

Abdulahap Kara¹, Kumganbayev Zh.²

¹Prof. Dr., Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Turkey, Istanbul, e-mail: kara_vahap@yahoo.com

²PhD. Zh. Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: zhankum0186@mail.ru

HOW MUSTAFA CHOKAI, A PROMINENT HISTORICAL FIGURE OF THE HISTORY OF KAZAKHSTAN'S INDEPENDENCE WAS PRESENTED AS A TRAITOR IN THE SOVIET PERIOD?

In this article, the authors consider the activity of Mustafa Chokai in the way of achieving national independence. Mustafa Chokai was a great Kazakh statesman who accused in the Soviet period of «enemy of the people», «counter-revolutionary element», «bourgeois nationalist», «fascist ally», «traitor» and «creator of the Turkestan Legion» etc. The reason for this that the main idea of political activity of Chokai was to establish an independent national government instead of the Soviet regime in Turkestan. The name of Chokai mentioned in the history books of the Soviet Period as a traitor who betrayed their homeland. The authors of the article analyze the Soviet propaganda against the Chokai. Concerning this considered KGB officer, Serik Shakibayev's book entitled «The collapse of Great Turkistan». This essay was presented as a documentary novel in which revealed Chokai as a traitor who sold home for the sake of the Nazi ranks and titles.

Key words: Mustafa Chokai, Soviet Period, Turkestan, Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, political activity, Alash Orda.

Абдулаһап Қара¹, Құмғанбаев Ж.²

¹Мимар Синан Өнер университеті профессоры, Түркия, Стамбул, e-mail: kara_vahap@yahoo.com

²Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: zhankum0186@mail.ru

Тәуелсіз Қазақстан тарихындағы белгілі тарихи тұлға Мұстафа Шоқайдың кеңестік кезеңде сатқын ретінде танылуы

Бұл мақалада авторлар Мұстафа Шоқайдың ұлттық тәуелсіздікке қол жеткізу жолындағы қызметін қарастырады. Қазақтың ұлы мемлекет қайраткері болған Мұстафа Шоқай кеңестік кезеңде «халық жауы», «контрреволюция элементі», «буржуазиялық ұлтшыл», «фашист одақтасы», «сатқын» және «Түркістан легионын құрушы», т.б. айыпталды. Мұның себебі – Шоқайдың саяси қызметінің басты идеясы кеңес билігінің орнына Түркістанда тәуелсіз ұлттық үкімет құру болды. Кеңестік кезеңдегі тарих оқулықтарында Шоқайдың есімі отанын сатқан сатқын ретінде аталды. Мақала авторлары Шоқайға қарсы кеңестік насихатты саралайды. Бұл туралы Серік Шәкібаевтың «Краһ Великого Туркестана» кітабында айтылады. Эссе құжаттық роман түрінде берілген, онда Шоқай фашистік шен-шекпенділер үшін үйін сатқан сатқын ретінде көрінеді.

Түйін сөздер: Мұстафа Шоқай, Кеңестік кезең, Түркістан, Қазақ Кеңес Социалистік Республикасы, саяси қызмет, Алаш Орда.

Абдулаһап Қара¹, Қумганбаев Ж.²

¹профессор Университета искусств Мимар Синан, Турция, г. Стамбул, e-mail: kara_vahap@yahoo.com

²PhD, Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: zhankum0186@mail.ru

Как Мустафа Чокай, известная историческая личность в истории независимого Казахстана, был представлен как предатель советского периода?

В этой статье авторы рассматривают деятельность Мустафы Чокай на пути к достижению национальной независимости. Мустафа Чокай был великим казахским государственным деятелем, который обвинялся в советский период как «враг народа», «контрреволюционный элемент»,

«буржуазный националист», «фашистский союзник», «предатель» и «создатель Туркестанского легиона» и т.д. Причиной этого стало то, что главной идеей политической деятельности Чокая было создание независимого национального правительства вместо советского режима в Туркестане. Имя Чокая упоминалось в книгах истории советского периода как предатель Родины. Авторы статьи анализируют советскую пропаганду против Чокая. Об этом рассказывается в книге Серика Шакибаева «Крах Великого Туркестана». Эссе было представлено как документальный роман, в котором был показан Чокай как предатель, который продал дом ради нацистских рангов и титулов.

