

A.M. Azmukhanova¹, M.Sh. Egamberdiyev²

¹L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

² Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

(E-mail: aiaz67@mail.ru, mirzahan.egamberdiyev@gmail.com)

Problems in the study of Turkic cooperation in the first half of the 20th century in the framework of national autonomies

Abstract. *The first half of the twentieth century was a period of significant political and social change for the Turkic-Muslim peoples. After the revolutionary changes, Turkic Muslim peoples were able to maintain their identity despite the new Bolshevik colonial policy of the Russian Empire. As a result, national autonomies started to be established, which led to a process of integration of Turkic Muslim peoples. Their ideological views were influenced by the Jadids, who were educated in the madrasas of Bukhara, Samarkand, Kazan, Istanbul, and Cairo. During their stay in Istanbul they came into contact with the Young Turks and were influenced by new ideas, which became the basis of cooperation of Turkic peoples at the stage of creation of national autonomies. Thus in the given article the aim of complex analysis of Turkic peoples' cooperation within the framework of national autonomies in the first half of XX century (Til-Ural, Alash Orda, Turkestan, Shuro-i-Islamia) on the basis of the archival data of the Russian Federation and the Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan is set. In order to reach this goal by means of discourse-analysis method and historical-comparative research method the author tries to shed light on the historical process of Turkic-Muslim peoples integration in Russian Empire.*

Keywords: *Turkic peoples, national autonomies, cooperation, Russian Empire, Turkic intelligentsia.*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-6887/2023-144-3-178-196>

Received: 11.05.2022 / Accepted: 14.08.2023

Introduction

The Jadids turned out to be full-fledged representatives of the Turkic peoples who began the struggle for national development and independence. They had two goals: to create a national democratic state for the Turkic people and to awaken the people's desire for development and enlightenment. To attain these goals, the ideology of Jadidism began the struggle for independence against the Bolshevik Sovietization policy. Their activities are aimed at creating a program of progressive development and unifying eastern and western traditions. The main content of the national idea of Jadidism was the unification of Turkic peoples into a single national-state framework. Thus, the modern

movement became the leader of the national-independent ideology from the sphere of education. The movement embraced all regions inhabited by Turkic-Muslim peoples. Although the ideology of Soviet Bolshevism started a «massacre» to impose domination, the Turkic-Muslim peoples did not stop their struggle for national independence in their historical homeland. Therefore, this article uses real data to examine the political activities of national autonomies in the Volga-Ural, Turkestan, Kazakh steppes, Alash, and the Caucasus and efforts to strive for national independence.

After the February Revolution of 1917 and the October Revolution that followed it, federalist views were revived among significant educated and politically active

groups in the areas inhabited by Turkic peoples. The issue of independence and autonomy came to the highest and national level in the political evolution of the ethnolites of the Volga-Ural region, the Caucasus, the Kazakh lands and the Turkestan region. And the all-Russian administrative-territorial system of governance became an obstacle in the realization of ethno-political projects and affected the interaction of Bolshevik regional leaders. The dynamics of autonomous ideas and their specific models depended on the nature and speed of political processes in the regions, the level of organization and influence of activists, and the strength of ties between the main participants in the struggle for power. The political elite from among the Turkic peoples who fought for autonomy and independence had to act in the extraordinary circumstances of the beginning of the Civil War, since the practical realization of these models was to begin in 1917. The boundless faith of the political elite of the Turkic peoples in autonomy as the only way of progress, their cooperation in the formation of state institutions and structures were upheld by their ethno-social traditions [1].

Between the “bloody struggle” of tsarist power and Bolshevik ideology, the reconstruction of nation-statehood took place in a confrontation between all-Russian Bolshevik (Red) and anti-Soviet (White) and national-regional competing projects combining political, religious, and cultural priorities. The main struggle was between the northern radical socialists and the regional elite, which was characterized by ideological and general cultural and religious similarities. Some Kazakhs had established active contacts with the “Young Bukharans” even before the emergence of the Bukhara People’s Socialist Republic. It was difficult for the Khivins to build contacts because of their geographical remoteness [2]. Even after 1920, S. Kozhanov and others established close ties with Bukharans. In 1918, T. Ryskulov and several of his associates established close relationships with the “Ihtihad ve Tarakki” party together with Uzbek activists; T. Ryskulov even became a member and dreamed of creating a Turkish Republic, although it was part of the Soviet government in later years.

Mahmudkoja Behbudi expressed his opinion on independence in the following way: «If we, the Muslims of Turkestan, unite faith and nation and take steps towards reform and unification today, all of us – the intelligentsia and progressives, the rich and the clergymen – will serve in the name of faith and nation. The prosperity of our homeland is important, we will not be dependent on anyone» [3]. Therefore, the topic for the object of study today is becoming increasingly important. Since in the early twentieth century the Turkic-Muslim peoples who entered the territory of the Russian Empire joined the political movement, we are confident that the consideration of their actions within the framework of national autonomies will open a new facet of theoretical and methodological foundation in historical science in general.

Materials and methods

In the course of the problem investigation, the historical-systematic method of studying historical processes in the early twentieth century was used in order to regulate the history of the creation of the nascent national autonomies. The actions of the political intelligentsia of Turkic peoples within the framework of national autonomies were considered as a single organism preserving the historical-systematic principle. At the same time, the historical-comparative method was used to compare the programs of political parties of the Turkic-Muslim peoples that remained in Russia. The method of synchronization was helpful to study the roots of mutual cooperation of Turkic peoples of the national autonomies that were created at the same time, as well as to study the political processes of establishing contact with Anatolian Turks depending on the geographical location. We have considered the historical course of the adoption of Islam and Muslimism by the Turkic peoples in the early twentieth century and the subsequent development of Turkism on the basis of the typological method. The method of content analysis was used to determine the degree of reliability of the database related to the topic and their mutual compatibility.

Discussion

The founders of the modernist movement actively participated in the development of methods of administration, forms of governance, theory and practice of statehood in Turkestan. They planned to carry out reforms in stages and believed that progress could only be made through peaceful means, i.e. through parliament. Moreover, they acted on the basis of a common position towards the Turkic peoples. At the beginning of 1917, under the influence of the events that took place in Petrograd, the Turkish people began to advocate full independence and autonomy. The emerging sprouts of a new society were looking for a new form of national statehood. In April 1917, after the 1st regional congress of Soviets and the congress of delegates of Soviet executive committees, who supported the idea of federation in Russia, the 1st regional congress of Muslims established the Kraymussovet. The delegates were split into federalists (supporters of cultural autonomy) and their opponents, but supported autonomy within the framework of a democratic federative Russia. As the chairman of the regional council of Muslims M. Shokai reminisced, «at the congress there was not a single word about secession from Russia» [4].

At the All-Russian Muslim Congress held in Moscow on May 1-11, 1917, M.A. Rasulzade proposed a resolution concerning state administration, which was supported by 446 delegates while 271 were against the proposed idea. According to this resolution, which consisted of three important articles, recognizing that the form of the state structure of Russia that would maximally ensure the interests of Muslim peoples was a democratic republic on national-territorial-federal principles, it was established that nations without a defined territory could enjoy the right of national-cultural autonomy. A central all-Muslim body with legislative functions in this area was established for the whole of Russia to regulate the common spiritual and cultural problems of the Muslim peoples of Russia and their joint problems. It is said that the form, composition and functions of this body will be determined by the first constituent congress of representatives of all autonomies [5].

The resolution proposed by Akhmed Salikhov at this congress was common to the Turkic-Muslim peoples. He raised the agrarian question in the lands inhabited by Turkic peoples and demanded an immediate end to colonialism. The problem he raised in his first article was related to land: «The organization of the Russian state according to territorial-federal principles makes it difficult to solve the agrarian problem, because it prevents the creation of a national land fund, which can be a source of land and Muslim peasants. The reserves of foreign lands can be used for its development, but the policy of colonization, which suits Russian colonizers at the expense of the local population, should be abolished. The marginal lands formed after the local population supported the land can become a base for Muslim farmers connected with the local population, their closest neighbors. Such a solution to the agrarian issue is possible only on a national scale», he said, noting the importance of land in the structures of national territories [6]. Akhmet Salikhov directly opposed the federal structure of Bolshevik Russia. The issue of nation-statehood, reflected in his proposed resolution, was clearly visible. Therefore, it is vital to emphasize the following excerpts from important articles of the resolution:

1. Territorial federalism leads to complete decentralization of Muslims. Certainly, each «state» seeks to isolate itself in its own spiritual organization and to free itself from the control of the central body. Special centers of spiritual and religious life will be established. Not to mention that this in itself inhibits the unity of Sunnis and Shiites, different currents and misconceptions based on regional isolation can arise;

2. Territorial federalism does not solve the national problem. Instead of doing so, it creates as many «states» as there are national problems. If this principle is implemented, Muslims will lose thousands of their relatives, and Muslims living in Russian states will undergo Russification.

