

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



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



2023. 10(1)
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

E-mail: edu.history@bk.ru.

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

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы
Тарих және этнология институты 2022
© Авторлар ұжымы, 2023

БАС РЕДАКТОР

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

РЕДАКЦИЯЛЫҚ АЛҚА

Аяған Бүркітбай Ғелманұлы — 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 Кэтти 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).

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).

Комеков Болат Ешмұхамедұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Әл-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, профессор Оксфордского университета (Великобритания).

Мунинов Ашірбек Құрбанұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Ислам тарихы, өнер және мәдениет ғылыми-зерттеу орталығының аға ғылыми қызметкері IRCICA – İslâm Tarih, Sanat ve Kûltyr Araştırmâ 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 Ә. Марғұлан атындағы Археология институты. (Қазақстан).

Смағұлов Оразак 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

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

ЖАУАПТЫ ХАТШЫ

Жәлиқызы Раушан — Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының кіші ғылыми 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

E-mail: edu.history@bk.ru.

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

© Институт истории и этнологии
им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2023
© Коллектив авторов, 2023

ГЛАВНЫЙ РЕДАКТОР

Кабульдинов Зиябек Ермуханович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, чл.-корр. НАН РК, 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 Кэти Стромилл (Kathie Stromile Golden) — PhD, Государственный университет долины Миссисипи (Mississippi Valley State University) (США).

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

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

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 (Želvys 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 и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан).

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

ОТВЕТСТВЕННЫЙ СЕКРЕТАРЬ

Жалиқызы Раушан — младший научный 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-ИА 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, 2023

© Group of authors, 2023

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

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

EDITORIAL BOARD

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

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

Ayagan Burkitbai Gelmanovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Deputy Director of the Institute of History of the State SC MSHE 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).

Matyzhanov 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). E-mail: aina__78@mail.ru

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).

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Zhalikyzy Raushan — Master in humanitarian sciences, junior researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology (Kazakhstan). E-mail: rosh85@mail.ru

ТЕОРИЯ ЖӘНЕ ӘДІСНАМА / ТЕОРИЯ И МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ / THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

Published in the Republic of Kazakhstan

Edu.e-history.kz

Has been issued as a journal since 2014

ISSN 2710-3994.

Vol. 10. Is. 1, pp. 16–25, 2023

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

FTAXP / MPHTI / IRSTI 03.09.00

https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994_2023_33_1_16-25


MODERNITY AND TOTAL WAR: A SUCCESSFUL MARRIAGE?

(A CRITICAL ANALYSIS)

Gide Van Cappel^{1*}, Alun Thomas²

¹Researcher at the political science department of the Free University Brussels & is affiliated to the School of Justice, Security, and Sustainability at Staffordshire University.

Master of Science

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4463-5310>. E-mail: Gide.Van.Cappel@vub.be

*Corresponding authors

²Senior Lecturer at the School of Justice, Security and Sustainability at Staffordshire University. He is an ordinary member of the British Association of Slavonic and East European Studies committee. PhD

© Gide Van Cappel, Alun Thomas, 2023

Abstract. *Introduction.* Modernity is often seen as a concept that links up with societal progress during the 18th and 19th century. Many articles have been written on what modernity is and what it imposes. However, in that process, authors have often claimed that besides positive effects, modernity also had a lot of negative impacts. One of those being the occurrence of a so called “total war”. *Goals and objectives.* This article aims to consider the relationship between Modernity and total war and examine whether total war was the very worst that modernity produced? *Results.* The definitions of both concepts are considered in detail and some time is devoted to the study of modern historiography related to this subject. The current historiography that relates to this subject has been examined. Moreover, within the framework of this essay, the concepts themselves are challenged within the scope of periodization and how history evolves and is studied. *Conclusions.* In essence, on our opinion Total War itself is hardly a stand-alone concept, and needs more proper historical, rather than political, definitions. Even more, accepting the existence of a so called total war, does not impose that total war is the worst aspects of modernity, as it does not take into account processes such as genocide, colonization and Western hegemonic dominance throughout the recent history.

Keywords: Modernity, total war, history, international history, progress

For citation: Gide Van Cappel., Thomas Alun. Modernity and Total War: a successful marriage? (a critical analysis) // Edu.e-history.kz. 2023. Vol. 10. No 1. Pp. 16–25.

https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994_2023_33_1_16-25.

ҚАЗІРГІ ЗАМАН ЖӘНЕ ТОТАЛЬДЫ СОҒЫС: ТАБЫСТЫ АЛЪЯНС? (СЫНИ ТАЛДАУ)

Гиде Ван Каппель¹, Алун Томас²

¹Брюссель Еркін университеті саясаттану факультетінің ғылыми қызметкері, Стаффордшир университетінің Әділет, қауіпсіздік және тұрақты даму мектебінің мүшесі.

Магистр

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4463-5310>. E-mail: Gide.Van.Cappel@vub.be

²Стаффордшир университетінің Әділет, қауіпсіздік және тұрақты даму мектебінің аға оқытушысы. Британдық славян және шығыс еуропалық зерттеулер қауымдастығы комитетінің қатардағы мүшесі.

PhD

© Гиде Ван Каппель, Алун Томас, 2023

Аннотация. *Kіріспе.* Қазіргі заман көбінесе XVIII және XIX ғасырлардағы қоғамдық дамуға байланысты тұжырымдама ретінде қарастырылады. Қазіргі заман деген не және ол нені міндеттейтіні туралы көптеген мақалалар жазылған. Алайда, бұл процесте авторлар көбінесе оң әсерлерден басқа, қазіргі заманның көптеген жағымсыз әсерлері болғанын мәлімдеді. Солардың бірі – «тотальды соғыс» деп аталатын ұғымның пайда болуы. *Мақсаттары мен міндеттері.* Мақалада қазіргі заман мен тотальды соғыс арасындағы қарым-қатынасты қарастыру міндеті қойылады, сонымен қатар тотальды соғыс қазіргі заман тудырған ең нашар жағымсыз әсер болды ма? *Нәтижелер.* Екі ұғымның анықтамалары егжей-тегжейлі қарастырылып, осы тақырыпқа қатысты қазіргі тарихнаманы зерттеуге назар аударылды. Сонымен қатар, осы эссе шеңберінде тұжырымдамалардың өздері кезеңделу шеңберінде және тарихтың қалай дамып, зерттелетіндігіне күмән білдірілді. *Қорытындылар.* Негізінде, біз тотальды соғыстың өзі жеке тұжырымдама емес деп санаймыз және оған саяси емес, неғұрлым қолайлы тарихи анықтамалар қажет. Сонымен қатар, тотальды соғыс деп аталатын нәрсенің болуын қабылдау тотальды соғысты қазіргі заманның ең нашар аспектілеріне мәжбүрлемейді, өйткені ол геноцид, отарлау және Батыстың соңғы тарихтағы гегемониялық үстемдігі сияқты процестерді ескермейді. **Түйінді сөздер:** Қазіргі заман, тотальды соғыс, тарих, дүниежүзілік тарих, ілгерілік **Дәйексөз үшін:** Гиде ван Каппель Г., Томас А. Қазіргі заман және тотальды соғыс: табысты альянс? (сыни талдау) // Edu.e-history.kz. 2023. Т. 10. № 1. С. 16–25. (Қаз.) DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2023_33_1_16-25.

