

D. Makhat 

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan, Nur-Sultan
e-mail: danagul77@mail.ru

BOLSHEVIK OPPOSITION TO THE IDEA OF TURKIC UNITY (the first quarter of the twentieth century)

The article discusses the emergence of the idea of the unification of Turkic peoples in the early twentieth century, as well as V. Lenin's and J. Stalin's position on national autonomy, unification on the cultural and national basis, the issues of the nation and the ways, the stages of its realization, the fight of the Bolsheviks against Turkic unity.

In addition, the article describes how, after the formation of the USSR in December 1922, the People's Commissariat for Nationalities, headed by Stalin, began to actively determine the direction and how to address the issue of nationalities in the national republics and oblasts.

To study one of the most complex and controversial periods in the history of the former USSR, the author was guided by the principle of historicism, considering processes and phenomena in causal, temporal contact. The use of the problem-chronological method made it possible to create material in a chronological sequence, as well as to highlight important patterns and trends. The following methods were used: historical-genetic, historical-comparative, and historical-systemic methods as specific methods of historical research. The study, based on archival data and the works of the intelligentsia of the Turkic nations, presents information about the Turkic movement in Russia in the first quarter of the 20th century.

Key words: Turkic unity, Alashorda, nationalism, Bolshevik, V. Lenin, J. Stalin, Soviet period.

Д. Махат

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Нұр-Сұлтан қ.
e-mail: danagul77@mail.ru

Түрік бірлігі идеясына большевиктердің қарсылығы (XX ғасырдың алғашқы ширегі)

Бұл мақалада XX ғасырдың басында түркі халықтарын біріктіру идеясының пайда болуы, сондай-ақ В. Ленин мен И. Сталиннің ұлттық автономияға, мәдени-ұлттық негіздегі бірлестікке түркі бірлігіне қарсы күресі қарастырылады.

Сонымен қатысты ұстанымы, ұлт мәселелері мен оны жүзеге асыру жолдары, большевиктердің қатар, автор мақалада 1922 жылы желтоқсанда КСРО құрылғаннан кейін И. Сталин басқарған Ұлттар істері жөніндегі халық комиссариаты ұлттық республикалар мен облыстардағы ұлттар мәселесіне қатысты саясаты сипатталған.

Бұрынғы КСРО тарихындағы ең қиын және қарама-қайшылықты кезеңдердің бірін зерттеу үшін автор тарихилық принципін негізге ала отырып, болған оқиғаларды себеп-салдарлық сабақтастықта қарастырған. Зерттеудің жалпы ғылыми әдістері ретінде келесі әдістер қолданылды: шолу, талдау, жүйелеу, салыстыру, индукция, дедукция, жалпылау және басқа әдістер. Проблемалық-хронологиялық әдісті қолдану материалды хронологиялық ретпен құруға, сонымен қатар маңызды заңдылықтар мен тенденцияларды бөлуге мүмкіндік берді. Тарихи зерттеудің нақты әдістері ретінде келесі әдістер қолданылды: тарихи-генетикалық, тарихи-салыстырмалы және тарихи-жүйелік. Архивтік деректер мен түркі халықтары зиялыларының еңбектеріне негізделген зерттеуде 20 ғасырдың бірінші ширегіндегі Ресейдегі түркі қозғалысы туралы ақпарат ұсынылған.

Түйін сөздер: Түрік бірлігі, Алаш орда, ұлтшылдық, большевик, В. Ленин, И. Сталин, Кеңестік кезең.

Д. Махат

Евразийский национальный университет им. Л. Н. Гумилева, Казахстан, г. Нур-Султан
e-mail: danagul77@mail.ru

Сопrotивление большевиков идее тюркского единства (Первая четверть XX века)

В статье рассматривается возникновение идеи объединения тюркских народов в начале XX века, а также позиция В.Ленина и И.Сталина в отношении национальной автономии, объединения на культурно-национальной основе, проблемы нации и пути, этапы ее реализации, борьба большевиков против тюркского единства.

Кроме того, в статье описывается, как после образования СССР в декабре 1922 года Народный комиссариат по делам национальностей во главе со Сталиным начал активно определять направления и способы решения вопроса национальностей в национальных республиках и областях.

Для изучения одного из самых сложных и противоречивых периодов в истории бывшего СССР автор руководствовался принципом историзма, рассматривая процессы и явления в причинно-следственном, временном контакте. В качестве общенаучных методов исследования использовались следующие методы: обзор, анализ, систематизация, сравнение, индукция, дедукция, обобщение и другие методы. Использование проблемно-хронологического метода позволило создать материал в хронологической последовательности, а также выделить важные закономерности и тенденции. В качестве специфических методов исторического исследования использовались следующие методы: историко-генетический, историко-сравнительный и историко-системный. В исследовании, основанном на архивных данных и трудах интеллигенции тюркских народов, представлена информация о тюркском движении в России в первой четверти XX века.

Ключевые слова: Тюркское единство, Алашорда, национализм, большевик, В.Ленин, И.Сталин, советский период.

Introduction

In 1904, J. Stalin wrote an article entitled “How does Social Democracy Understand the Problem of the Nation?” in the newspaper *Proletariatis Brdzola*, in which he pointed out: “The question of the nation is one of the main questions of the revolution of the proletariat, the dictatorship of the proletariat” (Beysembayev 1953: 31). On the eve of the World War I and during the war, special importance was given to the issues of the nation. Other works by Lenin were written at this time, such as “Critical Contemporaries on the Nation,” “On the Truth of Nationalism,” “The Socialist Revolution and the Right to Self-Government of Nations,” “The Results of the Debate on Self-Government,” “On the Making of a Caricature of Marxism and on “Imperialist Economism.” J. Stalin, having consulted with V. Lenin, prepared an extensive article “The Question of the Nation and Social Democracy,” devoted to the issues of the nation. In his letter to M. Gorky, V. Lenin wrote: “We have one wonderful Georgian man collecting all Austrian and other materials, starting to write large articles in *Prosveshenie*” (Stalin 1948: 86). The editors of the journal proposed to print this article as a ‘discussion article.’ However, V. Lenin said: “The article is very good. The question is very

hot...” (Stalin 1948: 86). He proposed to print it as the main article.

J. Stalin’s article “The Question of the Nation and Social Democracy” was published in 1913 in the journal *Prosveshenie* No. 3–5 (March–May). In the article, the author wrote (Stalin 1948: 46): “Damage to national autonomy... It prepares the basis not only to keep nationalities divided, but also for the decomposition of the whole movement of workers. The idea of national autonomy is to divide whole parties of workers into separate parties created by nationality. After the party, unions also break up and full civil strife is born. This is how the whole class movement is broken up into individual national streams.” J. Stalin expressed his opinion that he would not support the creation of cultural and national autonomy, unification on a national basis. Stalin put forward the idea of proletarian internationalism. The article refers to internationalism as follows (Stalin 1948: 81–84): “... It is necessary to unite workers of all nationalities of Russia into united whole collectives, to unite these collectives into one party... the very first tool to organize on an international basis. ... The principle of the international association of workers is a necessary point for solving the problem of the nation.” Proletarian internationalism is based on an

ideology that separates from the national language, culture, national unity, and national qualities.

In October 1913, at the Poronin meeting, V. Lenin openly objected to the “creation of cultural and national autonomy” (Rachkov 1954: 9). “Cultural and national autonomy is a subtle form of bourgeois nationalism, holding false socialist words on its face” he said. The leaders of the Bolsheviks categorically opposed the creation of “cultural and national autonomy” and tried to prove its unsuitability. Stalin stated that the only correct solution to the issue is regional autonomy (Stalin 1948: 78) and summed up: “The advantage of regional autonomy is primarily that one have to deal with a certain population living in a certain territory. Then, it does not distinguish people by nationality, does not strengthen national issues, but again, it destroys these frontiers and unites the people to give way to other losses, losses depending on the category. Thus, regional autonomy is a necessary point for solving the problems of the nation” (Stalin 1948: 77–78).

