

The Representation of Russians in Kazakh History Textbooks

Ushakova Anastassiya, Master Student, Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest. Egyetem tér 1-3, 1053, Hungary. E-mail: anastassiyaushakova@mail.ru

Abstract. The collapse of the Soviet Union resulted in serious consequences in the sphere of interethnic relations in territories of newly formed countries. Today it is obvious that the known inter-ethnic tensions are the result of accumulated errors in practice national policies. A content analysis of the policies of the new independent States shows that they were focused on rethinking national historiography, with the aim of strengthening national and civic identity.

This article is dedicated to analysis of books on the history of Kazakhstan, published in the period since 1991. through the prism of the problems of transformation in them the image of Russian. The analysis is carried out taking into account the dynamics of interethnic relations in the country. Carried out work allows to draw a conclusion that publications of recent years in Kazakhstan do not contain any radically negative narratives of the events of the past Imperial and Soviet periods. However, existing approaches to the interpretation of the history of this time are not fully accepted and established, need further elaboration. A number of questions regarding interpretation of the history of these periods is crucial for the formation of historical consciousness that promotes the spirit of tolerance and mutual respect of representatives of different ethnic groups to each other.

Key words: image of Russian; ethnic relations; national politics; history; Kazakhstan.

Қазақстандық тарихи мәтіндердегі орыстарды қайта таныстыру

Ushakova Anastassiya, магистрант Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest. Egyetem tér 1-3, 1053, Hungary. E-mail: anastassiyaushakova@mail.ru

Аннотация. Кеңестер Одағының ыдырауы жаңадан құрылған мемлекеттердің территорияларында ұлтаралық қатынастар саласында терең салдар туғызды. Бүгінде, орын алып отырған ұлтаралық араздықтар жүргізіліп отырған ұлттық саясаттардың қорланып қалған қателіктердің нәтижесі болып табылатындығы айқын. Жаңа тәуелсіз мемлекеттер саясатына талдау жасау олардың ұлттық және азаматтық өзін-өзі айқындауды нығайту мақсатында ұлттық тарихнаманы қайта қарастыруға бағдарланғанын көрсетеді.

Бұл мақала Қазақстан тарихы бойынша 1991 жылдан бастап жарық көрген кітаптарға олардағы орыстар бейнесінің өзгерісі тұрғысында талдау жасауға арналған. Талдау елдегі этникааралық қатынастар динамикасын ескере отырып жасалынған. Атқарылған жұмыс Қазақстандағы соңғы жылдардағы жарияланымдарда өткен империялық және кеңестік кезеңдерді түбегейлі келеңсіз баяндау жоқ деген қорытынды жасауға мүмкіндік береді. Соған қарамастан, аталған кезеңдегі тарихты түсіндіруде ұстанылған әдістер жалпы қабылданған және қалыптасқан түрде емес, қосымша қарастыруды талап етеді. Осы кезеңдердің тарихын баяндауға қатысты бірқатар мәселелерді шешу толерантылық рухы мен түрлі этнос өкілдерінің өзара құрметін қалыптастыруға ықпал етуші тарихи сананың қалыптасуында түбегейлі маңызға ие болып табылады.

Түйін сөздер: орыстардың бейнесі; этникааралық қатынастар; ұлттық саясат; тарих; Қазақстан.

The Representation of Russians in Kazakh History Textbooks

Ushakova Anastassiya, магистрант Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest. Egyetem tér 1-3, 1053, Hungary. E-mail: anastassiyaushakova@mail.ru

Аннотация. Распад Советского Союза повлек серьезные последствия в сфере межнациональных отношений на территориях вновь образовавшихся государств. Сегодня очевидно, что имеющие место межэтнические трения являются результатом накопившихся ошибок в практикуемых национальных политиках. Анализ содержания политик новых независимых государств показывает, что они оказались ориентированы на переосмысление национальной историографии с целью укрепления национальной и гражданской самоидентификации.

Данная статья посвящена анализу книг по истории Казахстана, изданных в период с 1991г. сквозь призму проблемы трансформации в них образа русских. Анализ осуществляется с учетом динамики межэтнических отношений в стране. Осуществленная работа дает возможность сделать вывод, что публикации последних лет в Казахстане не содержат радикально негативных повествований событий прошлого имперского и советского периодов. Тем не менее, имеющиеся подходы к интерпретации истории данного времени не являются в полной мере общепринятыми и устоявшимися, требуют дополнительной проработки. Решение целого ряда вопросов относительно трактовки истории данных периодов представляется принципиально важным для формирования исторического сознания, способствующего утверждению духа толерантности и взаимного уважения представителей разных этносов друг к другу.

Ключевые слова: образ русских; межэтнические отношения; национальная политика; история; Казахстан.

UDC 930

The Representation of Russians in Kazakh History Textbooks

Ushakova A.

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the appearance of independent states generated the creation of historic concepts and literature, focused on the ideas of national liberation and national statehood. «Decolonization» historiography and related scientific literature appear in almost all countries of the ex-Union. In this literature, Russia and its role in these processes is interpreted as negative. An analysis of school textbooks in post-Soviet countries conducted by Russian scholars shows that all former USSR states (except Belarus) give a nationalist interpretation of history. Moreover, the main enemy in these narratives is, most of the time, Russia and Russians themselves. (Danilov, Filippov 2009, P.16)

The history taught at schools is, of course, not the only source of knowledge about the past and not the only factor influencing the formation of a society's historic memory. Nonetheless, the interpretation of history that students see in their textbooks affects their understanding of the world, in particular the relationship between people and ethnicities. Thus, the aim of this article is to analyze the image of Russians in Kazakh textbooks and to stress the changes in historical narratives after 1991.

This work is based on the analysis of school and university history textbooks that were published during the years of independence. All these books were used for teaching national history at high schools or universities at some period of time starting from 1991. The oldest editions which are not used by students today were analyzed in the work in order to trace the changing of the image and representation of Russia and Russians. The books are written for schools in which education is delivered via the Russian language. It is important to note that the students of such schools are both ethnically Russians and Kazakhs. Added to these books, textbooks written in the Kazakh language for schools and universities with the education given in Kazakh were also analyzed. Finally, a few books published during the Soviet Era were analyzed as well to show the shift in the overall narration of history.