СОВРЕМЕННОСТЬ И ТОТАЛЬНАЯ ВОЙНА: УДАЧНЫЙ АЛЪЯНС? (КРИТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ)

Гиде Ван Каппель¹, Алун Томас²

¹Научный сотрудник факультета политологии Свободного университета Брюсселя и член Школы правосудия, безопасности и устойчивого развития Стаффордширского университета.

Магистр наук

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4463-5310>. E-mail: Gide.Van.Cappel@vub.be

²Старший преподаватель Школы правосудия, безопасности и устойчивого развития Стаффордширского университета. Рядовой член комитета Британской ассоциации славянских и восточноевропейских исследований.

PhD

© Гиде Ван Каппель, Алун Томас, 2023

Аннотация. *Введение.* Современность часто рассматривается как концепция, связанная с общественным прогрессом в XVIII и XIX веках. Написано много статей о том, что такое современность и что она навязывает. Однако в этом процессе авторы часто заявляли, что помимо положительных эффектов современность также имела много негативных последствий. Одним из них является возникновение так называемой «тотальной войны». *Цели и задачи.* В этой статье ставится задача рассмотреть отношения между Современностью и тотальной войной, а также будет рассмотрен вопрос о том, была ли тотальная война самым худшим из того, что произвела современность? *Результаты.* Подробно рассмотрены определения обоих понятий и уделяется некоторое время изучению современной историографии, относящейся к этому предмету. Более того, в рамках этого эссе сами концепции подвергаются сомнению в рамках периодизации и того, как история развивается и изучается. *Выводы.* По сути, мы считаем, что Тотальная Война сама по себе вряд ли является отдельной концепцией и нуждается в более подходящих исторических, а не политических определениях. Более того, принятие существования так называемой тотальной войны не навязывает тотальную войну худшим аспектам современности, поскольку не принимает во внимание такие процессы, как геноцид, колонизация и гегемонистское господство Запада на протяжении всей новейшей истории. **Ключевые слова:** Современность, тотальная война, история, международная история, прогресс. **Для цитирования:** Гиде ван Каппель Г., Томас А. Современность и тотальная война: удачный альянс? (критический анализ) /Edu.e-history.kz. 2023. Т. 10. № 1. С. 16–25. (Қаз.) DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2023_33_1_16-25.

Introduction

The twentieth century can be seen as a century in which war was omnipresent (Holslag, 2019: 448–450). Yet, the twentieth century can also be seen as a century of technological, democratic, social, and economic improvements (Stephans, 1989; Bille, 2001: 367–373; Hoffstetter, 2012: 330–332; Prescott, 2002: 6–10). Within historiography one might describe these innovations using the concept of modernity, which can be defined broadly as “The apex of societal development in those time periods where industrialisation occurred” (McNutt, 2014: 123). These innovations are also often linked with conflict and warfare (Kedward, 2007; Merriman, 2009: 742–788; McNutt, 2014). According to Jonathan Holslag, the positive consequences of modernity, as a matter of fact, (in)directly lead towards conflict, and more specifically total war (Holslag, 2019: 448–452). It can be argued that all the Western innovations made within the twentieth century were a contributor to inevitable conflict, because they provoked competition, a sentiment of moral superiority and tried to shift the balance of power within the European continent (Holslag, 2019: 448–450). Moreover, McNutt argued that modernism is inherently linked with Western development and innovations (McNutt, 2014). The unequal distribution of technological innovations and those sentiments of moral superiority caused, to some extent, both the First and Second World War (Kumari & Tiwari, 2022: 4–6; Schwabe, 2014: 876–881; Weisiger, 2013: 115–120).

The occurrence of both the First and Second World Wars can be framed as one of the darkest hours of modernity. Yet, one could pose the question whether Total War was the very worst that modernity produced? Moreover, to a lesser extent, this article will simultaneously ask the question whether Was Total War principally a product of modernity? In essence, the answer to this second question seems quite straightforward, yet it imposes a deeper understanding of both concepts. For this reason, it is important to look at the period of time in which this question is posed. Chakrabarty rightfully claimed that the concept of modernity has gone through major changes in the last four decades, as the concept today is different from what it was forty years ago (Chakrabarty, 2011). This requires the need to define both the concept of modernity and total war in general, as well as in function of period and relevance over time. Finally, this article will discuss whether total war is the

embodiment of all that went wrong within the historical concept of modernity. In other words, is total war the only negative consequence that derives from modernity? This article will argue that in a contemporary point of view, total war is not the only, and moreover, not the worst, embodiment of modernity.

Materials and Methods

This article uses a critical literature review as its method, analyzing several primary and secondary sources when dealing with the issue of modernity and total war. The main goal of this article is to make a contribution in the debate around modernity and its consequences. In doing so, this article will examine the question of whether Total War was the very worst that modernity produced. Throughout the article, to a lesser extent, also the question of whether total war was a product of modernity will be tackled. Before delving deeper into that discussion, it is interesting to define and frame both concepts, this is not an easy task as within the discipline of (international) history, the idea of what a concept is and its definition, in particular, is a never-ending discussion (Dobson & Ziemann, 2020). This is because different points of view on certain concepts like modernity and total war are prone to change over time (McNutt, 2014, Wei-Siang Hseih, 2014). This is specifically interesting for this subject as Wei-Siang Hseih argues that “historians usually conflate two different concepts — modern and total war — without adequately defining either, or fully explaining why they are connected” (Wei-Siang Hseih, 2014: 396). So, in order to see why both concepts are intertwined, it is necessary to adequately define both concepts. Through the scope of history, the true meaning and understanding of a concept can change, moreover, the elements that are or are not part of a concept, also give us understanding on how the historiography is interacting with the nature of concepts. Therefore, alongside defining these concepts, it is essential to give a brief overview of what the influence is of the changing nature of the discipline of history, in which concepts such as social-, cultural-, and post-colonial history have an impact on the framing of concepts in general (Dirlik, 2002: 17–21). In order to do so, the underlying paragraphs will focus on elaborating both on the idea of a total war and how it is linked with Modernity.