J. Stalin’s article “The Question of the Nation and Social Democracy” was a program of the Bolsheviks in the question of the nation. The article was published as a separate book by the Priboy publishing house (Petersburg) under the title “The Question of the Nation and Marxism.” In 1914, by order of the Minister of the Interior, the book was transferred to all public libraries and public educational houses. After the Bolsheviks came to power, he again became in demand and in 1920 and in 1934 it was included in the collection of selected articles and words *Marxism and the Question of Nationality*.

On the eve of the 1917 revolution, the area of Russian land amounted to 22.5 million square kilometers. According to the 1897 census, there were 146 languages and dialects (Tishkov 1995: 149). Such an ethnic structure was formed as a result of territorial expansion, which lasted for several centuries, through military occupation, colonization, seizure of new lands, during the Principality of Moscow and the Russian state that followed. Non-Slavic, and especially non-Orthodox people, were called ‘foreigners’ and socio-economically persecuted, and a policy of cultural colonization and assimilation was pursued in parallel. In 1897, the population of the Russian Empire was 125.7 million people (Tishkov 1995: 149).

The October Revolution of 1917 brought to power a party of Bolsheviks led by V. Lenin. The Decrees proposed by the Bolsheviks who came to political power preached issues of national freedom

and independence. Unfortunately, the appeal of the Bolsheviks, urging the people to take their will, was empty, and over time a false policy revealed. Bolshevik leader V. Lenin sought to create a system of power that controls all spheres of society. In the Russian state there were prerequisites for this.

Since the 18th century, tsarist Russia has been dominated by a centralized and strict hierarchical bureaucratic apparatus, the tsar’s power was unlimited. Supreme ministers and advisers were appointed by the tsar from among the best officials of the tsar’s court. Members of the State Council were also the highest ranks who served for life. The executive body of the autocratic state is the Council of Ministers, created during the reign of Alexander I. Created under Peter I, the Senate served as the Supreme Court, the tsar himself appointed senators. They’ve served all their lives. During the reign of Catherine II, the institute ‘leading nobles’, the main body of the administrative system, held senior positions in all regions. The ‘great reforms’ of Tsar Alexander II also did not bring significant changes to society. On July 11, 1867, Tsar Alexander II signed a project “On Temporary Rules for the Management of the Syrdarya and Zhetysu Regions,” and on October 21, 1868 he signed the second project “Provisional Regulations” on the Management of the Ural, Torgai, Akmola and Semipalatinsk Regions. Both projects of the Provisional Regulations were ordered to be implemented from May 1, 1869. According to the rules, the Kazakh lands completely became the colony of the Russian Empire, and the Kazakhs were ousted from administrative power. Alexander III adhered to a ‘counter-reform’ course, which prohibited liberal movements and introduced restrictions on interference in political life for students, merchants, entrepreneurs and other social groups. During the thirteen years of his reign, autocratic power strengthened. The whole sphere of society was in the state of the government control. The government control over universities was raised, ‘purges’ of lyceums were carried out, and censorship was increased. The policy of Russification of the occupied countries widespread. In 1894, Nicholas II ascended the throne. The people hoped that the new tsar would make changes to the life of the country, making transformations (separation of religion from the state, freedom of electoral bodies, national sovereignty and others) in the socio-political sphere, as in developed countries. However, the hopes of the people were not realized. On January 29, 1895, Nicholas II, speaking to Zemstvo representatives, stated that there would be no changes in society. N. Vert described the characteristic feature of the

development of the Russian state at the beginning of the 20th century as follows: “While everywhere in Europe state power developed in the direction of parliamentarism and elective structures, the Russian Empire remained the last stronghold of absolutism, and the power of the sovereign was not limited to any elective bodies. The Code of Laws of the Russian Empire published in 1892 solemnly proclaimed the obligation of complete obedience to the tsar; his power was defined as ‘autocratic and unlimited’ (Vert 2020: 7). This period can be described as the talented Kazakh writer Mukhtar Auezov once said: “People have lost their great former hopes, have surrendered, have dropped their hands, are headed for a new time, their bodies are used to slavery, abuse, scarcity and violence, their bodies are poisoned and put to death” (Auezov 1991: 220).

Materials and methods

The problem of the formation of a nation and national identity is important for both science and public opinion. Our research is devoted to the study of one of the most difficult and controversial periods in the history of the former USSR. In the late XIX – early XX centuries, the issue of the Turkism (Pan-Turkism) movement, which brought the Turkic-speaking peoples closer, its significance not only as a political, but also cultural and educational ideology, was considered. In the course of studying the idea of Turkic unity of the late XIX – early XX centuries and the problem of the resistance of the Bolsheviks, the author was guided by the principle of historicism, considering processes and phenomena in causal, temporal contact. The use of the problem-chronological method made it possible to create material in a chronological sequence, as well as to highlight important patterns and trends. The following methods were used: review, analysis, systematization, comparison, induction, deduction, generalization and other methods as the general scientific methods of research; historical-genetic, historical-comparative, and historical-systemic methods as specific methods of historical research.

The study, based on archival data and the works of the intelligentsia of the Turkic nations, presents information about the Turkic movement in Russia in the first quarter of the 20th century, its ideologists and leaders (USSR), and gives the general characteristics of the views of the activists.

Results and Discussion

The idea of the Turkic unity in the beginning of the 20th century. The idea of “The Turkic Unity,” “The Whole Turkestan,” that born with the Turkic peoples, is the most important factor that goes through times and performs the task of defense immunity for them in different difficult historical periods (Kazakh National Liberation Movement 2008: 13). Yusuf Akçura comments as follows: “Speaking of the Turks, we are talking about all those societies and tribes which have common roots, whose traditions and languages are very close to each other, whose life is interrelated, about which scholars in the field of ethnography, philology, and history sometimes recall as “Turkish-Tatar,” and now “Turkish-Tatar-Mongolian” (Akçura 2008: 70). At the beginning of the 20th century, the idea of the universal Turkic liberation gained strength and rose again. What caused it?

It was first connected with the rise of tribal feelings in the peoples of the Russian colonies to the level of nationhood. Here are specific examples from Kazakh history in this regard. In the 1920s, the Russian government abolished the khanate power among the Kazakhs and began to introduce the Russian regime. The tsarist government aimed to integrate Kazakhstan into Russia, to develop its natural and human resources. For this purpose, the territory of Kazakhstan, weather, soil, natural resources, history of the region, especially the customs, political structure, the nature of governance, economy and material culture of the Kazakh people had to be studied. Research on the economic development of the Kazakh steppe and the subjugation of Kazakhstan to the tsarist government was conducted by M.M. Speransky, S.B. Bronevsky and other tsarist government officials. Also G.S. Karelin and E.A. Everman’s first scientific expedition to the Bukey Horde was led by military engineer G.F. Gens’s frequent visits to the Kazakh steppes, and they coincided with this time. In 1832, a Russian official and a great scientist, A.L. Levshin wrote and published a three-volume work entitled *The Description of the Kyrgyz-Cossack or Kyrgyz-Kaysak Hordes and Steppes*¹. As a result of the tsarist government’s

¹ A.L. Levshin’s original work *The Description of the Kyrgyz-Cossack or Kyrgyz-Kaysak Hordes and Steppes* [Қазақ-қырғыз немесе қазақ-қайсақ ордалары мен даласы туралы сипаттама] (106 pages), written in Polish language, is stored in The Rare Books and Manuscripts Fund of the Scientific Library of L.N. Gumilyov ENU NC JSC. Submitted to the found by the writer-scientist A. Seydimbek (2001).

effective colonization of the Kazakh lands and administrative reforms, significant changes took place in the spheres of language, religion and education. The tsarist government planned to Russify the Kazakhs by opening schools and madrasas and attracting Kazakh children. Under the sending of missionaries N.I. Ilminsky, N.N. Ostroumov, A. Vasiliev, I.Ya. Yakovlev and others to the Kazakh steppes, the goal was to displace the original education system and Islamic religion. To achieve this goal, the tsarist government began to replace the script based on the existing Arabic alphabet with the Russian alphabet, and to open Russian-language schools among the Kazakhs.