3. Territorial federalism would fragment the political power of Muslims in Russia and culturally divide certain parts of the Muslim population. From the political point of view, instead of one national-political center in the

entire Russian parliament, this situation creates several divisions, each of which pursues its own politics in the periphery, forming single centers. Cultural division is expressed in the general segregation of Turkic and non-Turkic peoples from each other.

Akhmet Salikhov, who listed the problems that would arise if Bolshevik Russia formed a federal system: «Russia should offer a democratic decentralized parliamentary republic with extensive regional self-government of the Caucasus, Turkestan, steppe regions and Siberia. The cultural and national autonomy of Russian Muslims as a state institution should be guaranteed by the country's constitution» he stated his position with firm conviction. That is why 490 participants of the congress were against it, and only 271 supported it [7].

However, the issue of creating national political parties and autonomy for Russian Muslims lost its significance after the First All-Russian Muslim Congress. The Muslim governing structures created by the Congress did not have an ideological basis aimed at broadly promoting the idea of cultural or territorial autonomy of the Muslim peoples of Russia and the decisions of the Congress. Therefore, the Muslim administrative structures did not have the necessary social base to attract Turkic-Muslim peoples to their side. This political activity was a criticism intended only for representatives of a narrow national social stratum. The reason is that among them were the intellectuals who had socialist ideas prevailing in Russia and who had absorbed the ideas of individual national liberalism.

In the summer of 1917, the idea of autonomy for Turkic Muslims in Turkestan began to be openly expressed. The leading political figures of Bukhara and Khiva eventually moved to Tashkent, which was part of the Muslim active part of Turkestan. M. Shokai called their leaders national-revolutionaries and federalists. Later, Russian federalism was supported by Mahmudkoja Behbudi, who wrote about his desire to introduce parliamentarism in the region «inseparable from Russia», which would take into account the interests of «all Turkestanis, regardless of whether they are Jews, Christians

or Muslims [8]. Thus, aspects of ethnic identity of Turkic peoples were not taken into account. Consolidation on a confessional basis served to some extent to eliminate internal conflicts between small ethno-political processes. However, the ideas of autonomy were diluted among religious figures. Even the strife in June 1917 and the division of the Shurai-Ulema, based on misunderstanding on the issue of regional-territorial reorganization, revealed the need for Islamic modernization. That is, even at that moment, instead of national autonomy and Turkish identity, all problems could not come out of the religious-religious environment. As proof of this, on July 22, 1917, a meeting of three All-Russian Muslim congresses, priests, military and general representatives in Kazan proclaimed the cultural and national autonomy of the Muslims of Inner Russia and Siberia. At the same time a resolution was adopted to begin the immediate realization of the proclaimed autonomy. The II All-Russian Muslim Congress, which adopted a general provision on the cultural and national autonomy of the Muslims of Russia and Siberia, was entrusted with the creation of the order and methods of realization of the autonomy. From November 20, 1917 to January 11, 1918, the parliament of cultural and national autonomy called «National Majilis» (Milliat Majilisi) met in Ufa and adopted the constitution of national autonomy of the Turkic-Muslim peoples of Russia and Siberia [9].

The large joint session of the All-Russian All-Muslim Congress, as well as the congresses of military commanders and clergymen, which discussed the question of national-cultural autonomy of the Muslims of Inner Russia and Siberia, made the following decision:

1. To realize national-cultural autonomy of Muslims in internal Russia as soon as possible, without waiting for the convening of the Constituent Assembly;
2. To develop a detailed project (primary regulations), that takes into account the procedure of creating national-cultural autonomy institutions, for the 2nd All-Russian Muslim Congress that is currently (July 22, 1917) taking place in Kazan [10].

Shortly thereafter, on July 31, 1917, the Second All-Russian Congress of Muslims

adopted specific resolutions on the national-cultural autonomy of the Muslims of Inner Russia and Siberia. The issue of the autonomy project and the basic rules were discussed, the amendments to be made to the section according to the resolution were worked out and reported by Sadri Maqsudi. If necessary, the amendments and additions were entrusted to the «National Assembly» of the 1st Convocation. The Congress found it necessary to set up a 12-member commission to carry out activities for the purpose of declaring autonomy. Of these, 8 members were to be elected by the Congress, 1 representative was to be elected from the All-Russian Central National Council (Milli Shura) and 3 members, 1 person from each of the three divisions (supervisors) of the National Council. In addition to the mentioned 12 members, the Commission of Autonomy (Mukhtariyat) had the right to invite people from outside to assist it. The functions of the invited persons were determined by the Commission itself. In order to fulfill the tasks of national autonomy, the congress decided to create temporary administrations (senates) consisting of 7 persons in the field of education and 3 persons in the field of finance until the National Assembly was convened. The ecclesiastical administration was changed to the «Nazareth for Religious Affairs». These «observances» are entrusted with the functions indicated in the draft [11].

The National Assembly worked in Ufa from November 22, 1917 to February 11, 1918. The meeting was usually attended by more than 80 people. S. Maksudy was elected Chairman of the National Assembly, his deputies I. Akhtyamov and I. Alkin, secretaries G. Fakhretdinov and G. Akshora were appointed [12]. At the meeting, two groups were formed that openly expressed their views on ideological unification. These were the groups of «Turkists», who advocated unification within the framework of cultural and national autonomy, and «Tatars», who aspired to regional unification. Here D. Khuramshin, the head of the group «Turkshilder» and his supporters G. Iskhaki, G. Terekulov, Z. Kadyri, H. Maksudi, I. Bikkulov, S. Maksudi, H. Atlasi and I. Akhtyamov. An important outcome of the long-term work of the assembly was the

agreement between the supporters of cultural-national and territorial autonomy. As a result, in order to implement the ideas of cultural-national autonomy, the assembly, elected by the resolution of November 29, 1917, decided to create a territorial autonomy (state) in the form of a state [13]. January 5, 1918, S. Maksudi was elected Chairman of the National Council (government) under the National Assembly. On the same day, the All-Russian Constituent Assembly adopted the «Decree on the Government of Russia», which proclaimed that the Russian Democratic Federation, uniting all sovereign peoples and regions within the limits established by the constitution, recognized the right of Muslim peoples to positive cultural and national autonomy, as well as the question of creating national-territorial autonomy. In January, however, the Constituent Assembly was dissolved by decree of V. Lenin. On January 7, 1918, after V. Lenin and I. Stalin met with G. Ibragimov and M. Vakhitov, the Commissariat for Muslim Affairs of Inner Russia and Siberia, headed by M. Vakhitov, was established within the Commissariat of People's Commissariat for Nationalities. The National Board as an executive body of the Turkic-Muslim peoples existed until April 21, 1918 and was dissolved by the decree of the Bolshevik government signed by the People's Commissar of the RSFSR I. Stalin and the head of the Muslim Commissariat under the People's Commissariat. The Muslim Commissariat under the People's Commissariat M. Vakhitov, where «on condition of non-interference in political affairs» the Spiritual Administration of Muslims was preserved [14].

On January 6, 1918, after the proclamation of the Russian Federative Republic, the National Assembly announced the formation of the «Voldi-Ural State», which united the Turkic-Muslims of Vladimir-Ural. Thus, the territorial autonomy of Tatar and Bashkir Turks was proclaimed, the main principle of which was religious and national-cultural autonomy. However, part of the Turkic-Muslims recognized the Soviet power, while the second group, which constituted the Turkic-Muslim elite group, including the leadership of Muslim clerics headed by G. Barudi, refused to recognize the power of the Bolsheviks. The creation of the Volga-Ural Autonomous State

was in full compliance with the decision of the III All-Russian Congress of January 10-13, 1918, which declared the Soviet Russian Federation a federation of Soviet national republics. The body realizing the Volga-Ural State was elected and headed by the chairman of the Military Council I. Alkin and G. Sharaf. On January 8, 1918 in Kazan opened the Second All-Russian Muslim Military Congress, which was attended by 200 delegates. It was presided over by I. Alkin. Y. Muzaffarov presented the main report and its map on this structure to be established at the state level. It stated that each state was considered a constituent part of the Russian Federation and that its All-Russian Central Executive Committee and Council of People's Commissars should be established. It should be noted that Y. Muzaffarov's report is based on the collective decision to create the Volga-Urals [15].

