

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



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



№1 (29) қаңтар-наурыз 2022
ISSN 2710-3994



Бас редактор:
Қабылдинов Зиябек Ермұқанұлы

Редакциялық алқа:

Абашиин Сергей Николаевич – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Санкт-Петербургтегі Европа университеті (Ресей)

Абдырахманов Толобек Абылович – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, И. Арабаев атындағы Қызығыз мемлекеттік университетінің ректоры. (Қырғызстан)

Аяған Бүркітбай Ғелманұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР БҒМ ҒК Мемлекет тарихы институты директорының орынбасары. (Қазақстан)

Әлімбаев Нұрсан – тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Қазақстан Республикасы Орталық мемлекеттік музейінің директоры. (Қазақстан)

Әбусейтова Меруерт Қуатқызы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА корр.-мүшесі. ҚР БҒМ ҒК Р. Сүлейменов атындағы Шығыстану институтының «Тарихи материалдарды зерттеу» орталығының директоры. (Қазақстан)

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

Голден Кэтті Стромайл (Kathie Stromile Golden) – PhD, Миссисипи өңірлік мемлекеттік университеті (Mississippi Valley State University) (АҚШ)

Кәрібаев Берекет Бақытжанұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Әл-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)

Козодой Виктор Иванович – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор. (Ресей)

Көкебаева Гүлжауһар Какенқызы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР БҒМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты (Қазақстан)

Көмеков Болат Ешимұхамедұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті Халықаралық қытшақтану институтының директоры, Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің профессоры. (Қазақстан)

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

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

Муртазаева Рахборхон Хамидқызы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Мирзо Ұлықбек атындағы Өзбекстан ұлттық университеті «Өзбекстан тарихы» кафедрасының профессоры. (Өзбекстан)

Панто Дмитрий (Panto Dmitri) – PhD доктор, Гданьск қаласындағы Екінші дүниежүзілік соғыс мұражайының ғылыми қызметкері. (Польша)

Римантас Желвис (Želvyas Rimantas) – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Вильнюс педагогикалық университеті (Литва)

Самашев Зайнолла Самашұлы – археолог, тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Герман археология институтының корр.-мүшесі. ҚР БҒМ ҒК Ә. Марғұлан атындағы Археология институты. (Қазақстан)

Сайлан Болат Санабайұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті. (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. (Нұр-Сұлтан, 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

Ғылыми редактор:

Қозыбаева Махаббат Мәлікқызы

Редактор:

Кубеев Рустан Жаулыбайұлы

Жауапты хатшы:

Қоңқабаева Арайлым

Техникалық хатшы:

Хумарзах Алтынбек

Главный редактор:

Кабульдинов Зиябек Ермуханович

Редакционная коллегия:

Абашин Сергей Николаевич – доктор исторических наук, профессор, Европейский университет в Санкт-Петербурге (Россия)

Абдырахманов Толобек Абылович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, ректор Кыргызского государственного университета им. И. Арабаева (Кыргызстан)

Алимбай Нурсан – кандидат исторических наук, профессор, директор Центрального государственного музея Республики Казахстан (Казахстан)

Абусейтова Меруерт Хуатовна – доктор исторических наук, профессор, чл.-корр. НАН РК, директор Республиканского центра по изучению исторических материалов Института востоковедения имени Р.Б. Сулейменова (Казахстан)

Абиль Еркин Аманжолович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, директор Института истории государства КН МОН РК (Казахстан)

Аяган Буркитбай Гелманович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, заместитель директора Института истории государства КН МОН РК (Казахстан)

Голден Кэтти Стромайл (Kathie Stromile Golden) – PhD, Государственный университет долины Миссисипи (Mississippi Valley State University) (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 (г. Нур-Султан, 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)

Козодой Виктор Иванович – доктор исторических наук, профессор (Россия)

Кокебаева Гүлжаухар Какеновна – доктор исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч.Валиханова КН МОН РК (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)

Муртазаева Рахборхон Хамидовна – доктор исторических наук, профессор кафедры «Истории Узбекистана» Национального университета Узбекистана имени Мирзо Улугбека. (Узбекистан)

Панто Дмитрий (Panto Dmitri) – доктор PhD, профессор, главный специалист научного отдела Музея Второй мировой войны г. Гданьска (Польша)

Римантас Желвис (Želvyus 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 МОН РК (Казахстан)

Сайлан Болат Санабаевич – доктор исторических наук, Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби (Казахстан)

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

Таймагамбетов Жакен Кожжахметович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, Национальный музей РК (Казахстан)

Ответственный редактор:

Каипбаева Айнагуль Толганбаевна

Научный редактор:

Козыбаева Махаббат Маликовна

Редактор:

Кубеев Рустем Джаулыбайулы

Ответственный секретарь:

Конкабаева Арайлым Нурболатовна

Технический секретарь:

Хумарзах Алтынбек

Editor-In-Chief:

Kabuldinov Ziabek Ermukhanovich

Members of editorial board:

Abashin Sergei Nikolaevich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, European University at St. Petersburg (Russia)

Abdyrakhmanov Tolobek Abylovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Rector of I. Arabaev Kyrgyz State University (Kyrgyzstan)

Alimbay Nursan – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor, Director of the Central State Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Kazakhstan)

Abusseitova Meruert Khuatovna – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of the NAS RK, Director of the Republican Center for the Study of Historical Materials at R.B. Suleimenov Institute of Oriental Studies (Kazakhstan)

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

Ayagan Burkitbai Gelmanovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Deputy Director of the Institute of History of the State CS MES RK (Kazakhstan)

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. Auevov South Kazakhstan University (Kazakhstan)