Official governing bodies servants in the tsarist administration V.V. Grigoriev², N.I. Ilminsky³, V.V. Katarinsky, I.I. Kraft and others (Alektorov 2007:78) participated in the spread of Russian education in Kazakhstan. In order to effectively pursue their policies, they studied the history, language and way of life of the Kazakh people, sought to attract educated Kazakh youth. In one of the letters, Ilminsky wrote: "I know several Kazakhs, such as Shokan Valikhanov, two Seydalins, Zhanturin, Altynsarin, etc., they are very adventurous and well-educated" (Derbisalín 1965:49). At the same time, N.I. Ilminsky drew attention to the fact that the Kazakh people, along with their natural gift, receptivity, are not religious, and he viewed this as a possible way to his missionary goal. N.I. Ilminsky's last words in the last days of his life, testifying to his humanity and relations with his friends: "Opposition to the education of minority nations has long existed, but it has been growing and is now accompanied by accusations and hostility from all sides. There are people who see me as the only pillar in the education of minorities and look forward to my death" (Derbisalín 2005: 214).

The tsarist government intensified the policy of Russification in the 60s of the XIX century. The colonial authorities made extensive use of missionaries in this endeavour. Y. Altynsarin,

an educator who worked closely with Russian missionary intellectuals. It is no secret that to this day there are different opinions about this Kazakh intellectual. However, reading the letters written by Ybyrai Altynsarin and studying his works, we clearly see that his first goal was to open the eyes of the Kazakhs and to educate them. In his letter, revealing the image of Russian colonists, Y. Altynsarin wrote about the arrogance, haughtiness of the colonial masters and their wives, ridiculous card games and inappropriate talk, laughter, the depressing plight of the nation, and the oppressed people: "What kind of life is this, how can my whole life go like this? ... I don't even like Kazakh officials. They ruthlessly rob and plunder the poor Kazakhs, the defenceless meek, who become prey to the wolves. When I see them, I'm very sad, even if I'm not involved ..." (Altynsarin 1955: 276).

The Ministry of Education subordinated all types of schools to a single public school system, fearing that the opinion of Y. Altynsarin, who advocated justice, and his thought about the future of the people would become a social and pedagogical movement. A Russian school was opened in Omsk for Kazakh children from Akmola and Semipalatinsk regions, with an aimed to spread Russian knowledge among the Kazakhs. It received structure and internal content from the Orenburg School and intended to train personnel for lower management staff from among Kazakhs. Subsequently, on September 1, 1865, an elementary school was opened in Troitsk. The tsarist government established educational institutions and general administrations in the Kazakh lands in accordance with its colonial policy and began the process of final conquest of the Kazakh people. For this purpose, a commission headed by Colonel Girs was sent to the Kazakh steppes to prepare for the adoption of colonial rules. In 1867, the tsarist government issued a "Temporary Rules" for the Turkestan region, and in 1868 for the Orenburg and West Siberian regions. In accordance with this rule, the previous order of local government was changed and reorganized. All Kazakh lands were divided into six oblasts: Syrdariya and Zhetisu oblasts – Turkestan oblast (governor-general), Semei, Akmola oblasts – Western Siberia oblast (governor-general), Torgai, Ural oblasts – Orenburg oblast (governor-general). The former Bukey Khanate temporarily belonged to the Torgai region, then to the Astrakhan province, and the Mangistau Peninsula (Adai tribe) – to the Caucasus war district. Each oblast was divided into several counties, a county into several volost, and a volost into several villages.

² Vasily Vasilyevich Grigoriev was born on March 15, 1816 in St. Petersburg. In 1831 he entered the Eastern Department of the Faculty of Philology of St. Petersburg University, graduating in 1834 with the degree of Candidate of Sciences. He has more than 275 scientific works, more than 25 of which have been translated from the works of many oriental peoples in connection with the Kazakh way of life.

³ Nikolai Ivanovich Ilminsky was born on April 21, 1822 in the city of Penza. From 1836 to 1842 he studied at the seminary in Penza, in 1842 he came to Kazan and entered the academy, in 1846 he graduated with honors and in 1847 became a senior master of the academy.

The leader of the Alash, Alikhan Bukeikhanov, wrote about the colonists: "... the Russians could not switch to cultural work, since initially the conquest was done solely for the purpose of enrichment, and the first conquerors were completely not ready to play the role of culture. They were no more human than the primitive people, their pasts were questionable, rude, ignorant; true, in spite of all this, they happened to be more developed than the 'foreigners', but, having conquered them, they could not consciously move on to peaceful cultural work; they did not even try to use the rich gifts of nature wisely or to support themselves with their own labour. Instead, they chose another way of enrichment – to rob 'foreigners' and plunder natural wealth" (Bukeikhanov 1995: 49).

The above rule required the missionaries to work effectively. At this time, in a protest against colonialism, signs of the Turkic trend in the field of education and language were observed. Let's give a real example. In 1871 N.I. Ilminsky wrote a letter to Y. Altynsarin with some suggestions. The first was the introduction of the Russian alphabet among the Kazakhs. However, the implementation of the Russian missionary plan in the Kazakh steppes would face a great contradiction. First of all, the Kazakh child was sent to Russian schools to learn Russian and write in Russian, but not to serve the Russians. Second, the religion was different, the alphabet was foreign, and it was not easy to accept it. Undoubtedly, the Kazakh people refused to learn the alphabet of a foreign religion, and even sought to read books in the Tatar language, which has the same religion and language. Therefore, books written in the Russian alphabet would not leave the Russian school and would remain in the same school, and it would be illogical to say that anyone would look for and read them. What was Y. Altynsarin's opinion on this issue? Here is an excerpt from his letter dated August 31, 1871 from Torgai: "... It is hard to believe that our students or young graduates will go to the Kazakhs and explain the content of these books (written in the Russian alphabet – D.M.). We know that most (perhaps all) graduates, when they graduate from school, throw away the books that were a burden and never think of them. As for books written in Arabic, if these books are useful, if their content is interesting in the first place, they can quickly spread beyond the school and become a major force in attracting Kazakh youth to education. In fact, we must remember that even though Kazakh words are spelled more correctly with Russian alphabet, that Tatar writing harms the purity and integrity of the Kazakh language, until a long time Kazakhs cannot be deprived of Tatar

writing. Indeed, the Kazakh religion is written with the same script; Kazakhs pray in Arabic and Tatar; therefore, they are becoming closer to the Tatars and Uzbeks than before, and this is not diminishing; the power of our textbooks written in foreign letters seems very weak" (Altynsarin 1955: 278–279). He advised against switching to the new Russian alphabet, and that all efforts and money should be spent on improving the quality of textbooks written in the alphabet familiar to Kazakhs. "As for whether the alphabet will be Arabic or Russian, the fact that the Arabic alphabet is marginally harmful does not interfere with our affairs" he writes. The fact that the Arabic letter is 'harmful' means that the Kazakh language is mixed with Tatar words and the Kazakhs are influenced by Tatar fanaticism.

Altynsarin was concerned about the fate of the Kazakh people who had become a Russian colony. Although he did not seek to radically change society, he hoped that it would attract the Kazakhs to education, open their eyes, make them aware of the situation around them, and make them equal to others. During these years, Altynsarin wrote stories "Satemir Khan," "Qara Batyr," "Zhanibek Batyr," "Zhirenshe Sheshen," "Tazsha Bala," and "Altyn-Aidar." He did not forget to introduce children to the history of religion and instil Islamic values in the minds of the younger generation. In Soviet times, however, he was portrayed as an atheist. Probably one of the reasons his letters, which clearly reflect his views on society and social development, were not reprinted after 1955 was that he did not abandon the traditional spiritual and cultural knowledge of the Kazakh people. This is evidenced by his letter to N.I. Ilminsky: "... I do my best to make a moral impact. If you laugh, keep laughing, in my spare time from 'somehow' teaching, I tell them what I know about the history of religion and add other useful and understandable stories" (Altynsarin 1955: 274). Changes in public life, the creation of Russian-Kazakh administrations, and the beginning of its work in the country eventually required an open discussion of religion and language. The colonial policy of foreigners united the Kazakh, Tatar, Bashkir, and Uzbek peoples having a single religion and language. Many Kazakhs preferred to send their children to Tatar and Bukhara mullahs or Kazakhs educated in Tatar and Bukhara madrasas, giving preference to religious education, believing that education in Russian would weaken religion. It was a way to preserve their religion, language and mentality, to protect themselves from colonizers.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Jadid movement among Turkic-

speaking peoples revived in opposition to the colonial policies of the tsarist government. The important participants of the movement, I. Gasparaly, Sh. Marzhani, A. Ibragimov, M. Abdurashidkhanov, M. Behbudi, F. Khodzhaev and others began an educational struggle against the colonial policy of the tsarist government. This movement, which began with the Tatars in the Crimea and the Volga region, continued with the peoples of Central Asia. The Jadids proposed teaching in accordance with the “European education system” in Muslim madrasas and schools as a protest against spiritual stagnation in public life. They found it necessary to include subjects such as geography, history, mathematics, science, and Russian language in the curriculum.