After the resolutions were discussed, the final decision of the convention to form the state was based on the following two concerns:

1. The 2nd All-Russian Military-Muslim Congress is mainly composed of representatives of Turkic-Muslims living in the territory between the Urals and the middle course of the Volga. Taking into account the national, economic and other interests of the Turkic-Muslims and other peoples inhabiting this territory, they consider it necessary to form them only within the Volga-Ural Autonomous Soviet Republic, which is part of the RSFSR.

2. The borders of this republic should include the smallest parts of the territories inhabited by other nationalities and the largest parts of the territories inhabited by Turkic-Muslim peoples.

The Bolsheviks opposed the decision of the congress to create the Vladimir-Ural state, in which M. Sultangaliev participated and eventually left it, and on February 28, when the Muslims themselves, led by H. Urmanov, were arrested on the Theater Square. Kazan, the Muslims themselves were arrested at night under the leadership of H. Urmanov, including the military leaders of the council were brothers Alkin and U. Tukymbetov. After the October Revolution of 1917, contacts between the Tatar national organizations and the leaders of the Soviet power continued, but did not recognize each other. However,

the leaders of the military council supported the Soviet power, as they mainly adhered to the views of the SRs and Social-Democrats. They were in favor of territorial autonomy of the Middle Volga and Urals as subjects of the Russian Federation. The Bolsheviks' refusal to recognize the Volga-Ural state angered the leaders of the military council and created a conflict with the Soviet authorities [16].

On March 21-22, Bolshevik K. Gratsis, who opposed the creation of the Volga-Ural state, convened a congress of eleven provincial soviets, where, based on the decisions of the III All-Russian Congress of Soviets, he tried to replace the idea of a state with the creation of a «Kazan Republic». In contrast to the central body of the People's Commissariat, the leaders of the Kazan Soviet avoided tensions related to the national question and did not support the idea of a federative structure of Russia. The Kazan Tatars even completely opposed the creation of a Volga-Ural state. The proclamation of this state only on paper did not solve the national problem of the «Kazan Republic», but most importantly allowed it to concentrate power in its hands [17]. However, the confrontation in Kazan continued into March 1918. To overcome the rivalry and power struggle between Tatars and Bashkirs, the Bolsheviks created the «Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic». It was founded by Bolshevik supporters M. Vakhitov and G. Ibragimov. There were also figures who supported the idea of the «Tatar-Bashkir Republic» and the creation of the Volga-Ural state. The Commissariat for Muslim Affairs of Inner Russia even mobilized G. Sharaf, one of the main developers of the Volga-Ural State, to carry out work on the creation of the «Tatar-Bashkir Republic». As a result, the said republic was recreated as a copy of the Volga-Ural state project officially approved by V. Lenin and I. Stalin on March 23, 1918 [18]. Hence, the main goal of the new project was to create a «Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic» subordinate to the center and to suppress the idea of a «Volga-Ural national state» headed by Zaki Validi Togan. In this regard, on March 26, Stalin openly wrote in his telegram to the Orynbor Rada: «The area along the Southern Urals and Middle Volga is declared a «Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic» of the Russian Federation» [19]. On March 24,

1918, the Statute of the Republic was published in the newspaper «Znamya Revolutsii» in the city of Kazan. On May 2, 1918, a meeting of Tatars and Bashkirs was held in Ufa, where the project of establishing a Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic was approved and it was announced that the Tatar-Bashkir people «will defend Soviet power with all their might» [20].

Results

On May 10, 1918, Stalin spoke at the conference to convene the constituent congress of the Tatar-Bashkir Republic and criticized the activities of the Tatar, Bashkir and Kazakh national councils. In general, according to Stalin, the Turkic-Muslim peoples were unworthy of «independent action» and they could not exercise their power independently of the Bolsheviks. Autonomous republics were needed, including the Tatar-Bashkir Republic under the central authority in Moscow. During the discussion, M. Vakhitov, K. Yakubov and G. Ibragimov made a speech and supported Stalin's criticism, being one of the authors of the project [21]. The Soviet government publicly advocated the establishment of a Tatar-Bashkir republic and on July 3, 1918, declared to the «laboring Tatars and Bashkirs»: «Do not separate! Tatars and Bashkirs together strengthen unity and save the sacred red banner! We are well aware that there are differences geographically, as well as in everyday relations. But these differences should not hinder the establishment of the republic and our unity. We are trying our best to understand each other» [22]. In fact, the project of creating a Tatar-Bashkir republic was a propaganda move of the Bolsheviks and pursued other goals. In April 1918, the project played a decisive role in destroying the national organizations of the Tatars and Bashkirs, thus fulfilling its mission and making this republic unnecessary for the Bolsheviks. The project was rejected at a special meeting of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, held in Moscow from May 10 to 17, 1918, dedicated to the Tatar-Bashkir Republic. The civil war, which began in the summer of 1918, removed this question from the agenda. The opportunity to proclaim the Tatar-Bashkir Republic was sent. The world revolution did not materialize,

as the Bolsheviks thought, they set themselves the task of destroying the national interests of the people, preserving the central power as much as possible. It laid the foundation for socialist construction, determined the further development of the ideology of Bolshevism, and relentlessly pursued the domination of class consciousness over national interests.

By 1917, Jadidism had turned from the Enlightenment into a political movement. In 1917, the All-Turkestan Congress of Muslims was held four times. At the First Congress, held in Tashkent on April 16-23, 1917, the idea of creating Turkestan autonomy within white «democratic» Russia was on the agenda. In the same year, «Shuroy-Ulama Muslim autonomy» was proposed to be created, but the Jadidists evaluated this idea as utopian and anti-national. A. Fitrat, the head of the Hurriyat newspaper, called on the Jadidis, Kadims, mullahs and the rich to unite «in the name of God, religion, homeland and nation», disregarding long-standing «class divisions». [23]. This idea was the first step towards the restoration of national statehood of the Turkestan peoples. At the last session of the Congress, the central governing body decided to create the Turkestan Regional Council of Muslims (Kraimussovet). Its formation included unification of unrelated Muslim societies, committees and unions in order to give an organized character to the national movement. M. Shokai was elected chairman of the Criminal Council, Zeki Velidi Togan was elected secretary, Munawwar Qari, Mahmudkhodja Behbudiy, Abidjan Mahmudov, Ubaidullahodja Asadullahodjaev, Tashpulatbek Narbutabekov, Islam Shakhmedov and others were elected members of the board [24].

The Tashkent Committee was established under the leadership of Munawwar Qari and Sadriddinhan Efandi. The Samarkand Division led by Mahmudkhodja Behbudiy and the Fergana Division led by Nasyrkhan Tur were formed. The official publishing organ of the Criminal Council was the political activities of the newspaper «Nejat», edited by Munawwar Qari, and later the newspaper «Kengesh», edited by Zeki Velidi Togan [25]. However, disagreements between the Jadids and the «ordinary» clergy, which lasted for a long time

from the beginning of the 20th century, caused a split in the national-democratic movement. On March 14, 1917, the «Shurai Islamiyya» was established in Tashkent, and Munawwar Qari's place in its service was very prestigious. The process of organizational division was manifested by the departure of religious figures and their supporters from the Shurai Islamiyya, and in June 1917 the Shurai Ulyama (Spiritual Council) was established, whose branch in Tashkent was founded by S. Lapin. Soon the «Shurai Ulyama» started working in the city of Kokan. Due to ideological differences between the two organizations about the future political structure of the state, it did not allow them to come to an agreement. Although the «Shurai Ulyama» declared in its program to carry out activities in accordance with Islamic tradition, the Tashkent ulema led by S. Lapin tried to coordinate their actions, first of all, with the ideas of the Russian monarchists and then the Bolsheviks. In order to propagandize their ideas, the Shuroi Ulyama began to publish the journal *Al-Izakh*, whose editorial board was headed by Abdymalik Khoja Nabiyev [26]. M. Shokai, who became a victim of the ideological struggle between the two organizations thus created, later expressed his opinion in his memoirs: «The contradictions between Shurai Ulyama and Shurai Islamiyya weakened our common movement and disrupted our actions. On the other hand, the political program of the «Ulyamas» gave us a weapon against...the enemies of the national movement» [27].

