, 2020), which was predominant among the demographic majority of the USSR, including many leaders of the Soviet state, ideological functionaries and even scientists (the same academician Rybakov, for example, grew up in a Russian Old Believer family). Perceived as a symbolic social resource, communist morality and declared internationalism could not overcome the imprinting of the primary socialization of agrarian-traditional values, including group-centric priorities, which were not suppressed, but switched to another level of group identification, and sometimes, if the ideological situation allowed it, could even break out in an ethnocentric form. All this was reflected in critical articles and reviews, mixed with “scientific” arguments (Kuzmin, 1975), (Dmitriev, Tvorogov, 1976).

Of particular interest is the review of “Az i Ya” by Lev Gumilyov (unknown to most researchers who wrote about the book, including the author himself). In it, Gumilyov writes not so much about the book itself as he is ironic about the scandal that has flared up in the academic community, briefly addressing the theory of ethnogenesis and criticizing the critical reviews of “Az i Ya” (Gumilyov, 1975).

Probably, among the most odious reviews of the book is an article by one of the “spiritual leaders” of the writers and soil scientists, Yu. Seleznev, who compared “Az i Ya” with *Mein Kampf* and concluded the article with a thoughtful “epiphany”: “It is difficult to say whether O. Suleimenov will find in himself enough strength and talent, enough spiritual maturity, to understand the causes and consequences of his “myth-creation”, to realize where it leads and who benefits from it”. (Seleznev, 1976), (Ogryzko, 2013).

Writer, translator, chairman of the Union of Russian-speaking Writers of Israel David Markish wrote about the ideological condemnation of “Az i Ya” and its author as follows: “if there had been a Russian person in Olzhas's place, “one of our own”, such a scandal would not have erupted: well, they would have scolded the “scoundrel”, pointed out his mistakes... But here the Polovtsian, an ancient steppe enemy, took a swing at the sacred” (Markish, 2016).

Also, in the report on the results of the discussion of “Az i Ya” at a joint meeting of the Bureau of the Department of Literature and Language and the Bureau of the Department of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, special attention was paid to criticism of “phraseology and symbolism alien to us, internationalists, in relation to the “historical mission” of the Jewish people” (based on several historical and linguistic commentaries by Olzhas Suleimenov on the study of some late Semitic signs of Ancient West Asia and the history of the Khazar Khaganate) and accusations of Zionism against the author of the book. (ARAS, F. 457. Op. 1., D. 674., L. 133), apparently, here in the authoritarian consciousness of critics the Stalinist ideological legacy of the “struggle against rootless cosmopolitanism” was activated, as well as the anti-Zionist propaganda that intensified after

the Arab-Israeli Six-Day War of 1967.

In the second half of the 60s and early 70s of the twentieth century, conservative-conservative relapses intensified in the practice of Soviet ideology. The thickening substance of authoritarian unanimity more and more confidently dissolved in itself the watercolor mirages of creative hopes guessed by the 60s generation in the sky of Gagarin's heights and reflected in the puddles of the Khrushchev's thaw. Crypto-Stalinism was cautiously returning to life.

The authoritarian consciousness, cultivated over decades of totalitarian selection based on the principle of “we” and “not we,” manifested itself in ideological discussions around the book “Az i Ya”. This is evidenced not only by the critical reviews of scientists whose irritation with thought and the need for a reasoned dialogue was caused by the book, but also by numerous angry letters to the editors and personally to the author, as well as publications in newspapers and magazines, branding the poet “with a sense of deep satisfaction”.

In an open letter to D. A. Kunayev and the Members of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan on June 17, 1976, Olzhas Suleimenov cites the following facts:

“...Some liken me in print to “cattle allowed into Russian antiquities,” others accuse me in unprintable words of having “sold myself to the Russians for Komsomol prizes” ...

...I am writing these words with the full awareness that over time they will be perceived as a human document of uncommon significance...” (Suleimenov, 1990: 589).

In a document dated July 22, 1976, sent to the Central Committee of the CPSU signed by Deputy Head of the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the CPSU G. Smirnov, Head of the Department of Science and Educational Institutions of the Central Committee of the CPSU S. Trapeznikov and Head of the Department of Culture of the Central Committee of the CPSU V. Shauro, among other things, Suleimenov was accused by of the fact that he “views the history of the relations of the Turkic tribes with other peoples one-sidedly, from an extremely objectivist position” (RSAMH f.5. op.68. d.420. l.27). Perhaps, the poet's “subjectivist” positions were meant here, but even in such a word form, accidentally coming from the socialist realist pen of an ideological clerk, this accusation looks extremely characteristic.

The condemnation of the book continued not only in scientific and ideological journalism, but also in fiction. For example, in the novel by the writer and soil scientist Vasily Belov “Everything is Ahead”. (Belov, 1993).

At the same time, despite such a powerful ideological campaign, some critics still recognized the author's right to be right. Even the Note to the State Publishing House states that some of the author's positions seem justified. In particular, about the “insufficient study of the cultural history of the Turkic-speaking peoples, the Tengrism Turks, Kipchaks, and Khazars” and their role “in counteracting the aggression of the Arabs, and later the Tatar-Mongols, in the regions of Eastern Europe” (RSAMH f.5. op.48. d.420. l.2). The validity of the author's assessment of the nature of “feudal strife in Russia in the 11th–13th centuries, when the place of this or that prince, as well as the Polovtsians participating in this strife, was determined not by the confrontation between Russia and the “steppe”, but by the criteria of internecine struggle” (RSAMH, F. 5., Op., 48. D., 420. L., 3).