Kozhirova Svetlana Bassieвна – 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)

Kozodoi Viktor Ivanovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Russia)

Kokebayeva Gulzhaukhar Kakenovna – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, chief researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology CS MES RK (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)

Matyzhanov Kenzhekhan Slyamzhanovich – Doctor of Philology, Professor, Corresponding Member of the NAS RK, Director of M. Auevov Institute of Literature and Art (Kazakhstan)

Morrison Alexander – PhD, Professor, University of Oxford (UK)

Murtazayeva Rakhborkhon Khamidovna – doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at the Department of «History of Uzbekistan» of Mirzo Ulugbek National University of Uzbekistan. (Uzbekistan)

Panto Dmitri – PhD, researcher at the Museum of the Second World War in Gdansk (Poland)

Rimantas Želvyš – 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 CS MES RK (Kazakhstan)

Sailan Bolat Sanabayevich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (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

Scientific Editor:

Kozybayeva Makhabbat Malikovna

Editor:

Kubeyev Rustem Dzhaulybayevich

Executive Secretary

Konkabayeva Arailym Nurbolatovna

Technical secretary:

Khumarzakh Altynbek

ON SOME ISSUES OF TRADITIONALISM IN SOVIET CENTRAL ASIA (BRIEF HISTORIOGRAPHIC REVIEW)

R.D. Kubeyev¹ 

¹Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

E-mail: rustemlw@hotmail.com (Kubeyev)

Abstract. The article provides a brief overview of the historiography of issues related to the transformation of traditional society in the framework of Soviet modernization of Central Asia. The paper considers the views of prominent researchers, as well as the most common points of view on this topic. Issues of traditionalism in the Soviet period are considered in the context of the implementation of the Program article by N.A. Nazarbayev «Course towards the future: modernization of Kazakhstan's identity», where the socio-cultural sphere is given priority. At that it was during the Soviet period that this sphere of public life underwent an unprecedented reform and transformation. The work also analyzes the authors' studies on the policy of the Soviet government in relation to the sociocultural sphere of the Soviet Muslim East. In particular, some attention has been paid to studies on the transformation of traditional nomadic society and the nomadic sedentarization. Of particular interest are studies on the coincidence of religious and national identity. In this regard, some issues of the national-territorial demarcation of Soviet Central Asia, the education of the indigenous population, the change in the role of women in traditional Central Asian society, as well as the phenomenon of the preservation and strengthening of traditionalism in Central Asia during the Soviet period are also highlighted.

Keywords: Kazakhstan, Asia, Central, sphere, sociocultural, religion, traditionalism, tradition, traditional, society.

Introduction. In the program article by N.A. Nazarbayev «Course Towards the Future: Modernization of Kazakhstan's Identity» the Leader of the Nation paid special attention to the issues related to people's consciousness, identity, and traditions. According to N.A. Nazarbayev, the new modernization of Kazakhstan should be based on traditions, culture, connection with the past. The main shortcoming of previous modernizations, according to our leader, is ignoring the fact that every country has its unique features (Nazarbayev, 2017).

Kazakhstan as a former Soviet country quite felt such kind of modernization and its consequences. In order to understand the present situation it is necessary to pay certain attention to previous period.

Methods. As is known, the construction of such a community as the «Soviet people» generally required radical and unprecedented transformations, first of all, in the minds of the peoples who inhabited a vast empire. Moreover, this related such a «traditionalist» region as Central Asia with its strong influence of religion on all spheres of public life (which is generally a feature of Islam), as well as the patriarchal clan system, due to the nomadic or settled agricultural way of life. Correspondingly, this topic was reflected at the studies of researchers from Kazakhstan, CIS and foreign countries. In this article the author used the methods of analysis and comparison at considering the opinions of scholars.

Discussion. The issues of Soviet policy on transformation of traditional communities and the peoples' minds were all the more subtle for the regime that came to power as a result of the revolution and aimed at building in the end a utopian society without religion, private and communal property, as well as other integral features of traditional eastern society. In this connection the issues of interaction between the new government and traditional society in Central Asia, highlighted in the works of researchers, cause quite deserved interest.

On the whole, according to T. Rakovskaya-Harmstone, the very background to the relations of the Muslim population of Central Asia with the Bolsheviks contributed a lot to a positive perception of the new government. As you know, in 1916 a massive uprising broke out in the region, caused by the decision of the tsarist authorities to call on Muslims to do rear work, as well as the accumulated

discontent from Russian colonization, the appropriation of land and water rights. The suppression of the uprising by Russian troops caused anti-Russian sentiment and made Muslims more susceptible to revolution as a force that destroyed imperial power (Rakowska-Harmstone, 1983: 56-57).

At the same time, anti-Russian sentiments spread, including with political motivation, with the participation of some representatives of the «native» clergy (Пясковский, 1960: 93).

Russian researcher D.Yu. Arapov, describing the activities of the Soviets in relation to the sociocultural sphere of the Soviet Muslim East, notes the close interweaving of the national and Muslim issues. In this matter, the author shares the opinion of V.V. Bartold on the identity, in particular, «coincidence» of the religious (Islamic) and linguistic (national) community of Muslims in the territory of Tsarist Russia, while paying attention to the number of Muslims in the Russian Empire by 1914 (about 18 million), as well as the affiliation of most of them to Turkic peoples (Арапов, 2016: 128).