On September 10-11, 1917, the 2nd Muslim regional congress convened on the initiative of «Shurai Islamiyya» was held in Tashkent. In a resolution on the essence of republican power, «the congress declared that it was against the transfer of power to the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies and wanted it to be established on a national basis». Moreover, in the additional resolutions adopted, the national democracy for the first time firmly stated the basic principles of their position. Their demands are concrete and aimed at protecting the interests of the Turkic-Muslim peoples as symbols of statehood: «Muslims can and should participate in regional government only if their (Bolshevik) policy is democratic and their interests are taken into account as the majority of the population of the region;

The priority for the people of Turkestan is the right to free self-government; Kraymussovet, a legitimate all-Muslim body acting on behalf of the entire Muslim population and protecting its interests» [28] For three days, that is, from September 17 to 20, 1917, the congress of Turkic-Muslim peoples of Turkestan worked. Despite long heated disputes between the ulema and Shurai Islamists, the congress reached a compromise and made important decisions for the region. Having united «Shurai Islamiyya», «Turan», «Shurai Ulyama», it was decided to create a single political party called «Ittifaki Muslimin» (Union of Muslims) for all Turkestan and Kazakhstan. The main thing in the work of the congress was to clarify the issue of the future political organization of the Turkestan region. The congress decided to create «Turkestan Mukhtariyat» under the name «Union Republic of Turkestan» and defined the basic principles and norms of the future state structure on the basis of a parliamentary republic [29].

The establishment of political parties and the adoption of their program documents testify to the fact that the national movement in Turkestan acquired a wide scope. However, the revolution of 1917 in Petrograd and the events of October-November, particularly in Tashkent and Kokan, led the national liberation movement in a different direction. From November 26 to 28, 1917, the IV extraordinary regional congress of Muslims worked in the city of Kokan. Its resolution stated that «expressing the will of the peoples living in Turkestan to self-government on the principles proclaimed by the Russian Revolution, Turkestan is declared autonomous within the Russian Federation and ensures the establishment of the form of autonomy at the constituent assembly of Turkestan» [30]. Thus, the official state body, which appeared on November 28 (December 11), 1917, was given the name «Turkestan Mukhtariyat». The Congress determined the structure of power. According to it, until the convening of the Constituent Assembly, all power would be in the hands of the Turkestan Provisional Council and the Turkestan People's Assembly. The congress formed the government of the Turkestan Mukhtariyat, which included 8 members of the Turkestan Provisional Council.

M. Tynyshbaev was elected Prime Minister, and I.S. Shayakhmetov became his deputy and M. Shokai became Minister of Internal Affairs. Subsequently, a number of changes were made in the government, and M. Shokai became Prime Minister [31].

Soon the laws passed by the «National Assembly» were published. The new government invited leading lawyers to draft the state constitution. The newspapers «El Bayragy», «Birlik Tui», «Erkin Turkestan» and news of the Provisional Government of independent Turkestan began to be published in Uzbek, Russian and Kazakh languages. Thus, the concept of «nation» rose from the ethnic level to a new level. On April 30, 1917. «Ulyk Turkestan» printed «Let the division between Tatars, Sarts and Kazakhs be abolished! Let Islam and Turkism do it! Let us create a common Turkish language for all!» fiery slogans rang out [32]. At that time, nation-building was not on the agenda of either the Bolsheviks or the national-democrats of Turkestan; there is every reason to say that the basis of inter-ethnic ethnic construction, which became the «Turkestan Mukhtariyat», was forming itself as a «nation-state». The newspaper «Ulyk Turkestan» in its publications tried to emphasize the activities of the independent government. O. Makhmudov's private printing house was handed over to the state. The national army began to form. At the beginning of 1918 it had about one thousand soldiers, later its number reached two thousand. The government decided to provide a loan of 30 million rubles. These funds were intended to provide some internal expenses, to maintain the army, and to publish newspapers. To help the victims of famine in Turkestan, grain supplies were organized through Orinbor [33].

Having sensed an attempt to break free from Russian influence in the Turkestan region, the Bolsheviks could no longer stop the will of the people. In this connection the question of the «Turkestan Mukhtariyat» was brought to the attention of the participants of the 1st Extraordinary Congress of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, held in the city of Kokan on December 26-30 of the 1918 (January 8-12 of the 1918). Among the participants of the congress the representative

of the Bolshevik Party, commissar of the region P. Poltoratsky called the autonomy «autonomous». Poltoratsky called the autonomy «bai» (belonging to the rich). The congress adopted a resolution to support the government of the Turkestan Mukhtariyat and to express no confidence in the Council of People's Commissars of the Turkestan region. However, the first democratic government in the region did not last long. The Bolsheviks of the Tashkent Soviet began to feel a great danger. M. Shokai states about it in his memoirs. According to him, after his appointment as commissar of the Provisional Government in the Torgai region and before his departure from Petrograd to Orinbor, A. Bokeykhan sent M. Shokai to find out the true intentions of the Bolsheviks with regard to the colonial regions, and most importantly, the future of the creation of national autonomy in the former colonial lands. M. Shokai describes this moment as follows: «Before leaving Petersburg for Turkestan, in early April 1917, I met N.S., chairman of the executive committee of the Petersburg Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which had weight at the all-Russian level. I met Chkheidze and returned. At that time this trip became obligatory. The policy of the Provisional Government was determined by the St. Petersburg Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Georgian origin and leader of the Social Democratic faction of the IV State Duma N.S. Chkheidze rose in the vanguard of Russian revolutionary democracy in the early days of the revolution, serving as chairman of the executive committee of the St. Petersburg Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, and rose to the rank of Prime Minister of the Russian Federation. Revolution. To be honest, we were talking about Turkestan. N.S. To Chkheidze's question about the nature of our future work, I replied: «We are looking for a way to create an autonomous system for Turkestan, so our work will be preparation for autonomy». Chkheidze was frightened by my answer and replied: «For God's sake, Comrade Shokaev, do not talk about autonomy among your compatriots. First of all, it is too early to talk about it, and secondly, autonomy in a country like your Turkestan leads to independence and separatism». I said: «We are not going to declare autonomy or demand

autonomy in a hurry. We are waiting for the Constituent Assembly. In the meantime, before the Constituent Assembly, we consider it necessary to prepare the country and the people for this Autonomy. «As for your fears, while sincerely maintaining the slogans about the transition of autonomy to independence, about the freedom of peoples proclaimed by the revolutionary democracy of Russia for decades, these fears are groundless,» I replied. N.S. Chkheidze disagreed with my answer and demanded that we refuse to raise the question of autonomy: «Revolutionary and democratic Russia will give equal rights to all peoples living in it, taking into account all national peculiarities». Thus, «in Turkestan autonomy, where there is no Russian influence, people with completely different culture, blood, language and religion will quickly turn to separatism» [34].

The Bolsheviks began to act quickly, trying not to give independence to the Turkic-Muslim peoples of Turkestan. One of the main issues on the agenda of the IV Extraordinary Regional Congress of Turkestan Soviets, held on January 19-26 (February 1-8), 1918, was the autonomy of Turkestan. The chairman of the Tashkent Soviet I. Tobolin, who spoke at the congress on behalf of the Bolshevik faction, stated: «It is impossible now to talk about granting independence. The first condition for autonomy is the withdrawal of troops from the region» he said [35]. The congress decided to «declare the government of the Turkestan Mukhtariyat (Kokan autonomy) and its members illegal and arrest them». Three days later, on January 30 (February 12), the GKK in Turkestan began preparations to overthrow the autonomous government. For this purpose, the Red Guard and the armed forces of the Armenian party «Dashnaksutyun» were involved.

Information about this was also reflected in the newspaper «Turkestanskije Vedomosti», published in 1917. I. Tobolin, the poet pointed out the methods of the Bolsheviks not to give autonomy to Turkestan, claiming to protect the working population. He stated: «Supporting every movement of the local inhabitants towards self-government and independence, the Council of People's Commissars will in no way allow the free expression of the will

of the people to be distorted. To this end, the Council of People's Commissars has issued a decree on the self-government of peoples in order to prevent predators from robbing the proletarian Muslim masses» [36].

Thus, using the slogans of «nationalism», «feudal-bourgeois threat», the Bolshevik leadership tried to prevent the growth of national consciousness of the Turkic-Muslim peoples by the tried and tested means of lies, distortions and class resistance. Accordingly, in June 1918, Stalin, in his speech on national policy in the Turkic-Muslim areas of the RCP(b) of Russia, said: «Autonomy is a form. All that matters is what class content is included in this form. The Soviets allow autonomy only when all power is in the hands of the workers and peasants» [37]. Thus, a powerful propaganda work against «Turkestan Mukhtariyat» was used. The organs of the «socialist» government tried to discredit the «enemies of the working class» as much as possible and turned against them. Contrary to their propaganda work, the leaders of Turkestan Mukhtariyat tried to expand their social base and legitimize the established power by obtaining a mandate from the people. At the same time, it considered ways to reach a compromise with regional authorities. The First Extraordinary Congress of Workers, Peasants and Muslim Warriors of Turkestan, held on December 26 in the city of Kokan, is proof of this. The regional authorities tried to negatively influence the congress. By decision of the Council of People's Commissars, labor commissioners P. Poltoratsky and V. Samoilenko and tried to uncover the «exploitative» character of those who were organizing the movement for national autonomy in the usual aggressive manner, and to compare the principles of Soviet autonomy with their «bourgeois-nationalist» plans. However, he failed to take into account that those present at the congress were an angry mass of social workers and soldiers who had secured the armed coup in Tashkent. They were all fed up with the promises of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. At this congress, the national idea was combined with the idea of ethnic and religious unity rather than a social sense of superiority. That is why P. Poltoratsky's speech had no effect on the population [38]. Kurdistan decided to support the government

of «Turkestan Mukhtariyatyn». On the same day, a telegram was dispatched to V. Lenin: «We ask you, as the supreme authority of the Russian Democratic Republic, to transfer regional power to the Turkestan Autonomous Provisional Government in order to prevent anarchy and dual power, which could lead to the biggest disaster of Turkestan» [39].