The poet was supported by K. Simonov, E. Mezhelaitis, R. Rozhdestvensky, and many writers from Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Lithuania, Estonia, and other republics. The assessment of the First Secretary of the Azerbaijan SSR, Heydar Aliyev, voiced at a meeting of Soviet writers with the leadership of Azerbaijan is widely known: “Olzhas is needed not only by the Kazakhs, but also by all the Turks!” (Snegirev, 2020).

The KGB leaders also took part in the discussion (not publicly). According to the memoirs of Olzhas Omarovich, after the end of one of the writers' plenary sessions in 1976, a stranger in civilian clothes approached him and asked him to go “to Philipp Denisovich”. This is how Olzhas Suleimenov met the head of the Fifth “ideological” department, and then deputy chairman of the KGB, Philipp Bobkov, who said in a conversation that he and his employees “carefully studied the book and did not find anything bad in it. It may contain some controversial or erroneous judgments, but they are beyond our competence. This is a matter for science”. (Snegirev, 2020: 179).

The book was not reprinted until 1990. With the fee received for the second edition of “Az i Ya” in a print run of 200 thousand copies, Olzhas Suleimenov bought and donated 8 one-room apartments to students – participants in the December 1986 events, returning from prison (Suleimenov, 2023: 118).

Over time, some provisions of the book gradually entered the academic narrative, enriching not only “syllabics”, but also other humanities disciplines “prudently forgetting about their origins”. And the Nostratic theory of historical linguistics, now recognized by most linguists, came to the conclusion that the Turkic and Indo-European “language branches” originated from a single “tree” (Preobrazhensky, 2018).

Conclusion

Thus, the discussion and condemnation of the book “Az i Ya” gave rise to one of the most vivid and interesting ideological discussions around historical knowledge, during which not only scientific problems were solved, but also the fates of people and the possible future of the ideological situation in the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic.

The book became a multi-level decoding of the “dark places” of “The Word about Igor's Regiment”, then - the origin of the word and sign as a multicultural logos, and at the discussion stage - a reflection of the ideological contradictions of the era.

Despite the absurdity of the accusations brought against the author in 1975–1976, analyzed by us in the article, such a reaction of the ideological system was highly characteristic and was a mirror image of the radical epistemological break produced in the book. The author’s strategy – a way out of binary oppositions and ideological routes on the path of producing new, alternative knowledge – can be called one of the few successful attempts to gain historical subjectivity and overcome cultural hierarchies without falling into the abyss of glorification and victimization.

The importance of understanding the ideological legacy of that intellectual tradition, embodied in the works of several prominent figures, the most significant of whom was and remains Olzhas Suleimenov, lies in the fact that modern attempts to borrow and develop a decolonial and postcolonial agenda in Kazakhstani humanities, which have intensified over the past 10 years, appear unproductive, since they are borrowed through external reception – as an intellectual fashion, superimposed on cultural traumas and previous archetypes of mass consciousness, instead of studying and perceiving the intellectual experience of past decades and ideological discussions, the arguments, logic and paradoxes of which are repeated in new post-Soviet generations of a future that has not yet arrived.

Sources

RSAMH — The Russian State Archive of Modern History
ARAS — Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences

Источники

РГАНИ — Российский государственный архив новейшей истории
АРАН — Архив Российской Академии наук

References

Abdimanuly, et al., 2016 — *Abdimanuly O., Dzholdasbekova B.U., Kakilbaeva E.T., Kakisheva N.T.* Tvorchestvo Olzhasa Sulejmenova i voprosy nacionalnogo samosoznaniya [The work of Olzhas Suleimenov and issues of national identity]. Proceedings of the international scientific conference dedicated to the 80th anniversary of the Kazakh poet and public figure Olzhas Omarovich Suleimenov. Almaty: Kazakh university, 2016. 306 p. (In Russ.).

Abylkhozhin, 2020 — *Abylkhozhin Zh.B.* Poststalinskij period v istorii sovetskogo Kazahstana: chereda obrechennyh reform i nesostoyavshihsy deklaracij (1953–1991 gg.) [The Post-Stalin period in the history of Soviet Kazakhstan: a series of doomed reforms and failed declarations (1953–1991)]. Almaty: KBTU, 2020. 468 p. (In Russ.).

Auezov, 2006 — *Auezov M.* Osenennyj vyдохom vechnosti-slovom [Overshadowed by the exhalation of eternity-the word]. Central Asia Monitor: Kniga “Az i Ya” Olzhasa kak predtecha suverenizacii Kazahstana, 2006. No. 19. 8 p. (In Russ.).

Belov, 1993 — *Belov V.* Vse vpered. Roman [Everything is ahead. Novel]. Moscow: Sovremennij pisatel, 1993. 222 p. (In Russ.).