Concentrating his attention, in particular, on the Kazakhs of the Turkestan region, the researcher notes the Kazakhs' commitment to «Sunni Islam», as well as the paramount importance of patriarchal-tribal relations in their lives. By virtue of the above facts, the public life of the «Kirghiz» was regulated, as the author writes, by the «closely intertwined» norms of customary law (adat) and Muslim Sharia. An important point is the scholar's remark about the separate, independent existence of the European (Russian) and non-Russian (native-Muslim) communities of Semirechye and the whole Turkestan in everyday life. What was important for the new government was that the spread of «innovative» ideas (not to mention the radical revolutionary ones) occurred primarily in the European environment, while among the indigenous population these ideas were echoed only by a very small group (Ibid: 129).

And even the coup in Tashkent in 1917, as some authors note, was not supported by the population in the vast territory from the Caspian Sea to the Seven Rivers. The only exceptions were Perovsk, Chimkent, Aulie-Ata and some other settlements. At the Arys station, the activity of the Left Socialist Revolutionary organization was noted. (Резцов, 1927: 89-90).

This remark is of particular interest, since the authors of the Soviet period considered the situation with the spread of revolutionary ideas in Turkestan as a visual aid to the realization of the famous thesis of the new government on the coming to communism of backward countries not through capitalist development, but through the development of class consciousness, with the help of the leadership of the conscious proletariat from advanced countries (Ibid: 121).

The local population was engaged in cattle breeding and various crafts associated with it, which largely determined their lifestyle.

«Kirghiz» were considered followers of Sunni Islam, but patriarchal-tribal relations played a paramount role in their lives. The rules of conduct and the way of existence of the «Kirghiz» were regulated by closely interwoven norms of adat (customary law) and Muslim Sharia. «Kirghiz Islam» itself in many ways only covered centuries-old pagan traditions.

Thus, the issues of interaction of the new government with the socio-cultural sphere were of paramount importance.

Results. D.Yu. Arapov precisely explains this choice of M.V. Frunze to the post of commander of the Turkestan Front as a native of Semirechye, well acquainted with the customs of the local population, and also possessed sufficient flexibility and skills, unlike previous representatives of the Soviet government in Turkestan, which provoked a worsening of the socio-political situation in the region. The author notes that M.V. Frunze generally justified the trust. Whilst being atheist, the representative of Moscow was aware of the importance of showing due respect for the ethno-confessional traditions and customs of the local population. In order to gain the locality of the local Muslim population, the Soviet leader even visited the most revered place of the Turkestan region - Mount Takht-i Suleiman in the territory of modern Kyrgyzstan, where he performed a rite of Islamic worship, which, as the author notes, made a huge impression on the indigenous people of the region (Арапов, 2016: 131).

As is known, the subsequent modernization of the nomadic society «in a Soviet way» was expressed in its violent unprepared sedentarization and collectivization, which caused serious casualties among the population, the disappearance of some elements of the traditional nomadic culture and the «erosion» of ethnic identity of nomadic peoples.

F.L. Sinitsyn notes that some of the Soviet administrators still had a more realistic vision of the situation with the traditional way of life of the indigenous population of Kazakhstan and other cattle-breeding regions. So, in the issue of approaching the modernization of a nomadic society, two groups clearly appeared among the representatives of the new government, which can conditionally be called «scholars» and «authorities» (some representatives of the «scholars» group worked in government bodies, and supporters of the «authorities» group worked in the academic field) (Синицын, 2019: 45).

The author draws attention to the option of «reformatting» the economy of a nomadic society proposed by a group of «scholars»: abandoning nomadism during its intensification, or a combination of nomadic animal husbandry with agriculture. The researcher himself «develops» the idea proposed by the new authorities, talking about the possibility in this case of cultural, educational and other work with the nomadic population while staying in settled wintering grounds.

Of particular interest to the author is the idea that the authorities had the idea of creating family farms. But this option of developing the involvement of the nomadic economy in modernization processes was rejected because of a discrepancy with the ideas of the class struggle: with the existing tribal system, such farms did not solve the problem of eradicating the exploitation of poor congeners by «tribe leaders» (bays, manaps, etc.) (Ibid: 54-55).

Speaking about the fundamental restructuring of traditional society in Kazakhstan, it is necessary to take into account the relationship between the concept of «class» and real social differences among ethnic groups. The author notes that in cases where the former social categories relatively coincide with the class division promoted by the new government, as a result, the so-called class struggle helps to preserve or even strengthen the above social categories (Хамфри, 2010: с. 37).

K.E. Bendrikov, concentrating his attention on the issue of public education in Turkestan in the first years after the establishment of Soviet power (before the national-state demarcation of the republics), notes the special attention paid to the role of the public school in Turkestan in the context of ideological work. Thus, the author emphasizes that according to the directive of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkestan, the struggle for youth and the new school were declared the basis of party work directly on the ground. In this regard, a meeting of the region was held among the heads of agitation and propaganda departments. The result of the meeting was unanimous support for the proposal from the People's Commissariat of Turkestan to concentrate all party propaganda and agitation around the public school.

In addition, during the XII All-Turkestan Congress of Soviets, in the relevant resolution, the main task of the People's Commissariat of Education of Turkestan was set to create the so-called first-level public school as an educational base. And already on this base to carry out all vocational education, as well as all political and educational activities among the indigenous people in the village and village (elimination of illiteracy, etc.) (Бендриков, 1960: 444).

Soviet social scientists themselves noted that the new government paid great attention to the work to change the position of women in eastern traditional society. This activity was launched during the civil war and foreign military intervention. Under the Central Committee of Turkestan, a women's department was established in June 1919, and similar structural units also existed at the level of regions, cities, counties and districts, and particularly active work in this direction was already begun in 1920, when a circular letter from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkestan was sent to all the regional and district committees, which noted that despite the completion of the third anniversary of the revolution, the position of women has not changed compared to the pre-revolutionary period, and «millennia-old religious and domestic prejudices» are still determine her status (Астапович, 1971: 8).