Kazakhstani Historiography After 1991. There was concern at the beginning of the Soviet period in Kazakhstan amongst a select group of historians and writers that the history of Kazakhstan (and all other Union-republics) was being told from a Russian point of view. This preoccupation continued amongst writers into the 1960s as well. They sought the history of their country to be Kazakh-centered, based on the narration of the pre-revolutionary nomadic way of life, culture and traditions. Since any departure from the Soviet ideology was punished severely, many of the written works were banned, and their writers were sent to exile or executed. Nonetheless, these efforts allowed ethnic Kazakhs to preserve a small part of their history, based on oral Kazakh literature.

The break-up of the Soviet Union and liberation from ideological persecution led to the increasing importance of the issue of nation-building. There were two approaches to the phenomenon of nation and method of its perception in the framework of Kazakhstani scientific discourse. The first one is «ethno-cultural nationalism», whose supporters believe that the true nation in Kazakhstan is the Kazakh one, whilst others are merely diasporas. The main task of nation-building from this point of view is the recreation of the Kazakh nation; others must respect and understand it. Here major values are language, ethnic culture and history. The second approach is based on the principles of civil nationalism (Gajko 2011, P.53-54).

The most visible expression of the «national specific» idea has found itself in the historical science research of independent Kazakhstan. Being published in textbooks, these ideas inform the Kazakhstani youth of their historic past. By resorting to history the perception of the past is that it constitutes an ideal foundation for national-patriotic constructions (Alekseenko 2014, P.48-50).

The representation of Russia and Russians in the Textbooks. History can contribute to the harmonization of interethnic relations, by preventing national disputes and integrating minorities. On the other hand, it can dissociate nations, disseminate chauvinist and racist ideas, therefore increasing conflict in society.

There is much talk about tolerance in Kazakhstan. The President constantly raises this question in his speeches. It is obvious that tolerance between ethnicities is not something given per se, but it has to be nurtured all the time. Thus, the analysis of the role of the textbooks is important since they influence the youth's perceptions of past experience and, consequently, they may form positive or negative attitudes toward other cultures and ethnicities.

Three centuries of Russian-Kazakh relationships – Tsarist Russia, Soviet Russia and Russians themselves – as they are represented in schools and universities textbooks are examined in this article. Thus, the periods examined are: the beginning of the 18th century until the revolution of 1917, the Soviet period, contemporary Kazakhstan and the relationships between the nations. As stated previously the object of the examination is not authenticity of the facts, rather the very representation of the Russians and Russia as a whole including rhetoric methods of narration and possible influences on this image.

Our interest here is the changing in the representation of Russians from the immediate period after independence, when the process of the national self-consciousness revival took place and comparing it to post 2000 in the period when there appeared more and more discourses about the interethnic tolerance and friendly relationships in public discourse.

In order to understand changes in the representations of Russia and general narration of the history in these textbooks, the first one examined was published in 1979 during Soviet times. It is of high importance to mention that Soviet national policy was directed onto unification of all the nations in the Union, whilst at the same time the «enlightenment» role of the «elder brother» Russia was emphasized. Often Soviet history was too positive and Russia biased: Kazakhstan's unification with the Russian Empire was shown as willful and even helpful for Kazakh nomads, for example.

In the 1979 textbook on the history of the Kazakh SSR, authors Baishev and Beysembayev in the introduction wrote: «...Kazakh nation in a short historic period made a giant step from pre-capitalist relations to socialism...to the heights of modern progress...the success was achieved thank to the unselfish help of great Russian and other nations of our Fatherland – Union of SSR» (Baishev, Beysembayev 1979, P.8).

The writers also pointed out the political and trade contacts between the Kazakh Khanate and Russia, which became a base for «friendly relations between the Kazakh and Russian nations». This is reflected throughout the chapter «Kazakh-Russian relations» where Baishev and Beysembayev continually use phrases such as «friendly», «important and useful relations», «Kazakh-Russian rapprochement». (Baishev, Beysembayev 1977, P.290-298).

One of the most famous Kazakh historians Asfendiyarov was the first one to write a book on the history of the Kazakh nation up until the revolution of 1917. Unfortunately, with the expansion of the Soviet rule in Kazakhstan he was labeled as

the «nation's enemy» and sent into exile. However, after declaring independence his book was republished and approved by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan in 1993 and is considered to be an important piece of work. Where, as it was mentioned above, in previous publications the unification of Kazakhstan with Russia was interpreted as a willful one, Asfendiyarov divided his book into two chapters called «Kazakhstan before Czarism Conquest» and «Kazakhstan – a colony of Russian imperialism» showing a change in narrative (Asfendiyarov 1993).

Whilst writing about the beginning of Kazakh-Russian relationships, the author pointed out the violence of the Russian conquest, saying that «Russian capitalism, the same way as any other, grew on the blood of millions of workers...». (Asfendiyarov 1993, P.129). Asfendiyarov stressed that the books published for the majority of population were genuine «bourgeoisie fairytales». The czarist policy was called by the author a predatory one: «Violence, robberies, mass killings that accompanied the conquest caused unrest and discontent among Kazakhs; uprisings against violators-conquerors started». (Asfendiyarov 1993, P.132)

The author mentioned that tsarism, by giving a number of privileges to the Russian peasantry created national enmity between them and Kazakh workers. It is also important to mention that Asfendiyarov wrote about corrupt Kazakh *bays* whom, trying to save their positions, «sold themselves to coming tsarism» (Asfendiyarov 1993, P.150). To sum up this period in Kazakh history, it appears that Russia is seen as a violent country-conqueror that stirred up Russian Cossacks against the Kazakh population, brought destruction to the Kazakh steppes; and put Russian inhabitants into the position of a «great-power nation», while Kazakhs became people without any rights (Asfendiyarov 1993, P.171).

The subordinate character of Kazakhs in the Russian-Kazakh forced alliance is particularly stressed in this book. Russia seems to be a giant with selfish intensions, while Kazakhs are shown rather as a credent people. The plans of Russia were just about the colonizing and conversion of Kazakh lands.