Discussions

Total War. The idea of total war is inherently linked with politics. George Clemenceau in 1917 was one of the first to speak about a ‘total war’ (Saint Amour, 2014), as well as his Nazi counterparts who spoke a lot on the outcome of total war in the Second World War (Saint Amour, 2014). Total war can, thus, first be found in the field of political communication. Churchill’s famous Blood and Toil speech, for example, can be seen as the embodiment of what total war means. It means to put in all efforts to win the war. Churchill famously said the following: “I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat. We have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind” (Churchill, 1940). In essence, total war can also be seen as a war in which all resources possible are used to win the war effort. However, that frankly means nothing. As Saint Amour rightfully argues, this standard definition does not grasp the specificities of war, it does not grasp the details and it surely, in my understanding, does not deal with the fact that total war can be viewed through many disciplines and ideologies. (Saint Amour, 2014) This definition of using all resources possible, does not take into account that all resources can both be material or people, that all resources are within the framework of an economic dispute on what can and cannot serve in a war effort. It does not take into account, as Strachan for example argues, the purely military aspirations of what a total war effort would mean. Does that mean using all the legally granted methods? Does that meaning also using nuclear weapons? Or does it, in a broader sense, also mean that besides military matters, also civilians are used? From historiography it is clear that total war derives from a more political point of view. According to Chickering, the First World War is the first clear example of a total war. Yet, as

Mieskovski argues, the discussion should not be about romanticising the idea of a total war, it should be about how it occurred that both World Wars were the result of a new level of destruction and suffer (Mieskovski, 2009: 211–212). A *contrario*, when looking at Strachan's writings, his focus is laid on the military elements that are at stake in analysing total war. He also alludes on the fact that historians, political scientists, and academics should not be persuaded by the idea of over-analysing merely military elements (Strachan, 2000).

In line with those findings, this article defines total war as a concept in which new levels of destruction are used during warfare and agrees that a total war is a war that engages a whole society. Yet, I argue that the concept of total war, as such, is still open for discussion. When analysing it historically, the idea of total war derives from politicians and International Relations Theory (IRT) more than it does from history. Therefore, in contemporary history, we can argue that the concept of total war is a-historic and remains to be a *discontinuous continuity*, in which the discipline of International History struggles to make this a historic concept (Revel, 2004: 2). However, in answering our question, total war is seen as a moment of warfare in which new and more destructive methods are used, and where the whole population is somewhat involved in the process of the warfare. This definition gives the opportunity to establish a clear image that total war should be about (some sort) of military conflict, and not, as some argue, about, for example, the total war against COVID-19 (Griffin, 2021). Yet, to conclude, the idea of a total war as such is a difficult concept to grasp within the framework of historiography, while many attempts have indeed been made to define this concept, this article argues that total war as a stand alone concept, does not enjoy enough in depth substance and academic agreement to be dealt with. However, it can be said that throughout the 20th century many politicians did use the idea of a total war, and therefore it remains interesting to examine the relation between those idea's of total war and their link with modernity. Because, in essence, a devastating war, can easily be linked with the idea of modernity and modernization. But what is modernity?

Modernity. As stated in the introduction, modernity in essence can be defined as “the apex of societal development in those time periods where industrialisation occurred” (McNutt, 2014: 123). The element of societal development assumes the fact that modernity is inherently linked with an era of progress. Moreover, according to Brauner, the phenomenon of modernity and related concepts like globalisation, nation-state and democracy also have an influence on how the discipline of history is pictured today (Brauner, 2018: 397–401). So, it is not only necessary to define modernity, but it is also inevitable to look at modernity as a dominating factor in which the discipline of history occurs and evolves. Peter Wagner argues that Modernity has always been linked with progress (Wagner, 2016: 28). Within the literature, this statement finds support from authors such as Kedward, Merriman, and Martinelli as they agree with the fact that modernity can be seen as an era of progress and societal development (Kedward, 2007; Merriman, 2009: 742–788; Martinelli, 2005: 6–11). Examples of that progress can be found in many aspects of society, namely economic transformations, technological evolutions, but also social and democratic evolutions played an important part in what we now call modernity (Martinelli, 2005: 6–11). According to Merriman, modernity in some way finds its roots in the first Industrial Revolution (Merriman, 2009).

Yet, when delving deeper on the matter, it becomes clear that modernity can be framed in *grosso modo* two ways. First, one could view modernity as a period in which progress was perceived and valued. Or, secondly, one could also state that modernity was a period in which, measurably, more progress occurred, this point of view is supported by Mouzakatis as he states that “the development of the idea of progress in modernity was shaped to a certain extent by the combination of medieval eschatology and the emergence of expectations made possible by a host of unprecedented changes in science and political, economic and social institutions” (Mouzakatis, 2017: 2–3). Yet, in the 18th century, when the theoretical ideas around modernity, started to occur, it

became clear that classical social theorists started to use development and modernity as synonyms, they viewed modernity as development and vice versa. They, thus, supported the first claim, that during the era of the industrial revolution, European modernity was embraced, supported, and linked towards ideas of progress (Lushaba, 2009: 10–12). Within this article, the idea of modernity is framed as the former. It is clear that Modernity occurred in a period in which a lot of development took place, those developments had several implications and were present both in the economic, democratic, social and cultural field. So, it is reasonable that during that period, many scholars tended to follow the idea that modernity was inherently linked with the idea of development. Yet, when looked at from a modern perspective, it becomes clear that modernity occurred the way it did, because a lot of things developed in a relatively short period during and little before the industrial revolution. However, this statement deserves some nuance, as for some authors such as Martinelli and Jones & Knights, on the other hand, the roots for modernity are to be found in a period prior to the industrial revolution. They refer to the Renaissance and the Enlightenment as important factors in what we now call modernity (Martinelli, 2005: 6–7; Jones & Knights, 2018: 337–347).