In general, in accordance with Soviet ideology, the authors linked the unequal position of women with the advent of private property and the class division of society. Researchers emphasized the inability of society to change the existing situation under the previous «exploiting social systems», including through bourgeois-democratic revolutions (Ibid: 3).

On the whole, the women of the indigenous peoples of Central Asia were seen as an object of «triple oppression» of enslavement (social, national, and religious) (Ibid: 7).

Researchers studying the reforms related to the status of women in society also noted that there were more representatives of Kazakh ethnicity in joint vocational education schools: in the 1921-1922

academic year, out of 125 students in the Shymkent Pedagogical School, there were 10 girls. In addition, in 1922, the unification of male and female Kazakh pedagogical schools was held in Alma-Ata (Бендриков, 1960: 492).

American researcher S. Cameron, studying the problem of famine in Kazakhstan in the 1930s, makes an interesting conclusion about this disaster, including the topic of this draws attention to the fact that out of 1.5 million victims of hunger, about 1.3 million were people of Kazakh nationality. Thus, more than a third of the total number of Kazakhs died as a result of hunger, and after the disaster, Kazakhs became a minority in their republic. According to the scholar, through the crisis, Moscow sought to eradicate pre-existing elements of the Kazakh identity, such as ties of kinship, belonging to the hereditary aristocracy and the Kazakh nomadic lifestyle, superimposing the category of ethnicity «Kazakh» instead (Cameron, 2016: 120).

It is noteworthy that, as I. Zelensky notes, in the process of national-state demarcation of the republics of Soviet Central Asia, some attempts were also made at the same time to take into account the and economic side of the issue, in particular, the issue of the economic unification of the Central Asian republics with the Kirghiz (Kazakh) republic was actively discussed. The main argument of this opinion was the existing economic relationship between some areas, belonging to Kazakhstan and the Turkestan republics. However, as the author writes, the existing connection does not give sufficient grounds for an immediate similar economic union. On the whole, the vague prospects of economic benefits were outweighed by considerations of the cessation of national squabbles in the newly formed republics. The researcher points out the need to give the new republics the opportunity to strengthen and selfidentification («recognize themselves») (Зеленский, 1924: 77-78).

At the same time, Soviet researchers themselves considered the national demarcation of 1924 as one of the necessary prerequisites for the national consolidation of the peoples of Soviet Central Asia. The ideologists of the new regime considered the industrialization and collectivization as elements of socialist construction, and as means to strengthen the solidity of the nation, the formation of national identity and the eradication of tribal division. Scholars noted with satisfaction the socio-economic transformations, the establishment of socialist relations instead of feudal and patriarchal-feudal (Джарылгасинова, 1980: 5-6).

But, as S. Cameron notes, in spite of the regime's efforts, many of the similar pre-existing features of the Kazakh identity, such as clans or even the nomadic way of life (revived by the regime in some regions of the republic after the famine, to increase reserve of livestock in the republic) still played an important role in the life of the Kazakhs in the period after the famine (that is, in a later period after the national demarcation of the republics) (Cameron, 2016:121).

Russian researcher S. Abashin, studying this transition to a new policy in the field of national relations, notes that the Bolshevik leadership, using a «vague» wording about the national form and socialist content, thereby reserved for itself «room for maneuver» to do whatever conclusions from this scheme. In addition, this formulation was in line with the policy of «indigenization», begun in 1923, which essentially reduced itself to the transformation of Soviet power from «Russian» to «international», the formation of a national Soviet elite from the local population. These decisions were intended to: 1) strengthen stability in regions where an already ending civil war often transformed into clashes between ethnic groups; 2) to promote the spread of revolutionary ideas in the East. According to the researcher, the very formula «national in form, socialist in content» testified to the presence of different interests, the presence of contradictions between them, and also that there was a certain hierarchy of statuses and positions, and a struggle was waged between them (Абашин, 2011: 96-97).

Also, after the October Revolution, the authorities began to carry out activities aimed at the gradual eradication of the feudal-patriarchal family, its very foundations, the economic base, the basis of which was private-family property, as well as the entire household sphere of the indigenous population of Soviet Central Asia. At the same time, the main attention was paid to «hacking» the traditional way of life of the patriarchal family. The campaign for the liberation of women of the East occupied an important place in the Soviet modernization of the region. In the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, taking into account the socio-cultural specifics of the region (the restraining influence of traditions and the whole way of life), a number of special additional decrees (in addition to the all-

Russian ones) were issued that abolished the norms of Sharia and Adat regarding marriage. In the period after the national-state demarcation, republican legislation continued to develop in Kazakhstan (as well as other republics of the region), which was designed to contribute to the formation of a new type of family (Жданко, 1990: 444).

S.P. Polyakov, in the course of his research on the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan (the regions of Balkhash and Mangyshlak), links «traditional society», «traditionalism», with the denial of the new, that is brought from the outside into the «traditional» habitual way of life. In thinking about the topic of research, traditionalism in Soviet Central Asia, the author himself characterizes the problem as an extremely «extremely complex and controversial phenomenon».

The scholar notes that the answer to the question of the rules governing the life of the indigenous population and what determines their lifestyle, with few exceptions, came down to following the will of the fathers and the Muslim religion. The answer to the second part of the question has always been the same - tradition (Поляков, 1989: 3).

Of particular note is the approach of P.S. Polyakova to the solution of the problem of traditionalism as a system: the researcher notes the futility of criticizing the lifestyle without revealing the economic and social base (Ibid: 4).