In the Kazakh steppes in the 50s of the 19th century, the Akhmet Riza madrasa school opened in Semipalatinsk, which worked in this direction. The imam of the mosque was Akhmet Riza, a graduate of Shahabuddin Marjani Madrasa, a scholar who shaped the greatest reformist and jadidic teachings in the Islamic and Turkic worlds. He also continued the Reformist-Jadist teachings and followed the path of enlightenment. A madrasa was opened next to the mosque, where students lived. This madrasa differs from other religious schools in that Turkic, Arabic, Persian languages and the laws of oriental poetry and rhetoric, mathematics, geography and the natural sciences were taught as basic lectures. The great Abai studied at this mosque-madrasa from 1855 to 1858. The Jadid movement was so influential that during these three years, Abai mastered the history and philosophy, language and poetry of the East. Due to the Tsarist-missionary policy of punishment and special instructions to restrict Muslim religious teachings, the Akhmet Riza mosque later stopped accepting children in madrasa⁴.

The Russian Empire at the beginning of the twentieth century favored the preservation and strengthening of the agrarian and raw material economy in Kazakhstan; educational work was aimed at building schools and churches, providing little education to Kazakh children, primarily in Russian language, and recruiting them for service. In 1909 the Governor-General of the Steppe Vilayet Schmidt issued a decree in Akmola and Semipalatinsk provinces stating that “a Kazakh who

does not speak Russian language and does not know the Russian alphabet cannot be a volost”. Thus, most people studied Russian language and Russian alphabet not in order to be educated and skillful, but in order to get a degree, to be ranked (Azamat 1921: January 4). To escape this colonial policy of Russia, Turkic communities of the same religion, the same blood, the same language and the same origin (called as ‘foreigners’ by the colonizers) came to think that a common Turkic language should be unified. The leader of this process was Ismail Bek Gaspirinsky.

According to the *Ak Zhol* newspaper, all were Turks, however, the Crimean Nogais were not understood by the Kazans, the Kazan Nogais were not understood by the Uzbeks, Bashkirs and Kazakhs, and the Turkmens were not understood by the Bashkirs. They know it will be difficult for all of us to speak a common language, so alone we may be easy prey, and if we unite it will be difficult for them to overpower us” (Azamat 1921: January 4).

Ziya Gökalp explains that ‘Turkism’ is a movement that emerged in Europe in connection with the Turks, and that “the distant ideal of Turkism is Turan.” In his book, *Foundations of Turkism*, he divides this movement in Europe into two: one is “sympathy for Turks” and the other is “Turkology,” which has emerged in Europe (Ziya 2008: 85). Taking a broad view of Turkism in relation to the Turkic peoples, he shares the following opinion: “The far-reaching mission of Turkism is to unite the Oghuz, Tatars, Kyrgyz, Uzbeks and Yakuts in language, literature and culture under the name of Turan. Can this ideal become a reality or not? The same can be said of short-term ideals, but it is hard to say of distant ideals” (Ziya 2008: 93). Mohamed Khoja Behbudi addressed an open letter to his Kazakh brothers, telling them that the Serbs, Italians, Armenians, Slavs, Poles and others, distant brothers and even the Russians were uniting: The letter says: “There is a famous propaganda that our ancestors told us: “My descendants, always be united.” For example, if you stack the bushes of one willow tree and tie them together, no one can break them, and when they come up one by one, it is clear that anyone can break them. This is the propaganda and the task our forefathers told us. ... It’s time to unite! If you separate, the Turkmen brothers will also separate, then the Turks of Turkestan will be divided into three, and none of them will have a share of the mukhtariyat. This is what we say to the Muslims of Zhetisu as well” (Mohamed Khoja Behbudi 2008: 130–131).

The Russian Empire plundered the colonies both spiritually and economically. The national

⁴ Hazrat Kamaraddin continued the path of Akhmet Riza. However, he had to move to Bayanaul. The colonial policy of the Soviet authorities in the spiritual sphere went beyond the Tsarist period, the house of the Akhmed Riza madrasa-mosque was turned into a warehouse and office, and during the war the mosque burned down. Only the madrasa house, where the students studied, survived.

intelligentsia sought ways to escape economic and spiritual oppression. The Ittihad ve Terekki (Unity and Progress) party, founded by young people in Turkey, as well as national clubs and Turkish hearths that put forward the idea of unity among Turks settled from the Bosphorus to the Altai, had an impact on the Turkic-speaking peoples of Russia. This is clearly reflected in Omar Karashev's work, who was persecuted as a supporter of pan-Islamism and pan-Turkism. The national intelligentsia led by A. Bukeykhanov, M. Dulatov and A. Baitursynov sought to awaken the ambitious spirit of the Kazakh people. M. Dulatov resonated with his works "Awaken the Kazakh!" (Оян қазақ!), A. Baitursynov contributed with "Mosquito" (Мақа), "Kazakh Situation" (Қазақ қалпы), and "Kazakh Tradition" (Қазақ салты). National opposition to the official Tsarist government evolved in Kazakh society. They raised the issue of national independence and sovereignty. A. Bukeikhanov, B. Karatayev, and Zh. Seydalın became members of the Cadet Party. They took part in all the congresses of the Ittifaq Society, headed by a Tatar A. Ibrahimov. The revolutions of 1905–1907 and February 1917 helped the national intelligentsia to mature and implement its ideas. As a result, the Alash Party and the Alash Autonomy were established. The Bolsheviks who came to political power in Russia declared: "Pan-Turkism is based on the idea of uniting all Turkic-speaking peoples. ... Pan-Turkism has recently become Turanism" (Tinalin 1949. № 10: 34–35) and aimed at destroying Turkic unity. Turanism was an idea that united the people of the Turan family or Turan-speaking Turks, Finns, Mongols, Hungarians, Bulgarians and even the ancient Japans and Eskimos.

Bolshevik resistance to national freedom. Of bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism, Lenin defined: "Two irreconcilable slogans that correspond to the two class camps of the entire capitalist world and reflect the two policies of the nation (two different views of the world)" (Imashev 1956: 13). Did the Bolshevik leader really want to bring freedom and independence to the 'foreign' nations through his fight against bourgeois nationalism?

As for the meaning of the word bourgeoisie (French word 'bourgeoisie'), meaning the ruling class in a capitalist society which has the basic means of social production (Concise Dictionary of Foreign Words 1988: 9). In a capitalist society, the economic development of a country is directly linked to the national bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie influences the economic and socio-political life of its country. The

national bourgeoisie, which owns a certain share of its nation's wealth, has an interest in protecting the country and its wealth from encroachment and plunder. From this one can understand the essence of why Lenin contrasts bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism with each other as "two slogans of disagreement."

As mentioned above, the Bolshevik leader and Bolshevik position on statehood were simply empty slogans of "freedom" and "independence." Their priority was to create a centralized state. At the X and XII Congresses of the Bolshevik Party, special attention was paid to the issue of nationhood in party and state building, the great power chauvinism and local bourgeois nationalism, pan-Islamism in the East, pan-Turkism. The political struggle against Zionism among the Jews, pan-Islamism among the Turkic peoples, pan-Turkism, nationalism among the Polish, Armenian, Georgian and Ukrainian peoples intensified.