A conviction these authors share is that modernity is often framed – both by media and academics – as an inherently Eurocentric concept (Merriman, 2009; Martinelli, 2005). Moreover, Pomeranz, for example, stated that European countries denied other countries the claim for freedom and self-determination (Pomeranz, 2008: 33). More specifically, with the development of modernity in the nineteenth and twentieth century, a two-folded evolution is alluded to, in which “the political-cultural revolution in its French and American versions and the economic-social revolution in its double aspect of the systematic introduction of industry”, as well as “the development of the world market” can be found (Martinelli, 2005: 9). Both the social revolution, as well as the economic revolution, thus, have had an enormous impact on the development of the concept of modernity.

The idea, however, that modernity itself was one of the root causes for conflict is relatively new. When examining the concept of modernity in a historical perspective it is obvious that until the 1970s, it was not uncommon to support the Eurocentric perspective, and see modernity as a normal consequence of European dominance (Dietze, 2008: 69; Anievas & Nişancioğlu, 2015: 246–247). Over this period of fifty years, the discipline of history evolved into a discipline in which elements such as cultural history (Dirlik, 2002: 17), social-history and especially post-colonial history (Chakrabarty, 2011) does have an influence on how we picture the concept of modernity. We cannot extricate modernity from the historical frames of analysis through which we understand it, meaning that if we want to accept the basic premises of historical investigation, we have to accept modernity's conception of progress, making the analysis a *fait accompli*. Or, as Carr states it “, it would be impossible to imagine how we could think about history at all if we are not allowed to make (a) generalized abstraction. It is just those kinds of generalizations that makes it feasible to think of history in any systematic way and to come to a certain 'understanding' “(Carr, 1961). However, as stated with the idea modernity, although we accept the fact of progress, there is never a ‘single cause’ that defined and determined the concept, there are always many causes and interactions that make us understand history (Carr, 1961). Yet, we need to make a selection of those causes, and frame them in a logical and reasonable manner. In line with Carr his argumentation, it was also relevant to give a definition of total war and elaborate subsequently on the matter, as wars are inherently part of this discussion of generalisation and abstractions. Besides that, as seen in the introduction, Modernity is also often linked towards conflict, and moreover to the happening of (total) war (Mitter, 2008: 192; Wei-Siang Hsieh, 2011: 404). In what follows, both concepts will be identified in relation with each other, in order to answer this article's question.

Results

As discussed above, the idea of total war as such is problematic. Yet, to tackle this article's question, a working definition of the concept is established. As stated earlier, modernity is inherently linked towards conflict and is seen as one of the root causes for war (Kedward, 2007; Chakrabarty, 2011), as well as the difficulties within the democratisation process in Europe (Martinelli, 2005: 14).

The perception of what modernity is, has already changed over time. To understand those changes, it is important to consider the idea of periodisation. Prost once described periodisation as a method "to substitute to time's elusive continuity, [which is] a meaningful structure" (Prost, 1996: 115). This meaningful structure, according to Gilbert, does not live in any sort of isolation, but must be plural (Gilbert, 2014: 9–11). According to Guillaume, the idea of plurality refers to the fact that a period of history should not only look at how it evolved itself, but also on how it reacted and had influence on other periods over time (Guillaume, 2021: 563–564). However, this displays the fact that a period is a construct that is subjective and is often, in case of centuries, rather practical. This somehow makes the use of periodisation heuristic (Phillips, 2002: 363–365; Guillaume, 2021: 568). If periodisation is indeed a construct, and it thus can change over time, one needs to ask the question how we should engage with those, what Revel called, *discontinuous continuities*? (Revel, 2004: 2). This question is fundamental when studying International History, since the core of the study tries to examine the relations between nations, regions, and concepts over time. Therefore, according to Guillaume, the concept of modernity remains ahistorical when dealing with the issue of periodisation. So, when engaging with concepts like modernity and total war, one should be aware that in this discipline it is rather difficult to properly periodise and, therefore, conceptualise concepts that are still ongoing. This all plays a significant role in the period of examining modernity, as our perspective on what is both good and bad about the concept of modernity is prone to change over time.

To some extent, one could link this towards the idea of cultural hegemony and how we look at the world in a certain period, as well as what the dominant paradigm is, in which we examine the world (Gramsci, 2019: 42–58). In the case of modernity and total war, one could argue that prior to the historical movements in the 1970s, total war was indeed seen as the worst consequence of modernity. This is, to some extent, a legitimate claim to make, as total war is a devastating consequence of modernity. This has been argued widely within literature, in which authors more or less state that modernity made space for the innovations that were used in war, but also created an atmosphere of competition between countries and cultures in which they wanted to gain the most economic, political and even cultural benefits of modernity (Towers, 2011: 255–260; Verbeeck, 2020: 61; Simoens, 2016: 10–26; Kedward, 2007; Holslag, 2019; Kumari & Tiwari, 2022: 4–6; Schwabe, 2014: 876–881; Weisiger, 2013: 115–120).

Considering the latter, it can be argued that total war, is one of the cruelest elements deriving from the concept of modernity. There is, however, the need for nuance. Many academics show that the occurrence of war, and especially wars in the twentieth century, do not have one root cause. Many factors play a role in why war occurs. Modernity is seen as one of them. The idea that modernity plays a role in race towards war, is linked again with the fundamental definition that modernity is linked with progress, and progress also possibly creates new cleavages in society, but also an unequal distribution of wealth (internal and external). However, there is no perfect correlation between modernity and the occurrence of war as other factors like personality cults, uncertainty, and economic disparity also have a significant role in creating war (Blattman, 2022: 32–49; Simoens, 2016: 15–21). While this article is not dealing with those other causes, it is obvious that modernity is not the only factor that explains why the world went to war two times. For this reason, one needs to be aware that while total war is indeed a result of modernity, modernity will never be the only root-cause for the existence and development of total war.