Ключевые слова: Мустафа Чокай, Советский период, Туркестан, Казахская Советская Социалистическая Республика, политическая деятельность, Алаш Орда.

Introduction

We know today that Mustafa Chokai, a great Kazakh statesman was accused in the Soviet period of «enemy of the people», «counter-revolutionary element», «bourgeois nationalist», «fascist ally», «traitor» and «creator of the Turkestan Legion» etc. Why? Because, the main goal of political struggle of Chokai was to establish an independent national government instead of the Soviet regime in Turkestan. Therefore, Moscow announced Chokai as an «enemy of the people» and forbade to spread his ideas in the country. Those who do not obey the ban, even those who mention his name, were punished mercilessly. Under the pretext that he was an «enemy of the people», it wasn't possible to provide information about him in textbooks and encyclopedias. For this reason, even you will not find any mention on him in the Kazakh Soviet Encyclopedia with 12 volumes including all the details about Kazakhstan and the Kazakh people.

The name of Chokai is, if necessary, mentioned in the history books, it is always shown as a traitor who betrayed their homeland. For example, his name was mentioned as a counter-revolutionary figure in the history of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic which was considered the official history of Kazakhstan during the Soviet era, when outlining the events connected with the Turkestan autonomy.

The Main Part

In the history of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic published in Almaty in 1961, we find the following lines: «... *However, at the behest of British imperialism at the end of November 1917 was created in Kokand autonomy. Kazakh nationalists M.Tynyshbayev and M.Chokayev took part in this reactive rebel government along with the Uzbek bourgeois nationalists*» (Qazaq SSR tariyhy. Sotsializm daviri. 40 – p).

Each assessments in the history of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic is very important. Because

this work express the official view on the history of Kazakhstan. Books such as the history of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic were prepared under the careful supervision of the Communist Party, as expressed its views and principles.

No one could conduct research and publish materials about Chokai as the history of the Kazakh SSR expressed a negative opinion on him. Citizens of Kazakhstan, especially scientists and artists, and writers and young people called «builders of communism» had to reckon with the views set out in this book. For this reason, it was impossible to talk about Chokai.

In the official history of Soviet Kazakhstan was banned not only Chokai and Turkestan autonomy. The movement of «Alash Orda» and his leaders were also banned. But all leaders of the movement except Chokai, after the established power of the Bolsheviks, did not left his homeland to fight the Soviet regime. Other leaders such as Alikhan Bukeikhanov, Ahmet Baytursynov and Mir Yakup Duvlatov have chosen the path of cooperation with the Bolsheviks and have made an important contribution to the national character of the Soviet system management in Kazakhstan. They especially have done a lot of in the fields of education, science and the arts. Who today can say that their work is not useful now that Kazakhstan has a worthy place in the international community as a nation state?

However, the Soviet government began to persecute them after 1925. In various courts held between 1930 and 1932, active members of Alash Orda were sentenced to deprivation of liberty, deportation or death with charges of spying on the people. The survivors of these courts were killed during the repressions of 1937-1938. Conducting researches and publishing works on the Alash Orda movement and its leaders were also banned after 1935. (Nurpeisov K. 1995, 9-14 – p.)

Chokai understood everything. According to him, soviet historians could not write objectively the history of the national liberation movements of the Soviet peoples. Because they do not generally accept

neutrality in historical science. So they used history as a tool for class struggle. Chokai emphasizes that Soviet historians were well aware that history is not only a science that goes beyond the past, but also a tool for the future. (Chokai M. *Yash Turkistan*. 1931 December, № 25, 5 – p.)

It was not just Chokai who was accused of making various accusations due to his political activities and views. His relatives were also suspected. It was not necessary for them to support Chokai's views. The fact that they were relatives of the enemy was enough to be subjected to various punishments. Therefore, relatives of Chokai were also subjected to Soviet repression. (Sarbulak I. // *Cas Alaş*, 27.6.1991; 28.6.1991.)