V. Lenin's statement that "the working class should unite, not divide, the right of nations to self-government does not mean separation in any case" (Beisembayev 1953: 33) made it clear that his dream was to preserve a centralized state. Shortly before the Bolsheviks came to power, on April 29, 1917, his sympathizing comrade J. Stalin in his speech on the question of statehood at the VII (April) Conference of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party and Russia revealed the background of the Bolshevik policy on the question of statehood: "I may approve of a nation's right to secede, but that does not mean that I am forcing it to do so. The population has the right to secede, but may not exercise that right, depending on the circumstances" (Stalin 1938: 53–54). Mustafa Shokai, a Kazakh intellectual who promoted Turkic unity, described the political position of state power in Russia before the February Revolution as "the totalitarian policy of the Tsarist government" (Shokai 1998: 105) and described the Bolsheviks who came to power after the October Revolution as "Heirs of the Russian Empire" (Shokai 1998: 82). The political power based on the steppe democracy of Kazakh statehood during the khanate era was subordinated to the unlimited power of the Tsar, a Soviet totalitarian system since the Russian colonization.

"The February Revolution was defeated because of the political failure of Russian democracy. Russian Bolshevism dominates Russia," Shokai wrote in his article "Let Our Direction Be Clear," noting that civil society and democracy are alien to the Russian state. This view of the intelligentsia came true from the early days when the Bolsheviks

came to power. As he described “Soviet power, that is, the Bolshevik Party – one word,” the State was ruled by the Bolshevik Party alone (Shokai 1998: 71). After the October Revolution, the technical possibilities of the twentieth century, the rapid development of the media, the formation of a national bourgeoisie and national proletariat, and the totalitarian domination of the Tsarist government created favorable conditions for the formation of a full-fledged totalitarian system. The involvement of tsarist officials, accustomed to authoritarian colonial policies during the tsarist period, facilitated the Bolshevik line.

The class struggle under the Bolshevik motto “was only possible in independent countries with a national industry, competing political, social and economic interests, a national bourgeoisie and a national proletariat” (Shokai 1998: 2015). In Kazakhstan, where capitalist relations had not developed and which had lagged behind for centuries because of the colonial tyranny of the Russian state, a class revolution could not happen. Consequently, “the Kazakh people participated neither in the October Revolution, nor in the acquisition of virgin lands by the Soviet government” (Shokai 1998: 116).

On November 16, 1917 the “Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia” was published. The People’s Commissariat for Nationalities, headed by Stalin, is established. The People’s Commissariat for Nationalities, headed by Stalin, was established. In his speech at the opening of the Council of Communists of the Turkic Peoples of the RSFSR on January 1, 1921, Stalin said: “As a leading nation, the Russians in general and the Russian Communists in particular have not experienced national oppression. In general, there were no nationalist tendencies among them, except for some intentions of ‘superpower chauvinism,’ ...

The difference between the sons of Turkic communists, the sons of oppressed peoples who lived through a period of national oppression, is that among them there was and still is a tendency towards nationalism, a vestige of it. Getting rid of this vestige is therefore the next task of the Turkic communists” (Stalin 1948: 2). He thus obliged the Turks and their Communists to submit to the new order. Stalin ignored some of the Russian Communists’ intentions of ‘superpower chauvinism’ and openly declared that the nationalism of the Turkic Communists was an obstacle to explain Communism in the East. The desire for freedom of people who have been spiritually and economically plundered by the policies of the colonial state for centuries was considered as nationalism.

At the 10th Congress of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Russia in March 1921 the question of statehood was put on the agenda. The congress heard Stalin’s report on “The Party’s Immediate Tasks in the Question of the Nation.” It included the opening of industrial enterprises, the creation of own nation-specific Soviet states, the training of national personnel, the organization of judicial proceedings in the national language, the opening of cultural and educational institutions, press, books, schools and much more. From the outside, the party’s approach to solving the national problem seemed right. However, Stalin soon abandoned the idea of “the creation of own nation-specific Soviet states.” In September 1922, Stalin took the idea of ‘autonomization’ of the Soviet republics as the basis for a Draft Resolution on the Relations of the RSFSR with the Independent Republics. This project envisaged the accession of the Soviet republics of Ukraine, Belarus, Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia to the RSFSR based on autonomy.

While Stalin’s position on statehood was aimed directly at the ultimate goal of the Bolsheviks, Lenin slyly tried to disguise the true face of “the Russian apparatus, taken from Tsarist rule and only slightly altered by Soviet life” (Lenin’s unpublished documents 1956, № 7: 10). He therefore criticized Stalin’s plan to unite Ukraine, Belarus, Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia into the RSFSR based on autonomy. He demanded “caution, humility and flexibility” from the minority nationalities (Lenin’s unpublished documents 1956, № 7: 12). He made the following remarks to Stalin on the question of nations: “I think that his haste and his love of government and his hatred of the notorious ‘social nationalism’ will play a disastrous role. Blood feuds play the worst role in politics” (Lenin’s unpublished documents 1956, № 7: 11).

Lenin put forward the idea of a federation of republics against “autonomization.” Because the Bolsheviks feared that the slogan “freedom of secession,” with which they justified their policies and actions, would be proven false by the republics in question, which paid particular attention to the question of statehood. The Bolshevik leader made a confession in a letter dated 30 December 1922 “On the question of nations or ‘autonomization’”: “Have we taken enough care to protect the foreigners from the real Russian aggressors? We have not taken such measures, although we could and should have” (Lenin’s unpublished documents 1956, № 7: 11).

After the formation of the USSR in December 1922, the People’s Commissariat for National

Affairs, headed by Stalin, decided to convene a special meeting to determine how to deal with the question of statehood in the national republics and regions. On 25 May 1923, a telegram was sent on behalf of the Secretary of the Central Committee, Stalin, to the leadership of the national republics and regions. The first issue on the agenda was "Report of the Central Control Commission on Sultan-Galiyev," the second was "Measures of the Party to Implement the Resolution of the XII Congress on the National Question" (Kazybek, Maimakov 1999: 23–24). It was noted that the second question is dealt with in eleven paragraphs.

The fourth meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Russia with the leaders of the national republics and regions was held in Moscow on 9–12 June 1923. The meeting was attended by 58 representatives of the national republics and regions, 17 members of the Central Committee of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Russia, 3 candidates for membership, 6 members of the Central Committee of The Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Russia, staff of the People's Commissariat for National Affairs, the Eastern Branch of the Communist International, 11 members of the Political Bureau of the Party Central Committee (Kazybek, Maimakov 1999: 23–24). Bukharin, Zinovyev, Kalinin, Molotov, Radek, Rudzutak, Sokolnikov, Stalin, Tomskiy, Trotskiy, Frunze, Kuibyshev, Ordzhenikidze, Narimanov, Ryskulov, Kozhanov and other prominent Party and Soviet officials spoke at the four-day meeting. Kamenev headed the council.

Representatives from 20 government agencies from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bashkortostan, Belarus, Buryatia-Mongolia, Georgia, Dagestan, Kalmyk region, Karelia, Kazakhstan, Crimea, Mari, Tatarstan, Turkestan, Ukraine, Chechnya, Yakutia and others participated in the meeting (Kazybek, Maimakov 1999: 23).

B. Kuibyshev made a report on the Sultan-Galiyev Case on the agenda. He pointed out two reasons for the emergence of the Sultan-Galiyev Case. The first was the inequality of nations and the politics of superpower chauvinism; the second was local nationalism. Although the speaker was well aware that the Sultan-Galiyev Case was a reaction against the great Russian chauvinist politics, he said "if local communists could combat the nationalist bias that remained in their hearts by giving the party a true internationalist character, the Sultan-Galiyev case would not arise."

Kuibyshev warned the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of Turkestan ASSR T.

Ryskulov, Tatarstan representative Firdevsk, and from the Republic of Crimea Mukhtarov: "You can fall into the abyss where Sultan-Galiyev fell" (Kazybek, Maimakov 1999: 23–24). This was a warning to communists in the country who disagreed with the policies of the Communist Party. The Bolsheviks and their leaders did not fight equally with great-power chauvinism and local nationalism. At such collegiate gatherings, they often talked about how to axe the roots of local nationalism. In the Turkic-speaking republics, there was a suspicion that the ideas of the nation's intelligentsia, which strongly demanded the preservation of national identity, were interlinked, and the political struggle against them intensified.