As mentioned above, the framing of concepts and the idea of history are prone to change over

time. In accordance with that, this essay argues that from a modern perspective, total war is not the worst consequence of modernity. Moreover, this piece sees at least two equally wrongful consequences of modernity, namely the concept of colonisation, and the ongoing existence of eurocentrism. When talking about colonisation, it is argued that the concept of colonisation partly originates from the concept of modernity, as aiming towards economic and cultural expansion, as well as the idea of superiority are directly linked with the technological, democratic, and societal evolutions that modernity encompasses (Gillen & Gosh, 2007: 104–105; Thomas & Curless, 2017: 4–9; Anievas & Nişancioğlu, 2015: 261–270; Betts, 2012: 34–37; Barthémély, 2010: 17; Patel, 2021: 381). Moreover, when taking a closer look at what happened within several colonies, a lot of conflict and loss of life occurred. In the case of Congo, many Belgian historians even considered what was happening as a genocide (Witte et al., 2016, Deneckere et al., 2020; Vantemsche et al., 2020; Witte & Heynen, 2007; Van Reybrouck, 2021). This essay argues that genocide, racial discrimination, and slavery are also indirectly bound with modernity, considering the idea of moral superiority. There is, however, some disagreement within the literature whether the concept of genocide is part of a ‘total war’ or whether genocide is a stand-alone concept that occurs without the presence of a total war (Forsters, 2007). This essay follows the latter, and thus considers genocide as an indirect consequence of modernity, as one could argue that genocide also is a direct consequence from modernity. Moreover, within the narrow definition of the concept of Total War, the occurrence of a genocide is not seen as an act of total war, yet the Western hegemony and dominance in the 19th and 20th century have also caused several genocides, both in the colonial framework as in the scope of World War II. So, to conclude, it is clear that cruelty and modernity go hand in hand, just as progress and modernity are linked. However, one cannot argue that Total War is the worst of what modernity produced, as the concept of a total war is too narrow to tackle all the specific characteristics that surrounded the political and military deeds that have occurred in the 19th and 20th century.

Besides Total War being too narrow all the cruel deeds that followed out of Modernity, another, more contemporary, effect occurred out of the progress and modernity. Within the many historiographical works this point is alluded on, yet not always made had. However, it is clear that modernity also contributed towards the idea that we tend to view the world from a Western and Eurocentric point of view. In essence, this statement has little to do with the existence of a total war and is thus a bit sensitive for a categoric error. However, this article had the purpose to examine whether Total War was the worst that Modernity produced; besides a direct analyses that is done above. It is also interesting to look at more subtle forms of influence and effect of Modernity. Therefore, the Eurocentric idea that Modernity imposed on our thinking and handling, is also problematised. To some extent, this can even be linked towards Total War, as one could ask whether it was that notion of Eurocentrism that drove us to colonise the world, and made us want to dominate our own region? However, this question cannot directly be answered without deeper analyses, and as such, this article does not try to make that assessment. What it does try to do, is polemizing that within the European continent we frame our reality, and often forget to look at conflicts, cultural elements and societal developments from a European modernity point of view. For this reason, one could argue that the worst aspect of modernity is the idea that eurocentrism, and legitimating our problematic past, still influences our current perspective of thinking (McNutt, 2014; Chakrabarty, 2011; Phillips, 2018; Dietze, 2008). Yet, as Hobson argues, while we do indeed feel guilt for our racist behaviour that is linked with modernity, the idea of institutional – Eurocentric – modernity is still relevant today and still tends to be an important perspective in Western academia (Hobson, 2014). This argument is also followed by Dietze as he explains that in contemporary history European authors can still ignore the works from non-European writers without being viewed provincial (Dietze, 2008: 71; Chakrabarty, 2011). Although this perspective has already changed over time, the Eurocentric paradigm remains omnipresent (Chakrabarty, 2011).

Conclusion

This article has examined whether the occurrence of total war To do so so, this essay has defined modernity, per McNutt (2014), as “the apex of societal development in those time periods where industrialisation occurred” in which both positive and negative elements derive from such societal developments. One of those negative elements is the occurrence of total war. While this article argues that the concept of total war is problematic, as it finds its roots more in politics than it does in historiography, it does show that modernity has led towards armed conflict. Although armed conflict is of course a very negative consequence of modernity, one needs to consider that the discipline of history is continuously evolving. Those evolutions make it somehow difficult to tackle ongoing concepts like modernity and total war, because the way we picture them is prone to change over the course of time.

Therefore, when looking from a contemporary perspective, total war is not the only negative consequence that derives from the concept of modernity. The negative embodiment of modernity imposes both total war and the colonisation process as direct embodiments of the worst result of modernity, as well as the Eurocentric vision, which is still ongoing in more popular discourses and even within academic fields. These are still the most influential, and inherently problematic, consequences of the concept of modernity. Although steps in the right direction have been taken, and historical schools such as the post-Colonial one has raised the issue multiple times, this problem remains at the centre of the discipline of contemporary International History.

REFERENCES

- Anievas, Nisancioglu, 2015 — Anievas A., Nisancioglu K. (2015). Origins of the Great Divergence over the Longue Durée: Rethinking the ‘Rise of the West’. How the West Came to Rule: The Geopolitical Origins of Capitalism. London: Pluto Press, 2015. Pp. 245–273.
- Barthélemy, 2010 — Barthélemy P. L’enseignement dans l’Empire colonial français: une vieille histoire? Histoire de l’éducation. 2010. No 128. Pp. 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.4000/histoire-education.2252>
- Betts, 2012 — Betts R. F. Decolonization. A brief history of the word. Beyond Empire and Nation: The Decolonization of African and Asian societies, 1930s–1970s. Leiden: Brill, 2012. Pp. 23–37. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004260443_004
- Bille, 2001 — Bille L. Democratizing a democratic procedure: Myth or reality? Candidate selection in Western European parties, 1960–1990. Party politics. 2001. No 7(3). Pp. 363–380.
- Blattman, 2022 — Blattman C. Why we fight: the Roots of War and the Paths to Peace. Penguin Books. Brauer, D. (2018). Theory and Practice of Historical Writing in Times of Globalization. London: Viking, 2022. 400 p.
- Chakrabarty, 2009 — Chakrabarty D. Philosophy of Globalization, 397. Provincializing Europe. Provincializing Europe. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2009. 336 p.
- Dirlik, 2002 — Dirlik A. Modernity as history: Post-revolutionary China, globalization and the question of modernity. Social History (London). 2002. No 27(1). Pp. 16–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03071020110094183>
- Dietze, 2008 — Dietze C. Toward a History on Equal Terms: A Discussion of “Provincializing Europe. History and Theory. 2008. No 47(1). Pp. 69–84.
- Dobson, Ziemann, 2020 — Dobson M., Ziemann B. Reading primary sources: the interpretation of texts from nineteenth and twentieth century history (Second ed.). New York: Routledge, 2020. 304 p.
- Forster, 2007 — Forster S. Total War and Genocide: Reflections on the Second World War. Australian Journal of Politics and History. 2007. No 53(1). Pp. 68–83.
- Garon, 1994 — Garon S. Rethinking Modernization and Modernity in Japanese History: A Focus on State-Society Relations. The Journal of Asian Studies. 1994. No 53(2). Pp. 346–366. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2059838>
- Gibert, 2014 — Gibert S. Les enjeux renouvelés d’un problème fondamental: la périodisation en histoire. ATALA Cultures et sciences humaines. 2014. No 17. Pp. 7–31. (In Fr.)
- Gillen, Ghosh, 2007 — Gillen P., Ghosh D. Colonialism & modernity. Sydney: UNSW Press, 2007. 271 p.
- Gramsci, 2019 — Gramsci A. Alle mensen zijn intellectuelen. Notities uit de gevangenis [All men are intellectuals. Prison notes]. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Vantilt, 2019. 272 p. (In Dut.)
- Griffin, 2021 — Griffin C. The American Government and “Total War” on COVID-19. Angles. 2021. No 12. <https://doi.org/10.4000/angles.4058>
- Guillaume et al., 2021 — Guillaume X., Costa López, J., de Carvalho, B., Leira, H. Historical Periods and the Act of Periodisation. Routledge Handbook of Historical International Relations. London: Routledge, 2021. Pp. 562–570.
- Goddeeris et al. 2020 — Goddeeris I., Lauro A., Vanthemsche G. Waarom een geschiedenis in vragen. Koloniaal Congo. Een geschiedenis in vragen [Why ask for a history. Colonial Congo. A history in questions]. Kalmthout: Polis. 2020. Pp. 9–424. (In Dut.)
- Hsieh, 2011 — Hsieh W. (2011). Total War and the American Civil War Reconsidered: The end of an outdated “Master Narrative.” Journal of the Civil War Era. 2011. No 1(3). Pp. 394–408. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26070141>