In support of the Turkestan Mukhtariati, this was reflected in the decision of the 1st All-Kazakh Congress held in Orinbor, July 21-26, 1917. According to this, in the memoirs of Zaki Validi Togan, who was a witness and one of the participants in the creation of the Turkestan Mukhtariati, he mentioned that the initiative to create the Turkestan Mukhtariati was put forward not in Tashkent and Kokand, but in the residence of the head of the Provisional Government of the Torgai region A. Bokeykhan in Orinbor [40]. Zaki Validi Togan, who participated in the creation of the Mukhtariat or came to share his experience, and Azerbaijani figure A. Amin-Zadeh can be especially noted. «After the seizure of central power in Petrograd on October 25 (November 7, current style) 1917, and then on October 26, power in the city of Ufa passed into the hands of the Soviet authorities, on October 28, «The Tatar-Bashkur military council of Ufa province also moved to the side of the Bolsheviks» – Zaki Validi Togan noted in his memoirs. Later, the Bolsheviks easily gained power in the Syrdarya and Zhetysu regions. The seizure of power by the Bolsheviks in Ufa and Turkestan forced the «Alash» Kazakh intelligentsia to take urgent and decisive action. Due to the real danger of dragging the Great Kazakh Steppe into the abyss of civil war, accordingly, it was possible to cancel the plan to create the Alash autonomy. Basically, the Alash intelligentsia planned to declare the territory of the future autonomous state, the number of regions that passed into the hands of the Soviet power consisted of 9 regions inhabited by the indigenous Kazakh people, Astrakhan province and a number of places in the Altai province [41]. The Kazakh intelligentsia was especially concerned about the state of Turkestan, which was in the hands of the Soviet power in the south of the future Alash autonomy. In this regard, the leader of Kazakhs A. Bokeykhan in the last days

of October 1917 urgently gathered his close associates to his residence in Orinbor, Zaki Validi Togan wrote about it in his memoirs. After that, A. Bokeykhan says that M. Shokai decided to stay in Orinbor due to the transition of power in Tashkent to the Soviet government. During the meeting, A. Bokeykhan decided to leave Zaki Validi Togan for a while with Bashkir affairs and go to Tashkent with M. Shokai [42]. It should be noted that Zaki Validi Togan reports in his memoirs that after an emergency meeting at the residence of Torgai district commissar M. Tynyshbayuly, A. Orazayuly and others together with M. Shokai went to Tashkent and then to the city of Kokan. There is every reason to believe that N. Torekululy, who served in the Torgai District Committee in Orynbor before the October Bolshevik coup in Petrograd, also participated in this meeting. The discussion of the situation in Turkestan at the residence of A. Bokeykhan lasted two days and largely determined the future course of action of the Alash leaders. Zaki Validi Togan reported that at this meeting he «decided to be faithful to the ideas of democracy and the Constituent Assembly, not to recognize the Bolsheviks, to attract the attention of Ukraine, to pursue a policy of regional autonomous independence, and to convene a Kazakh-Bashkir congress in Orinbor at the end of December and take the path of struggle for the independence of Turkestan». From here we can conclude that the decision to create «Turkestan Mukhtariyat», referred to in Soviet historiography as «Kokan autonomy», was made at an emergency meeting held in Orynbor in late October-early November 1917 under the leadership of A. Bokeykhan. At that time, A. Bokeykhan continued to serve as a commissar of the deposed Provisional Government. Therefore, the leaders of the movement «Turkestan Mukhtariyat» and the leaders of the Alash party together waged their struggle for independence, so «the Turkestan region also embarked on the path of struggle for independence».

As for Turkestan itself, the colonial character of the Bolshevik power in the southern regions was clearly manifested at the III Oblast Congress held in Tashkent

on November 15-22, 1917. Here the Soviet autonomy of Turkestan was proclaimed, but representatives of the Turkic-Muslim peoples were removed from power on the pretext that they were «not ready» for the proletarian revolution. The armed forces suppressed the discontent of the Kazakh and Uzbek populations. Against this background, on November 26 of the same year, in pursuance of the decision of the emergency meeting in Orynbor, the IV Extraordinary Turkestan Regional Congress was organized by members of the «Alash» movement and party members M. Tynyshbayuly, M. Shokai, A. Orazayuly and others began their work. Here is what is written in the resolution of this historic congress: «The IV Extraordinary Turkestan Congress, expressing the will of the peoples living in Turkestan to self-government on the principles proclaimed by the Russian Revolution, declared Turkestan territorially and territorially autonomous in unity with the Russian Federation. The formation of the structure of autonomy is proposed to the Turkestan Constituent Assembly, which should be convened as soon as possible. The Congress solemnly declares that the rights of national minorities living in Turkestan will be fully protected» [43]. In other words, by creating the «Turkestan Mukhtariyat» opposing the Bolshevik government in Tashkent, Alash leaders equalized the situation in Turkestan, and for the proper formation of the Autonomy Alash immediately decided to organize the III All-Kazakh Constitution, the date of convocation of which remained unknown, instead of the All-Russian Constituent Assembly [44]. Therefore, we can conclude that the arguments of some researchers that M. Shokai supported the idea of unification of Turkic peoples and that such an approach to the future of Turkestan contradicts the position of the Alash movement, which advocated the creation of a separate national autonomy as an integral part of the future democratic Russia, namely the Kazakh autonomy, are untenable. There is every reason to believe that there were no contradictions in the opinions of the leader of the Alash movement A. Bokeykhan and M. Shokai. The idea of unification of Turkic-Muslim peoples appeared in 1905-1907, and after the February Revolution of

1917 an attempt was made to realize it. The program of the «Alash» party mentioned the possibility of creating a single autonomy with other related peoples. In the second article of the program it is written: «If possible, it is necessary to create a Kazakh autonomy together with other related peoples or, in other cases, to create an independent autonomy» [45]. In this regard, the concept of «Alash» is broader than the concept of «Kazakhstan» and includes both the Kyrgyz-Kazakhs themselves and the related Karakalpaks», said M. Shokai himself in his article entitled «Kyrgyz Soviet Republic» published in the Georgian newspaper «Svobodny Gorets». Moreover, in 1918 the leaders of Alash and Bashkortostan agreed to create a single Kazakh-Bashkir state. In connection with this incident the chairman of Alash-Orda A. Bokeykhan gave the following explanation to the investigator of the OGPU-NKVD on August 6, 1937: «In September 1918 in Ufa there was a meeting between the government of Alash-Orda and representatives of the anti-revolutionary Bashkir government. At this meeting we agreed on the creation of a unified Kazakh-Bashkir state. The necessity of taking such a decision stemmed from the following considerations. First, it was necessary to unite our armed forces to fight against the Soviet system. Secondly, the territory is contiguous and many Kazakhs live in Bashkortostan. Thirdly, the efficiency of uniting the economies of Kazakhstan and Bashkortostan. Bashkir ore, timber and Kazakh bread, cattle and butter. Based on these considerations, we believed that by uniting we could create a strong state militarily and economically» [46].

At the «state meeting» held in Ufa in September 1918, the question of creating a «Federation of South-Eastern Muslim Regions» was not limited to the leaders of Alash and Bashkortostan. The leaders of Tatarstan and M. Shokai of Turkestan were present at this meeting. Zaki Walidi Togan in his memoirs published in Turkey said: «When it came to the question of the proposed name of the future state, Yusuf Akshora advised that it should be called the Federation of Eastern Turks». A. Bokeyhan, in turn, made a correction: «we should avoid names that give Russians a reason to call us pan-Turkism, such a name

may be adopted in the future, but now we should limit ourselves to «Muslim Federation of Eastern Russia» [47].

The main directions of activity of the Alash-Orda government were determined by the program of the Alash party, published in the newspaper «Kazakh» in November 1917. There, the leaders of the Kazakh national liberation movement clearly raised the issue of declaring Russia a democratic federal republic and, accordingly, granting state autonomy to the Kazakh people within the framework of this federation. [48].