On November 4, 1930, the newspaper *Pravda* published a resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to expel six right-wing Tatar 'communists' from the Party. They were Mukhtaruly, former chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of Tatarstan, Sabyruly, former deputy chairman of the Central Committee, Yenbaiuly, former deputy land and water commissariat, Mansuruly, head of the regional party committee, Derenuly, former chairman of the Crimean Commissariat, and Perdeuisuly, who held various positions in Crimea. They were mainly accused of continuing the nationalist path of M. Sultangaliyev. The *Pravda* newspaper wrote: "Sultangaliyevism is firmly entrenched among the Tatars, Bashkirs and Crimeans. After that, among the people of the traditional eastern republics like Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan there were some supporters, although there was no organisational relationship. They still exist. Take for example the Saduakasovism, which supports the alashordists. After all, this is the basis of Sultangaliyevism, where local nationalism is prevalent in all eastern nations. The result of all this: to become national-communists in the Tatar, Bashkir, Crimean, Kazakh-Kyrgyz republics, to destroy the roots of Sultangaliyevism and nationalism, to fight against all sects" (Shaymerdenuly 1930: №19).

After Lenin's death, Stalin took full responsibility for the creation and consolidation of a centralized state. In his work *On the Problems of Leninism* he wrote: "Leninism is Marxism in the age of imperialism and the revolution of the proletariat. More precisely, Leninism as a whole is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution, especially the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Stalin 1948 8-volume: 14). As a successor of the Bolshevik 'doctrine', Stalin actively began to translate his ideas on the question

of the nation from theory to practice. Stalin, while retaining the slogan “The right to self-government before the division of nationalities into states,” perfected in every way the mechanism for tying former colonial countries to Russia. Stalin realized that the separation of each nation and the creation of an independent state was directly linked to the political-economic and cultural conditions of that nation, and took these areas under strict control. First and foremost, he rejected a new economic policy that allowed the economy to develop freely. He strongly prohibited the enrichment of individuals. The evolutionary course of the economy of Kazakh society was severely disrupted, and nomadic animal husbandry, which required legitimate historical and natural development, fell into disrepair. Various methods of forgetting the Kazakh language, history and literature were developed and implemented in the cultural and spiritual life of the country.

In 1929, Stalin wrote a work entitled *The Question of Nation and Leninism*. This was a continuation of the ideas of *Marxism and the Problem of the Nation, The October Revolution and the Problem of the Nation* and his speeches on the question of the nation at the X and XII Congresses of the Party. Stalin’s work stated: “As a result of the Kazan Revolution, after the liquidation of the bourgeoisie and its nationalist parties, socialist nations developed on the basis of the old bourgeois nationalities” (Stalin 1948 Vol. 8: 378). Stalin said “amongst the remnants of capitalism in human consciousness, the remnants of the national question are more persistent than others” (Alashorda – the executioner of the Tsarist government 1936: № 210) and deliberately and gradually pursued a policy of denationalization the population united in the USSR. He noted three phases in the denationalization of the peoples of the USSR.

In the first phase: an era of eradicating national pressures and mistrust between nations, the flourishing of national languages, the strengthening of equality of nationalities, the restoration and strengthening of international ties between nationalities. However, this was one of the lies that Bolshevik leaders Lenin and Stalin used to cover up communist colonial policies. The main priority at this stage was the elimination of nationalist residues and education on an international basis from kindergarten to oblique old age (Report of the Chairman of the Soviet People’s Commissariat of the Kazakh SSR, Comrade U. Isayev 1937: № 5). National pressures have not disappeared, but the politics of the great Russian nation even increased. Kaipnazaruly exposed the shortcomings of the

Communist Party in the nation’s politics: “Great Russianism is the most dangerous bias of our time. Great Russianism is often reflected in the practices of Soviet peasant institutions. Those who hold the reins of the Great Russian do not serve the interests of local workers. Signs of Great Russianism in the nation’s politics are:

The great russianists are against the transformation of Kazakhstan into a manufacturing industry. They say that Kazakhstan does not need any plants, factories, state farms, power stations or road construction. They object to these matters.

In land policy, the great russianists want to pursue the old colonial policy. They oppose the use of good land by Kazakh workers. ... they say it is necessary to resettle the Russians who have come to the land. They tried to implement the same Stalypin policy.

The great russianists also intervened in the policy of Kazakhization and localization of party, Soviet and peasant institutions. Many Kazakh workers could have been involved in social construction when the issue of party localization was carried out in full” (Kaiypnazaruly 1930: № 187).

In the second phase, in the process of forming a single world socialist economy ... a kind of common language begins to emerge, because only at this phase do the people ... begin to feel the need for a common inter-ethnic language, along with their national languages. This communist position has achieved its objective. The Kazakh people were forcibly separated from their language, culture and intellectuals who cared about the nation. On behalf of the Kazakh people, the periodicals of those years wrote: “Today the Kazakh people ... are grateful to the courageous great Russian people, the Russian proletariat, for the freedom they have gained. The Kazakh people will completely destroy the remnants of Alash Orda who tried to lead them away from a happy life, from their homeland, and will never allow them to do harm” (The Kazakh people who have found their homeland. For the 16th anniversary of Kazakhstan in 1936: № 229). This is evidenced by the text in a letter from the Kazakh people to Stalin in October 1936 on the occasion of the 16th anniversary of Kazakhstan: “Party of Lenin-Stalin, Comrade Stalin, you have been to us the sun that cherishes and pampers all the people day and night, in the mirage and in the storm.

... The man has changed, Comrade Stalin! Each of us feels like a real man, ready to live and work under the new constitution, conscientiously fulfilling the great duty of citizens of the USSR, the public duty to the Fatherland ...” (Letter from

the revived Kazakh people to Comrade J.V. Stalin 1936: № 230). Interestingly, these communist publications were busy clarifying the meaning of an article or letter written on behalf of the people. The people themselves did not understand the essence of the letter published on behalf of ‘the people’, so special interpretation and instructions were required. For example, the newspaper *Social Kazakhstan* explained the meaning of the letter to the people in its main article “Letter from the Kazakh People” (Letter from the Kazakh People 1936: № 231).

Only in the third phase of human development will the national differences and languages begin to disappear, to be replaced by a universal language. (Stalin 1948 vol. 11: 389). It was stressed that the ultimate goal was the integration of the nations: “The disappearance of the national differences and the unification of the nations will not happen at the time of the victory of socialism in one country, but at the time of the worldwide realization of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, at the time of the victory of socialism in all countries and the foundation of a world socialist economy” (A Fine Example of Creative Marxism 1950: № 5: 27).

The Alash intelligentsia, accused of nationalism by the leaders of the Communist Party, wrote in the *Kazakh* newspaper: “The Kazakhs have always been an integral nation, from the Volga to the Irtysh, from the Urals to Afghanistan. Can we remain the Kazakh nation without losing our name when different nationalities mix with us? This is what prevents us from sleeping peacefully” (*Kazakh* newspaper 1998: 14). Young nationalists who followed in the footsteps of the intelligentsia of Alashorda: “... the Kazakh state used to be a Russian colony, in which case, “in Soviet times it is necessary to join the Soviet Union, becoming a rich territory” means that it itself cannot take the reins? Tell me ... just as the rich oppress a small nation, so the proletariat oppresses it” (Kamza 1928: № 1–2: 4–5). According to Stalin, all such views were the main ideological obstacle to the development of Marxist cadres, the Marxist vanguard in the nationalist regions and republics (Stalin 1938: 173). J. Stalin: “The main role in the struggle against local nationalism must be played by the national communists themselves ... In the struggle against Georgian nationalism and chauvinism, only the struggle of the Georgian communists can work” (Kabulov 1937: № 40). He gave such an order by telegram to fight against nationalists to the first secretary of Kazakhstan L. Mirzoyan.