- Bobrov, 1995 — *Bobrov A.G.* Suleimenov. Enciklopediya “Slova o polku Igoreve”, 1995. URL: <http://febweb.ru/feb/slovens/es/es5/es5-0831.html>. (access date: 01.01.2024). (In Russ.).
- Caffee, 2020 — *Caffee N.* Between First, Second, and Third Worlds: Olzhas Suleimenov and Soviet Postcolonialism, 1961–1973. *Russian Literature*, 2020. Vol. 111. Pp. 91–118. (In Eng.).
- Dmitriev, Tvorogov, 1976 — *Dmitriev L., Tvorogov O.* «Slovo o polku Igoreve» v interpretacii O. Sulejmenova [“The Word about Igor's Regiment” as interpreted by O. Suleimenov]. *Russkaya literatura*, 1976. Pp. 251–258. (In Russ.).
- Dobrenko, 2020 — *Dobrenko E.* Pozdnij stalinizm: Estetika politiki [Late Stalinism: The Aesthetics of Politics]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2020. Vol. 1–2. Pp. 712, 600. (In Russ.).
- Dokladnaya zapiska, 1949 — *Dokladnaya zapiska* No. 75. Otdela propagandi i agitacii SK VKP (b) sekretaryu SK VKP (b) M.A. Suslovu o spornix voprosax v osvshenii istorii narodov Sredney Azii [Memo from the Propaganda and Agitation Department of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) to the Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) M.A. Suslov on controversial issues in the coverage of the history of the peoples of Central Asia]. Moscow, 1949. (In Russ.).
- Dolzhirov, 2019 — *Dolzhirov V.A.* Evrazijskij integralnyj tyurkoslavizm O. Sulejmenova [Eurasian integral turkoslavism by O. Suleimenov]. *Otvetstvennyj redactor*, 2019. 70 p. (In Russ.).
- Dzhusupov 2020 — *Dzhusupov M.* «Az i Ya» Olzhasa Sulejmenova (gen nepovinoventiya i gen spravedlivosti) [“Az i Ya” by Olzhas Suleimenov (the gene of disobedience and the gene of justice)]. *Uzbekistonda horizhij tillar*, 2020. No. 1(30). Pp. 219–236. URL: <https://doi.org/10.36078/> [access date: 01.01.2024]. (In Russ.).
- Frizman, 2002 — *Frizman L.* Vozmutitel spokojstviya. Kniga O. Sulejmenova “Az i Ya” pod ognem ideologicheskoy kritiki [A troublemaker. O. Suleimenov's book “Az and I” under fire of ideological criticism]. *NLO*, 2002, No. 55. 68 p. URL: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2002/55/friz.html>. (access date: 01.01.2024). (In Russ.).
- Gumilev, 1975 — *Gumilev L.N.* Spor s poetom [Dispute with the poet], 1975. 12 p. URL: <http://kulichki.rambler.ru/~gumilev/>. (access date: 01.01.2024). (In Russ.).
- Krivoshapova, 2016 — *Krivoshapova T.V.* «Az i Ya» O. Sulejmenova v kontekste izucheniya «Slova o Polku Igoreve» v vuze [“Az i Ya” by O. Suleimenov in the context of studying the “Words about Igor's Regiment” at the university]. *Kazakhstan respublikasy bilim zhane gylim ministriligi al-Farabi atyndagy Kazakh Ul'tytk Universiteti*, 2016. 109 p. (In Russ).
- Krupko, 2023 — *Krupko I.V.* Ot znakov k znaniyam: obrazy i syujety obreteniya istoricheskoi sub'ektnosti v narrativah Olzhasa Suleimenova [From signs to knowledge: images and plots of the acquisition of historical subjectivity in the narratives of Olzhas Suleimenov] // *Vestnik KazNU. Seriya istoricheskaya*, 2023. 21 p. ISSN 2617–8893. URL: <https://bulletin-history.kaznu.kz/index.php/1-history/article/view/1700>. (access date: 01.01.2024). (In Russ)
- Krupko, 2023 — *Krupko I.V.* Pereizobrenie istoricheskoy subektnosti kazahov v tvorchestve Olzhasa Sulejmenova 1960-h gg. [Reinvention of the historical subjectivity of the Kazakhs in the work of Olzhas Suleimenov in the 1960s]. *Uralskij istoricheskij vestnik*, 2023. No. 1(78). Pp. 123–132. DOI: 10.30759/1728-9718-2023-1(78)-123-132 (In Russ.).
- Kunaev, 1992 — *Kunaev D.A.* O moem vremeni: Vospominaniya [About my time: Memories]. Alma-Ata: Daur, MP «Yntymak», 1992. 312 p. (In Russ.).
- Kuzmin, 1975 — *Kuzmin A.* Tochka v krughe, iz kotoroj vyrastaet repej [The point in the circle from which the burr grows]. *Molodaya gvardiya*, 1975. No. 12. Pp. 270–280. (In Russ.).
- Lihachev, 1976 — *Lihachev D.S.* Gipotezy ili fantazii v istolkovanii temnyh mest “Slova o polku Igoreve” [Hypotheses or fantasies in the interpretation of dark places “Words about Igor's regiment”]. *Zvezda*, 1976. No. 6. Pp. 203–210. (In Russ.).
- Lihomanov, Bojko, 2020 — *Lihomanov I. V., Bojko V. A.* “Az i Ya” Olzhasa Sulejmenova v kontekste evrazijskogo diskursa [“Az i Ya” by Olzhas Suleimenov in the context of Eurasian discourse]. *Tomsk State University Bulletin*. 2020. No. 454. Pp. 137–144. (In Russ.).
- Manichkin, 2023 — *Manichkin N.A.* Interdependent formation: poetic reinterpretation of symbols and images of historical memory in Kazakhstan. *Electronic scientific journal “edu.e-history.kz”*, 2023. Vol. 10. No. 2. Pp. 334–346. (In Russ.).
- Markish, 2016 — *Markish D.* Stepoj veter legendy [Steppe wind of legend]. *Olzhas i Ya [Olzhas and I]*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura, 2016. Pp. 199–203. (In Russ.).
- Melnikov, 2023 — *Melnikov D.* K post- / dekolonialnomu voobrazheniyu: Hudozhestvennaya refleksiya prostranstva iazyka v postsovetso. russkoyazychnoj literature Kazahstana [Towards the post-/decolonial imagination: artistic reflection of space and language in the post-soviet russian-language literature of Kazakhstan] / *Bisenova A.Zh. et al.* (2023) *Qazaqstan. Kazahstan, قازاقستان: labirinty sovremennoego postkolonialnogo diskursa // Centr sovremennoj kultury «Celinniy», Almaty*. Pp. 120–122, 467. (In Russ.).
- Ogryzko, 2023 — *Ogryzko V.* I vechnyj boj: Yuriy Seleznev (And the eternal battle: Yuri Seleznev). *Literaturnaya Rossiya*, 2013. No. 23. URL: <http://www.litrossia.ru/archive/item/6495-oldarchive> (In Russ.).
- Potantin, 1893 — *Potantin G.N.* Vostochnye motivy v zapadnoevropejskom srednevekovom epose [Oriental motifs in the Western European Medieval Epic]. Moscow, 1893. 73 p. (In Russ.).
- Preobrazhenskij, 2018 — *Preobrazhenskij S.Yu.* O voobrazhaemoj filologii O.O. Sulejmenova [About the imaginary philology of O.O. Suleimenov] // *Polilingvialnost i transkulturnye praktiki*, 2018. Vol. 15. No. 3. Pp. 406–409. (In Russ.).
- Radlov, 1989 — *Radlov V.V.* Iz Sibiri. Stranicy dnevnika. [From Siberia. Diary pages]. Moscow: Nauka, 1989. 752 p. (In Russ.).