The anti-colonial and anti-repressive nature of the program was especially evident in the sections «Fundamental Rights» and «Education in Science and Knowledge». Here it was stated that all citizens of the Russian Federation have the same equal rights, regardless of religion, nationality and race. The leaders of the movement believe that class differentiation, which has developed in Kazakh society due to certain conditions, is imperfect, for example, in Russian society. At the same time, Kazakh society, which was on the rise of the national liberation movement, paid more attention to the grouping of national forces than to confrontation on the basis of class differences and interests. Thus, the program of the «Alash» party is devoted to the creation of a new socio-political and economic order in Kazakhstan, the necessary prerequisites for social transformation, ensuring the full participation of all social spheres [49]. The Alash movement is not an underdeveloped phenomenon, as Soviet ideology tried to present it. It is a national liberation movement of the Kazakh people for their freedom and independence, Kazakh intellectuals fought to preserve their identity. Hence, the topic of Alash should be avoided from political and scientific conclusions from the point of view of rational thinking.

Alash-Orda's plans included the creation of territorial-national autonomy on the territory of the Bokei Horde, Akmola, Transcaspian, Ural, Semey, Torgai and Syr Darya provinces, Kazakh counties in Fergana, Samarkand, Amu Darya subdivisions bordering the Kazakh bolas of Altai province. The leaders

of Alash-Orda considered federation to be the optimal form of national-state structure. A. Bokeykhan considered himself a «westerner», opposed separatism, and wanted to unite with «the great democratic federative Russia». Having achieved independence, he demanded partition in the form of autonomy. The government of the Alash Horde consisted of 25 commissioners, 15 of whom were Kazakhs. 8 of the 15 members had higher legal education, 4 were elected deputies of the State Duma. 5 members of the Alash Orda, including A. Bokeykhanov, M. Shokai, M. Tynyshbaev and others, held positions of commissioners of the Provisional Government. A. Bokeykhanov and M. Tynyshbaev were members of the Extraordinary Commission of the Provisional Government of the Turkestan region, and both had professional experience in the judicial system. Among the commissioners and candidates of the Alash Orda were an orientalist, a railway engineer, a military doctor, an agronomist, a forest scientist, a mathematician and other highly qualified personnel. All 15 members of the Alash Orda were elected to the Constituent Assembly [50]. The supreme body of the Alash Horde was the Provisional People's Council, with A. Bokeykhanov elected chairman. The Alash Constitution had to be approved by the All-Russian Constituent Assembly.

On December 5-13, 1917, at the All-Kazakh Congress held in Orinbor, M. Shokai announced the creation of the Turkestan Autonomous Oblast. Federalism did not separate it from the Alash autonomy. M. Shokai considered it necessary to include the Alash-Ordyn autonomy of Turkestan. In the discussions on federalism and autonomy A. Bokeykhanov advocated mutual cooperation of Turkic-Muslim peoples. However, he was suspicious of the conservative religious traditions of Central Asia, which turned into fanaticism. At the same time, Bokeykhan considered it important to avoid direct conflict with the Soviet regime, when «the entire body of the Russian state was infected with Bolshevism like an epidemic» and its destructive power had reached its peak. In his words, this «leads the Kazakh people to

bloodshed ... and opens up the possibility of disgracing Kazakh society, spreading the ideas of Bolshevism locally, creating differentiation in society and thus destroying the foundations and traditions of our national life, which have been formed over centuries». [51].

The Turkic-Muslim political elite of Turkestan relied on the hopes of the indigenous population and the masses instead of preparing in advance a program for the establishment of the Turkestan Mukhtariat. Moreover, the promises made by the Bolsheviks convinced the Turkic-Muslim peoples of Turkestan. All the political zeal of the Turkestan people, i.e., the «desire for rapid change», was an obstacle to taking concrete steps toward independence. The ethno-political institutions of the party tried to bring the representatives of the working class as close as possible to the local population, agitation activities were mobilized with all their strength. The finances of the Turkestan national liberation movement were too limited, and the armed forces were unable to come forward in an organized manner. The boundaries of the mukhtariat were not defined in the documents of the political intelligentsia of Turkestan. In this context, the Bashkir-Tatar, Alash, and Caucasian provinces could not lead a systematic movement together with Turkestanis.

In September 1918, the leaders of Turkestan and Alash unanimously spoke at the state assembly held in Ufa. The delegations of Alash-Orda and Turkestan autonomy were headed by A. Bokeykhanov and M. Shokai. Most of the participants of the rally were supporters of «democracy» and opponents of dictatorship. They were joined by delegates from the Alash Orda. In his speech on September 12, A.Bokeykhanov said: «I want to speak on behalf of the national organizations and say that they have nothing to do with separatism, they are sure that they will be part of a united Russia, autonomous regions cannot take any role in the games of world powers. We are united with the democratic federal republic of Russia, we consider ourselves part of the united Russia» [52].

Conclusion

In the early 20th century, the Alash movement, which united the political forces of the Kazakh people, not only created a program of modernization of the country, but also proposed the idea of autonomy as the first step to future independence. At the same time, it united with the intelligentsia of Turkic-Muslim peoples, established cooperation and supported the idea of self-government of the peoples. In the harsh conditions of the revolutionary turmoil and civil war, the Alashordians politically, economically and culturally supported the idea of autonomy in the Volga-Ural, Caucasus and Turkestan regions, and fought against the Turkic-Muslim peoples.

Starting with the religious component and even putting it in the middle of its structure, the «Turkish version» of federalism turned into an ethno-cultural version of autonomy, which was influenced not only by circumstances but also by the interests of its elites. For the head of the Central Committee I. Stalin, S. Maksudi's idea of «Turkism» and union on the basis of Islam, Zaki Validi Togan's demand for «loyalty to the federation», M. Shokai's «Turkestan Mukhtariyat» and A. Bokeykhan's «Alash Orda» were equally rejected. It was based on the fact that the true attitude of the Bolsheviks to the question of self-government of nations was completely different from that expressed in party slogans. As it was said at a meeting of the Central Committee of the RSDLP in August 1913, i.e. before the 1917 revolution, «the question of the right of nations to self-government should not be confused with the secession of one nation». National self-consciousness and identity were viewed by the Bolsheviks through class (class) theory, and those who did not belong to the social class of workers were categorized as «unsuitable class» or «parasitic» elements. Thus, the «working class» continued to root colonial policies of the Russian Empire through social categorization. In essence, the Bolsheviks restructured the Russian Empire as a de-facto union of national republics and within the limits allowed by the terms of foreign policy.