In the context of this study, the author's observation that in contemporary period a large intensification of traditionalism is observed in the cattle-breeding areas of the studied region deserves special attention, with the December 1986 events in Kazakhstan and the activation of ritual practice in Mangyshlak as evidence. It is noteworthy that the widespread construction of mosques and mausoleums (as the author notes, the cost of the latter reached 20 thousand rubles) took place on the sites of necropolises of the medieval period. Information on the use of ancient Saka underground and semi-underground funerary crypts as mosques is also interesting. In addition, Muslim holidays are actively celebrated, which was not observed a quarter century ago (Ibid: 7-8).

The scholar associates all of the above with the fact that in this region traditionalism was not just a relic in the Marxist sense of the word, but always reflected the socio-economic system, a way of life based on a specific economic structure that combined extensive cattle breeding and irrigated agriculture.

P.S. Polyakov makes an important conceptual remark about the consideration of traditionalism in the USSR as a phenomenon that exists separately from traditionalism outside the country. According to the author, this concept is not specifically stated and substantiated anywhere, but, nevertheless, exists. As an example, the researcher cites studies of modern Islamic society. The scholar considers it unreasonable to talk about the existence of a special «Soviet» Islam, which differs radically from the «aggressive» foreign Islam. According to the researcher, such a theoretical premise about the «isolation» of the Muslim religion in the Soviet Union, coupled with a bias (involuntary or intentional) in studying the level of religiosity in the region in practice, led to the creation of a false picture of the "security" of Islam in the Soviet Union and its «withering away». As the author himself notes, the issue of the «withering away» of religion in the USSR was actively declared. The basis of this process was the growth of consciousness of the masses when the materialistic worldview won. It should be noted that in the course of this discussion, the scholar makes one of the most important conclusions. The Soviet researcher draws attention to the fact that in the course of discussions about the victory of materialistic consciousness in the country, the position was actively hushed up that materialism is a worldview inherent in the industrial proletariat, and not in the peasant petty-bourgeois class. Namely, this peasant class prevailed in the USSR. As the author admits, even at the time of writing (1989), social stratigraphy in the country does not have the potential to spread the ideas of materialism. Thus, P.S. Polyakov confirms the theses of scholars saying that, despite all industrialization, society in the USSR remained agrarian in sociocultural terms (Ibid: 8-9).

The importance of developing the urban industrial class as a socio-cultural component of Soviet domestic policy is also mentioned in the work of N. Kosmarskaya and A. Kosmarsky, who agree with the opinion that, in the course of the pre-revolutionary course, Russian-Soviet culture developed as ideological support for the regime, and not the vehicle of Russian ethnic consciousness in itself. At the same time, on the periphery of the Soviet territory, the «settler community» was formed as a multinational and primarily urban-industrial - as the cutting edge of Soviet social life; it is these authors

who explain the fact that the identity of these «settler communities» was defined in sociocultural rather than ethnic terms (Kosmarskaya:72).

It is noteworthy that the need for resolving the agrarian question as a prerequisite for the comprehensive and effective development of productive forces was also posed by Soviet scholars when discussing the course of socialist reforms in China. The authors emphasize the sharp and complex ideological struggle in this matter. The comparison with China deserves mention due to some similarities between the situation and the structure of the economy (the ratio of the agrarian and industrial sectors of the economy, and, accordingly, to a certain extent, of society) with the Soviet ones. L.P. Delyusin, in his work in the early 1970s, emphasizes the predominance of agriculture in the national economy, and the peasantry among the population of China. The author draws attention to the fact that overcoming the backwardness of China in the economic and political spheres largely depends on the success of a radical change in socio-economic relations, their breakdown, modernization of agriculture and, on the whole, the solution of the agrarian-peasant question (Делюсин, 1972: 3).

Continuing to focus on Islam as a form of traditionalism, M.S. Polyakov turns his attention to such a specific feature of the Muslim religion as the absence of a division into the «secular» and the religious. The author notes that the Qur'an regulates all spheres of life of believers, including contains instructions regarding the state system and forms of ownership [Поляков, 1989:10]. In the period after the October Revolution, the new government virtually abolished official Islamic institutions. Nevertheless, at the grassroots level, the structure of the organization of the Muslim society has structurally remained the same (Ibid: 13). And even the organization of collective farms, in fact, did not violate the established order, since the formation of production units took place on the basis of tribal (among nomads) or kinshipneighborly, or makhalla (among the settled population) principles (Ibid: 14). In general, the researcher notes the growth of traditionalism, and its «political» form, ideas for preserving the «traditional» norms and orders (Ibid). P.S. Polyakov expresses his disagreement with the opinion about the absence of traditionalism in the USSR as a concept; in the country, traditionalism is perceived only as a manifestation of the outwardly visible side of religious ritualism on the part of the older generation and some groups of the population. As a result, the scientist, traditionalism was «let out of the sight» and this was allowed to develop to a «dangerous level» (Ibid: 15-16).

This remark is all the more valuable because the author's work was published in 1989, that is, the period of the end of the USSR existence and, thus, it can be considered to some extent a «unintentional summarizing» of the Soviet state's policy to change traditional society.

Soviet researcher O.A. Sukhareva notes the stability of traditional marital relations among the peoples of Soviet Central Asia, in particular the preservation of many institutions that originated «in a pre-class society». At the same time, without even representing an active force acting against new relations, these institutions do not degenerate, but are intertwined with the new, adapt to the situation and exist as remnants for centuries.