- Ram, 2001 — *Ram H.* Imagining Eurasia: The Poetics and Ideology of Olzhas Suleimenov's *Az i Ya*. *Slavic Review*, Vol. 60, No. Summer, 2001. Pp. 289–311 // URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2697272>. (access date: 01.01.2024). (In Eng.).
- Seleznev, 1976 — *Seleznev Yu.* Mify i istiny [Myths and truths]. Moscow, 1976. Pp. 201–208. (In Russ.).
- Snegirev, 2020 — *Snegirev V.N.* Olzhas Suleimenov. Moscow: Molodaya gvardiya / ZhZL: Biografiya prodolzhaetsya...: seriya biograficheskaya [Life of Remarkable People: Biography Continues...: biographic series], 2020. 488 p. (In Russ.).
- Suleimenov, 1990 — *Suleimenov O.* Kochevniki i kultura: kazahskij eksperiment [Nomads and culture: a Kazakh experiment]. Esse1, publicistika. Stihi, poemy. *Az i Ya*. Alma-Ata: Zhalyn, 1990. 580 p. (In Russ.).
- Suleimenov, 2002 — *Suleimenov O.O.* Tyurki v doistorii: o proishozhdenii drevnetyurkskih yazykov i pismennostej [Turks in Prehistory: On the Origin of Ancient Turkic Languages and Scripts]. Atamura, 2002. 319 p. (In Russ.).
- Suleimenov, 2013 — *Suleimenov O.O.* *Az i Ya*. [Az and Ya]. Almaty: OF Literaturnyj Alyans, 2013. 304 p. (In Russ.).
- Suleimenov, 2023 — *Suleimenov O.* Tak bylo... [It was like that...]. Almaty: Service press, 2023. 16. p. (In Russ.).
- Tlostanova, 2018 — *Tlostanova M.* Glavnoj ego mishenyu byl evropocentrizm. *Olzhas i Ya*. Book 2. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura, 2018. Pp. 415–436. (In Russ.).
- Tolmachev, 2011 — *Tolmachev G.* Povest ob Olzhase [The story of Olzhas]. Almaty, 2011. 220 p. (In Russ.).
- Zueva, Shtejngrad, 1975 — *Zueva R., Shtejngrad S.* “Vrosli v slavyanskuyu stroku kypchakskie slova” O novoj knige Olzhasa Sulejmenova “Az i Ya” [“Kipchak words have grown into the Slavic string” About Olzhas Suleimenov's new book “Az and Ya”]. *Leninskaya smena*, 1975. No. 133(8621). Pp. 2–3. (In Russ.).