- Hobson, 2014 — *Hobson J. M.* Re-viewing the Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: A Response to Knutsen, Ling, Schmidt, Tickner and Vitalis. *Millennium*. No 42(2). Pp. 485–514. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829813515042>
- Hofstetter, 2012 — *Hofstetter R.* Educational Sciences: Evolutions of a Pluridisciplinary Discipline at the Crossroads of other Disciplinary and Professional Fields (20th Century). *British Journal of Educational Studies*. No 60(4). Pp. 317–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2012.729666>
- Holslag, 2019 — *Holslag J.* Vrede en Oorlog: een wereldgeschiedenis [Peace and War: A World History]. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij De Bezige Bij, 2019. 558 p. (In Dutch)
- Kedward, 2007 — *Kedward H.R.* France and the French: A modern history. New York: Overlook Press, 2007. 736 p.
- Kumari, Tiwari, 2022 — *Kumari P., Tiwari N.* Analyzing the Causes of the First World War. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*. 2002. 21.
- Kümin, (ed.), 2018 — *Kümin B.* The European World 1500-1800: an introduction to early modern history. (Third Edition). New York: Routledge, 2018. 442 p.
- Lim, 2015 — *Lim J.* Modernity, the South Korean Path. Washington: US-Korea Institute at SAIS, 2015. 24 p.
- Lushaba, 2009 — *Lushaba S.* Development as modernity, modernity as development. African Books Collective. 69. Dakar: Codesria, 2009. 78 p.
- Martinelli, 2005 — *Martinelli A.* Global Modernization. *Global Modernization: Rethinking the Project of Modernity*. London: SAGE Publications, Limited, 2005. 168 p. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446216583>
- McNutt, 2014 — *McNutt J.* What is modernization? Encounters/Encuentros/Rencontres on Education. 2014. 15. Pp. 121-136.
- Merriman, 2009 — *Merriman J.* A history of modern Europe: from the Renaissance to the present (Vol. 1). New York: WW Norton & Company, 2009. 592 p.
- Mieszkowski, 2009 — *Mieszkowski J.* Great War, Cold War, Total War. *Modernism/modernity* (Baltimore, Md.). 2009. No 16(2), Pp. 211–228. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mod.0.0094>
- Mitter, 2008 — *Mitter R.* Writing War: Autobiography, Modernity and Wartime Narrative in Nationalist China, 1937–1946. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. 2008. No 18. Pp. 187–210. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0080440108000704>
- Patel, 2021 — *Patel S.* Sociology's encounter with the decolonial: The problematique of indigenous vs that of coloniality, extraversion and colonial modernity. *Current Sociology*. 2021. No 69(3). Pp. 372–388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392120931143>
- Phillips, 2018 — *Phillips A.* Gender and Modernity. *Political Theory*. 2018. No 46(6). Pp. 837–860. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591718757457>
- Pomeranz, 2009 — *Pomeranz K.* Putting Modernity in its Place(s). *Theory, Culture & Society*. 2009. 26(7–8). Pp. 32–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409348080>
- Prescott, 2002 — *Prescott E.* Prosperity and Depression. *The American Economic Review*. 2002. No 92(2). Pp. 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1257/000282802320188916>
- Prost, 1996 — *Prost A.* Douze leçons sur l'histoire. Paris: Seuil, 1996. Pp. 105–108.
- Phillips, 2002 — *Phillips D.* Comparative Historical Studies in Education: Problems of Periodisation Reconsidered. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 2002. 50 (3). Pp. 363–377. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8527.t01-1-00208>
- Revel, 2004 — *Revel J.* Michel Foucault: discontinuité de la pensée ou pensée du discontinu? [Michel Foucault: discontinuity of thought or thought of the discontinuous?]. *Le Portique. Revue de philosophie et de sciences humaines*. 2004. 13–14. Pp. 1–11. (In Fr.)
- Saint-Amour, 2014 — *Saint-Amour P. K.* On the Partiality of Total War. *Critical Inquiry*. 2014. No 40(2). Pp. 420–449.
- Schwabe, 2014 — *Schwabe K.* World War I and the Rise of Hitler. *Diplomatic History*. No 38(4). Pp. 864–879. <https://doi.org/10.1093/dh/dhu030>
- Simoens, 2016 — *Simoens T.* De Chaos van het Slagvel. Het Belgisch Leger in de Loopgraven 1914–1918 [The Chaos of the Battle Skin. The Belgian Army in the Trenches 1914–1918]. Amsterdam: Overamstel Uitgevers. Horizon, 2016. 608 p. (In Dut.)
- Stephens, 1989 — *Stephens J.* Democratic Transition and Breakdown in Western Europe, 1870–1939: A Test of the Moore Thesis. *The American Journal of Sociology*. 1989. No 94(5). Pp. 1019–1077. <https://doi.org/10.1086/229111>
- Strachan, 2000 — *Strachan H.* Essay and Reflection: On Total War and Modern War. *The International history review*. 2000. No 22(2). Pp. 341–370.
- Thomas, Curless, 2017 — *Thomas M., Curless G.* Decolonization and Conflict: Colonial Comparisons and Legacies. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 296 p.
- Van Reybrouck, 2021 — *Van Reybrouck D.* Congo. Een geschiedenis [Congo. A history]. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij de Bezige Bij, 2021. 680 p. (In Dut.)
- Verbeeck, 2020 — *Verbeeck G.* Vond er in de Onafhankelijke Congostaat een genocide plaats? [Did a genocide take place in the Congo Free State?]. *Koloniaal Congo. Een geschiedenis in vragen*. Amsterdam: Polis, 2020. Pp. 9–424. (In Dut.)
- Wagner, 2016 — *Wagner P.* Progress: A Reconstruction. Cambridge: Polity, 2016. 200 p.
- Weisiger, 2017 — *Weisiger A.* World War II: German Expansion and Allied Response. In *Logics of War*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2017. Pp. 105–140. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9780801468179-006>
- Witte, Meynen, 2006 — *Witte E., Meynen A.* Het Naoorlogse Herstelbeleid (1944–1950) [The Post-war Restoration Policy (1944-1950)]. *De Geschiedenis van België na 1945*. Antwerpen: Standaard Uitgeverij, 2006. Pp. 11–576. (In Dut.)