Turar Ryskulov, who opposed Stalin’s one-sided policy on the national question, wrote: “Among

former educated nationalists, among the Kazakh communists, it is obvious that the former influence has not yet disappeared. As an example, it can be cited the way how both in the press and in other works national identity takes on different forms. ... The formation of the Kazakh people as a nation takes place not under the leadership of the bourgeoisie, but under the leadership of the proletariat and Soviet power. In Soviet times, the prosperity of the nation was subordinated to the task of bringing the Kazakh people to socialism” (Ryskulov 1926: № 123). The following opinion was expressed in the newspaper *Enbekshi Kazakh*: “Kazakh nationalism does not have a colonial character. It is not looking for domination or submission; it simply defends itself, wants to get freedom if capable. Kazakh nationalism is nationalism born of self-defense.” At the 6th All-Kazakh Party Conference on November 15–23, 1927, F. Goloshchekin criticized this opinion. At the plenum of the regional party committee in April 1928, Goloshchekin spoke about political trends within the party, focusing on the “three trends against the party.” In accordance with his words, the first trend is the bourgeois nationalist movement headed by Smagul Saduakasov. According to this trend, the cornerstone of the national economic policy is the strengthening of the largest industry in Kazakhstan, as well as the fact that 100% of Kazakhstani raw materials should be processed in Kazakhstan.

The second trend is not very strong, it has few supporters. ... In their opinion, there are 35% of Europeans in Kazakhstan, and the government of Kazakhstan should meet their needs. Consequently, in their presence, the needs of the Kazakh nation are not fully satisfied. Therefore, it is necessary to resettle a large number of Europeans from Kazakhstan and put a single Kazakh people in the basis of the Republic of Kazakhstan. From the point of view of the national policy of the Soviet government, aimed at bringing the whole nation closer together, this is impossible given the future development of the economy of the people of Kazakhstan.

The third trend is the actual Saduakasovism. More dangerous than the previous ones (Plenum of the Regional Party Committee 1928: № 96).

F. Goloshchekin gave the following task: “The way the smagulists solve the problem of the nation, the contradiction of their opinion to the decisions of both the party and the workers ... must be written in one booklet” (Comrade Goloshchekin’s speech at a meeting of Kyzylorda activists 1928: № 120). In 1933, Brainin and Shapiro, employees of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, wrote the book “Alash-Orda.” Comrade of F. Goloshchekin O. Isaev

wrote in the booklet “Documents of Alashorda” explaining that the political struggle of the national direction against the Kazakh intelligentsia will not end: “We must remember one thing: in addition to intensifying the attack on the rich in general, we must also intensify the fight against the alashordists and their opinions. As for the undertakings of Alashorda, we need to take state measures where it is necessary.

It cannot be assumed that all former Alashorda residents are the same. There are those in Alashorda who do not deny their wealth, and the only thing that can fix them is the grave» (Isauly 1929: №162, 163). A. Baydildin’s article “Saduakasovism under the guise of young Kazakhstan,” written on a party assignment, was signed by Ongarov, the secretary of the propaganda department of the All-Union Communist (Bolshevik) Party of the Kazakh Territorial Committee, and sent to periodicals for publication (“Materials on nationalist groups.” Fund of the Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan 141; vol. 1, case 2410. 3 p.). In the newspaper *Enbekshi Kazakh* in the main article “We will not Interfere with the Party of Lenin” the following is stated: “Any opinion deviating from the party path is rooted in the ideology of wealth. Everything leads to the right. We need to intensify the struggle against them” (We will not Interfere with the Party of Lenin 1929: No. 242).

While nationalism is viewed in the world practice as an objective ethnic process in the life of society, arising in order to protect one’s nation, country and land from aggressive wars against another dominant nation or conquests, the Soviet system discredited and blamed people, groups of people and even the entire population. The Communist Party subordinated national interests to the interests of classes and tried to keep national ideals in the shadows, mainly to destroy them. However, the leaders of the Communist Party found it difficult to establish themselves in the country’s politics. Therefore, there was a constant political struggle against Saduakasovism and Ryskulovism in Kazakhstan, Sultangalievism in Tatarstan, Ualiism in Bashkortostan, Ybyraiymism in Crimea, religiosity and nationalism in Uzbekistan. Over time, the continuous and systematic communist international education began to bear fruit. The iron ‘order’ subordinated all spheres of social

and political life to its own politics and ideology. M. Shokai on totalitarian political power: “Today the issue of national independence in our country stands in such a way that it is impossible to talk about the simplest symbols of political and national freedom” (Shokai 1999. vol. 2: 123).

Conclusion

J. Stalin defined: “The issue of the nation is not a problem that will stand on its own and will remain unchanged forever. Being only a part of the general matter of changing the existing structure, the issue of the nation is determined by the social situation, the nature of power in the country, and, in general, by the entire course of social development” (Stalin 1948, vol. 4: 174). He defined Turkey as a hotbed of pan-Turkism (Sabitov, 1949: № 5 (50). 65–74) and called on the people to beware of the real reactionary ideology in the East. In Russia, as well as in the predominantly Muslim Crimea, Azerbaijan, the North Caucasus, Central Asia and Kazakhstan, pan-Islamism and pan-Turkism turned into religious and political movements. Political and ideological education in this area has been strengthened. During the rule of Stalin, the principles of equality of nations and democracy were rejected. The infinity of centralized power has not preserved even a limited form of sovereignty. The nations were subjected to political repression. Khrushchev’s political repressions, which began after the death of Stalin, did not end. Before the perestroika in the 80s, interethnic relations were glorified – peace and cooperation, the triumph of friendship between nations and their rapprochement. In fact, there were many contradictory moments in the nation and in interethnic relations. State ideology was based on class, party and international priorities, and national values were not mentioned. One of the main measures aimed at eliminating national differences and keeping them from the process of the dominant nation was the systematic campaign of accusations of ‘nationalism’ and ‘pan-Turkism’.

The article was prepared within the framework of the project OR11465470-OT-21 «Mass Political Repressions in Kazakhstan in the 20-50s of XX Century and Rehabilitation Processes: Creating a Unified Database»

References

- A Fine Example of Creative Marxism (About the J.V. Stalin's work The Question of the Nation and Leninism) (1950). *Communist* № 5: 27.
- Akçura Yusuf (2008). Zhana tırık memleketiniñ zholbasshylary [Leaders of the new Turkish state. Kazakh national liberation movement. Vol. 8: Great Turkestan. Almaty: El-shezhire.
- Alashorda – the executioner of the Tsarist government (September 11, 1936). *Social Kazakhstan*. № 210.
- Alektorov Alexander Efimovich (2007). Iz istorii razvitiya obrazovaniya sredi kirgizov Akmolinskoj i Semipalatinskoj oblastej [From the History of the Development of Education Among the Kyrgyz of Akmola and Semipalatinsk Oblasts] / Religious Beliefs and Rituals of the Kazakhs [Религиозные верования и обряды казахов]. (Library of Kazakh ethnography, vol. 46). Pavlodar: EKO.
- Altynsarin Ibrahim (1955). N.I. Il'minskijge. Asa markabatty Nikolaj Ivanovich [For N.I. Ilminsky. Especially Blessed Nikolai Ivanovich] (March 16, 1864) / I. Altynsarin. Selected Works / Edit. B.S. Suleimenov. Almaty: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR.
- Altynsarin Ibrahim (1955). N.I. Il'minskijge. Shapagatty torem, Nikolaj Ivanovich! For N.I. Ilminsky. [A Merciful Lord, Nikolai Ivanovich!] (August 31, 1871) / I. Altynsarin. Selected works / Edit. B.S. Suleimenov. Almaty: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR.
- Altynsarin Ibrahim (1955). N.I. Il'minskijge. Asa akkonil Nikolaj Ivanovich [For N.I. Ilminsky. Very Kind Nikolai Ivanovich] (April 14, 1864) / I. Altynsarin. Selected Works / Edit. B.S. Suleimenov. Almaty: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR.
- Auezov Mukhtar (1991). Adebiet tarihy [History of literature]. Almaty: Ana tili.
- Azamat (January 4, 1921). Til maselesi [Language issues]. *Akzhol* № 10.
- Beisembayev Serikbay (1953). I.V. Stalin – ылт мәсеlesiñiñ asa ылт теоретиги [J.V. Stalin is the Greatest Theorist on the Nation Issue. *Communist of Kazakhstan*. 5: 31–40
- Bukeikhanov Alikhan (1995). Istoricheskie sud'by Kirgizskogo kraja i kul'turnye ego uspehi. Izbrannye [The Historical Fate of the Kyrgyz Region and its Cultural Successes. Selected]. Almaty: Main editorial board of The Kazakh Encyclopedia.
- Comrade Goloshchekin's speech at the meeting of Kyzylorda activists (30 May, 1928). *Kazakh Worker* № 120.
- Concise Dictionary of Foreign Words. 9th ed. (1988). Moscow: Rus.yaz.
- Derbisalın Anuar (1965). Ybyraj Altynsarin. Omiri men kyzmeti turaly [Ybyrai Altynsarin. About His Life and Activity]. Almaty: Kazakhstan Publishing House.
- Derbisalın Anuar (2005). Ybyrai (Ibrahim) Altynsarin. Documentary Essay. Almaty: Arda.
- Gökalp Ziya (2008). «Türkshildik negizderi». Kazak ылт-azattyk kozralysy [Fundamentals of Turkism. Kazakh National Liberation Movement]. vol. 8: Great Turkestan [Ұлығ Түркістан]. Almaty: El-shezhire.
- Imashev Sattar (1956). V.I.Lenin ult zhane ылт-otar maselesi turaly [VI Lenin on the question of nation and nation-colonization. *Communist of Kazakhstan* [Қазақстан коммунисті] 11: 12–18.
- Isauly Oraz (August 18, August 16, 1929). Alashordanyñ otken kыnderi. *Kazakh worker* [Еңбекші қазақ]. №162; №163.
- Kabulov Ilyas (February 18, 1937). Boevaja zadacha u kazahskih bol'shevikov [Combat challenge for the Kazakh Bolsheviks]. *Kazakhstanskaya Pravda* № 40.
- Kamza (1928). Kazakstanda socialdyk kurylystyn zholdary [Ways of social construction in Kazakhstan]. *Red Kazakhstan*. №1-2: 4–5.
- Kayypnazaruli Mustafa (August 24, 1930). Uly orysshyllydyk pen ultshyllydykka karsy partijanyn ult sajasaty [National Policy of the Party Against the Great Russianism and Nationalism]. *Kazakh Worker*. №187.
- Kazakh National Liberation Movement (2008). Vol. 8: Great Turkestan. Almaty: El-shezhire.
- Kazakh newspaper. Editor-in-chief A. Nysanbayev (1998). Almaty: Main editorial board of The Kazakh Encyclopedia.
- Kazybek Mukhtar & Maimakov, Gappar (1999). Kupija kenester [Secret Tips]. Almaty: Sanat.
- Lenin's Unpublished Documents (1956). *Kazakhstan communist*. № 7: 10.
- Letter from the Kazakh People (October 6, 1936). *Social Kazakhstan*. № 231.
- Letter from the revived Kazakh people to Comrade J.V. Stalin (October 5, 1936). *Social Kazakhstan*. № 230.
- Materialy o nacionalisticheskikh gruppirovkah [Materials on nationalist groups]. Fund of the Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan 141; vol. 1, case 2410. 3 p.
- Mohamed Khoja Behbudi (2008) Kazak kandastarymyz gashyk hat [An Open Letter to Our Kazakh Brothers]. *Kazakh National Liberation Movement*. vol. 8: Great Turkestan [Ұлығ Түркістан]. Almaty: El-shezhire.
- Olkelik partija komitetinin plenumy [Plenum of the regional party committee] (April 30, 1928). *Kazakh Worker*. № 96.
- Rachkov O (1954). Nacional'nyj vopros v dokumentah partii [The National Question in Party Documents]. *Kazakhstan Communist*. № 4: 9.
- Doklad predsedatelja Sovnarkoma KazSSR tov. U.Isaeva [Report by Comrade U. Isayev, Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the Kazakh SSR]. *Kazakhstanskaya Pravda* № 5.
- Ryskulov Turar (June 9, 1926). [Response to Young People's Letter] [Жастардың хатына жауап]. *Kazakh Worker*. №123.
- Sabitov Nigmat (1949). Against the Reactionary Ideology of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism [Против реакционной идеологии панисламизма и пантюркизма]. *Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR* № 5 (50): 65–74.
- Shaymerdenuly (January 24, 1930). Sultangalievshyllydykka, zhergilikti ultshyllydykka zhane zhikhshildikke karsy [Against Sultangalievism, Local Nationalism and Separatism]. *Kazakh Worker*. № 19.

- Shokai Mustafa (1998). 1916 zhylygy ulttyk kozgalys turaly bol'shevikterdiń otirigi [The Bolsheviks' Lies about the 1916 National Movement. Selected. vol. 1. Almaty: Kainar.
- Shokai Mustafa (1998). Kerenskij zhane Tırkistandagy ulttyk kozgalys [Kerensky and the national movement in Turkestan]. Selected. vol. 1. Almaty: Kainar.
- Shokai Mustafa (1998). «The Cotton Struggle». Selected. vol. 1. Almaty: Kainar.
- Shokai Mustafa (1998). «Tırkistan leninshilderine zhauap». Tandamaly. T. 1 [Response to Turkestan Leninists]. Selected. Vol. 1. Almaty: Kainar.
- Shokai Mustafa (1999). Resejdegi ult maselesine oraj». Tandamaly. T. 2. [On the Issue of Nationhood in Russia. Selected. Vol. 2.]. Almaty: Kainar.
- Shokai Mustafa. Kazakstannyn on zhyldygyna». Tandamaly. T. 1 [For the 10th Anniversary of Kazakhstan]. Selected. Vol.1. Almaty: Kainar.
- Stalin Joseph (1938). Marksizm zhane ulttyk-kolonijaldyk masele. Tandamaly makalalar men sozderdin zhinagy [Marxism and the National-Colonial Question. A Collection of Selected Articles and Words]. Alma-Ata: Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Kazakhstan Орталық Комитетінің партиябаспасы
- Stalin Joseph (1948) Shygarmalar. 4, 8, 11 tom [Essays. Volume 11]. Almaty: Kazakh United State Publishing House.
- Stalin Joseph (1948) RSFSR Tırk halyktary kommunisterinin keńesin asharda sojlegen soz». 1 nantar, 1921 zhyl. Shugarmalar [Speech at the Opening of the Council of Communists of the Turkic Peoples of the RSFSR". January 1, 1921. Essays]. vol. 5. Almaty: Kazakh United State Publishing House.
- Stalin Joseph (1948). Marksizm zhane ult maselesi [Marxism and the Problem of the Nation]. Almaty: Kazakh United State Publishing House.
- The Kazakh people who have found their homeland. For the 16th anniversary of Kazakhstan in 1936 (October 4, 1936). Social Kazakhstan. № 229.
- Tinalin Zh (1949). Panislamizm, pantyrkizm – Batys imperializminin Shygys halyktaryna salgan bugalygy [Pan-Islamism, Pan-Turkism – Western Imperialism's Noose on the Peoples of the East]. Communist. № 10: 32-37, 34.
- Tishkov V.A. (1995). Nacional'nosti i nacionalizm v postsovetskom prostranstve [Nationalities and Nationalism in the Post-Soviet Space] (Historical Aspect). Istoricheskie zapiski. Teoreticheskie i metodologicheskie problemy istoricheskikh issledovanij [Historical Notes. Theoretical and methodological problems of historical research]. Issue. 1. (119). Moscow: JSC Publishing Group Progress.
- Vert Nikolai (2002). Istorija Sovetskogo Gosudarstva [History of the Soviet State]. Moscow: Infra-M.
- Lenin partijasynyn zholyna kol sugtyrmajmyz [We will not Interfere in the Path of Lenin's Party] (November 21, 1929). Kazakh Worker. № 242.
- Zhurgenov Temirbek (January 10, 1937). Raschistit' razgromlennogo nacionalizma! [Clean up the Defeated Nationalism!]. Kazakhstanskaya Pravda № 8.