In particular, the researcher discovers such traces of social relations from ancient times in customs concerning marriage relations among nations that have experienced several times the change of socioeconomic formations and, accordingly, changes in the way of life. But as the author notes, the institutions that appeared in the tribal society are still widespread and regulate this sphere of social relations. In particular, with respect to the Kazakhs, the viability of the norms of the traditional exogamy of the patriarchal kind is mentioned (prohibition of marriage between relatives by father to the seventh generation) (Сухарева, 1978: 118-131).

Conclusion. The Soviet transformation of Central Asian (and other) traditional societies is unprecedented process that left quite an ambiguous legacy. In spite of the radical reforms directed on changing the people's consciousness, some Soviet scholars noted that traditionalism in Central Asia at the end of 1980s not just survived but even strengthened. This phenomenon still needs deeper study as some of its mechanisms are not described and explained in details.

The present situation with identities, traditional society transformation, modernization conditions is in much result of the Soviet period's processes. Studying these processes deeper will undoubtedly allow us to understand the present situation much better and contribute the nation-building of independent Kazakhstan.

References

- Абашин, 2011 – Абашин С. Советская власть и узбекская махалля // Неприкосновенный запас. – 2011. – № 04 (78). – сс. 95-110.
- Арапов 2016 – Арапов Д.Ю. «Мусульманский Восток в деятельности М.В. Фрунзе» // Ислам в современном мире. – 2016. – Т.12. – № 3. – сс. 127-138.
- Астапович, 1971 – Астапович З.А. «Великий Октябрь и раскрепощение женщин Средней Азии и Казахстана» (1917-1936 гг.). Сборник документов и материалов. – Москва: «Мысль», 1971. – 462 с.
- Бендриков, 1960 – Бендриков К.Е. «Очерки по истории народного образования в Туркестане (1865-1924 годы)». – М.: Издательство Академии педагогических наук РСФСР, 1960. – 509 с.
- Делюсин, 1972 – Делюсин Л.П. «Аграрно-крестьянский вопрос в политике КПК (1921-1928)». – М.: Изд-во «Наука», 1972. – 463 с.
- Джарылгасинова, 1980 – Джарылгасинова Р.Ш. «Этнические процессы у национальных групп Средней Азии и Казахстана». – Москва, 1980. – 104 с.
- Жданко, 1990 – Жданко Т.А. «Семейный быт народов СССР». – М.: «Наука», 1990. – 519 с.
- Зеленский, 1924 – Зеленский И.А. // И.М. Варейкис, И.А. Зеленский «Национально-государственное размежевание в Средней Азии». – Ташкент, Сред.-Азиат. изд-во, 1924. – 86 с.
- Kosmarskaya, 2019 – Kosmarskaya N., Kosmarski A. Russian Culture in Central Asia as a Transethnic Phenomenon. – Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2019. – сс. 69-93.
- Nazarbayev, 2017 – Nazarbayev N.A. Course towards the future: modernization of Kazakhstan's identity. – [Электронный ресурс] –
URL: http://www.akorda.kz/en/events/akorda_news/press_conferences/coursetowards-the-future-modernization-of-kazakhstans-identity (дата обращения - 12.04.2020)
- Поляков, 1989 – Поляков П.С. «Традиционализм в современном среднеазиатском обществе». Москва, 1989. – 112 с.
- Пясковский 1960 – Пясковский А В Восстание 1916 года в Туркестане в Средней Азии и Казахстане. Сборник документов. – Москва, 1960. – 786 с.
- Rakowska-Harmstone, 1983 – Rakowska-Harmstone T. Islam and Nationalism: Central Asia and Kazakhstan under Soviet Rule // Central Asian Survey. – London, 1983. – Vol.2. – №2. – сс. 7-87
- Резцов, 1927 – Резцов Л. «Октябрь в Туркестане». – Ташкент. Издательство акционерного общества «Средазкнига», 1927. – 121 с., сс. 89-90.
- Cameron, 2016 – Cameron S. «The Kazakh Famine of 1930-33: Current Research and New Directions». // East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies. – Vol.III. No 2. – 2016. – сс. 117-132.
- Синицын, 2019 – Синицын Ф.Л. «Советское государство и кочевники. История, политика, население. 1917-1991 гг.». – Москва: Центрполиграф, 2019. – 318 с.
- Сухарева, 1978 – Сухарева О.А. «Традиция семейно-родственных браков у народов Средней Азии» (в порядке дискуссии) // Семья и семейные обряды у народов Средней Азии и Казахстана. АН СССР Институт этнографии им. Н.Н. Миклухо-Маклая. – М.: «Наука», 1978. – сс. 118-131.
- Хамфри, 2010 – Хамфри К. Постсоветские трансформации в азиатской части России (антрополог, очерки). – М.: Наталис, 2010 г. – 384 с.