МАЗМҰНЫ

ТЕОРИЯ ЖӘНЕ ӘДІСНАМА

Бенхүр Ч., Жолдасұлы Т.

ҚАЗАҚСТАН ТӘУЕЛСІЗДІГІ ЖӘНЕ ТҮРІК МЕДИАСЫ.....7

Ван Каппел Г., Томас А.

ҚАЗІРГІ ЗАМАН ЖӘНЕ ТОТАЛЬДЫ СОҒЫС: ТАБЫСТЫ АЛЬЯНС? (СЫНИ ТАЛДАУ).....16

Қуанбай О.Қ.

ЖАПОНИЯНЫҢ ПОСТБИПОЛЯРЛЫ ЖҮЙЕ ДӘУІРІНДЕГІ СЫРТҚЫ САЯСАТЫ.....26

Нұрмұхамбетов А.А.

XX ҒАСЫР БАСЫНДА ҰЛТ ЗИЯЛЫЛАРЫНЫҢ ҚАЗАҚ ТІЛІНДЕГІ

ОҚУЛЫҚТАР ДАЙЫНДАУДАҒЫ РӨЛІ.....41

Ошан Ж., Бөтөнөев Ж.С.

ҚАЗАҚСТАН ШЫҒЫСТАНУШЫЛАРЫ ЗЕРТТЕУІНДЕГІ ҚЫТАЙ АРХИВІ

ҚҰЖАТТАРЫНДАҒЫ БҰРЫТТАР (ҚЫРҒЫЗДАР) ТУРАЛЫ МАҒЛҰМАТТАР.....53

Ужкенов Е.М., Шотанова Ғ.А., Морякова М.Т.

ҚАЗАҚ ДАЛАСЫ ТАРИХЫНДАҒЫ КӨШПЕЛІ ЭЛИТА:

ЕЖЕЛГІ МЕМЛЕКЕТТЕН КӨШПЕЛІ ИМПЕРИЯҒА ДЕЙІН.....68

ТАРИХ

Бижигитова Қ.С. Джампеисова Ж.М.

XIX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ СОҢЫ – XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАСЫНДАҒЫ ЖЕТІСУ КАЗАКТАРЫ:

СӘЙКЕСТЕНДІРУ ЖӘНЕ ӨЗІН-ӨЗІ СӘЙКЕСТЕНДІРУ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ.....84

Дүйсенова Н.К., Смағұлов Б.Қ.

МЕМЛЕКЕТТІК ОРТАЛЫҚ МУЗЕЙДІҢ 1940–1950 ЖЫЛДАРДЫҢ

БАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚЫЗМЕТІНІҢ НЕГІЗГІ БАҒЫТТАРЫ.....97

Комилов Н., Қасымова, Д.Б., Байжұманова З.Б.

«САДУАҚАСОВШЫЛДЫҚ» МӘНМӘТІНІНДЕГІ КСРО-ДАҒЫ

ТЕРГЕУ ІСІ МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫНЫҢ БҰРМАЛАУШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ (1928–1938).....111

Конырова А.М.

1860–1890 ЖЫЛДАРДАҒЫ ПАТШАЛЫҚ РЕСЕЙДІҢ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ

ҚОНЫСТАНДЫРУ САЯСАТЫ: ТАРИХИ-ДЕМОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ ТАЛДАУ.....124

Мұхатова О.Х.

ВЕРНЫЙ ЕРЛЕР ГИМНАЗИЯСЫ ЖӘНЕ ЖЕТІСУ АЛАШ ҚАЙРАТКЕРЛЕРІ.....138

Ташағыл А., Мұқанова Г.Қ.

КЕҢЕСТІК ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ ТҰҢҒЫШ АСТАНАСЫНЫҢ ТАҒДЫРЫ.....154

Шукеева А.Т., Буканова, Р.Г. Утегенов М.З.

СОЛТҮСТІК ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ ТЫҢ ИГЕРУ

АУДАНДАРЫНЫҢ КҮНДЕЛІКТІ ӨМІР ТАРИХЫ.....166

АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

Картаева Т., Даубаев Е., Алтынбекова Э.

«ХАН ОРДАСЫ» ҚОРЫҚ-МУЗЕЙІНДЕГІ

ҚҰДЫҚТЫ ҚАЙТА ҚАЛПЫНА КЕЛТІРУ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ.....179

Сакенов С., Бороффка Н.