Thus, one can see the definitive policy undertaken by the Soviet elite: the history must be positive, or it should not be written at all. Consequently, the role of Russians was interpreted as very positive, bringing civilization to the Kazakh steppes.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union the historiography of Kazakhstan suffered a crisis. Students at schools and universities were still taught in accordance with the Soviet system of education, and using Soviet textbooks. Consequently, a book published in 1993 and written by a group of historians continued to show the colonization of Kazakhstan by Russia in a less negative way, pointing out that some of the Kazakh regions took Russian allegiance willfully. The authors also mentioned positive sides the unification, such as the expansion of literacy amongst the Kazakh population alongside the development and growth of trade (Kasymbayev, Kozybayev, Akishev 1993, P.185). As well as this, and comparing to the previous book, where the author wrote «willful allegiance» in quotation marks referring to the historically opposite reality, here the period of the 17th-18th centuries was called «Unification of Kazakhstan and Russia: entrance, conquest, colonization». It gives the reader an opportunity to speculate on the real processes taking place in Kazakhstan, but also skips the purposeful and violent conquest of the Kazakh steppes.

In the chapter dedicated to science and education in Kazakhstan during imperial times, the author pointed out the positive sides of interaction of Kazakh culture with the Russian one, explaining that a lot of famous Russian researchers made their outstanding works based on Kazakh music, oral historiography, ethnography, and so on (Kasymbayev, Kozybayev, Akishev 1993, P.239).

As regards interethnic relations, the authors stated that the tsarist administration artificially stirred up interethnic discontent and spread chauvinistic slogans. It was a fight for the land that was taken away from Kazakhs and given to Russian peasantry reflected in the discussion of the «national-emancipatory movement» of Kazakhs against wide ranging russification policies (Kasymbayev, Kozybayev, Akishev 1993, P.274).

The Soviet period is described as a period of forced russification of the republic, predominance of eurocentrism and discrimination of Union-states regarding their national self-identification. The author paid particular attention to the problem of the Kazakh language and its usage only in the everyday life communication between Kazakhs. Names of the cities, villages, lakes and rivers were given in the Russian language, as the author explains, to cement the position of this language as the official one in the republic (Kasymbayev, Kozybayev, Akishev 1993, P.375-377).

Thus, the authors of the book refer to the policy run in Tsarist and Soviet Russia rather as a negative one. They always stress the intensive movement of Russians to the Kazakh lands, and resulting Kazakh emancipatory movements. However, the authors make a strong distinction between the policy and the people, saying that two cultures were interacting, thus giving birth to new masterpieces of the Russian ethnographers, poets, writers and Kazakhs in their turn got access to education.

For closer consideration of the Soviet rule on the republic, a textbook published in 1997 for school pupils was analyzed. Here one can see the same approach as that of the previous books. Historic events were described from different points of view; however, a lot of attention was paid to the negative consequences of the colonization started in 18th century: «In the beginning of the 20th century further colonization of the Asian East by Russia went on at a forced pace...On a large scale colonization went through in Kazakhstan. Tsarism ...by 1916 deprived Kazakhs of 40 millions of hectares of the best lands, displacing them to the unfertile steppe and mountains» (Kozybayev, Kozybayev 1997, P.3).

Documentary material, as the authors called it, can be found on the pages of the books. These are different declarations and letters written by the Kazakh activists to the Soviet administration. One example is the letter written by Baytursynov, Kazakh activist, to Lenin: «Just by renaming themselves into communists-internationals, Russians cannot gain trust of the non-Russian nation, which has experience with the sly policies of czarist government» (Kozybayev, Kozybayev 1997, P.80).

Many pages were dedicated to the complicated process of the unification of territories into the Kazakh SSR, and in particular the new economic policy and its consequences. In one of the letters published in the textbook, Trocki, revolutionary activist, wrote about the relationships between party members coming from the center to Kazakhstan. He stressed that there is a «wall between European and Kazakh communists». However, there are no comments given to any letter from the textbook. Thus, school students are given the idea that such attitudes toward Kazakhs and Kazakhstan as a whole is a feature of not only the Russian administration, but the Russian people as well.

In the chapter dedicated to collectivization, the authors state that «most experienced and literate adult people (75% of bays) were sentenced to confiscation and dispossession, in reality to physical extinction...» (Kozybayev, Kozybayev 1997, P.125). Undoubtedly, these processes took place, and the authors had the right to interpret it in this way. However, a history textbook must give not only one point of view, since there appears the impression that the Russian administration acted like this not because it wanted to set up a new type of social relations, but because it wanted to harm Kazakhs. Nonetheless, in the last chapter analyzing the Second

World War the authors stressed that this grief brought together different nations sent to exile in Kazakhstan with its inhabitants (Kozybayev, Kozybayev 1997, P.198).

Thus, the analysis of the books published in the early periods of independence show that they were dedicated to the revival of national pride lost in Tsarist and Soviet periods. These books show the struggle of Kazakh people against the alien «them». They encourage empathy with the Kazakhs and generate dislike towards others, depicted as the policy of the Soviets and Tsarist Russia who are in turn associated with the Russian people. This, of course, could not create tolerant relations between ethnicities at the period these books were taught at schools and universities.

As it was mentioned, these books belong to the earliest period of Kazakhstan's historiographical development. It is useful to supplement this by analyzing the textbooks of more modern times. A textbook published in 2002 for students of universities is written in a different way and style than the analyzed above ones. The textbook starts with «Our Fatherland Kazakhstan» and gives general information on the population, square kilometers and geography. The author continues saying that the Kazakh land gave the world a «most valuable historic and cultural legacy». (Abdakimov 2002, P.23) The author states that the history of Kazakhstan is the history of a nation that was on the edge of extinction more than 30 times. One such example provided by the author is the policy of genocide implemented by Joseph Stalin (Abdakimov 2002, P.28).

In the chapter devoted to the beginning of Kazakh-Russian relationships they are shown only as negative. If in previous textbooks, one could encounter the words «unification» and «protectorate», here the author calls it «colonization»: «military-administrative colonization», «migratory colonization» and «spiritual-ideological colonization» (Abdakimov 2002, P.155).

The author does not give a number of real facts or processes, instead they speculate on the policy of tsarism and the «cruel methods» of running a country. He states that «Kazakhs got a role of aliens on genuinely their land» (Abdakimov 2002, P.157). Moreover, in his opinion, there are no more nations in the world that suffered so much from colonizers. Abdakimov writes that it was not enough for colonizers to humiliate the nation; they damaged «national consciousness, language, religion and traditions». Basically, he criticizes the policy of so-called «Soviet enlightenment» in Kazakhstan, saying that it deprived Kazakhs of their historic legacy (Abdakimov 2002, P.158). Education, in his opinion, had two goals, on one side it was massive russification, and on the other its goal was the stirring of envy and «love to enmity» (Abdakimov 2002, P.160). Abdakimov continues by saying that Soviet historiography accentuated only positive moments of unification, and today one cannot replace them with only negative ones. Here the author contradicts himself, since he gives only negative information on the Kazakh-Russian relationships.