References

- Abashin, 2011 – Abashin S. Sovetskaja vlast' i uezbeckskaia mahallja // Neprikosnovennyj zapas. – 2011. – № 04 (78). – ss. 95-110 [in Russian]
- Arapov 2016 – Arapov D.Ju. «Musul'manskij Vostok v dejatel'nosti M.V. Frunze». //Islam v sovremennom mire. 2016. –T.12. –№ 3.–ss. 127-138. [in Russian]
- Astapovich, 1971 – Astapovich Z.A. «Velikij Oktjabr' i raskreposhhenie zhenshhin Srednej Azii i Kazahstana» (1917-1936 gg.). Sbornik dokumentov i materialov. –Moskva, «Mysl'», 1971. –462 s. [in Russian]
- Bendrikov, 1960 – Bendrikov K.E. «Ocherki po istorii narodnogo obrazovanija v Turkestane (1865-1924 gody».–M.: Izdatel'stvo Akademii pedagogicheskikh nauk RSFSR, 1960. –509 s. [in Russian]
- Deljusin, 1972 – Deljusin L.P. «Agrarno-krest'janskij vopros v politike KPK (1921-1928)».–M.: Izd-vo «Nauka», 1972. –463 s. [in Russian]
- Dzharylgasinova, 1980 – Dzharylgasinova R.Sh. «Jetnicheskie processy u nacional'nyh grupp Srednej Azii i Kazahstana».–Moskva, 1980. –104 s. [in Russian]
- Zhdanko, 1990 – Zhdanko T.A. «Semejnyj byt narodov SSSR». –M.: «Nauka», 1990. –519 s. [in Russian]
- Zelenskij, 1924 – Zelenskij I.A. // I.M. Varejkis, I.A Zelenskij «Nacional'no-gosudarstvennoe razmezhevanie v Srednej Azii». – Tashkent: Sred.-Aziat. izd-vo,1924. – 86 s. [in Russian]
- Kosmarskaya, 2019 – Kosmarskaya N., Kosmarski A. Russian Culture in Central Asia as a Transethnic Phenomenon. –Madison: University of Wisconsin –Press, 2019. –cc. 69-93. [in Russian]
- Nazarbayev, 2017 – Nazarbayev N.A. Course towards the future: modernization of Kazakhstan's identity. – [Electron. resource] – URL: http://www.akorda.kz/en/events/akorda_news/press_conferences/coursetowards-the-future-modernization-of-kazakhstan-identity(data obrashcheniya: 12.04.2020).
- Poljakov, 1989 – Poljakov P.S. «Tradicionalizm v sovremennom sredneaziatskom obshhestve».–Moskva, 1989. –112 s. [in Russian]
- Pjaskovskij, 1960 – Pjaskovskij A.V. Vosstanie 1916 goda v Turkestane v Srednej Azii i Kazahstane. Sbornik dokumentov.–Moskva,1960. – 786 c. [in Russian]
- Rakowska-Harmstone, 1983 – Rakowska-Harmstone T. Islam and Nationalism: Central Asia and Kazakhstan under Soviet Rule. // Central Asian Survey. – London, 1983. – Vol.2. –№2. – ss. 7-87.
- Rezcov, 1927 – Rezcov L. «Oktjabr' v Turkestane». –Tashkent. Izdatel'stvo akcionernogo obshhestva «Sredazkniga», 1927.–121 s. [in Russian]
- Cameron, 2016 – Cameron S. «The Kazakh Famine of 1930-33: Current Research and New Directions»//East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies. –Vol. III. No 2. –2016. –cc. 117-132.
- Sinicyn, 2019 – Sinicyn F.L. «Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i kochevniki. Istorija, politika, naselenie. 1917-1991 gg.».–M.: Centrpoligraf, 2019. – 318 s. [in Russian]
- Suhareva, 1978 – Suhareva O.A. «Tradicija semejno-rodstvennyh brakov u narodov Srednej Azii») v porjadke diskussii)// Sem'ja i semejnye obrjady u narodov Srednej Azii i Kazahstana. AN SSSR Institut jetnografii im. N.N. Mikluho-Maklaja.–M.: «Nauka», 1978.–cc. 118-131. [in Russian]
- Hamfri, 2010 – Hamfri K. Postsovetskie transformacii v aziatskoj chasti Rossii (antropolog, ocherki). –M.: Natalis, 2010. – 384 s. [in Russian]

О НЕКОТОРЫХ ВОПРОСАХ ТРАДИЦИОНАЛИЗМА В СОВЕТСКОЙ ЦЕНТРАЛЬНОЙ АЗИИ (КРАТКИЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ ОБЗОР)

Р.Д. Кубеев¹

¹Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, Алматы

E-mail: rustemlw@hotmail.com

Аннотация. В статье приведен краткий обзор историографии вопросов, касающихся трансформации традиционного общества в рамках советской модернизации Центральной Азии. В работе рассмотрены мнения видных исследователей, а также наиболее распространенные точки зрения по данной тематике. Вопросы традиционализма в советский период рассматриваются в контексте реализации Программной статьи Н.А. Назарбаева «Взгляд в будущее: модернизация общественного сознания», где именно социо-культурной сфере уделяется первостепенное значение, при том, что именно в советский период данная сфера общественной жизни подверглась беспрецедентному реформированию и трансформации. В работе также анализируются исследования авторов, посвященные политике советской власти по отношению к социокультурной сфере советского мусульманского Востока. В частности, некоторое внимание уделено исследованиям, посвященным трансформации традиционного кочевого общества и седентаризации кочевников. Особый интерес вызывают исследования о совпадении религиозной и национальной идентичности. В связи с этим освещены также некоторые вопросы национально территориального размежевания советской Центральной Азии, образования коренного населения, изменения роли женщин в традиционном центральноазиатском обществе, а также феномен сохранения и усиления традиционализма в Центральной Азии в советский период.

Ключевые слова: традиция, традиционализм, религия, социокультурная сфера, Центральная Азия, Казахстан, традиционное общество.