ҚОЛА ОРАҚ-ШАЛҒЫ – БУРАБАЙ МАҢЫНАН ТАБЫЛҒАН ЗАТ.....194

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

ТЕОРИЯ МЕТОДОЛОГИИ

Бенхур Ч., Жолдасулы Т. НЕЗАВИСИМОСТЬ КАЗАХСТАНА И ТУРЕЦКАЯ ПРЕССА.....	7
Ван Капель Г., Томас А. СОВРЕМЕННОСТЬ И ТОТАЛЬНАЯ ВОЙНА: УДАЧНЫЙ АЛЬЯНС? (КРИТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ)	16
Куанбай О.К. ВНЕШНЯЯ ПОЛИТИКА ЯПОНИИ В ЭПОХУ ПОСТБИПОЛЯРНОЙ СИСТЕМЫ.....	26
Нурмухамбетов А.А. РОЛЬ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ИНТЕЛЛИГЕНЦИИ В ПОДГОТОВКЕ УЧЕБНИКОВ НА КАЗАХСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ В НАЧАЛЕ XX ВЕКА.....	41
Ошан Ж., Ботоноев Ж.С. СВЕДЕНИЯ О БУРЫТАХ (КЫРГЫЗАХ) В КИТАЙСКИХ АРХИВНЫХ ДОКУМЕНТАХ, ИЗУЧЕННЫХ КАЗАХСКИМИ ВОСТОКОВЕДАМИ.....	53
Ужкенов Е.М., Шотанова Г.А., Морякова М.Т. КОЧЕВАЯ ЭЛИТА В ИСТОРИИ КАЗАХСКОЙ СТЕПИ: ОТ РАННЕГО ГОСУДАРСТВА ДО КОЧЕВОЙ ИМПЕРИИ.....	68

ИСТОРИЯ

Бижигитова К.С., Джампенсова Ж.М. ПРОБЛЕМЫ ИДЕНТИФИКАЦИИ И САМОИДЕНТИФИКАЦИИ СЕМИРЕЧЕНСКИХ КАЗАКОВ В КОНЦЕ XIX–НАЧАЛЕ XX ВВ.	84
Дуйсенова Н.К., Смагулов Б.К. ОСНОВНЫЕ НАПРАВЛЕНИЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ЦЕНТРАЛЬНОГО ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО МУЗЕЯ В ПЕРИОД 1940 – НАЧАЛА 1950-Х ГОДОВ.....	97
Комилов Н., Касымова Д.Б., Байжуманов З.Б. ПРЕДВЗЯТОСТЬ МАТЕРИАЛОВ СЛЕДСТВИЯ В СССР В КОНТЕКСТЕ «САДВОКАСОВЩИНЫ» (1928–1938)	111
Коньрова А.М. ПЕРЕСЕЛЕНЧЕСКАЯ ПОЛИТИКА ЦАРСКОЙ РОССИИ В КАЗАХСТАНЕ В 1860–1890-Е ГОДЫ: ИСТОРИКО–ДЕМОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ.....	124
Мухатова О.Х. ВЕРНЕНСКАЯ МУЖСКАЯ ГИМНАЗИЯ И ЖЕТЫСУСКИЕ ДЕЯТЕЛИ ДВИЖЕНИЯ АЛАШ.....	138
Ташагыл А., Муканова Г.К. СУДЬБА ПЕРВОЙ СТОЛИЦЫ СОВЕТСКОГО КАЗАХСТАНА.....	154
Шукеева А.Т., Буканова Р.Г., Утегенов М.З. ИСТОРИЯ ПОВСЕДНЕВНОЙ ЖИЗНИ В ЦЕЛИННЫХ РАЙОНАХ СЕВЕРНОГО КАЗАХСТАНА.....	166

АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

Картаева Т., Даубаев Е., Алтынбекова Э. ПРАКТИКА РЕКОНСТРУКЦИИ КОЛОДЦА В МУЗЕЕ-ЗАПОВЕДНИКЕ «ХАН ОРДАСЫ»	179
Сакенов С., Бороффка Н. БРОНЗОВЫЙ СЕРП-КОСА – НАХОДКА ИЗ ОКРЕСТНОСТИ БУРАБАЯ.....	194

CONTENTS

THEORY OF METHODOLOGY

Benhür Ç., Zholdassuly T. INDEPENDENCE OF KAZAKHSTAN AND THE TURKISH PRESS.....	7
Van Cappel G., Thomas A. MODERNITY AND TOTAL WAR: A SUCCESSFUL MARRIAGE? (A CRITICAL ANALYSIS)	16
Kuanbay O.K. JAPAN'S FOREIGN POLICY IN THE POST-BIPOLAR SYSTEM ERA.....	26
Nurmukhambetov A.A. THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENTSIA IN THE PREPARATION OF TEXTBOOKS IN KAZAKH LANGUAGE IN THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY	41
Oshan ZH., Botonoev ZH. INFORMATION ABOUT THE BURYTS (KYRGYZ) IN CHINESE ARCHIVE DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY KAZAKH ORIENTALISTS.....	53
Uzhkenov E.M., Shotanova G.A., Moryakova M.T. NOMADIC ELITE IN THE HISTORY OF THE KAZAKH STEPPE: FROM THE EARLY STATE TO THE NOMADIC EMPIRE.....	68

HISTORY

Bizhigitova K., Jampeissova ZH. THE PROBLEMS OF IDENTIFICATION AND SELF-IDENTIFICATION OF THE SEMIRECHYE COSSACKS IN THE LATE XIX th – EARLY XX th CENTURIES.....	84
Duisenova N., Smagulov B. THE MAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE CENTRAL STATE MUSEUM IN THE PERIOD BETWEEN 1940S AND EARLY 1950S.....	97
Komilov N., Kassymova D., Baizhumanova Z. BIAS OF INVESTIGATION MATERIALS IN THE USSR IN THE CONTEXT OF "SADVOKASOVSHINA" (1928–1938)	111
Konyrova A. RESETTLEMENT POLICY OF TSARIST RUSSIA IN KAZAKHSTAN IN THE 1860S–1890S: HISTORICAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS.....	124
Mukhatova O. VERNY MEN'S GYMNASIUM AND ZHETYSU FIGURES OF THE ALASH MOVEMENT.....	138
Tashagyl A., G. Mukanova G. THE FATE OF THE FIRST CAPITAL OF SOVIET KAZAKHSTAN.....	154
Shukeyeva A.T., Bukanova R.G., Utegenov M.Z. EVERYDAY LIFE HISTORY IN VIRGIN LANDS OF THE NORTH KAZAKHSTAN.....	166

ANTHROPOLOGY

Kartaeva T., Daubaev Y., Altynbekova E. THE PRACTICE OF WELL RECONSTRUCTION IN THE «KHAN ORDASY» MUSEUM- RESERVE.....	179
Sakenov S., Boroffka N. THE BRONZE SICKLE-SCYTHE – A FIND FROM THE VICINITY OF BURABAY.....	194

EDU.E-HISTORY.KZ

электрондық ғылыми журналы

2023. 10(1)

Бас редактор:
Қабылдинов З.Е.

Компьютерде беттеген:
Зикирбаева В.С.

Жарияланған күні: 28.03.2023.
Пішімі 70x100/16. Баспа табағы 26,6.

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

E-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