In general, the author refrains from Russophobe ideas, for instance there is no information in the book on bad relations between the nations. Nonetheless, the reader can draw an analogy between tsarism, Soviet administration and the Russians, accusing them all for contributing to the grief of the Kazakh people. The book itself does not seem to be a historical work, rather anti-Russian propaganda reflecting the personal ideas and opinions of the author.

In the textbook «History of the Republic of Kazakhstan» produced by Ryspayev also in 2002 for universities students, the interaction of Russia and Kazakhstan is described in the sixth chapter called «Kazakhstan - Colony of the Russian Empire». Here the first two paragraphs are named «The beginning of colonization» and «The beginning of double oppression». Again the reader encounters sentences showing

all the negative sides of the tsarist administration, its cruel plans toward Kazakhs and their «enormous territory» combined with liquidation of centuries long traditions (Ryspayev 2002, P.106-111).

Even in textbooks for pupils of fifth grade at school published in 2006 the relationships between Russian and Kazakhstan are called «Fight for Independence in the 19th century»: «Left without land Kazakhs became dependent on Russians» (Artykbayev, Sabdanbekova, Abil 2006, P.115). Thus even students of a very young age, not having critical thinking developed, can start to form the negative ideas about their neighbor and the Russian minority in Kazakhstan.

Another textbook of the same year for school students of the tenth grade stated that the tsarist administration's idea was «to appropriate Kazakhstan» (*pribrat' k rukam*). (Zholdasbayev 2006, P.151) In the section regarding resettlement of the Russian peasants in the second half of the 19th century, the author says that the lands of Kazakhstan were used for achieving [Russia's] colonial goals. He continues by saying that the government's goal was to settle in Kazakhstan rich Russian people that could «fight for the empire's interests» (Zholdasbayev 2006, P.171) Thus, the people who moved from central parts of Russia to Kazakhstan are shown as those who take the best lands from the Kazakhs. As it was mentioned above, such aspiration of the authors to give the «originators» of the negative historic events that happened in Kazakhstan an ethnic identity can easily lead to the wrong interpretation of history by the students reading the works.

The events of the Soviet period are shown in the textbook for the pupils of the last grade in school. The authors described consequences of the mass immigration of different nations after the Second World War which occurred during the rule of Stalin (Nurpeisov, Ayaganov, Zhaksylykov 2004). They explain that it was a difficult time for all the people inhabiting Kazakhstan which united them and made them «brotherly nations» (Nurpeisov, Ayaganov, Zhaksylykov 2004, P.7-8). Furthermore, the authors estimate the benefits/harm of virgin lands reclamation on the territory of the republic. Impression that this period was something coming from the outside, not necessary and harmful for Kazakhstan is strengthened by the assertion that the «process of virgin land reclamation contributed to in-flow of population from other republics, which led to a decrease of the role of national customs and traditions, to sharp reduction of schools with the Kazakh language of education, edition of national literature and printed media declined. Language and demographic problems in northern regions became strained» (Nurpeisov, Ayaganov, Zhaksylykov 2004, P.37).

The changes that occurred in Kazakhstan in the 1960s and 1970s are shown in the book which describes the growth of the cities, construction of new industrial sights, etc. However, these events do not have a positive background. They are shown mostly as the processes that led to changes in the demographic structure. «All this inevitably led to a gap between a number and share of aboriginal population, on one hand, and representatives of other nationalities on the other. In 1962 Kazakhs were less than a third of the whole population of the republic- just 29%, while in 1897 they were 85%. This influenced the national culture and role of the mother tongue» (Nurpeisov, Ayaganov, Zhaksylykov 2004, P.40).

Thus, the representation of Russia becomes less negative than before. Still, the events of the Soviet times are shown, regardless of the educating role of the Soviets and the construction of huge metallurgical bases that are economically very important today for Kazakhstan, as something not necessary for the country. It is important to mention that the authors pay attention to the grievances of all the nations of the country that were experienced during the Second World War, saying that this event united the people.

As it was mentioned earlier, education in Kazakhstan is given in two languages, Russian and Kazakh. There are ethnically mixed classes in Russian language schools, i.e. the pupils are Russians, Kazakhs, Koreans, Ukrainians, etc. While in Kazakh language schools the majority of students are Kazakh. There are, of course, cases of Russian children studying in Kazakh schools, but these are rather exceptional. Thus, we analyze textbooks written in Kazakh as well in order to compare whether their content differs from those written in Russian.

The book published in 2004 by Amanzholov is dedicated for the students of universities and approved by the Ministry of Education and Science (Amanzholov 2004). It embraces the history of ancient Kazakhstan up until the revolution of 1917. The chapter devoted to the relationships of Russia and Kazakhstan is called «Kazakhstan inside the Russian Empire», which does not bear any negative characteristics. However, one of the issues the author proposes to consider is as follows: «The colonization of Kazakh land and country by the Russian Empire and its severe consequences». The author continues that the biggest harm for Kazakhstan from the reign and colonization of Russia was made to cattle-breeding. «Taking huge territories...displacing local people to waterless steppes made an obstacle for Kazakhs to practice agriculture» (Amanzholov 2004, P.356). Amanzholov states that during 70 years of Soviet rule all the historic information was falsified, denying the destruction of Kazakh agriculture and cattle-breeding. The author pays more attention to the development of the industrial bases in Kazakhstan, saying that it was a center of cheap raw materials. However, such information does not contain any negative characteristics. Amanzholov merely enumerates the events happening in Kazakhstan as systematic of wider processes. Regarding the relationships between the people, the author stresses the participation of Kazakhs in the Russian revolution against czarism as being «hand in hand» (Amanzholov 2004, P.380).

Another Kazakh textbook published the same year contains chapters on Kazakh-Russian relations called «Characteristics of Kazakhstan's unification with Russia» and «Whole Kazakh movement against Russia's colonization» (Sabyrov 2004, P.232). Information given in these chapters resembles that of the previous book: harmful for Kazakh cattle-breeding traditions originating from czarism, seizure of territories and usage of raw materials taken from Kazakh lands.