**КЕҢЕСТІК ОРТАЛЫҚ АЗИЯДАҒЫ ДӘСТҮРШІЛДІКТІҢ КЕЙБІР МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ
ТУРАЛЫ (ҚЫСҚАША ТАРИХНАМАЛЫҚ ШОЛУ)**

Р.Д. Кубеев¹

¹Әл-Фараби ат. ҚазҰУ-нің курс докторанты, Алматы, Қазақстан

E-mail: rustemlw@hotmail.com

Аңдатпа. Мақалада Орталық Азияның кеңестік модернизациясы аясындағы дәстүрлі қоғамның қайта құрылуымен байланысты мәселелердің тарихнамасына қысқаша шолу берілген. Мақалада белгілі зерттеушілердің пікірлері сонымен қатар тақырып бойынша жиі кездесетін көзқарастар қарастырылады. Кеңестік кезеңдегі дәстүршілдік мәселелері Тұңғыш Президент Н.Ә. Назарбаевтың «Болашаққа бағдар: рухани жаңғыру» бағдарламалық мақаласын жүзеге асыру контекстінде қарастырылады, онда әлеуметтік-мәдени салаға ерекше мән беріледі. Сонымен қатар, мақалада авторлардың кеңестік билік саясатына арналған кеңестік мұсылман шығысындағы әлеуметтік-мәдени салаға қатысты зерттеулері талданады. Атап айтқанда, дәстүрлі көшпелі қоғамды өзгертуге және көшпенділердің отырықшыландыруына арналған зерттеулерге біраз көңіл бөлінген. Діни және ұлттық бірегейліктің сәйкестігі туралы зерттеулер ерекше қызығушылық тудырады. Осыған байланысты кеңес Орталық Азияның ұлттық-аумақтық межеленуінің, тұрғылықты халықтың қалыптасуының, дәстүрлі Орталық Азия қоғамындағы әйелдердің рөлін өзгертудің кейбір мәселелері, сондай-ақ кеңес кезеңінде Орталық Азияда дәстүршілдікті сақтау және күшейту феномені баяндалды.

Түйін сөздер: дәстүр, дәстүршілдік, дін, әлеуметтік мәдени сала, Орталық Азия, Қазақстан, дәстүрлі қоғам.

МАЗМҰНЫ / СОДЕРЖАНИЕ / CONTENTS

І.Ғ. Ғалымова Арабтілді деректердегі Орталық Азияның этникалық тарихы.....	5
Т.Н. Мухажанова, Г.Е. Сабденова, Д.С. Байгунаков Мажар этномәдениетіндегі түркілік контекст.....	19
А.Р. Хазбулатов, А.И. Ибрагимов Практика сохранения традиционных ремесел в странах Азиатско-Тихоокеанского региона.....	33
Д.Б. Касымова, М.Ч. Калыбекова Казахи в Туркменистане в начале 1930-х гг.: эпизоды противостояния советской власти.....	45
Е.Ш. Ақымбек, М.С. Шагирбаев Талас өңіріндегі ортағасырлық төрткүлдердің зерттелу тарихы.....	58
О.Х. Мұхатова Қазақстанда ХІХ-ХХ ғасырдың бас кезіндегі білім берудің революцияға дейінгі тарихнамасы.....	77
А.Қ. Ахмет, Ғ.А. Шотанова Неплюев училищесінің қазақ түлектері.....	92
Л.С. Динашева, Г.Ж. Примкулова, М.О. Аксой ХІХ ғ. 60-70 жж. патша үкіметінің Оңтүстік Қазақстанда жүргізген қоныс аудару саясаты және көпэтносты құрылымның қалыптасуы.....	105
О.Б. Қуанбай, Н.Н. Құрманалина Қазақ-жоңғар күресі кезеңіндегі тұлғалардың зерттелу мәселелерінен (қазіргі қазақстандық еңбектерде).....	119
С.А. Асанова, А.Т. Капаева Некоторые аспекты истории казахской культуры второй половины ХХ века.....	129
Р.Х. Муртазаева Подготовка женщин-лидеров – неотъемлемый элемент достижения целей развития Узбекистана.....	143
А.Ш. Махаева, О. Чаргынова Түркі халықтарының өзара байланыстарын зерттеудің кейбір мәселелері (ХІХ ғ. екінші жартысы мен ХХ ғ. басы).....	151
З.К. Сураганова, К.К. Сарсембина Ұлы даланың есте қалдыру мәдениеті шеңберіндегі қымызға қатысты мерекелер, рәсімдер мен ғұрыптардың символдық қоры.....	163
Қ.Қ. Жылқышыбаева, А.Т. Жағыпар Қазақ қоғамындағы әйелдердің әлеуметтік және саяси рөлі.....	177

О. Кuanбай Features of functioning of the institution of kazakh batyrs (XVIII – XIX c.).....	192
Д.М. Иноятова Меннониты в Туркестане: процессы диаспоризации.....	205
Soner Saglam, Yashar Sozen Consideration of the concept of criticism as a social theme in Jambyl Jabayev's poems.....	218
Ә.Ә. Тәжекеев, Ы.С. Құрманиязов, Е. Каналхан ЖЕТИАСАР ЕСКЕРТКІШТЕРІ ӨЛКЕТАНУШЫ ҒАЛЫМДАРДЫҢ ЕҢБЕКТЕРІ МЕН РЕСЕЙ ИМПЕРИЯСЫНЫҢ КАРТОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫНДА (XIX ғ. аяғы – XX ғ. басы).....	230
Р.Д. Кубеев ON SOME ISSUES OF TRADITIONALISM IN SOVIET CENTRAL ASIA (BRIEF HISTORIOGRAPHIC REVIEW).....	243

Редакцияның мекен-жайы:
050010, Қазақстан Республикасы
Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28,
ҚР БҒМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты
«edu.e-history.kz» журналының редакциясы
Телефон: +7 (727) 261-67-19
E-mail: edu.history@bk.ru
Электрондық мекен-жайы: www.edu.e-history.kz

Журнал 2013 жылдан бастап шығады.
Қазақстан Республикасы Инвестициялар және даму министрлігінің Байланыс, ақпараттандыру және ақпарат комитетінде 2014 ж. 29 қазанында тіркеліп, № 14602-ИА куәлігіне ие болды.