When the name of Chokai was mentioned for any reason immediately added to the negative characteristics after it. Most often, it was marked by equalities such as «panturkist», «islamist», «nationalist» or «spy of the world bourgeoisie», which were then heavily accusations in the Soviet republics. (Chokai M. *Almaty*, 1992, 3 – 4 – p.)

Soviet propaganda against Chokai has reached its climax in 1968. In the same year, Serik Shakibayev, a KGB officer, published a book entitled «The collapse of Great Turkistan». This essay was presented as a documentary novel in which revealed Chokai as a traitor who sold home for the sake of the Nazi ranks and titles. This book, the only publication about Chokai in the Soviet era, was published in Russian in 1972 and in the Kyrgyz language in 1976.

It begins with the fact that Chokai in a Nazi prison wrote a letter to Alfred Rosenberg, the Minister of Nazi Germany for the Occupied Eastern Territories. In his letter Chokai said he wanted to help the German army, because he was confident that the Turkestan can be saved only by Germany, so he wants to collect auxiliary troops from the captured Soviet soldiers. So, a series of events started aimed at portraying Chokai as a traitor who tried to make their country a colony, in order to become the leader of Turkestan under the power of the Nazis. At the end of the story, Chokai was poisoned by Vali Kayyum Khan, his close associate. (Shakibayev S. *Almaty*, 1968, 36 p.)

Actually, we do not deny that Shakibayev's writings were based on documents. Maybe it was right. However, we can definitely say that the documents used in the story were incorrect. As we have noticed in our researches, these documents mostly were the protocols of members of the Turkestan Legion of the under the KGB investigation, which was returned home after the war.

Perhaps, Moscow had documents from the archives of the Turkestan Legion in Germany and Poland after the war. However these documents were not used but only the protocols in the Soviet era. Because these archival materials didn't corresponds to the purpose of the Soviet ideology.

Therefore, false information from members of the legion under investigation was used as a source. Despite the fact that even some members of the legion who did not know about Chokai, gave false information under torture, Shakibayev assessed them as documents. Then he thought he wrote a documentary story. Because any one can find many the facts that are contrary to truth in the story.

We can give some examples of them.

1. Chokai, who wrote a letter to Alfred Rosenberg, the minister of the Occupied Eastern Territories at the beginning of the story, has been in prison for one year. (Shakibayev S. *Almaty*, 1968, 1 p.) However, Chokai never was imprisoned. We know that Chokai was only three weeks in the Nazi detention camp of Compien near Paris in his life. (Shakibayev S. *Almaty*, 1968, 14 p.)

2. The story tells that Chokai studied with Kerensky at the faculty of law in the university of St. Petersburg. (Shakibayev S. *Almaty*, 1968, 12 p.) In fact, both of them were not be a student at one time. After graduating from Kerensky, Chokai arrived in St. Petersburg. Kerensky, born on April 22, 1881, was at St. Petersburg University 11 years ago from Chokai. (Kara, A. *Almaty*, 2004, 196-198 p.)

3. Shakibayev alleged in his story that Chokai collaborated with British intelligence. (Shakibayev S. *Almaty*, 1968, 1 p.) We can say that Chokai did not work for exploration of any country. This charge was the usual method of Soviet authorities.

4. Shakibaev writes that Chokai arrived in Europe at the request of his wife Maria. (Kerensky, A. 1965). In Kara's book details that Chokai came to Europe in order to conduct the political struggle. (Shakibayev S. *Almaty*, 1968, 9 p.)

5. It is mentioned in the book that Vali Kayyum helped Chokai to publish the journal of «Yash-Turkistan» (Shakibayev S. *Almaty*, 1968, 12 p). This is not true. Because Chokai did not know Vali Kayyum in the years between 1929-1939 when he published the journal «YashTurkistan». They got acquainted with each other during the Second World War when the journal ceased publication.

6. The idea of establishing the Turkestan Legion was first mentioned by Chokai. (Kara, A. *Almaty*, 2004, 94-151 p). here is no evidence that Chokai said that. On the contrary, there are many reports and archival materials that Chokai was against this project.