Литература

- Абылхожин, 2020 — *Абылхожин Ж.Б.* Постсталинский период в истории советского Казахстана: череда обреченных реформ и несостоявшихся деклараций (1953–1991 гг.). Алматы: КБТУ, 2020. 468 с.
- Ауэзов, 2006 — *Ауэзов, М.* Осененный выдохом вечности-словом / М. Ауэзов // *Central Asia Monitor: Книга "Az i Ya" Олжаса как предтеча суверенизации Казахстана*, 2006. № 19. 8 с.
- Белов, 1993 — *Белов В.* Все впереди. Роман. М.: Современный писатель, 1993. 222 с.
- Бобров, 1995 — *Бобров А.Г.* Сулейменов // Энциклопедия «Слова о полку Игореве», 1995. С. 83–85. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://febweb.ru/feb/slovens/es/es5/es5-0831.html>
- Гумилев, 1975 — *Гумилев Л.Н.* Спор с поэтом По поводу статьи А. Кузьмина «Точка в круге, из которой вырастает репей» [журнал «Молодая гвардия» 1975. № 12.] 12 с. // URL: <http://www.kulichki.net/~gumilev/articles/Article02.htm>. (дата посещения: 01.01.2024).
- Джусупов, 2020 — *Джусупов М.* «Az i Ya» Олжаса Сулейменова (ген неповиновения и ген справедливости) // *Ўзбекистонда хорижий тиллар*. 2020. № 1(30). С. 219–236. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://doi.org/10.36078/>. (дата посещения: 01.01.2024).
- Дмитриев, Творогов, 1976 — *Дмитриев Л., Творогов О.* «Слово о полку Игореве» в интерпретации О. Сулейменова // *Русская литература*, 1976. С. 251–258.
- Добренко, 2020 — *Добренко Е.* Поздний сталинизм: Эстетика политики. Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 2020. Том 1–2. С. 712, 600.
- Докладная записка, 1949 — *Докладная записка № 75* Отдела пропаганды и агитации ЦК ВКП (б) секретарю ЦК ВКП (б) М.А. Сулову о спорных вопросах в освещении истории народов Средней Азии. Москва, 1949.
- Должиков, 2019 — *Должиков В.А.* Евразийский интегральный тюркославизм О. Сулейменова // *Ответственный редактор*, 2019. 70 с.
- Әбдіманұлы, т.д., 2016 — *Әбдіманұлы Ә., Джолдасбекова Б.У., Какильбаева Э.Т., Какшиева Н.Т.* Творчество Олжаса Сулейменова и вопросы национального самосознания // *Материалы международной научной конференции, посвящённой 80-летию казахского поэта и общественного деятеля Олжаса Омаровича Сулейменова*. Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 2016. 306 с.
- Зуева, Штейнград, 1975 — *Зуева Р., Штейнград С.* «Вросли в славянскую строку кыпчакские слова». О новой книге Олжаса Сулейменова «Az i Ya» // *Ленинская смена*, 1975. № 133(8621). С. 2–3.
- Кривошапова, 2016 — *Кривошапова Т.В.* «Az i Ya» О. Сулейменова в контексте изучения «Слова о Полку Игореве» в вузе // *Қазақстан республикасы білім және ғылым министрлігі әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ Ұлттық Университеті*, 2016. 109 с.
- Крупко, 2023 — *Крупко И.В.* От знаков к знаниям: образы и сюжеты обретения исторической субъектности в нарративах Олжаса Сулейменова. // *Вестник КазНУ. Серия историческая*, 2023. 21 с. URL: <https://bulletin-history.kaznu.kz/index.php/1-history/article/view/1700>.
- Крупко, 2023 — *Крупко И.В.* Переизобретение исторической субъектности казахов в творчестве Олжаса Сулейменова 1960-х гг. // *Уральский исторический вестник*, 2023. № 1(78). С. 123–132. DOI:10.30759/1728-9718-2023-1(78)-123-132
- Кузьмин, 1975 — *Кузьмин А.* Точка в круге, из которой вырастает репей // *Молодая гвардия*, 1975, № 12. С. 270–280.
- Кунаев, 1992 — *Кунаев Д.А.* О моем времени: Воспоминания. Алма-Ата: Дәуір, МП «БІнтымак», 1992. 312 с.
- Лихачев, 1976 — *Лихачев Д.С.* Гипотезы или фантазии в истолковании темных мест «Слова о полку Игореве» // *Звезда*, 1976. № 6. С. 203–210.

- Лихоманов, Бойко, 2020 — *Лихоманов И.В., Бойко В.А.* «Аз и Я» Олжаса Сулейменова в контексте евразийского дискурса // Вестник Томского государственного университета, 2020. № 454. С. 137–144.
- Маничкин, 2023 — *Маничкин Н.А.* Взаимозависимое становление: поэтическая реинтерпретация символов и образов исторической памяти в Казахстане // Электронный научный журнал «edu.e-history.kz», 2023. Т. 10. № 2. С. 334–346.
- Маркиш, 2016 — *Маркиш Д.* Степной ветер легенды // Олжас и Я. Москва: Художественная литература, 2016. С. 199–203.
- Мельников, 2023 — *Мельников Д.* К пост- / деколониальному воображению: Художественная рефлексия пространства и языка в постсоветской русскоязычной литературе Казахстана / Бисенова А.Ж. и др. (2023) Qazaqstan. Казахстан, قازاقستان: лабиринты современного постколониального дискурса // Центр современной культуры. Алматы: Целинный, 2023. С. 120–122, 467 с.
- Огрызко, 2013 — *Огрызко В.* И вечный бой: Юрий Селезнев // Литературная Россия, 2013, № 23. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.litrossia.ru/archive/item/6495-oldarchive> (дата посещения: 01.01.2024).
- Потанин, 1893 — *Потанин Г.Н.* Восточные мотивы в западноевропейском средневековом эпосе. Москва, 1893. 73 с.
- Преображенский, 2018 — *Преображенский С.Ю.* О воображаемой филологии О.О. Сулейменова // Полилингвильность и транскультурные практики, 2018. Т. 15. №. 3. С. 406–409.
- Радлов, 1989 — *Радлов В.В.* Из Сибири. Страницы дневника. Москва Наука, Москва. 1989. 752 с.
- Селезнев, 1976 — *Селезнев Ю.* Мифы и истины. // Москва, 1976. № 3. С. 201–208.
- Снегирев, 2020 — *Снегирев В.Н.* Олжас Сулейменов. Москва: Молодая гвардия / ЖЗЛ, 2020. Вып. 42. 488 с.
- Сулейменов, 1990 — *Сулейменов О.* Кочевники и культура: казахский эксперимент // Эссе, публицистика. Стихи, поэмы. Аз и Я. Алма-Ата: Жалын, 1990. 580 с.
- Сулейменов, 2002 — *Сулейменов О.О.* Тюрки в доистории: о происхождении древнетюркских языков и письменностей. Алматы: Атамура, 2002. 319 с.
- Сулейменов, 2013 — *Сулейменов О.О.* Аз и Я. Алма-Ата: Жазушы, 1975. 304 с.
- Сулейменов, 2023 — *Сулейменов Олжас* Так было... // Алматы: Service press, 2023. 424 с., илл. 16 с.
- Глостанова, 2018 — *Глостанова М.* Главной его мишенью был европоцентризм // Олжас и Я. Книга вторая. Москва: Художественная литература, 2018. С. 415–436.
- Толмачев, 2011 — *Толмачев Г.* Повесть об Олжасе. Алматы, 2011. 220 с.
- Фризман, 2002 — *Фризман Л.* Возмутитель спокойствия. Книга О. Сулейменова «Аз и Я» под огнем идеологической критики // НЛО, 2002. № 55. 68 с. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2002/55/friz.html>.
- Caffee, 2020 — *Caffee N.* Between First, Second, and Third Worlds: Olzhas Suleimenov and Soviet Postcolonialism, 1961–1973. Russian Literature, 2020. Vol. 111. Pp. 91–118.
- Ram, 2001 — *Harsha Ram* Imagining Eurasia: The Poetics and Ideology of Olzhas Suleimenov's Az i Ya. Slavic Review. Summer, 2001. Vol. 60, No. 2. Pp. 289–311. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2697272>.