References

1. РФ ӘТМ (Ресей Федерациясы Әскери-тарихи мұрағаты), 17 қ., 86 т., 129 іс, 109-115 пп.
2. РФ ММ, 1788 қ., 2 т., 13 іс, 13-17 пп.
3. Қазақ ұлт-азаттық қозғалысы. Көп томдық М.Қ. Қойгелдиевтің жетекшілігімен. 10-том. Тұтас Түркістан идеясы. – Астана: «Астана полиграфия» АҚ, 2008. 128-132 б.
4. Шоқай М. Шығармалары толық жинағы: XII томдық. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2012.
5. Революция и национальный вопрос. – М., 1930. Т. 3. – С. 294-296.
6. Наша трибуна. Сборник 1. – М., 1917. – С. 67–68.
7. Национальный вопрос в программных документах политических партий, организаций и движений России. Начало XX в. Учебное пособие. – Издательство Томского университета, 2016. – С. 215-225.
8. Давлетшин Т. Советский Татарстан. – Лондон, 1974. – С.73.
9. Яна милли юл (Новый национальный путь) / Редактор Г.Исхаки. – Варшава-Берлин, 1937, №5. – С.1-3.
10. Исхаки Г. Идель-Урал. – Казань, 1991. – С. 48-52.
11. Айда А. Садри Максуди Арсал. – М., 1996. – С.113–118.
12. Исхаков С. Российские мусульмане и революция 1917-1918. – М., 2004. – С. 240-247.
13. Тагиров И.Р. История национальной государственности татарского народа и Татарстана. – Казань, 2000. – С. 180-182.
14. Кириллов А. К вопросу создания Уральской республики // Уральский федеральный округ. 2013. № 7–9 (Август-октябрь). – С. 44–45.
15. Мухетдинов Д.В. Из прошлого религиозного мусульманского образования на Нижегородчине в XVIII – начале XX вв. – Нижний Новгород: Махинур, 2004. – С. 120.
16. Грасис К. К национальному вопросу. Сборник статей. – Казань, 1918. – С.1-7.
17. Чугаев Д.А. Коммунистическая партия – организатор Союза Советских Социалистических Республик. – М., 1972. – С. 140–149.
18. Тагиров И.Р. История национальной государственности татарского народа и Татарстана. – Казань, 2000. – С. 179-186.
19. Ямаева Л. А. Мусульманский либерализм начала XX века как общественно-политическое движение. – Уфа: Гилем, 2002. – 300 с.
20. Заки Валиди Тоған. Воспоминания. Кн. 1. – Уфа: Китап, 1994. – 400 с.
21. Коммунистическая партия Советского Союза в резолюциях и решениях съездов, конференций и пленумов ЦК. – М.: Политиздат, 1984. – Т.3. – 494 с.
22. Бажанов Б. Кремль, 20-е годы: Воспоминания бывшего секретаря Сталина // Огонек. – М., 1989. – № 38.
23. Литвинов П.П. Антитатарская политика царизма в Средней Азии и Казахстане // Материалы по истории татарского народа. – Казань, 1995. – С. 375-379.
24. РФ ММ (Ресей Федерациясы Мемлекеттік мұрағаты), 1916 қ., 365 т., 300 іс, 301-34 пп.
25. РФ ММ, 461 қ., 1 т., 417 іс, 127-130 пп.
26. РФ ММ, 1358 қ., 3 т., 45 іс, 11-13 пп.
27. РФ ММ, 461 қ., 1 т., 385 іс, 155-159 пп.
28. РФ ММ, 461 қ., 1 т., 416 іс, 93-97 пп.
29. РФ ММ, 1358 қ., 3 т., 456 іс, 10-15 пп.
30. РФ ММ, 1318 қ., 1 т., 440 іс, 5-8 пп.
31. ӨР ОММ (Өзбекстан Республикасы Орталық Мемлекеттік мұрағаты), 17 қ., 1 т., 336 іс, 341-345 пп.
32. Туркестан в начале XX века: К истории истоков национальной независимости. – Ташкент, 2000.
33. Улуг Туркистон. – 1918, 4 января.
34. М. Шоқай. Избранное (в 2-х томах). – Алматы: Кайнар, 1998. – С. 4-11.
35. РФ ММ, 406 қ., 7 т., 324 іс, 15-27 пп.
36. Туркестанские ведомости. – 1917, 6 декабря.
37. РФ ӘТМ, 71 қ., 34 т., 1632 іс, 31-33 пп.
38. За советский Туркестан. (Сборник воспоминаний) – Т., 1963. – С. 79-85.
39. Алексеенко П. Кокандская автономия. – Т., 1931. – С. 29-30.

40. Zeki Velidi Togan, *Natıraları*. – Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2019. – 612 s.
41. РФ ММ, 461 қ., 1 т., 385 іс, 155-161 пп.
42. Абдуллаев Р. Хроника противостояния // *Звезда Востока*. – 1995, № 1112. – С.201.
43. Аккулы Султан-Хан. Алихан Букейхан. Т.1. Творец истории. Т.2. Завещание. – Шымкент, 2016.
44. РФ ММ, 7 қ., 2 т., 466 іс, 56-59 пп.
45. РФ ММ, 110 қ., 2 т., 530 іс, 12-13 пп.
46. РФ ОММ (Ресей Федерациясы Орталық мемлекеттік мұрағаты), 51 қор, Р-34862 іс, 225–237 пп.
47. РФ ММ, 110 қ., 2 т., 531 іс, 83-87 пп.
48. Алаш қозғалысы / *Движение Алаш*. Сборник документов и материалов. – Алматы: Алаш, 2004. – Т. 1. – С. 429-451.
49. Бочаров А.К. Алаш-Орда. Краткий исторический очерк. – Кзыл- Орда. Казгосиздат, 1927.
50. Кенжетаев Б.А. Казанские учебные заведения и процесс формирования казахской интеллигенции в середине XIX - начале XX вв. – Издательский дом «Пиф», 1998. – С. 85-89.
51. Аманжолова Д. На изломе. Алаш в этнополитической истории Казахстана. – Алматы: Таймас, 2009. – 412 с.
52. РФ ММ, 670 қ., 1 т., 1 іс, 29-31 пп.

А.М. Азмұханова¹, М.Ш. Эгамбердиев²

¹*Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан*

²*Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ Ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан*

XX ғасырдың бірінші жартысында түркі халықтары ынтымақтастығын ұлттық автономиялар шеңберінде зерттеудің мәселелері

Аңдатпа. XX ғасырдың бірінші жартысы түркі-мұсылман халықтары үшін маңызды саяси-әлеуметтік өзгерістер кезеңі болып саналады. Революциялық қайта құрулардан кейін түркі-мұсылман халықтары Ресей империясының отарлау саясатының жаңа большевиктік кезеңіне қарамастан, өздерінің ұлттық болмысын сақтай алды. Соның нәтижесінде ұлттық автономиялар құрыла бастады, олардың аясында түркі-мұсылман халықтарының бірігу процесі жүрді. Олардың идеологиялық көзқарастарына Бұхара, Самарқанд, Қазан, Ыстамбұл, Каир медреселерінде білім алған жәдидшілер ықпал етті. Олар Ыстамбұлда болған кезінде жас түріктермен байланысқа түсіп, ұлттық автономиялар құру кезеңінде түркі халықтарының ынтымақтастығына негіз болған тың идеялардың ықпалында еді. Сонымен, бұл мақалада Ресей Федерациясының және Өзбекстан Республикасының Орталық мемлекеттік мұрағатынан алынған деректеріне сүйене отырып, XX ғасырдың бірінші жартысындағы ұлттық автономиялар (Еділ-Орал, Алаш Орда, Түркістан, Шүрө-и-Исламия) құрамындағы түркі халықтарының өзара ынтымақтастығын жан-жақты талдау мақсаты қойылған. Бұл мақсатқа жету үшін дискурстық талдау әдісі мен тарихи салыстырмалы зерттеу әдісін қолдану арқылы Ресей империясының түркі-мұсылман халықтарының интеграциялануының тарихи үдерісін көрсетуге талпыныс жасалған.

Түйін сөздер: Түркі халықтары, ұлттық автономиялар, ынтымақтастық, Ресей империясы, түркі зиялылары.

А.М. Азмұханова¹, М.Ш. Эгамбердиев²

¹*Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан*

²*Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан*

Проблемы исследования сотрудничества тюркских народов в первой половине XX века в рамках национальных автономий

Аннотация. Первая половина XX века стала для тюрко-мусульманских народов периодом значительных политических и социальных изменений. После революционных преобразований тюрко-мусульманские народы несмотря на новый большевистский этап колониальной политики

Российской империи смогли сохранить свою самобытность. В результате этого начали создаваться национальные автономии, в рамках которых шел процесс интеграции тюрко-мусульманских народов. На их идейные взгляды повлияли джадиды получившие образование в медресе Бухары, Самарканда, Казани, Стамбула и Каира. Во время своего пребывания в Стамбуле они вступали в контакт с младотурками и находились под влиянием новых идей, что стало основой сотрудничества тюркских народов на этапе создания национальных автономий. Таким образом в данной статье поставлена цель комплексного анализа сотрудничества тюркских народов в рамках национальных автономий первой половины XX века (Итиль-Урал, Алаш Орда, Туркестан, Шуро-и-Исламия) на основе архивных данных Российской Федерации и Центрального государственного архива Республики Узбекистан. Для достижения поставленной цели путем применения метода дискурс-анализа и историко-сопоставительного метода исследования делается попытка освещения исторического процесса интеграции тюрко-мусульманских народов Российской империи.

Ключевые слова: Тюркские народы, национальные автономии, сотрудничество, Российская империя, тюркская интеллигенция.