7. According to the story, Zaki Validi first arrived in Paris in 1937 and took him to Berlin and charged him with Galymzhan Idrisi publish the journal of «Yash Turkistan». Before Validi left Berlin for Istanbul, Chokai and Idrisi assisted him to publish the journal. (Shakibayev S. Almaty, 1968, 13 p). Which of these words do you correct? Validi first arrived in Paris at the end of 1923, not 1937. (Shakibayev S. Almaty, 1968, 15 p). Galimjan Idrisi and Zaki Validi did not work for the journal. The journal of «Yash Turkestan» was published not since 1937, but since 1929. (Shakibayev S. Almaty, 1968, 21-22 pp).

Conclusion

In the conclusion, it is clear that the episode of the document, which is referred to as a documentary, has drifted away from reality, due to using false materials. Also, the writer's efforts to evaluate Chokai's political activities from the point of view of Soviet ideology further aggravated his erroneous-ness.

Undoubtedly, Shakibayev's book published also in Russian has served a great deal to spread a false

impression of Chokai as a traitor who collaborated with the Nazis among not only the citizen of Kazakhstan, but also the whole Soviet people.

Thus, we can say that Soviet propaganda mechanism who failed to find anything anti-national facts about Chokai tried to achieve their goals via the story of Shakibayev based on false information.

In the conclusion, we can say that it is completely unjustified allegations of the Soviet propaganda about Chokai such as «national enemy, anti-revolutionary element, bourgeois nationalist, reactionary revolutioner, foreign spy, British spy, spy of the world bourgeoisie, Islamist, traitor, a man who betrayed his country to the Nazis, an initiator of the creation of the Turkestan legion».

Although the Soviet Union went missing from the stage of history in 1991, but we can not say that the effects of its anti-propaganda on Chokai has completely disappeared. Because ideological propaganda in the human consciousness pumped for decades can't be erased instantly, it requires dozens of years. Sometimes it is necessary to change generations for this. As time goes by, Chokai as a prominent figure in the history of Kazakhstan's independence will be more exalted.

Әдебиеттер

- Қазақ ССР тарихы. (1961). Социализм дәуірі. Алматы, II.
Нұрпейсов К. (1995). Алаш және Алашорда. Алматы: Ататек
Chokai M. (1931). Bir «İlmi» Yalganga Karşı (Hokand Muhtariyetinin 14ncı Yıldönümü Münasebtiyle) // Yash Turkistan. December, № 25.
Sarbulak I. (1991). Mustafa Şokayulı // Cas Alaş, 27.6.; 28.6.
Шоқай М. Түркістанның қилы тарихы. (Байбота Серікбайұлы. Көшім Ноғай). Алматы.
Шәкібаев С. Үлкен Түркістанның күйреуі. Документальды повесть. Алматы: Жазушы.
Қара А. (2004). Мұстафа Шоқай. Өмірі. Күресі. Шығармашылығы. Алматы.
Kerensky, A. (1965). The Kerensky Memoirs, Russia and History's Turning Point. London.
Togan Z.V. (1969). Hatıralar Türkistan ve Diğer Müslüman Doğu Türklerinin Milli Varlık ve Kültür Mücadeleleri. İstanbul.

References

- Qazaq SSR tarihy. (1961). Sotsializm daviri. Almaty, II, etc.
Nurpeisov K. (1995). Alash and Alash Orda. Almaty, «Atatek».
Chokai M. (1931). Bir «İlmi» Yalganga Karşı (Hokand Muhtariyetinin 14ncı Yıldönümü Münasebtiyle) // Yash Turkistan. December, № 25.
Sarbulak I. (1991). Mustafa Şokayulı // Cas Alaş, 27.6.; 28.6.
Chokai M. Turkistannın qyily tagdyry. (Baybota Serikbaily – Koshym Nogai). Almaty.
Shakibayev S. Ulken Turkistannın kuirevi. Dokumental'dy povest'. Almaty, «Zhazushy».
Kara, A. (2004). Mustafa Shokai. Omiri. Kuresi, Shygarmashylygy. Almaty.
Kerensky, A. (1965). The Kerensky Memoirs, Russia and History's Turning Point. London.
Togan Z.V. (1969). Hatıralar Türkistan ve Diğer Müslüman Doğu Türklerinin Milli Varlık ve Kültür Mücadeleleri. İstanbul.