МАЗМҰНЫ

ТЕОРИЯ ЖӘНЕ ӘДІСНАМА

| | |
|---|-----|
| Абуов Н.А., Мәлікова С.З. ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК ТРАГЕДИЯ КОНТЕКСТІНДЕ СОЛТҮСТІК ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ҰЖЫМДАСТЫРУ ЖӘНЕ АШТЫҚ..... | 528 |
| Нұртазина Н.Д., Қартабаева Е.Т., Дауытбекова М.К. ҚАЗАҚТЫҢ ИШАНДАРЫ МЕН ӘУЛИЕ ЕМШІЛЕРІНІҢ МҰРАСЫ: ОРТАЛЫҚ АЗИЯ МҰСЫЛМАНДЫҚ-СОПЫЛЫҚ ДӘСТҮРІ АЯСЫНДА ЖАҢАША ЗЕРТТЕУ ПЕРСПЕКТИВАЛАРЫ..... | 541 |

ТАРИХ

| | |
|---|-----|
| Алмагамбетова А., Уста А. ҚАРАХАНДАР САРАЙЫНДАҒЫ НЕГІЗГІ ЛАУАЗЫМДАР: СЫРТҚЫ САЯСАТТЫ ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУ..... | 558 |
| Бейсембаева А.Р., Абенова Г.А., Мамытова С.Н. XVIII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 50-ШІ ЖЫЛДАРЫНДАҒЫ АМУРСАНА КӨТЕРІЛІСІ ЖӘНЕ ҚАЗАҚ ЖАСАҚТАРЫ: МҰРАҒАТ МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫНЫҢ НЕГІЗІНДЕ..... | 572 |
| Жолдасұлы Т., Тайман С.Т., Құдайбергенова А.И. СОВЕТТІК ОРТА АЗИЯДАҒЫ БАСМАШЫЛАР ҚОЗҒАЛЫСЫНЫҢ ДІНИ СИПАТЫ (1918–1930)..... | 585 |
| Жумағанбетов Т.С. ҚАЗАҚ ХАНДЫҒЫНЫҢ ПАЙДА БОЛУЫ МӘСЕЛЕСІНДЕГІ ШАҒАТАЙ ҰЛЫСЫНЫҢ ТӨРТ ФАКТОРЫ (ҚАЗАҚ-ШАҒАТАЙ ҚАТЫНАСТАРЫ)..... | 600 |
| Исмаилзаде С.Д., Жеміс Ж.Ж. XI–XIV ҒАСЫРЛАРДАҒЫ ОҢТҮСТІК КАВКАЗ ҚЫПШАҚТАРЫНЫҢ ТАРИХЫНА АРНАЛҒАН ЗЕРТТЕУЛЕРГЕ ШОЛУ..... | 614 |
| Крупко И.В., Бұрханов Б.Б. «АЗ И Я» – ИДЕОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ ТАРИХЫ: АЙЫПТАУДАН ТАЛҚЫЛАУҒА ДЕЙІН..... | 626 |
| Қушенова Г.И. ХАЙДУ ЖӘНЕ ТАЛАС ҚҰРЫЛТАЙЫНЫҢ ТАРИХИ МАҢЫЗЫ..... | 642 |
| Қаратаев Ә.Ә. ҚАЗАҚ ХАНДЫҒЫНЫҢ САЯСИ-ӘКІМШІЛІК ЖҮЙЕСІ: ҚАНАТТАР, ЖҮЗДЕР, ТАЙПАЛАР ЖӘНЕ ШЕЖІРЕ..... | 658 |
| Легкий Д.М., Түрежанова С.А., Саметова Г.С. ҚАЗАҚ АКСР ДЕНСАУЛЫҚ САҚТАУ ЖҮЙЕСІНДЕГІ ҚОСТАНАЙ АКУШЕРЛІК ТЕХНИКУМЫ (1929–1935 ЖЖ.)..... | 671 |
| Сатенова М.Р., Оразов Р.Е. ТАШКЕНТ ОАЗИСІНДЕГІ ҰЛЫ ЖҮЗДІҢ ДАЛАЛЫҚ ЭЛИТАСЫ (XVIII Ғ.)..... | 687 |
| Шотанова Г.А., Сатенова М.Р. РЕСЕЙ ИМПЕРИЯСЫНЫҢ ЭМБА ЖӘНЕ ОЙЫЛ БЕКІНІСТЕРІНІҢ БАТЫС ҚАЗАҚСТАН ТАРИХЫНДАҒЫ РӨЛІ МЕН МАҢЫЗЫ..... | 702 |
| Эгамбердиев М., Ахантаева Ә., Ахантаева Г. СЫРДЫҢ ТӨМЕНГІ ЖӘНЕ ОРТА АҒЫСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚТАРДЫҢ ШАРУАШЫЛЫҚ САЛАЛАРЫ: ДИҚАНШЫЛЫҚ, МАЛ ЖӘНЕ БАЛЫҚ АУЛАУ (XIX ғ. ортасы мен XX ғ. басы)..... | 714 |

АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

| | |
|--|-----|
| Шайкен Ж.А. «ДЫҢ» ТИПТІ ЕРТЕТҮРКІ МЕМОРИАЛДЫҚ-КУЛЬТТІК ТАС ҚҰРЫЛЫСТАРЫН ЗЕРТТЕУ МӘСЕЛЕСІНЕ..... | 729 |
| Ярыгин С., Сакенов С., Шульга В. САНДЫҚТАУ ТАУДАҒЫ СТЕЛАЛЫҚ КЕШЕН ЖӘНЕ БЕТТІҢ РЕЛЬЕФ БЕЙНЕСІ (СОЛТҮСТІК ҚАЗАҚСТАН)..... | 748 |

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

ТЕОРИЯ И МЕТОДОЛОГИИ

| | |
|---|-----|
| Абуов Н.А., Маликова С.З. КОЛЛЕКТИВИЗАЦИЯ И ГОЛОД В СЕВЕРНОМ КАЗАХСТАНЕ В КОНТЕКСТЕ СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ ТРАГЕДИИ..... | 528 |
| Нуртазина Н.Д., Картабаева Е.Т., Дауытбекова М.К. НАСЛЕДИЕ КАЗАХСКИХ ИШАНОВ И СВЯТЫХ ЦЕЛИТЕЛЕЙ: НОВЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ ИЗУЧЕНИЯ В КОНТЕКСТЕ МУСУЛЬМАНСКО-СУФИЙСКОЙ ТРАДИЦИИ ЦЕНТРАЛЬНОЙ АЗИИ..... | 541 |

ИСТОРИЯ

| | |
|--|-----|
| Алмагамбетова А., Уста А. ГЛАВНЫЕ ДОЛЖНОСТИ ПРИ ДВОРЕ КАРАХАНИДОВ: ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ ВНЕШНЕЙ ПОЛИТИКИ..... | 558 |
| Бейсембаева А.Р., Абенова Г.А., Мамытова С.Н. ВОССТАНИЕ АМУРСАНЫ И КАЗАХСКИЕ ОПОЛЧЕНИЯ В 50-Е ГГ. XVIII В.: НА ОСНОВЕ АРХИВНЫХ МАТЕРИАЛОВ..... | 572 |
| Жолдасулы Т., Тайман С.Т., Кудайбергенова А.И. РЕЛИГИОЗНЫЙ ХАРАКТЕР ДВИЖЕНИЯ БАСМАЧЕСТВА В СОВЕТСКОЙ СРЕДНЕЙ АЗИИ (1918–1930 гг.)..... | 585 |
| Жумаганбетов Т.С. ЧЕТЫРЕ ФАКТОРА ЧАГАТАЙСКОГО УЛУСА В ВОПРОС ВОЗНИКНОВЕНИЯ КАЗАХСКОГО ХАНСТВА (КАЗАХСКО-ЧАГАТАЙСКИЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ)..... | 600 |
| Исмаилзаде С.Д., Женис Ж.Ж. ОБЗОР ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ ПО ИСТОРИИ КЫПЧАКОВ ЮЖНОГО КАВКАЗА В XI–XIV В.В..... | 614 |
| Крупко И.В., Бурханов Б.Б. ИДЕОЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ ИСТОРИЯ «АЗ И Я»: ОТ ОСУЖДЕНИЯ К ОБСУЖДЕНИЮ..... | 626 |
| Кушенова Г.И. ХАЙДУ И ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЕ ЗНАЧЕНИЕ ТАЛАССКОГО КУРУЛТАЯ..... | 642 |
| Каратаев А.А. ПОЛИТИКО-АДМИНИСТРАТИВНАЯ СИСТЕМА КАЗАХСКОГО ХАНСТВА: КРЫЛЬЯ, ЖУЗЫ, ПЛЕМЕНА И ШЕЖИРЕ..... | 658 |
| Легкий Д.М., Турежанова С.А., Саметова Г.С. КУСТАНАЙСКИЙ АКУШЕРСКИЙ ТЕХНИКУМ В СИСТЕМЕ ЗДРАВООХРАНЕНИЯ КАЗАХСКОЙ АССР (1929–1935 ГГ.)..... | 671 |
| Сатенова М.Р., Оразов Р.Е. СТЕПНАЯ ЭЛИТА СТАРШЕГО ЖУЗА В ТАШКЕНТСКОМ ОАЗИСЕ (XVIII В.)..... | 687 |
| Шотанова Г.А., Сатенова М.Р. РОЛЬ И ЗНАЧЕНИЕ ЭМБИНСКОГО И УИЛСКОГО УКРЕПЛЕНИЙ РОССИЙСКОЙ ИМПЕРИИ В ИСТОРИИ ЗАПАДНОГО КАЗАХСТАНА..... | 702 |
| Эгамбердиев М., Ахантаева А., Ахантаева Г. ОТРАСЛИ ХОЗЯЙСТВА КАЗАХОВ НИЖНЕГО И СРЕДНЕГО ТЕЧЕНИЯ СЫРДАРЬИ: ЗЕМЛЕДЕЛИЕ, ЖИВОТНОВОДСТВО И РЫБОЛОВСТВО (середина XIX–начало XX в.)..... | 714 |

АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

| | |
|--|-----|
| Шайкен Ж.А. К ВОПРОСУ ИЗУЧЕНИЯ РАННЕТЮРКСКИХ МЕМОРИАЛЬНО-КУЛЬТОВЫХ КАМЕННЫХ СООРУЖЕНИЙ ТИПА «ДЫН»..... | 729 |
| Ярыгин С., Сакенов С., Шульга В. КОМПЛЕКС СО СТЕЛОЙ И РЕЛЬЕФНЫМ ИЗОБРАЖЕНИЕМ ЛИЦА В ГОРАХ САНДЫКТАУ (СЕВЕРНЫЙ КАЗАХСТАН)..... | 748 |

CONTENTS

THEORY OF METHODOLOGY

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abuov N.A., Malikova S.Z. COLLECTIVISATION AND FAMINE IN NORTHERN KAZAKHSTAN IN THE CONTEXT OF SOCIAL TRAGEDY..... | 528 |
| Nurtazina N.D., Kartabayeva E.T., Dautbekova M.K. THE LEGACY OF THE KAZAKH ISHANS AND HEALING SAINTS: NEW APPROACHES AND PROSPECTS FOR STUDYING IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ISLAMIC-SUFI TRADITION OF CENTRAL ASIA..... | 541 |

HISTORY

| | |
|---|-----|
| Almagambetova A., Usta A. KEY OFFICIALS IN THE QARAKHANID COURT: SHAPING FOREIGN POLICY..... | 558 |
| Beisembayeva A.R., Abenova G.A., Mamytova S.N. THE UPRISING OF AMURSANA AND KAZAKH MILITIAS IN THE 1750S: BASED ON ARCHIVAL MATERIALS..... | 572 |
| Zholdassuly T., Taiman S.T., Kudaibergenova A. THE RELIGIOUS NATURE OF THE BASMACHI MOVEMENT IN SOVIET CENTRAL ASIA (1918–1930)..... | 585 |
| Zhumaganbetov T.S. FOUR FACTORS OF THE CHAGATAI ULUS IN THE ISSUE OF THE EMERGENCE OF THE KAZAKH KHANATE (KAZAKH-CHAGATAI RELATIONS)..... | 600 |
| Ismailzade S.J., Zhenis Zh. REVIEW OF RESEARCHES ON THE HISTORY OF THE KIPCHAKS OF THE SOUTH CAUCASUS IN THE XI–XIV CENTURIES..... | 614 |
| Krupko I.V., Burkhanov B.B. IDEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF “AZ I YA”: FROM CONDEMNATION TO DISCUSSION..... | 626 |
| Kushenova G. QAIDU AND THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TALAS QURILTAI..... | 642 |
| Karatayev A.A. POLITICAL-ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM OF THE KAZAKH KHANATE: WINGS, ZHUZES, TRIBES AND SHEZHIRE..... | 658 |
| Legkiy D.M., Turezhanova S.A., Sametova G.S. KUSTANAY OBSTETRICAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL IN THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM OF THE KAZAKH ASSR (1929–1935)..... | 671 |
| Satenova M.R., Orazov R.E. THE STEPPE ELITE OF THE SENIOR ZHUZ IN THE TASHKENT OASIS (XVIII CENTURY)..... | 687 |
| Shotanova G.A., Satenova M.R. THE ROLE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EMBA AND UIL FORTIFICATIONS OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN THE HISTORY OF WESTERN KAZAKHSTAN..... | 702 |
| Egamberdiyev M., Akhantaeva A., Akhantaeva G. ECONOMIC SECTORS OF THE KAZAKHS ENGAGED IN THE LOWER AND MIDDLE REACHES OF THE SYR: AGRICULTURE, LIVESTOCK AND FISHING (mid-XIX – early XX centuries)..... | 714 |

ANTHROPOLOGY

| | |
|---|-----|
| Shaiken J.A. ON THE ISSUE OF STUDYING EARLY TURKIC MEMORIAL AND CULT STONE STRUCTURES OF THE “MELON” TYPE..... | 729 |
| Yarygin S., Sakenov S., Shulga V. COMPLEX OF A STELE AND A RELIEF IMAGE OF A FACE IN THE SANDYKTAU MOUNTAINS (NORTH KAZAKHSTAN)..... | 748 |

EDU.E-HISTORY.KZ

электрондық ғылыми журналы 2024. 11 (3)

Бас редактор:

Қабылдинов З.Е.

Компьютерде беттеген:

Копеева С.Ж.

Жарияланған күні: 20.09.2024.

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 РМК

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

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

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов ат. ТЖЭИ басылған:

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