In the second chapter the author Sabyrov writes that Kazakhs united with Russia merely for their protection from the neighboring nation's assaults, and they believed, the author states, that this process would be temporal, which means Kazakhs could leave the Empire anytime they wanted (Amanzholov 2004, P.84). Russia in response ran a tough domestic policy.

In general, to sum up these two books, one can notice a big difference with those written in the Russian language. The authors pay more attention to positive sides, such as the development of trade, construction of industrial bases in Kazakhstan and so on. The unique negative characteristic of that epoch is deprivation of Kazakh traditional way of living, which basically was cattle-breeding and its influence on the number of livestock. There was not found any anti-Russian propaganda, or expressions such as «genocide», «Kazakhstan as a Russian colony», etc. The authors of Kazakh editions try to criticize the policies of tsarism and its administration objectively.

The last three books that were taken for the research belong to the contemporary period: they were published in 2011 and 2013. The first two were written by the same authors in two languages, Kazakh and Russian, and are dedicated to the students of universities. The seventh chapter of these textbooks is dedicated to the beginning of Russian-Kazakh relationships (Karazhan, Tashenev

2011, Russian ed., P.141-149). Interestingly, in the Russian edition this chapter is called «Taking allegiance (*poddanstvo*) of the Russian empire by rulers of Junior and Middle Zhuz», while in Kazakh the same chapter is called «The beginning of conquest (*basyp alu*) of Kazakhstan by the Russian Empire» (Karazhan, Tashenev 2011, Kazakh ed., P.111-119). All other chapters have the same names in Russian and Kazakh language.

The content of the two chapters differs significantly. The Russian edition explains the necessity of the Kazakh Khan to be under a Russian protectorate in order to guard Kazakhs from the Dzungars. The authors point out that due to the inner-political fight of Kazakh Khans (which existed before the unification with Russia), Kazakhstan's weak political system created a background for an «open Military-Cossack colonization». In the next chapter the authors write about the Tsarist colonization of the territory. They give the detailed information about the years and places, without giving any colors to the events. Here, they are neither negative, nor positive. They are rather interpreted as something that took place. They write about the Tsarist expansion, but they also write about the local sly Kazakh governors who supported the Tsarist policy in order to get some benefits.

The Kazakh language edition pays more attention to an explanation of what «protectorate» exactly means, and whether the Russian protectorate was friendly to both sides. Here it seems to be more polemic, than factual. The authors conclude that by uniting with Russia, Kazakhstan turned into its colony.

Thus, the beginning of the process of unification is shown in different ways by the same authors. I compared other chapters and they are identical in the narration. The result is that the students of Kazakh schools get a different interpretation of the beginning of the relationship between Russia and Kazakhstan. It is difficult to say how the students themselves interpret this chapter. However, it is important to note that like in the Russian version the Kazakh edition remains objective in the use of material it does include.

The last textbook that was taken for analysis is from 2013 and is approved by the Ministry of Education and Science (Igibayev, Zhanbosinova, Khalidullin 2013). This period of Russian-Kazakh relations is called «Kazakhstan under the Russian Empire's Protectorate». The first sub-chapter considers the unification of Kazakhstan and Russia (Igibayev, Zhanbosinova, Khalidullin 2013, P.109) Here one can see the words «colonial expansion» and «violent measures» in describing the process of unification. However, in comparison to the previous books this one does not show the history as if all the nations during the long period of time tried to conquer Kazakhstan, and Kazakh people were to obey. Every topic is described in two to three page blocks and looks very precise without many epithets as before. The authors explain that during the resettlement policy of tsarism Kazakhstan became a multiethnic country; with trade and interaction between Russians and Kazakhs expanding (Igibayev, Zhanbosinova, Khalidullin 2013, P.130). Moreover, they bring the quotation of famous Kazakh writer Abay, saying that it was necessary to have friendly relationships and respect toward other nations, including Russians (Igibayev, Zhanbosinova, Khalidullin 2013, P.141).

To sum up, we can say that the representation of Russia and Russians in the textbooks evolved from very negative in the 1990s to more neutral and in some cases positive today. Nonetheless, the last analyzed book is just one objective interpretation of history out of dozens of others. How many students were taught according to the books of earlier publications? What is the resulting representation of the Russians that they form in the school and university?

Some chapters of the studied books are devoted to the material culture of Kazakhs, their traditions, customs and traditional cuisine. Unfortunately, there is no such information about the other nationalities inhabiting Kazakhstan, or, at least, the second biggest one - Russians, living in the territory of the country from the 18th century onward. Thus, here another question is important- whether these textbooks contribute into education of tolerance and do they create consolidating tendencies inside a multiethnic society?

Moreover, many historians inclined to see the history of Kazakhstan exclusively as the history of the Kazakh nation, showed their discontent with the name of the work «History of Kazakhstan: Nations and Cultures» (Almaty, 2000). The book represents one of few attempts to show the history of Kazakhstan as «the history of commonality of fates of all the country's nations» (Fominyh, 2014, P.394). It gives detailed information on the beginning of Russian-Kazakh relations, the construction of fortresses in the north of Kazakhstan and the relations between indigenous peoples and migrants. The demographic catastrophe of 1929-1933 happened during the policy of collectivization which the authors show not as the intended genocide of Kazakh people as in some textbooks, but as the tragedy of all the nations residing in Kazakhstan, who also suffered from the Soviet policy (Masanov, Abylkhozhin, Erofeeva, Alekseenko 2000, P.374-375).

In 2009 a group of historians from Russia published a book on the representation of Russia in the textbooks of post-Soviet countries (Presentation of general history of Russian and nations of post-Soviet countries in school textbooks on history of new independent states, Moscow, 2009). They came to the conclusion that existing models presenting the historic past is a characteristic for almost all post-Soviet countries. For example, Azeri, Georgian, Latvian and other national historiography call the integration with Russia a «colonial process» of social, economic, religious and cultural oppression (Masanov, Abylkhozhin, Erofeeva, Alekseenko 2000, P.81). Most of the time, such affirmations are not accompanied by real facts, data or numbers. Russia and Russians are shown as an alien power.

In the same way the historiography of Kazakhstan is full of methodological contradictions and myths. Unfortunately, the masses accept such mythological interpretations of history; these masses usually have a «traditional» mentality (Masanov, Abylkhozhin, Erofeeva 2007, P.13). This is characteristic not only of people residing in the countryside, but also for the «village-city» migrants. Such migration creates socio-cultural marginalization and creates obstacles for integration into urbanized subculture (Masanov, Abylkhozhin, Erofeeva 2007, P.34). Consequently, this mentality with a «crisis of self-identification» can give rise to the projection of traditionalist symbolism. However, this problem goes back to the earlier period. In the 20th century this mass mentality was formed on the values of a «Great nation», «Great enormous country», belonging to Soviet «Great world power». Today, these ambitions can be satisfied only by the creation of a «new», alternative history (Masanov, Abylkhozhin, Erofeeva 2007, p.38). Some historians create enormous ancient countries with links to the statehood of antiquity. Already shaped by totalitarian research traditions this interpretation of history is taken as a unique truth. Thus, some Kazakhstani historians find «Kazakh parallels» with Genghis Khan, the name of Italy with the Kazakh name of the river Volga (in Kazakh it is «Itil»), and other examples (Masanov, Abylkhozhin, Erofeeva 2007, P.39). Consequently, the «perfect past» becomes more attractive for the masses than, in the case of Kazakhstan, the 300 years of «Russian colonialism».

These myths are then propagated by the mass media, and diffused into school curriculums. Myth makers often do not indicate their sources, while people, and especially students without formed critical thinking, accept such primitive explanation of the things quite readily.

Mythologization is a natural method for a part of national intelligentsia to «prove» exclusiveness and specialness of an ethnicities history and culture. (Masanov, Abylkhozhin, Erofeeva 2007, P.52) Unfortunately, unproved statements connected with the origin of the Kazakh nation were found on the pages of some textbooks: «...without understanding of the role of Kazakh-nomads in the historic past history of nations of China, Iran, Russian, European nations and even ancient Rome, Greece, Egypt and India will not be full» (Abdakimov 2002, P.26). Unfortunately (for Kazakh historians). The result is that the Kazakh nation does not have any relation to the ancient inhabitants of the territory of modern Kazakhstan (Masanov, Abylkhozhin, Erofeeva 2007, P.87).

Some textbooks are so full of myths they are republished several times. It means that these books are widely used by students. As it was mentioned, the masses accept this interpretation of history, particularly periods of social unrest. Consequently, they can put their ethnicity above all others. Consciousness of yet not educated, immature pupils can easily take this information as the unique truth. In addition to the negative representation of Russians in these textbooks, and «knowledge» about the Kazakh ethnicity as «the best one», the feeling of hatred and grievance for interrupted for the 300 years «perfect past» can appear among Kazakh students.

Therefore, the majority of historians today are not conscious about the fact that the past of the Kazakh nation is connected not only with the nomadic past, but to a great extent with the imperial and Soviet one, which is still rooted in social and political institutes that exist today. Kazakhstan still has close relationships with Russia in many spheres, e.g. economic, political and cultural. Moreover, the biggest migratory exchange Kazakhstan has is with Russia. (For more information see: Ethno-demographic yearbook of Kazakhstan) However, this «colonial» interpretation of the past can be understood as a call for Russia to admit «its fault».

Back in 2006 leading historians of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), alongside scholars from Russian Academy of Science and Kazakhstani Institute of History and Ethnology highlighted a question of the possible creation of a common history textbook. They pointed out that it was necessary to write a history without mutual insults and blames. They admitted the fact that in the near future such a book will not be published. Nonetheless, working together would give an opportunity to reconsider the common past and give a recommendation for the professors and the authors of scientific literature in every country an approach to interpret the disputed periods of the past (Novoselova Nd). The predictions of the scholars were correct, since no book was published. It is difficult to secure the national identity and to find a world outlook which can unite all the cultures of the CIS.

Yet, the interest of this research is interethnic relations between Kazakhs and Russians residing in Kazakhstan. More specifically, how the history taught in Kazakhstan can be interpreted by the students? Or, what their reaction is and will be? For now, self-identification of Russians as an ethnic group is very weak. Finally, they show their discontent not on the group, rather on a personal level- through emigration.

Another problem is interpretation the country's history in different ways in Kazakh and Russian languages. This can lead to misunderstanding, or, even worse, to more serious interethnic conflicts between the students: whose truth is real?

Lastly, Kazakhstani cities' streets are full of billboards with statements, such as «My fatherland- Kazakhstan», «Big country-big family» (this one with the picture of a multiethnic family), «25 years of unity and creation». Thus, the government runs its political ideology directed at the reformation of the population's consciousness. Moreover, in his annual message in 2014, the President launched an idea of «*Mangilik El*» [Imperishable nation]. It is a part of a bigger project «Plan of the nation- 100 steps toward realization of five institutional reforms», whose idea, among the others, is further preservation of national unity, peace and consent. «We have one fatherland- independent Kazakhstan; we have one country- one fate. The nation that is faithful to the great deed of peace and consent will exist for thousands of years» (Patrioticheskij akt Nd)

This idea was launched in order to restrain from the discussion the issue of nation-building and Kazakh nationalism. According to the deputy of *Majilis* Kappel 95% of the citizens consider themselves as the representatives of the united nation of Kazakhstan. In his words, all the nationalities of the country co-reside in peace and consent today³.

Yet, absence of a conflict does not mean consent. On the one hand, the government runs the policy of «whole-national tolerance», saying that non-titular nations «do not have the fault that they live thousands of kilometers far from their ethnic fatherlands» (Elbasy, nurlı ZhOL 2014) It opens Assembly of the Peoples of Kazakhstan, carefully chooses ideological slogans on the streets whilst the same government approves textbooks sometimes full of hatred, indifference toward other nations. Can it create a feeling of consent among the representatives of other nationalities, and tolerance of the titular nation?

Yet, it must be noted that the last years' publication does not contain the negative connotation of the past as in the previous ones. At the same time, modern textbooks on the history of Kazakhstan do not contain enough material for the education of tolerance amongst the students and the accomplishment of this goal depends on the competence and the desire of the professors who work with them.

Әдебиеттер тізімі / Список литературы

1. Абдакимов А. История Казахстана (с древнейших времен до наших дней). – Алматы: Казахстан, 2002.
2. Алексеенко А.Н. Этноизация и традиционализация социально-политического пространства Казахстана // Journal of political philosophy and social politics. – 2014. – №2(73).
3. Аманжолов К. Қазақстан тарихының дәрістер курсы. – Алматы: Білім, 2004.
4. Артыкбаев Ж., Саданбекова А., Абил Е. Рассказы по истории Казахстана. – Алматы: Атамұра, 2006.
5. Асфендияров С. История Казахстана. – Алма-Ата: Қазақ университеті, 1993.
6. Байшев Б., Бейсембаев С. История Казахской ССР. – Т.4. – Алма-Ата: Наука, 1979.
7. Байшев Б., Бейсембаев С. История Казахской ССР. – Т.2. – Алма-Ата: Наука, 1977.
8. Данилов А., Филиппов А. Освещение общей истории России и народов постсоветских стран в школьных учебниках истории новых независимых государств. – М., 2009.
9. Елбасы, «нұрлы ЖОЛ», МӘҢГІЛІК ЕЛ: Ключевая триада будущего Казахстана [Электронный ресурс] // Казахстанская правда. –2014. – 13 декабря. – URL: www.kazpravda.kz/fresh/view/elbasi-nurli-zhol-mangilik-el-kluchevaya-triada-budushchego-kazahstana/. (дата обращения 24.02.2017).

³ Стратегия. Центр социальных и политических исследований. – URL: <http://www.ofstrategy.kz>

10. Фоминых В. Роль истории Казахстана в формировании культуры межэтнических отношений // Этнодемографические процессы в Казахстане и сопредельных территориях. – Усть-Каменогорск, 2014.
11. Гайко О. Этнодемографические аспекты национального строительства в Казахстане // Этнодемографические процессы в Казахстане и сопредельных территориях. – Усть-Каменогорск, 2011.
12. Игибаев С., Жанбосинова А., Халидулин Г. История Казахстана. – Алматы: КазНур, 2013.
13. Каражан К., Ташенев М. История Казахстана. – Алматы: Нұр-Пресс, 2011.
14. Қаражан К., Ташенев М. Қазақстан тарихы. – Алматы: Нұр-Пресс, 2011.
15. Касымбаев Ж., Козыбаев М., Акишев А., Мансуров Т. История Казахстана. – Алматы: Дәуір, 1993.
16. Козыбаев И., Козыбаев М. История Казахстана. – Алматы: Атамұра, 1997.
17. Масанов Н., Абылжолдин Ж., Ерофеева И. Научное знание и мифотворчество в современной историографии Казахстана. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2007.
18. Масанов Н., Абылжолдин Ж., Ерофеева И., Алексеенко А.Н. Баратова Г. История Казахстана: нации и культуры. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2000.
19. Новоселова Е. Нужен объективный учебник о совместной жизни в СССР, убеждены ученые стран СНГ [Электронный ресурс] // Российская академия наук. – URL: www.ras.ru/digest/showdnews.aspx?id=ba270d82-104e-48c3-a897-5da2dc232f4b&print=1 (дата обращения 24.11.2016).
20. Нурпеисов К., Аяганов Б., Жаксылыков Н. История Казахстана. – Алматы: Мектеп, 2004.
21. Патриотический акт «Мәңгілік ел». [Электронный ресурс] // Казахстанская правда. – URL: www.kazpravda.kz/rubric/shanirak/patrioticheskii-akt-mangilik-el-polnii-tekst/ (дата обращения 24.06.2016)
22. Распрыгаев К. История Республики Казахстан. – Алматы: Білім, 2002.
23. Сабыров С. История Казахстана. – Алматы: Ғылым, 2004.
24. Жолдасбаев С. История Казахстана. – Алматы: Мектеп, 2006.

References

- Abdakimov 2002 – Abdakimov, A 2002, *Istorija Kazahstana (s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnei)*, Kazakhstan, Almaty. (Abdakimov, A 2002, *History of Kazakhstan (from ancient times to the present day)*, Kazakhstan, Almaty). (in Rus).
- Alekseenko 2014 – Alekseenko, AN 2014, Jetnizacija i tradicionalizacija social'no-politicheskogo prostranstva Kazahstana, *Journal of political philosophy and social politics*, №2(73). (Alekseenko, AN 2014, Traditionalization and Ethnicity in the socio-political space of Kazakhstan, *Journal of social and political philosophy politics*, №2(73)). (in Rus).
- Amanzholov 2004 – Amanzholov, K 2004, Kazakstan tarihnyn dfarister kursy, Bilim, Almaty. (Amanzholov, K 2004, *A course of lectures on the history of Kazakhstan*, Bilim, Almaty). (in Kaz).
- Artykbaev, Sadanbekova, Abil 2006 – Artykbaev, Zh, Sadanbekova, A, Abil, E 2006, *Rasskazy po istorii Kazahstana*, Atamura, Almaty. (Artykbaev, Zh, Sadanbekova, A, Abil, E 2006, *Stories on the history of Kazakhstan*, Atamura, Almaty). (in Rus).
- Asfendijarov 1993 – Asfendijarov, S 1993, *Istorija Kazahstana*, Kazak universiteti, Alma-Ata. (Asfendijarov, S 1993, *History of Kazakhstan*, Kazak universiteti, Alma-Ata). (in Rus).
- Baishev, Bejsembaev 1979 – Baishev, B, Bejsembaev, S 1979, *Istorija Kazahskoj SSSR*, T.4, Nauka, Alma-Ata. (Baishev, B, Bejsembaev, S 1979, *The history of the Kazakh SSR*, T.4, Nauka, Alma-Ata). (in Rus).
- Baishev, Bejsembaev 1977 – Baishev, B, Bejsembaev, S 1977, *Istorija Kazahskoj SSSR*, T.2, Nauka, Alma-Ata. (Baishev, B, Bejsembaev, S 1977, *The history of the Kazakh SSR*, T.2, Nauka, Alma-Ata). (in Rus).
- Danilov, Filippov 2009 – Danilov, A, Filippov, A 2009, *Osveshhenie obshhej istorii Rossii i narodov postsovetskij stran v shkol'nyh uchebnikah istorii novyh nezavisimyh gosudarstv*, Moscow. (Danilov, A, Filippov, A 2009, *The history of the new independent States lighting the General history of Russia and peoples of post-Soviet countries in school textbooks*, Moscow). (in Rus).
- Elbasy, nurlı ZhOL 2014 – Elbasy, «nurlı ZhOL», MANGILIK EL: Ključevaja triada budushhego Kazahstana 2014, *Kazahstanskaja pravda*, 13 dekabnja retrieved 24 February 2017 <www.kazpravda.kz/fresh/view/elbasi-nurli-zhol-mangilik-el-kluchevaya-triada-budushchego-kazahstana/>. (Of the President "Nurlı ZHOL" MANGILIK EL: a Key triad for the future of Kazakhstan 2014, *Kazahstanskaja pravda*, 13 dekabnja retrieved 24 February 2017 <www.kazpravda.kz/fresh/view/elbasi-nurli-zhol-mangilik-el-kluchevaya-triada-budushchego-kazahstana/>). (in Rus).
- Fominyh 2014 – Fominyh, V 2014, Rol' istorii Kazahstana v formirovanii kul'tury mezhjetnicheskikh otnoshenij, *Jetnodemograficheskie processy v Kazahstane i sopredel'nyh territorijah*, Ust'-Kamenogorsk. (Fominyh, V 2014, *The role of the history of Kazakhstan in formation of culture of*

- interethnic relations, *Ethnic-demographic processes in Kazakhstan and neighboring territories, Ust'-Kamenogorsk*). (in Rus).
- Gajko 2011 – Gajko, O 2011, *Jetnodemograficheskie aspekty nacional'nogo stroitel'stva v Kazahstane, Jetnodemograficheskie processy v Kazahstane i sopredel'nyh territorijah, Ust'-Kamenogorsk*. (Gajko, O 2011, *Ethnodemographic aspects of nation-building in Kazakhstan, Ethnic-demographic processes in Kazakhstan and neighboring territories, Ust'-Kamenogorsk*). (in Rus).
- Igibaev, Zhanbosinova, Halidulin 2013 – Igibaev, S, Zhanbosinova, A, Halidulin, G 2013, *Istorija Kazahstana, KazNur, Almaty*. (Igibaev, S, Zhanbosinova, A, Halidulin, G 2013, *History of Kazakhstan, KazNur, Almaty*). (in Rus).
- Karazhan, Tashenev 2011(in Rus) – Karazhan, K, Tashenev, M 2011, *Istorija Kazahstana, Nur-Press, Almaty*. (Karazhan, K, Tashenev, M 2011, *History of Kazakhstan, Nur-Press, Almaty*). (in Rus).
- Karazhan, Tashenev 2011(in Kaz) – Karazhan, K, Tashenev, M 2011, *Kazakstan tarihy, Nur-Press, Almaty*. (Karazhan, K, Tashenev, M 2011, *History of Kazakhstan, Nur-Press, Almaty*). (in Kaz).
- Kasymbaev, Kozybaev, Akishev 1993 – Kasymbaev, Zh, Kozybaev, M, Akishev, A, Mansurov, T 1993, *Istorija Kazahstana, Dair, Almaty*. (Kasymbaev, Zh, Kozybaev, M, Akishev, A, Mansurov, T 1993, *History of Kazakhstan, Dair, Almaty*). (in Rus).
- Kozybaev, Kozybaev 1997 – Kozybaev, I, Kozybaev, M 1997, *Istorija Kazahstana, Atamura, Almaty*. (Kozybaev, I, Kozybaev, M 1997, *History of Kazakhstan, Atamura, Almaty*). (in Rus).
- Masanov, Abylkozhin, Erofeeva 2007 – Masanov, N, Abylkozhin, Zh, Erofeeva, I 2007, *Nauchnoe znanie i mifotvorchestvo v sovremennoj istoriografii Kazahstana, Dajk-Press, Almaty*. (Masanov, N, Abylkozhin, Zh, Erofeeva, I 2007, *Scientific knowledge and myth-making in contemporary historiography of Kazakhstan, Dajk-Press, Almaty*). (in Rus).
- Masanov, Abylkozhin, Erofeeva, Alekseenko 2000 – Masanov, N, Abylkozhin, Zh, Erofeeva, I, Alekseenko, AN, Baratova, G 2000, *Istorija Kazahstana: nacji i kultury, Dajk-Press, Almaty*. (Masanov, N, Abylkozhin, Zh, Erofeeva, I, Alekseenko, AN, Baratova, G 2000, *History of Kazakhstan: Nations and cultures, Dajk-Press, Almaty*). (in Rus).
- Novoselova Nd – Novoselova, E Nd, Nuzhen ob#ektivnyj uchebnik o sovместnoj zhizni v SSSR, ubezhdenny uchenye stran SNG, *Rossijskaja akademija nauk* retrieved 24 November 2017 <www.ras.ru/digest/showdnews.aspx?id=ba270d82-104e-48c3-a897-5da2dc232f4b&print=1> . (Novoselova, E Nd, *Need an objective textbook on joint life in the Soviet Union, convinced scientists of the CIS countries SNG, Russian Academy of Sciences* retrieved 24 November 2017 <www.ras.ru/digest/showdnews.aspx?id=ba270d82-104e-48c3-a897-5da2dc232f4b&print=1>). (in Rus).
- Nurpeisov, Ajaganov, Zhaksylykov 2004 – Nurpeisov, K, Ajaganov, B, Zhaksylykov, N 2004, *Istorija Kazahstana, Mektep, Almaty*. (Nurpeisov, K, Ajaganov, B, Zhaksylykov, N 2004, *History of Kazakhstan, Mektep, Almaty*). (in Rus).
- Patrioticheskij akt Nd – Patrioticheskij akt «Mangilik el» Nd, *Kazahstanskaja pravda*. retrieved 24 June 2016 <www.kazpravda.kz/rubric/shanirak/patrioticheskii-akt-mangilik-el-polnii-tekst/>. (Patriotic document «Mangilik el» Nd, *Kazahstanskaja pravda*. retrieved 24 June 2016 <www.kazpravda.kz/rubric/shanirak/patrioticheskii-akt-mangilik-el-polnii-tekst/>). (in Rus).
- Rasprjagaev 2002 – Rasprjagaev, K 2002, *Istorija Respubliki Kazahstan, Bilim, Almaty*. (Rasprjagaev, K 2002, *The History of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Bilim, Almaty*). (in Rus).
- Sabyrov 2004 – Sabyrov, S 2004, *Istorija Kazahstana, Gylym, Almaty*. (Sabyrov, S 2004, *History of Kazakhstan, Gylym, Almaty*). (in Rus).
- Zholdasbaev 2006 – Zholdasbaev, S 2006, *Istorija Kazahstana, Mektep, Almaty*. (Zholdasbaev, S 2006, *History of Kazakhstan, Mektep, Almaty*). (in Rus).