References

1. МНА РФ (Military Historical Archive of the Russian Federation), 17 fund, 86 inventory, 129 file, 109-115 p. [in Russian].
2. SA RF, 1788 fund, 2 inventory, 13 file, 13-17 p. [in Russian].
3. Qazaq ult-azattyq qozgalysy. Kop tomdyq M.Q. Koigeldiyevtin zhetekshiligimen. 10-tom. Tutas Turkistan ideyasi [Kazakh National Liberation Movement. Multi-volume under the leadership of M.K. Koigeldiev. Volume 10. The idea of a whole Turkestan]. – Astana: «Astana polygrafiya» AQ, 2008. 128-132 p. [in Kazakh]
4. Shoqay M. Shygarmalary tolyq zhinagy: XII tomdyq [Complete collection of the works: XII volumes]. – Almaty: Daik-press, 2012. [in Kazakh].
5. Revolyutsiya i natsionalny vopros [Revolution and national question]. – M., 1930. V. 3. – p. 294-296. [in Russian].
6. Nasha tribuna. Sbornik 1 [Our podium. Compilation 1]. – M., 1917. – P. 67–68. [in Russian].
7. Natsionalny vopros v programnykh dokumentah politicheskikh partii, organizatsii i dvizhenii Rossii. Nachalo XX v. Uchebnoe posobiye [The national question in the program documents of political parties, organizations and movements in Russia. Early 20th century. Study guide]. – Izdatelstvo Tomskogo Universiteta, 2016. – P. 215-225. [in Russian].
8. Davletshin T. Sovetskii Tatarstan [Soviet Tatarstan]. – London, 1974. – P.73 [in Russian]
9. Yana milli yul (Novyi Natsionalny Put) [Yana milli yul (New National Way)] / Redaktor G.Iskhaki. – Varshava-Berlin, 1937, №5. – P.1-3. [in Russian].
10. Iskhaki G. Idel-Ural [Idel-Ural]. – Kazan, 1991. – P. 48-52.
11. Aida A. Sadri Maksudi Arsal [Sadri Maksudi Arsal]. – M., 1996. – P.113–118. [in Russian].
12. Iskhakov S. Rossiiskie musulmane i revolyutsiya 1917-1918 [Russian Muslims and the Revolution 1917-1918]. – M., 2004. – P. 240-247. [in Russian].
13. Tagirov I.R. Istoriia natsionalnoi gosudarstvennosti tatarskogo naroda i Tatarstana [The history of the national statehood of the Tatar people and Tatarstan]. – Kazan, 2000. – P. 180-182. [in Russian].
14. Kirillov A. K voprosu sozdaniia Uralskoi respubliki [On the issue of the creation of the Ural Republic]// Uralskii federalnyi okrug. 2013. № 7–9 (Avgust-oktiabr). – P. 44–45. [in Russian].
15. Mukhetdinov D.V. Iz proshlogo religioznogo musulmanskogo obrazovaniya na Nizhegorodchine v XVIII – nachale XX vv. [From the past religious Muslim education in the Nizhny Novgorod region in the 18th - early 20th centuries] – Nizhnii Novgorod: Mahinur, 2004. – P. 120. [in Russian].
16. Grasis K. K natsionalnomu voprosu. Sbornik statei [Regarding the national question. Compilation of articles]. – Kazan, 1918. – P.1-7. [in Russian].
17. Chugayev D.A. Kommunisticheskaia partiya – organizator Soyuz Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik [The Communist Party is the organizer of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics]. – M., 1972. – P. 140–149. [in Russian].
18. Tagirov I.R. Istoriia natsionalnoi gosudarstvennosti tatarskogo naroda i Tatarstana [The history of the national statehood of the Tatar people and Tatarstan]. – Kazan, 2000. – P. 179-186. [in Russian].

19. Yamayeva L. A. Musul'manskii liberalizm nachala XX veka kak obshestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie [Muslim liberalism of the early 20th century as a socio-political movement]. – Ufa: Gilem, 2002. – 300 p. [in Russian].
20. Zaki Validi Togan. Vospominaniya [Memories]. B. 1. – Ufa: Kitap, 1994. – 400 p. [in Russian].
21. Kommunisticheskaya partiya Sovetskogo Soyuza v rezolyutsiyah i resheniyah syezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK [The Communist Party of the Soviet Union in resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee]. – M.: Politizdat, 1984. – V.3. – 494 p. [in Russian].
22. Bazhanov B. Kreml, 20-e gody: Vospominaniya byvshego sekretarya Stalina [Kremlin, 1920s: Memoirs of Stalin's Former Secretary] // Ogonek. – M., 1989. – № 38.
23. Litvinov P.P. Antitatarskaya politika tsarizma v Srednei Azii i Kazakhstane [Anti-Tatar policy of tsarism in Central Asia and Kazakhstan] // Materiyaly po istorii tatarskogo naroda. – Kazan, 1995. – P. 375-379. [in Russian].
24. SA RF (State Archive of the Russian Federation), 1916 fund, 365 inventory, 300 file, 301-34 p. [in Russian].
25. SA RF, 461 fund, 1 inventory, 417 file, 127-130 p. [in Russian].
26. SA RF, 1358 fund, 3 inventory, 45 file, 11-13 p. [in Russian].
27. SA RF, 461 fund, 1 inventory, 385 file, 155-159 p. [in Russian].
28. SA RF, 461 fund, 1 inventory, 416 file, 93-97 p. [in Russian].
29. SA RF, 1358 fund, 3 inventory, 456 file, 10-15 p. [in Russian].
30. SA RF, 1318 к., 1 inventory, 440 file, 5-8 p. [in Russian].
31. CSA RU (Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan), 17 fund, 1 inventory, 336 file, 341-345 p. [in Russian].
32. Turkestan v nachale XX veka: K istorii istokov natsionalnoi nezavisimosti. [Turkestan at the beginning of the 20th century: On the history of the origins of national independence] – Tashkent, 2000. [in Russian].
33. Ulug Turkiston [Great Turkistan]. – 1918, 4 января. [in Uzbek].
34. M. Shokai. Izbrannoe (v 2-h tomah) [Selected (in 2 volumes)]. – Almaty: Kainar, 1998. – P. 4-11. [in Russian].
35. SA RF, 406 fund, 7 inventory, 324 file, 15-27 p. [in Russian].
36. Turkestanskije Vedomosti [Turkestanskije Vedomosti]. – 1917, 6 dekabrya. [in Russian].
37. MHA RF, 71 fund, 34 inventory, 1632 file, 31-33 p. [in Russian].
38. Za sovetskii Turkestan. (Sbornik vospominanii) [For the Soviet Turkestan. (Collection of memories)] – T., 1963. – P. 79-85. [in Russian].
39. Alekseenko P. Kokandskaya avtonomiya [Kokand autonomy]. – T., 1931. – P. 29-30. [in Russian].
40. Zeki Velidi Togan, Hatıraları. – Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları [Memories. – Diyanet Foundation Publications], 2019. – 612 p. [in Turkish].
41. SA RF, 461 fund, 1 inventory, 385 file, 155-161 p. [in Russian].
42. Abdullayev R. Khronika protivostoyaniya [Chronicle of confrontation] // Zvezda Vostoka. – 1995, № 1112. – P.201. [in Russian].
43. Akkuly Sultan-Khan. Alikhan Bukeikhan. T.1. Tvorets istorii. T.2. Zaveshaniye. [Alikhan Bukeikhan. V.1. History maker. V.2. Bequest] – Шымкент, 2016. [in Russian].
44. SA RF, 7 fund, 2 inventory, 466 file, 56-59 p. [in Russian].
45. SA RF, 110 fund, 2 inventory, 530 file, 12-13 p. [in Russian].
46. CSA RF (Central State Archive of the Russian Federation), 51 қор, P-34862 file, 225–237 p. [in Russian].
47. SA RF, 110 fund, 2 inventory, 531 file, 83-87 p. [in Russian].
48. Alash qozgalysy / Dvizhenie Alash. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov [Alash Movement. Collection of documents and materials]. – Almaty: Alash, 2004. – V. 1. – P. 429-451. [in Kazakh].
49. Bocharov A.K. Alash-Orda. Kratkii istoricheskii ocherk [Alash-Orda. Brief historical outline]. – Kzyl-Orda. Kazgosizdat, 1927. [in Russian].
50. Kenzhetayev B.A. Kazanskije uchebnye zavedeniya i protsess formirovaniya kazakhskoi intelligentsii v seredine XIX - nachale XX vv. [Kazan educational institutions and the process of formation of the Kazakh intelligentsia in the middle of the 19th - early 20th centuries.] – Izdatelskii dom «Pif», 1998. – P. 85-89. [in Russian].
51. Amazholova D. Na izlome. Alash v etnopoliticheskoi istorii Kazakhstana [At the break. Alash in the ethnopolitical history of Kazakhstan]. – Алматы: Таймас, 2009. – 412 с. [in Russian].
52. SA RF, 670 fund, 1 inventory, 1 file, 29-31 p. [in Russian].

Information about the authors:

Azmukhanova Aiman Maksutovna – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Oriental Studies, Faculty of International Relations, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.

Egamberdiyev Mirzahan Sharipbaiuly – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor Dr., Department of TURKSOY, Faculty of Oriental Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Азмұханова Айман Махсұтқызы – т.ғ.к, қауымдастырылған профессор (доцент), Шығыстану кафедрасы, Халықаралық қатынастар факультеті, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан.

Эгамбердиев Мырзахан Шарипбайұлы – т.ғ.к, қауымдастырылған профессор (доцент), ТҮРІКСОЙ кафедрасы, Шығыстану факультеті, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ Ұлттық Университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан.