

САЯСИ ЖӘНЕ ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК ТАРИХ
ПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ И СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ ИСТОРИЯ
POLITICAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY

FTAXP/ MPHTI / IRSTI: 03.20

ӘӨЖ/УДК/ UDC: 93/94

<https://doi.org/10.51889/2959-6017.2026.90.3.011>

G.Kushenova ^{*1}, A.Auanasova ²

¹ Associate Professor of L. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.

*e-mail: kushenovaganizhamal@gmail.com.

Orcid ID: 0000-0001-9438-8381

² Professor of L. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.

e-mail: auanasova_a@mail.ru

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9214-8576>

THE PARADOX OF COLONIZATION: RUSSIA'S ROLE IN THE PROMOTION
OF PAN-TURKISM IN THE KAZAKH STEPPE (LATE 19th - EARLY 20TH CENTURY)

Abstract

Within the framework of the study, an analysis of key primary sources and scholarly works was conducted, providing a deeper understanding of the impact of imperialist policies on the spread of the ideology of Turkism.

During the late 19th - early 20th century, although the Russian Empire viewed Pan-Turkism as a threat to its territorial integrity, its policies toward nationalities inadvertently fostered conditions that facilitated the movement's development. This paradox highlights the intricate relationship between colonization and national identity, which evolved through close interaction and demonstrated a dynamic of mutual influence.

At the beginning of the 20th century, the paradoxical nature of imperial colonization policies became evident in Kazakh society. The empire's "civilizing" policies, implemented in the fields of education, culture, and religion, accelerated the formation of an intellectual elite and contributed to the strengthening of intellectual and political movements within Kazakh society. Concrete results of this development can be seen in the three political projects: the Alash Autonomy, the Turkestan Autonomy, and the activities of the Shura-i Ulema party.

Thus, the Russian Empire's policy of undermining local cultural identity actually acted as a catalyst for the spread of «Turkism» ideas and the strengthening of national consciousness in the Kazakh steppe.

Keywords: Pan-Turkism, colonization, Kazakh Steppe, Alash Autonomy, Turkestan Autonomy, Shura-i Ulema Party.

Acknowledgments. The work was carried out within the framework of grant funding for the project "The History of Islamism, Turkism, and the Alash Movement: Dialogue of Traditions and Features of the Formation of National Identity" (IRN AP23484987), with financial support from the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Г.И. Кушенова ^{1*}, А.М. Ауанасова ²

1 Ассоциированный профессор
Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева,
кандидат исторических наук.
Астана, Республика Казахстан. e-mail: kushenovaganizhamal@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9438-8381>*

*2 Профессор Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева,
доктор исторических наук.
Астана, Республика Казахстан. e-mail: auanasova_a@mail.ru
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9214-8576>*

ПАРАДОКС КОЛОНИЗАЦИИ: РОЛЬ РОССИИ В ПРОДВИЖЕНИИ ПАНТЮРКИЗМА В КАЗАХСКОЙ СТЕПИ (КОНЕЦ XIX-НАЧАЛО XX ВЕКА)

Аннотация

В рамках данного исследования проведён анализ ключевых источников и научных трудов, что позволило глубже понять влияние имперской политики на распространение идеологии тюркизма.

В конце XIX - начале XX века, несмотря на восприятие пантюркизма Российской империей как угрозы её территориальной целостности, проводимая ею национальная политика непреднамеренно создавала условия, способствовавшие развитию данного движения. Указанный парадокс выявляет сложный характер взаимосвязи между колонизацией и национальной идентичностью, формировавшейся в процессе их тесного взаимодействия и отличавшейся динамикой взаимного влияния.

В начале XX века парадоксальный характер колониальной политики империи стал особенно очевиден в казахском обществе. «Цивилизаторская» политика империи, реализуемая в сферах образования, культуры и религии, ускорила формирование интеллектуальной элиты и способствовала усилению интеллектуальных и политических движений в казахском обществе. Заметные результаты данного процесса нашли отражение в трёх политических проектах: Алашской автономии, Туркестанской автономии и деятельности партии «Шура-и улема».

Таким образом, политика Российской империи, ориентированная на подрыв местной культурной идентичности, в действительности выступила катализатором распространения идей тюркизма и укрепления национального самосознания в казахской степи.

Ключевые слова: пантюркизм, колонизация, казахская степь, Алашская автономия, Туркестанская автономия, партия «Шура-и улема».

Благодарность: Работа выполнена при финансовой поддержке Комитета науки Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан в рамках грантового финансирования «История движений исламизма, тюркизма и Алаш: диалог традиций и особенности формирования национальной идентичности» (ИРН AP23484987).

Г.И. Кушенова ¹*, А.М. Ауанасова ²

¹* Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің қауымдастырылған профессоры, тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты.

Астана, Қазақстан Республикасы. e-mail: kushenovaganizhamal@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9438-8381>

² Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің профессоры, тарих ғылымдарының докторы

Астана, Қазақстан Республикасы. e-mail: auanasova_a@mail.ru
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9214-8576>

ОТАРЛАУ ҚАЙШЫЛЫҒЫ: РЕСЕЙДІҢ ҚАЗАҚ ДАЛАСЫНДА ПАНТҮРКІШІЛДІКТІҢ ДАМУЫНА ӘСЕРІ (XIX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ СОҢЫ - XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАСЫ)

Аңдатпа

Осы зерттеу аясында негізгі дереккөздер мен ғылыми еңбектерге талдау жүргізіліп, империялық саясаттың түрікшілдік идеологиясының таралуына ықпалын тереңірек түсінуге мүмкіндік берілді.

XIX ғасырдың соңы - XX ғасырдың басында Ресей империясы пантүркішілдікті өзінің аумақтық тұтастығына төнген қауіп ретінде қабылдағанына қарамастан, оның жүргізген ұлттық саясаты бұл қозғалыстың дамуына қолайлы жағдайларды бейсаналы түрде қалыптастырды. Аталған парадокс отарлау мен ұлттық бірегейліктің өзара тығыз ықпалдастықта қалыптасқан күрделі байланысын айқындайды және олардың өзара әсерінің серпінді сипатын көрсетеді.

XX ғасырдың басында империяның отарлық саясатының қайшылықты сипаты қазақ қоғамында айқын көрініс тапты. Білім беру, мәдениет және дін салаларында жүзеге асырылған империяның «өркениеттендіру» саясаты зиялы қауымның қалыптасуын жеделдетіп, қазақ қоғамындағы зияткерлік және саяси қозғалыстардың күшеюіне ықпал етті. Бұл үдерістің айқын нәтижелері Алаш автономиясы, Түркістан автономиясы және «Шура-и улема» партиясының қызметі арқылы үш саяси жобада айқындалды.

Осылайша, жергілікті мәдени бірегейлікті әлсіретуге бағытталған Ресей империясының саясаты іс жүзінде түрікшілдік идеялардың таралуына және қазақ даласындағы ұлттық сананың нығаюына түрткі болды.

Кілт сөздер: пантүркішілдік, отарлау, қазақ даласы, Алаш автономиясы, Түркістан автономиясы, «Шура-и улема» партиясы

Алғыс айту: Жұмыс «Исламшылдық, түрікшілдік және Алаш қозғалыстарының тарихы: дәстүрлер диалогы мен ұлттық бірегейлікті қалыптастыру ерекшеліктері» (ИРН АР23484987) гранттық қаржыландыру аясында Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитетінің қаржылық қолдауымен орындалды.

Introduction

At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, 'Pan-Turkism' spread widely among Turkic peoples, and although the Russian Empire perceived it as a threat, its policies indirectly contributed to its development.

Therefore, the aim of this research is to uncover the paradox of the Russian Empire's colonial policies, demonstrating how its efforts to suppress cultural identity in the Kazakh steppe inadvertently contributed to the spread and consolidation of Pan-Turkism.

The hypothesis of the research is that, despite the Russian Empire's colonial policies being aimed at eliminating the cultural and religious distinctiveness of the Kazakh steppe, these policies, paradoxically,

contributed to the strengthening of the idea of Pan-Turkism within Kazakh society. In other words, Pan-Turkism emerged as a response to imperial pressure and played a significant role in the development of Kazakh national consciousness.

Thus, there is a need to understand the impact of the colonial regime on the development of national movements and cultural identities. In this regard, the relevance of the research topic can be demonstrated from several perspectives: first, the study is important for understanding how colonial policies aimed at weakening local cultures actually contributed to the development of opposing trends, and for analyzing the evolution of national movements.

Second, studying the paradox within the context of colonialism not only allows for a deeper understanding of historical phenomena, but also provides insight into the broader social and political processes that emerge in colonial conditions. In other words, it demonstrates how external interference in the pursuit of intended goals can lead to unintended consequences.

Third, the colonial regime was directed at assimilating local populations, which in practice led to cultural transformation among these communities. However, as a response to such efforts, intellectual movements emerged with the aim of preserving and reviving local cultural and religious traditions. This research, therefore, aids in understanding the complexities of adaptation and resistance processes. Fourth, we believe that issues related to resistance against colonial regimes and the formation of new cultural and political ideologies remain relevant today. Thus, the findings of this study offer valuable insights into current geopolitical and cultural transformations.

The scientific novelty of this research lies, first, in its focus on the relationship between colonial policy and the idea of Pan-Turkism. As a result, for the first time, the impact of Russia's colonial policies on the spread of Pan-Turkism is analyzed in a comprehensive manner, offering new interpretations. Second, the activities of the Kazakh intellectuals are re-examined in relation to Pan-Turkism ideas. Third, through the analysis of archival and historical data, the paradoxical nature of imperial policies is clarified, and their impact on the national movement of the Kazakh people is explored.

Materials and methods

The study analyzed key sources and scholarly works that provide a deeper understanding of the influence of imperialist policies on the spread of 'Turkism'. To this end, works published in English, Turkish, Russian, and Kazakh languages were examined.

The source base of this research consists of materials from the British Newspaper Archive of the British Library in the United Kingdom. These sources include materials related to interactions within the framework of Russia's colonial policy toward Central Asia. Specifically, the following periodicals were used: The Berkshire Chronicle [1], The Globe and Traveller [2].

The source base of this research is further enriched by the works of key ideologists of Pan-Turkism, including Ziya Gokalp [3], Yusuf Akchura [4], Ismail Gasprinsky [5; 6], as well as Bashkir intellectual Ahmet Zeki Velidi Togan [7]. Additionally, works by Kazakh intellectuals and political leaders of Central Asian peoples – such as Serali Lapin [8; 9], Alikhan Bokeikhan [10], Mustafa Shokay [11], Mirzhaqip Dulatuly [12] – were also utilized.

The historiographical foundation of this research is composed of scholarly works that have both direct and indirect relevance to the topic. The work 'Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse' [13] by American scholar Homi Bhabha, is valuable for establishing the theoretical basis of the article and for providing a deeper understanding of the paradoxical nature of colonial policies. Additionally, the work 'Pan-Turanism' [14] by American historian T. Lothrop Stoddard, which examines racial and ethnic issues within the context of global politics, is significant for exploring the theoretical aspects of this research.

Relevant to the research topic is the work of French Orientalist Alexandre Bennigsen, 'Panturkism and Panislamism in History and Today' [15], which is valuable for its examination of issues related to the topic. Additionally, the work 'Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia' [16] by emigre American scholar

Serge A. Zenkovsky, was also utilized. However, S.A. Zenkovsky's perspective seems to suggest that only members of the Russian intelligentsia influenced the development of Kazakh national consciousness.

It is important to note that, for states within the post-Soviet territory, this topic remained largely outside the scope of scholarly research from the imperial period up until the collapse of the Soviet Union. Predominantly, only its negative effects, harmful consequences, and potentially dangerous aspects were addressed.

Recent studies have included works by Russian scholars. Among them, the researcher R.F. Mukhametdinov's comprehensive monograph, which provides a comparative analysis of the birth and development of 'Turkism' in the Russian and Ottoman Empires, stands out [17]. Researcher Yu. A. Lysenko explores the reasons for the participation of the peoples of Central Asia in the all-Russian Muslim movement of the early 20th century, attributing it to the consequences of the integration policies implemented in these ethno-regions [18]. Scholars O.N. Senyutkina and Yu.N. Guseva focus on the views of the political police officials of the Russian Empire towards 'Pan-Islamism' and 'Pan-Turkism', tracing these movements back to I. Gasprinsky's 'Tarcuman' newspaper [19].

Among Kazakhstani researchers, there are also studies that address 'Turkism' as a specific scientific issue. Notably, the fundamental works of researchers such as A. Auanasova, S.K. Shildebay, and M.K. Koigeldiev can be highlighted. In his dissertation titled 'The Role and Importance of Turkism in the National Liberation Movement of Kazakhstan in the First Half of the 20th Century (A Historical Analysis)', S.K. Shildebay concludes that 'Turkism, or the idea of a united Turkestan, was a significant historical and mobilizing ideology in the national liberation movement of Kazakhstan in the first half of the 20th century' [20, 24]. Similarly, M.K. Koigeldiev in his monograph 'Kazakhstani Statehood: The Struggle for National Unity (19th Century to Early 21st Century)' states: 'in the face of threats from Russian rule, there was a search for a common idea that would unite the Turkic peoples within the empire' [21, 332]. In analyzing the activities of Turkestan intellectuals, A. Auanasova notes that when the Tsarist regime collapsed, Turkestan came under the control of the 'triple' power (Bolsheviks, the executive bodies of the Provisional Government, and the 'Shura-i-Islamia'), and emphasizes that the only organization defending the national interests of the local Kazakh, Uzbek, Turkmen, and other indigenous peoples was the 'Shura-i-Islamia' [22, 106].

Thus, as mentioned above, a number of scientific works indirectly related to the topic were also used in the course of the research.

The research was carried out through the following set of methods: 1) The historical-genetic method is effective in analyzing the evolution of the idea of 'Turkism'. It allows for the identification of the factors that influenced the formation and development of this idea and the changes in its understanding and application across different historical periods. It also helps to understand the impact of Russia's colonial policies and the social changes in the Kazakh steppe on the formation of the 'Turkism' ideology; 2) The use of the historical systematization method in the research allows for the study of colonial policies, the idea of «Turkism», the actions of the national intelligentsia, and the connections between them; 3) The content analysis method was used to identify the explanations of the 'Turkism' ideologists and the Kazakh intellectuals on the concept of 'Turkism' and the terms related to the research topic; 4) The comparative analysis method was employed to study the views and positions of Kazakh intellectuals, such as A. Bokeikhan, M. Shokay, and S. Lapin, on 'Turkism'; 5) The historical reconstruction method allows for the reconstruction of the developmental processes of the national movement by describing the social and political conditions of the Kazakh steppe during the imperial period; 6) The cause-and-effect analysis method enables the understanding of the interconnections between processes and their effects. For example, the cause is the assimilation and unification policies of the Russian Empire towards the Turkic peoples, and the consequence is the strengthening of political driving ideas, which led to the consolidation of ties between the Turkic peoples.

Thus, the combination of methods helps to uncover the paradoxical aspects of imperial policies.

Results and discussion.

In scholarly discourses, the colonial experience of empires is viewed not only as a process of oppression and subjugation but also as a multi-layered interaction of cultures that generates forms of cultural resistance. This perspective is particularly influenced by the concept put forward by H. Bhabha, which has had a significant impact on postcolonial theory. He combines the concepts of ‘mimicry’ and ‘ambivalence’ in imperial rule, which allows for a deeper understanding of the internal contradictions of the colonial process. According to H. Bhabha, ‘mimicry’ describes the process in which colonized peoples change their cultures by imitating the colonizers, while ‘ambivalence’ highlights the contradictory and multifaceted nature of this process. The colonized people not only resist but also end up submitting to the colonizers. Thus, Bhabha attempts to explain how these processes lead to internal conflicts and uncertainties [13, 126-133]. Furthermore, A.I. Miller states in ‘Empire and the Modern World – Some Paradoxes and Misconceptions’ that ‘the relationships between empire and the nation-state represent one aspect of the paradox of relations between empire and the modern state’. He points out that even France, which became the model for nation-states, underwent a process of suppressing local cultures and languages in favor of the dominant culture and language of the Île-de-France region [23, 6-7].

This theory can be illustrated through the political actions of the Russian Empire in the Kazakh steppe. According to H. Bhabha’s concept, the ideas of ‘mimicry’ and ‘ambivalence’ in the cultural policy of the colonizing empire play an important role in understanding this situation. The influence of the Russian Empire on the Kazakh land led to the local population’s aspiration for civilization and progress, while at the same time, the emergence of cultural differences and linguistic dependency intensified the contradictions. To better understand the practical application of Bhabha’s concepts of ‘mimicry’ and ‘ambivalence’, we can refer to the memoirs of the Kazakh intellectual S. Lapin. His statement: ‘We sought solace in the “purity” of the Russians, as we had distanced ourselves from our roots’ [8, 190], reveals that the process in Kazakh society led to profound social and cultural changes. This view illustrates that the people who fell victim to colonialism were deprived of their cultural, linguistic, and spiritual identity, and we can also observe the deepening contradictions between cultures. The contradiction is evident in the way the Kazakh people, imitating and adapting to Russian culture, began to view their own native culture with a sense of alienation.

This contradiction became especially apparent when empires justified their actions as ‘civilizing missions’. For example, in 1864, the Russian Empire’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, Alexander Gorchakov, sent a memorandum to Russian ambassadors abroad, emphasizing that civilized nations would be forced to exert dominance in order to protect the interests of border security and trade relations [23, 97]. A concrete manifestation of this approach was the establishment of Russian cultural and linguistic dominance, which generated resistance and contradictions among the local populations. The ambiguity and cultural contradictions created under colonial rule can also be clearly seen in the memoirs of the Kazakh intellectual S. Lapin. He reveals the changes in the thoughts of his people and the spiritual crisis they experienced: «In the late 70s and early 80s, we, still young foreign peoples, were pleased with external recognition and interaction, studying in Russian schools, and our teachers assured us that ‘the civilizing mission of Russia in the Asian East lay in education and enlightenment. We eagerly believed these beautiful words, and with the enthusiasm typical of youth, we gave ourselves completely to the spiritual authority of the Russian teachers, which deeply worried our mothers and grandmothers. However, the period of naive enthusiasm was replaced by a time of doubt and an attempt to understand the silent struggle within us between two, sometimes contradictory, forces» [8, 190]. This excerpt from the memoirs illustrates the concrete social and cultural impact of colonialism and how it led to changes in the spiritual life of the people. Thus, by observing the cultural contradictions in Bhabha’s theories and Lapin’s memoirs, we can gain a deeper understanding of how colonial empires created internal conflicts and contradictions.

Thus, the colonial policy was complex and multifaceted. It sought to ‘civilize’ the local region and make it more conducive to its own interests, while the local population lived in a state of adaptation and

resistance. This process was implemented by introducing laws into the local region, imposing restrictions on their existing way of life, and making radical changes to their traditional laws. For example, the introduction of restrictions on religious practices led to conflicting goals and outcomes. Studies show that in the first half of the 19th century, only a few people from among the Kazakhs went on pilgrimage to Mecca, whereas by 1905, as many as 500 people from just Omsk alone had obtained passports to travel to Mecca [10, 302]. Considering that the pilgrimage process was made more difficult compared to earlier periods, we can observe the negative consequences of this policy. Moreover, the local population began finding even illegal alternative ways to perform the pilgrimage. In another example, we find information about the Russian administration's requirement for teachers in Kazakh primary schools to know Russian, as well as the need to obtain special permission to build schools and mosques, with such permits typically being denied. However, shortly after, it is noted that this policy 'opened the way for the illegal construction of schools and mosques' [10, 303].

Thus, the deepening of socio-economic difficulties and the need for spiritual unity prompted Kazakh society to seek new ideas. This process especially influenced the widespread dissemination of Islamic and Turkic ideologies. In turn, this led to a series of social and cultural reactions as a result of the policies implemented by the Russian Empire. In order to protect their traditions, the local population sought ways to unite as a singular political force rather than acknowledging cultural differences. Thus, the ideas of Turkism and Islamism became pathways reflecting the need for the spiritual and cultural unity of the people.

The Crimean Tatar I. Gasprinsky's slogan 'The Unity of Language, Thought, and Action' became a rallying cry, and the reformist Jadidist movement can be seen as one of the first efforts of this period aimed at promoting 'Turkism' and establishing its scientific foundation. His newspapers were read not only throughout all regions of Russia but also by Turkic peoples in China, Iran, and Turkey, and he never used the term 'Pan-Turkism' [5, 5].

As researcher A. Bennigsen noted, Muslims of Russia, isolated and forgotten by the rest of the Muslim World, seemed doomed. These Muslims reacted with exceptional vigour, and the Panturkic movement was a by-product of their reaction. The reformist jadid movement, inaugurated in 1883 by the Crimean Ismail Gaspraly [15, 39]. The vigorous response of Russia's Muslim populations to their isolation was also spurred by imperial policies directed toward other ethnic groups, including those in Central Asia.

Similarly, Yu.A. Lysenko characterized the empire's policies in the Central Asian regions as 'an attempt to modernize the traditional social institutions and lifestyles of local ethnic groups', further noting that it 'contributed to the formation of the Russian super-ethnos and helped to maintain the territorial integrity of the empire' [18, 94-95].

However, the researcher does not dismiss the fact that 'a crucial aspect of this integration policy was cultural and linguistic unification, which became one of the key factors in the strengthening of ethnic consciousness and ethnic cohesion among the peoples of the national regions, leading to an increase in processes aimed at separation from the centre' [18, 95].

Thus, Russia's cultural and linguistic integration policy not only created social difficulties in Kazakh society but also sparked a strong drive to preserve ethnic and cultural identity. These processes contributed to the Kazakh society's striving for political independence and its efforts to strengthen cultural cohesion.

It is well known that by the end of the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire became an important centre for many reformers. Understanding the context of this situation in relation to the Russian Empire is crucial, as the cultural and political activities of both empires played a significant role in the development of national unity and political movements among Turkic peoples. The influence of the Ottoman Empire laid the foundation for the formation of such modernist reforms. Therefore, when the First State Duma was dissolved and members of the Muslim faction were persecuted, Russian Turks sought refuge in Istanbul. Researcher S.A. Zenkovsky notes that this situation had ambiguous outcomes. On the one hand, the active group of 'nationalist-panturkist' leaders moved their operations to Turkey,

and through their underground struggle in Russia, they fostered radicalism; on the other hand, the cessation of open propaganda services led to the pacification of the eastern regions of Russia [16, 106].

Thus, the idea of 'Turkism', which was aimed at supporting the cultural development of Turkic peoples, could have been seen as a political movement threatening the integrity of the Russian Empire and may have been replaced by the concept of 'Pan-Turkism'. Considering that the Russian Empire consisted of multi-ethnic territories, it was not out of the question that the territories populated by Turkic peoples in Central Asia and the Caucasus could have split off.

In this regard, considering Z. Gokalp's 'Turkism' ideology was crucial for the Russian Empire, as it viewed the unification of Turkic peoples from a geopolitical standpoint. This, in turn, raised concerns about the potential national divisions within Russia. Z.Gokalp categorized the concept of 'Turkism' into three levels: 'Turkism', 'Oguzism or Turkmenism' and 'Turanism' [3, 24]. According to Z.Gokalp, the term «Turk» was specifically used to refer to the Turks of Turkey, whereas the concept of «Turan» was the common designation used to unite ancient, related peoples as one community [3, 23].

There is a significant distinction between Z.Gokalp's 'Turkism' ideology and the views of Yu. Akchura. While Z.Gokalp adhered to the geopolitical idea of 'Turan', which advocated for the unity of Turkic peoples, Yu.Akchura believed that 'Turkism' should primarily be cultural and scientific in nature. These differing perspectives had varying impacts on the political actions of the Turkic peoples within Russia.

However, under strict control and persecution policies, the cultural unity of Turkic peoples was clearly perceived as a step towards nationalism and separatism.

According to Yu. Akchura, the most favorable regions for the formation and development of Turkism were Turkestan, the Volga, and the Ural regions, rather than the Ottoman Empire, where the Turks were more densely located. He stated: 'The idea of forming a Turkic political nationalism based on ethnicity is very new. I do not think this idea existed in the current Ottoman state or in previous Turkic states', and further wrote that 'recently, in Istanbul, a society has been formed that supports the idea of Turkism with a scientific, rather than political, nature' [4, 23]. Similarly, L. Stoddard noted, 'In fact, this movement began earlier along the Volga than on the Bosphorus' [14, 17].

Although the imperial system was unified, it is important to note that intellectual, political, national, and other movements in the context of local regional characteristics could lead to different outcomes. In this regard, the influence of the 'Turkism' ideology in the Russian Empire had its own distinct features when compared to the Ottoman Empire. Researcher A. Bennigsen attempts to explain this comprehensively: 1) Supporters of Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism among the Russian Turks did not engage in conflicts. In this case, the two movements complemented each other, whereas in the Ottoman Empire, they opposed one another; 2) In Russia, non-Muslim Turks were not considered part of the Turkish people. However, Shiites and Sunnis cooperated equally. Conflicts arose not from theoretical differences but from practical issues; 3) The Pan-Turkism program, as Soviet historians claimed, was not an 'imperialist dream', but rather reasonable and pragmatic. The Turks comprised 75% of Russia's Muslim community, and their literacy rate was approximately 90%. Therefore, their political dominance was uncontested; 4) Among Russian Turks, especially at the literary level, linguistic unity had already existed. All Muslims shared a common historical and cultural heritage; 5) While political rivalries between the right-wing and left-wing emerged in 1904, they did not escalate into national conflicts [15, 40].

Thus, although there were deep contradictions between the Turkism ideology in Russia and the 'Turkism' movement in the Ottoman Empire, both movements aimed at supporting the unity of the Turkic peoples. However, in Russia, these movements complemented each other and found harmony, while in the Ottoman Empire, these views stood in opposition. Therefore, when studying the 'Turkism' movement, it is important to evaluate it while considering regional peculiarities. In this way, the 'Turkism' movement contributed to strengthening the national consciousness of the Turkic peoples within the multi-ethnic structure of the Russian Empire. As Bennigsen correctly notes, 'Turkism' was not the result of a prolonged historical evolution [15, 39].

In Yu. Akchura's research, we believe that his statement regarding the favorable development of the Turkism ideology in the regions of Turkestan, the Volga, and the Ural was not made by chance. This is because, in these regions, the paradoxical effects of colonial policy had a significant impact on the consciousness of the Turkic peoples. Here, it is also worth considering the perspective of researcher R. F. Mukhammetdinov. According to him, in the Ottoman Empire, loyalty to the sultanate came first, followed by the idea of religious Islamism [17, 24]. This could have acted as a brake on the development of Turkism.

The division of views on 'Turkism' ideology in Russia and the overestimation of its political danger is particularly evident when considering the differing opinions among 'police officials'. The harsh actions of the Russian authorities toward the Muslim elite only intensified the popular resistance to colonialism [19, 35]. Thus, the recognition of the danger of 'Turkism' in Russia, on the contrary, contributed to the effective spread of the idea. In the Kazakh steppe, restrictions and censorship on literary and cultural publications, as well as the policy of Russification, accelerated the process. For example, despite strict bans on publications promoting ideas of independence, national consciousness, or religious unity, and the establishment of censorship controls, the movement among the Tatars developed significantly, and its influence reached the Kazakhs as well. More specifically, in terms of national consciousness and cultural development, the impact of the Tatars on Kazakh society was particularly notable. After 1904, the lifting of many government restrictions in the Russian Empire even led the Tatars into a literary renaissance period. They were primarily supported by the Tatar oil oligarchs in Baku, who played a key role in providing the financial backing for the movement. [14, 18].

The Kazakh intellectuals began reading the books of Tatar publishers, and through these works, they started to absorb the idea of 'Turkism'. These literary and cultural exchanges not only strengthened the enlightenment process within Kazakh society but also contributed to the spread of the idea of 'Turkism' in the Kazakh steppe. In this regard, the writings of the Kazakh intellectual A. Bokeikhan provide specific examples: 'in the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) steppe, a large number of books by Tatar publishers and Tatar newspapers are copied. Since 1905, several booklets containing poems and prose in the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) language by Kazakh authors have also begun to be published by Tatar publishers' [10, 307].

In general, there had been long-established connections between the Kazakhs and Tatars in the fields of education, enlightenment, and religion. For example, on July 27, 1878, the periodical publication 'The Globe' reported that the Torghay Kazakhs had raised 20,000 rubles to send three children to Kazan University for their studies [2, 1]. The idea of 'Turkism' further energized this existing relationship and strengthened the ties between the Kazakhs and the Ottoman Turks.

The spread of the idea of Turkism in the Kazakh steppe can be traced through the Russification policy, which was based on the common Turkic identity. The policy of Russification provoked resistance within Kazakh society, which, in turn, led to skepticism towards the influence of Western culture. The idea of modernization through Western culture is clearly reflected in the views of Azerbaijani intellectual A. Hussein-zadeh, I. Gasprinsky, and Kazakh intellectuals. However, in practice, the acceptance of Western cultural innovations conflicted with local conservative perspectives.

In the work titled 'Kyrgyz', Kazakh intellectual A. Bokeikhan identifies two main directions within the Kazakh intelligentsia: Westernizers and Turkists-Islamists. Among these, Turkism and Islamism received more support from the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) intellectuals. This, of course, demonstrates that Kazakh society strongly opposed the Russification policy and viewed Western culture with scepticism [10,308-309]. A clear example of the «Turkism» movement in this context is Alash intellectual M.Dulatuly, who published his writings under the pseudonym 'Child of the Turk's' (Turk Balasy) [24, 131].

In conclusion, the rapid spread of the idea of 'Turkism' in the Kazakh steppes resulted from the multifaceted imperial policies. Additionally, the interconnectedness of the factors influencing this spread was profound. The colonial policy, including the Russification policy, and the efforts of cultural homogenization increased the local population's need to protect their national and religious identities,

which in turn facilitated the development of the «Turkism» ideology. Thus, the reformist movement, based on education and enlightenment, laid the scientific and practical foundation for the ‘Turkism’ ideology. This contributed to the cultural advancement of Kazakh society, the acquisition of knowledge, and the strengthening of national consciousness.

The expansion of Russian territory in Central Asia was a significant part of the European colonial expansion in the 19th century. This process was perceived in a similar way by both the Russian Empire itself and its opponents [24, 97]. Like other European empires, Russia’s colonial policy had paradoxical consequences. Initially, its goal appeared to be strengthening control and integration of the region, yet in practice, it contributed to the flourishing of the ‘Turkism’ movement. The primary mechanism driving this process was Russia’s policies of ‘cultural identity’ and ‘Russification’.

The policy of ‘cultural identity’ was implemented through the introduction of imperial laws and administrative governance systems, the adoption of Russian educational standards, and the restriction of local customs and traditions. The ‘Russification’ policy was primarily carried out through measures such as the introduction of the Russian language in local schools, the use of Russian in official institutions, the settlement of Russian peasants in Kazakh lands, and the strengthening of the Orthodox Christian faith. For example, the reforms adopted under the titles ‘The Siberian Kyrgyz (Kazakh) Regulation’ of 1822 and ‘The Orenburg Kyrgyz (Kazakh) Regulation’ of 1824 abolished the governance institutions in the Kazakh steppes. The dismantling of these governance institutions led to a fundamental change in the political structure of the Kazakh steppe. These changes not only abolished traditional political independence but also disrupted the political hierarchy and internal relations within Kazakh society. As a result, Kazakh society lost its traditional political independence and the local political elite’s ability to influence domestic policy.

The Russian administrative structure was fully established in the Kazakh steppe. This situation eliminated the internal political influence of the Kazakh people and demonstrated their complete subordination to Russian officials. As M. Shokay stated, ‘in Turkestan, the ruling nation is the Russians. Therefore, the administration was also in their hands...’ [11, 63]. These changes not only disrupted the traditional political structures of Kazakh society but also increased the local population’s complete dependency on the Russian administrative centre. From this point onward, only individuals deemed «convenient» for the authorities were appointed to leadership positions, and the Russian administration became a unified central authority. The newly introduced imperial governance system aimed to establish full dependence on Russia’s centralized power.

These changes affected not only the administrative structure but also the social and spiritual frameworks. The new administrative divisions of the Kazakh steppe not only facilitated central control but also led to the disruption of the Kazakh people’s tribal connections, accelerating their cultural and social fragmentation. In this context, the Kazakh intellectual S. Lapin wrote that the new administrative divisions and the rules implemented for the steppe regions represented a ‘blow to the tribal unity’ of the Kazakh people [9, 130]. Lapin’s statement highlights that the tribal relations in Kazakh society were not only a social structure but also a fundamental pillar of stability and internal unity. Until then, these tribal connections had provided a system of social support through kinship ties, maintaining the unity of the Kazakh people. From this point onward, the social and cultural fragmentation of the people and the loss of the nation’s identity became much easier.

In addition, structural changes in the spiritual sphere were aimed at diminishing the influence of Muslim religious leaders. New structures were established to oversee the activities and appointments of the mullahs among the Kazakhs. However, it was precisely in this context that restrictions were imposed on religious activities such as the construction of mosques and the distribution of religious literature. Muslim clergy were required to register with the authorities.

Furthermore, restrictions were imposed on preaching related to national or religious unity. This was because religious belief was one of the unifying factors of society. In his 1916 essay ‘The Life of the People in Turkestan’, Russian officer N.S. Lykoshin stated that the propagation of Sufi doctrine should not only be seen as a gradual Islamization of the Kazakh-Kyrgyz nomads but also as a powerful political unifying force. He emphasized the need to consider measures to weaken the authority of the religious leaders (ishans) in the region [25, 155].

Indeed, for centuries, Islam has not only been the foundation of spiritual and cultural values in Kazakh society, but also the primary pillar of social and collective unity. The Islamic beliefs of the people, based on traditional customs, moral principles, and spiritual values, have played a significant role in maintaining social and moral order.

In this territory, the Russian Empire's attempts to impose religious restrictions targeted not only the people's religious beliefs but also their cultural unity. As religious pressure increased, religion became not just a matter of faith and spiritual support, but also a form of resistance to the authority of the imperial government. Thus, Kazakh society began to perceive Islam not only as a religious belief but also as a tool for preserving its national identity. As a result, the group of Kazakh intellectuals was divided into two factions: one was pro-Western, while the other was Turkic-Islamic. The divide between Islam and national identity was not sharply pronounced.

This reform, on the one hand, contradicted the traditional structures of society, while, on the other hand, it prompted the Kazakh intellectuals and national elites to seek new political directions. The laws enacted, in practice, led to inequality and discrimination against the Kazakhs. This is clearly reflected in S. Lapin's statement: 'God save us from such protectors of the Kyrgyz... "Zhana Zaman" employees and the officials of the resettlement administration' [9, 131]. This situation, in turn, contributed to the intensification of the Kazakhs' efforts to preserve their national identity, fostering new cultural and intellectual initiatives. For example, in 1912, A. Baitursynov created the first version of the Kazakh alphabet based on Arabic script [26].

The imperial government strengthened the status of the Russian language by applying it in administrative and legal matters, thereby reducing the opportunities for Kazakhs to engage in political and social life. To further consolidate Russian influence, the educational system began to be used as a tool for «training cadres favorable to the empire». For example, like many other English newspapers, 'The Berkshire Chronicle' also reported on January 25, 1868, the opening of a Russian military school in Orenburg, located on the border of Turkestan, which accepted 120 children from Kazakh nobility among its 200 students [1, 2].

Overall, such schools provided opportunities for career advancement. Mastery of the Russian language and knowledge of Russian laws opened access to administrative positions within the imperial governance structure. As A. Bokeikhan noted, 'in any district of the Kazakh steppe, a person who could not read or write in Russian would not be able to become a district leader, which excluded even respected individuals who had previously held such positions...' [10, 457], this in turn affected the social status and cultural outlook of society. Moreover, the repeated petitions of Kazakh intellectuals to St. Petersburg reflected their efforts to preserve cultural and linguistic identity. In 1905, a group of Kazakh intellectuals and tribal elders went to St. Petersburg to solicit Tsar Nicholas II to limitation of colonization in the Kazakh steppe and to allow the use of the Kazakh language, along with Russian in legal and administrative matters. However, as usual, their petitions were not granted [16, 67].

The empire's efforts to assimilate the local population continued to manifest in other areas of the Kazakh people's lives. In an attempt to establish the dominance of Russian culture and values, Russian culture was actively promoted. The organization of theatrical performances, public lectures, reading rooms, and libraries, many of which featured Russian literature, became widespread. The settlement of Russian peasants in the Kazakh steppe expanded. These state-funded initiatives contributed to the positive reception of Russian culture among the Kazakh population. Additionally, a concept was formed that in order to be considered a 'cultured' person, it was necessary to abandon one's own cultural roots.

However, despite this assimilation, a rise in the cultural and linguistic self-awareness of Turkic peoples began to emerge. By the end of the 19th century, although printing in the Turkic-Tatar languages in the Russian Empire had developed relatively slowly, the first newspapers in various Turkic languages started to appear. For example, in Tbilisi, the Azerbaijani language newspaper 'Ziya' and 'Keshkul'; in Tashkent, the Uzbek language 'Turkestan Gazette'; and in Bakhchysarai, the Crimean Tatar language 'Tarcuman' [6, 217]. However, the first publications of the Kazakh press did not appear until the early 20th century.

These publications were mainly funded by the founders' own resources, making it difficult to establish a long-term, stable press. In contrast, publications that promoted imperial values were funded by the Russian authorities. One such publication was the 'Turkestan Vedomosti' newspaper.

For the imperial authorities, the strict censorship and restrictions imposed on publications were measures aimed at suppressing any national activism, whereas for the Kazakh intellectuals, these publications became an important channel for spreading ideas of cultural and political independence. An example of this is the case of the Tatar newspaper 'Vakit', the Kazakh newspaper 'Qazaq', and the 'Ay Qap' journal. During this time, M. Dulatyuly's poem 'Oyan, Kazakh!' (Wake Up, Kazakh!) became a rallying cry to awaken the national consciousness of the Kazakh people.

These trends can be seen in official documents and archival materials. For example, in the document titled «No. 10. August 4, 1911, a report was submitted from Semey to the Orenburg Governor regarding the content of the communication dated July 31, No. 8636. The document stated: I request that the editors of 'Vakit' newspaper and 'Ay Qap' journal be held accountable for the published correspondence. These materials were printed in violation of the mandatory permit procedure. Additionally, should it be possible to identify the author of these correspondences, please inform me. Governor Troynitsky» [12, 17]. Furthermore, 'according to the Orenburg Governor's decree No. 93411 dated September 3, 1911, it was found that the 'Vakit' newspaper, published in Orenburg, contained a brochure titled 'Oyan, Kazakh!' written in the Kazakh language. This brochure was accused of potentially inciting protests among the Kazakh population against the current policies of the Russian government' [12, 20].

Soon after, the author of the poem, M. Dulatyuly, was arrested. Additionally, starting in 1913, the editor of the 'Qazaq' newspaper, A. Baitursynov, who dedicated his efforts to introducing the people to their rich cultural heritage and encouraging spiritual development and education, was imprisoned in the Semey prison following the First Russian Revolution [27, 11]. Thus, numerous examples of such incidents can be found in the biographies of Kazakh intellectuals. Furthermore, publications addressing topics related to Turkic unity or issues concerning the culture and history of Turkic peoples were also subjected to restrictions or bans.

The strict censorship and various restrictions imposed by the imperial authorities further intensified the national struggle of Kazakh intellectuals. These measures accelerated the development of national consciousness and elevated the anti-colonial struggle to a new level, leading to significant political events such as the establishment of the Alash and Turkestan autonomies.

Thus, we believe that the influence of the 'Turkism' ideology in the Kazakh steppe can be demonstrated within the framework of three political projects. The first project is the Alash autonomy, which was limited to the Kazakh steppe, and it is evident that the influence of the 'Turkism' ideology played a crucial role in its foundation.

The Alash Autonomy, officially declared in December 1917, marked the first outcome of the Kazakh struggle for independence. It led to the unification of the nation, the awakening of political and cultural consciousness, and created an opportunity for the Kazakh people to be recognized as a political entity. The leaders of Alash supported the unity and cooperation of the Turkic peoples. This idea later became the central political direction that contributed to the formation of the Turkestan Autonomy. Historical records show that A. Bokeikhan, M. Tynyshpaev, and the Bashkir intellectual Z. V. Togan, when they arrived in Samara from Ufa to participate in the State Duma, met with Yu. Akchura, where they discussed plans for state formation and proposed organizing the state's foreign affairs [7, 370]. It is important to note that M. Tynyshpaev, who was not only a participant in the Alash Autonomy but also the first chairman of the Turkestan Autonomy, took part in this meeting. And this event and proposal demonstrate the deep connection between them.

The second project was the Turkestan (Khokand) autonomy, which covered parts of the Kazakh steppe and several regions of present-day Uzbekistan, declared in November 1917. As mentioned earlier, the first chairman of the autonomy was the Kazakh intellectual M. Tynyshpaev, followed by the last chairman, another Kazakh intellectual, M. Shokay. M. Shokay became one of the founding figures

of the 'United Turkestan' idea. Upon the proposal of A. Bokeikhan, he was appointed secretary of the Muslim faction in the Fourth State Duma. From that point on, until the end of his life, he supported Islamism and Turkism ideas [11, 11].

For M. Shokay, the idea of a 'United Turkestan' represented not only a geographical territory but also the political and cultural unity of all Turkic peoples within that region. The historical significance of his idea lies, firstly, in its opposition to the policies of the Russian Empire and later the Soviet Union, which were aimed at suppressing the Turkic peoples. Secondly, the idea highlighted the necessity of uniting the political organizations of the Turkestan peoples.

The third project that reflects the influence of the 'Turkism' ideology was the 'Shura-i Ulema', a political party composed of religious leaders, nobles, and intellectuals from Turkestan. It sought to protect the national, religious, and cultural characteristics of Turkestan and supported the establishment of the Turkestan (Kokand) autonomy. Additionally, it aimed to unite religious figures and intellectuals, strengthening the connection between politics and religion. Through this unity, it strived to maintain social cohesion and cultural integrity among the people.

When the Bolsheviks came to power, their leader, S. Lapin, reached out to Germany, which was allied with the Ottoman Empire. He submitted a Memorandum to Emperor Wilhelm II and Paul von Hindenburg [7, 372]. The primary content of the Memorandum aimed to create a federation that would unite the governments of the Tatars (Zhayik), Bashkirs (Ural), Kyrgyz Steppe (Kazakhstan), and Turkestan. The document stated: «From an ethnographic perspective, the northeast Turkic peoples are a unified whole, inseparable in political and economic matters. Our slogan is complete separation from Russia, which has oppressed and been our enemy for centuries, and the creation of a fully independent state, free from submission, where we can choose our own friends and foes» [7, 479-480].

In conclusion, as Russia sought to tighten its control over the Central Asian territories, an intellectual and political movement emerged among the Turks, including the Kazakhs. As a result, Kazakh youth pursued the idea of establishing national political autonomy.

Conclusion

The cultural colonization of the Russian Empire and the policy of strengthening the dominance of Russian culture provoked a reaction in Kazakh society, leading to an effort to preserve the national identity. This awakening of national consciousness paved the way for the active spread of the 'Turkism' ideology.

The introduction of Russian culture and the strengthening of Russian-language education standards triggered a cultural defensive reaction in Kazakh society. The emergence of Kazakh-language periodicals and the strengthening of national movements played a crucial role in the formation of this national consciousness. As a result of these processes, the idea of Turkism laid the foundation for new political movements.

Thus, under the influence of the Turkism ideology, political movements emerged in the Kazakh steppe. This is evident in the historical emergence of political movements and organizations such as the Alash and Turkestan autonomies, as well as the 'Shura-i Ulema'. These movements amplified the aspirations of Turkic peoples for independence and encouraged them to unite in the struggle against the colonial policies of the Russian Empire.

As a result, the internal policy of the empire, which aimed at ensuring its unity and stabilizing its future, paradoxically led to the emergence of movements opposing imperial dominance.

References

- 1 British Newspaper Archive, 'Untitled', *The Berkshire Chronicle*, Saturday 25 January 1868, 8. URL: <https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000358/18680125/002/0002>
- 2 British Newspaper Archive, 'Kirghiz Progress', *The Globe*, 27 July 1878, 17. URL: <https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0001652/18780727/005/0001>

3 Ziya Gökalp, *The Principles of Turkism [Türkçülüğün Esasları]* (Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi, 2019), 190. [in Turkish]. ISBN: 978-975-06-3567-0

4 Yusuf Akçura, *Three Types of Policy [Üç Tarz-i Siyaset]* (Ankara: Türk Tarihi Kurumu, 1976), 60. [in Turkish].

5 *A Word about Ismail Gasprinsky [Slovo o Ismaile Gasprinskom]. The Complete Works of Ismail Gasprinsky [Polnoe sobranie sochinenij Ismaila Gasprinskogo], Volume I*, G.Yu.Seitvanieva, S.A. Seitmemetova (ed.), (Simferopol: SCO Forma, 2016), 384. https://crimeanreview.ru/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/gasprinskiy_1-1.pdf.

6 *Muslim press [Musul'manskaya Pechat' v Rossii]*, Ismail Gasprinsky. *The Complete Works, Early Journalism: 1879-1886* [Ismail Gasprinskij. Polnoe sobranie sochinenij. T. II. Rannyya publicistika: 1879-1886 gg.], Volume II, R.S. Khakimov, S.A. Seitmemeova (ed.), (Kazan-Simferopol: Institute of History named after Sh. Marjani, 2017), 397. [in Russian]. URL: <https://crimeanreview.ru/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/gasprinskiy-2tom.pdf>

7 A. Zeki Velidi Togan, *Contemporary Turkic Lands (Turkestan) and Their Recent History [Bugünkü Türkili (Türkistan) ve Yakın Tarihi]* (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1981), 709. [in Turkish].

8 Lapin Serali, 'Letter to the editor [Pis'mo v redaktsiyu]', *Rech*, 164 (1908), 129-131. [in Russian]. URL: <https://abashin.org/2025/07/24/lapin-s-a-vspomnili-o-turkestane/>

9 Lapin Serali, 'We recalled Turkestan [Vspomnili o Turkestane]', *Slovo*, 503 (1908), 189-192. [in Russian]. URL: <https://abashin.org/2025/07/24/lapin-s-a-vspomnili-o-turkestane/>

10 'Kirgizy' 'Kazahi', Alihan Nurmukhameduli Bokeikhan (1866-1937), in Zh.S. Akkululy (ed), *Volume III*, (Astana: Saryarka, 2009), 559. [in Kazakh-Russian]. ISBN 978-601-277-022-9.

11 Mustafa Shokay. *Selected Works [Mustafa Shokay. Shigarmalar zhinagy]*, in A.Nusipkhan (ed), *Volume I*, (Almaty: Kaynar, 1998), 512. [in Kazakh]. URL: <https://kazneb.kz/kk/bookView/view?brId=1632858&simple=true#>

12 'Mirzhaqip Dulatuly. *Works in Six Volumes Collected [Mirzhaqip Dulatuly. Alty tomdik shigarmalar zhinagy]*', Volume VI, in G.Dulatova, S.Imanbayeva, V.Galiyev (ed), (Almaty: Mektep, 2013), 480. [in Kazakh]. URL: <https://kazneb.kz/kk/bookView/view?brId=1151757&simple=true>

13 Homi K. Bhabha, 'Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse', *Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis*, XXVIII (1984), 125-133. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/778467>

14 T. Lothrop Stoddard, 'Pan-Turanism', *American Political Science Review*, 11 (1917), 12-23.

15 Alexandre Bennigsen, 'Panturkism and Panislamism in History and Today', *Central Asian Survey*, 3 (1984), 39-49.

16 Serge A. Zenkovsky, *Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia* (USA: Harvard University Press, 1960), 345.

17 Mukhametdinov R. F., *Origin and Evolution of Turkism [Zarozhdenie i Ehvoluciya Tyurkizma]* (Kazan: Zaman, 1996), 272. [in Russian].

18 Yu.A. Lysenko, 'The Causes and Forms of the Participation of Central Asian Peoples of the Russian Empire Borderlands in the Muslim Movement in the Early 20th Century [Prichiny i formy uchastiya narodov central'noaziatskih okrain Rossijskoj imperii v musul'manskom dvizhenii nachala XX v]', *Istoricheskie Nauki*, IV (2016), 94-100. [in Russian]. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/prichiny-i-formy-uchastiya-narodov-tsentralnoaziatskih-okrain-rossijskoy-imperii-v-musul'manskom-dvizhenii-nachala-hh-v>

19 O.N. Senyutkina and Ju.N. Guseva, 'Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism as Understood by Russian Officials (early 20th century) [Panislamizm i pantyurkizm v osmyslenii rossijskih chinovnikov (nachalo XX veka)]' *Novyj istoricheskij vestnik*, II (60) (2019), 21-36. [in Russian]. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/panislamizm-i-pantyurkizm-v-osmyslenii-rossii-skih-chinovnikov-nachalo-xx-veka>

20 S.K. Shildebay, 'The Role and Significance of Turkism in Kazakhstan's National Liberation Movement in the First Half of the 20th Century (Historical Analysis) [XX gasyrdyn I zhartysyndagy Qazaqstannyn ult azattyq qozgalysyndagy tyrikshildiktin orny men manyzy (tarihi taldaui)]' (Abstract of

the Ph.D. dissertation, Almaty, 2001), 31. [in Kazakh]. URL:<https://nabr.kz/ru/e-catalog?searchType=simple&field=all&value=%D0%A8%D1%96%D0%BB%D0%B4%D0%B5%D0%B1%D0%B0%D0%B9&operator=AND&page=4>

21 Koygeldiev Mambet, *Nation: the Struggle for Preserving National Identity (19th century - early 21st century)* [Qazaq eli: Ultyq biregeilikti saqtau zholyndagy kures (XIX g.-XXI g. basy)]' (Almaty: Karatau, 2014), 431. [in Kazakh]. URL:<https://kazneb.kz/kk/bookView/view?brId=1177641&simple=true>

22 Auanasova Alima, 'The National Intelligence of Turkestan in the first quarter of the 20th century [Nacional'naya intelligenciya Turkestana v pervoj chetverti XX veka]' (Almaty: Kazakh University, 2001), 262. [in Russian]. URL: <https://kazneb.kz/index.php/ru/catalogue/view/1625602>

23 Miller A.I., 'Empire and the Modern World: Some Paradoxes and Misconceptions [Imperiya i Sovremennyy Mir – Nekotorye Paradoksy i Zabluzhdeniya]' *Politicheskaya Nauka*, III (2004), 411. [in Russian].

24 Adeeb Khalid, *Central Asia: A New History from the Imperial Conquests to the Present*, (Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2021), 556.

25 Lykoshin N. S., *Half a Lifetime in Turkestan: Essays on the Life of the Native Population [Polzhizni v Turkestane. Ocherki Byta Tuzemnogo Naseleniya]* (Petrograd: Slad T-va V.A. Berezovsky, 1916), 415. [in Russian].

26 Baytursinov A., 'Textbook: The Kazakh Alphabet Organized According to a New Method [Oqu quraly: zhana zholmen tartip etilgen qazaqsha alippe]' (Semeypalatinsk, 1921), 24. [in Kazakh].

27 'Vozvrashchennye imena: Zhusupbek Ajmautov, Ahmet Baitursynov, Myrzhakyp Dulatov, Magzhan Zhumabaev, Shakarim Kudaiberdiev [Return of the Names: Zhusupbek Aymaulytov, Ahmet Baitursynov, Mirzhaqip Dulatov, Magzhan Zhumabayev, Shakarim Kudayberdiyev]', Baymuratova A. (ed.), (Almaty: National Library, 1994), 49. [in Russian].

Список использованной литературы:

1 British Newspaper Archive, 'Untitled', *The Berkshire Chronicle*, Saturday 25 January 1868, 8. URL: <https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000358/18680125/002/0002>

2 British Newspaper Archive, 'Kirghiz Progress', *The Globe*, 27 July 1878, 17. URL: <https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0001652/18780727/005/0001>

3 Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi, 2019), 190. ISBN: 978-975-06-3567-0

4 Yusuf Akçura, *Üç Tarz-i Siyaset* (Ankara: Türk Tarihi Kurumu, 1976), 60.

5 Полное собрание сочинений Исмаила Гаспринского (Симферополь: ООО ФОРМА, 2016). Т. I. 384 с. <https://crimeanreview.ru/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/gasprinskiy-1-1.pdf>

6 Мусульманская печать в России. Исмаил Гаспринский. Полное собрание сочинений. Т. 2. Ранняя публицистика: 1879-1886 гг. / Гл. ред. Р. С. Хакимов; сост. С. А. Сеитмеметова (Казань – Симферополь: Институт истории им. Ш. Марджани АН РТ, 2017), 397 URL: <https://crimeanreview.ru/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/gasprinskiy-2tom.pdf>

7 A. Zeki Velidî Togan, *Bugünkü Türkili (Türkistan) ve Yakın Tarihi* (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1981), 709.

8 Лалин Сер-Али. Письмо в редакцию, *Речь*, 164 (1908), 129-131. URL:<https://abashin.org/2025/07/24/lapin-s-a-vspomnili-o-turkestane/>

9 Лалин Сер-Али. Вспомнили о Туркестане, *Слово*, 505 (1908), 189-192. URL:<https://abashin.org/2025/07/24/lapin-s-a-vspomnili-o-turkestane/>

10 «Киргизы». Әлихан Нұрмұхамедұлы Бөкейхан (1866-1937). Шығармаларының 7 томдық жинағы. Құраст.: Ж.Аққұлұлы. Т. III, (Астана: Сарыарқа, 2009), 559. ISBN 978-601-277-022-9.

11 Мұстафа Шоқай. Шығармалар жинағы, құраст., А.Нүсінхан, Т. I, (Алматы: Қайнар, 1998), 512. URL:<https://kazneb.kz/kk/bookView/view?brId=1632858&simple=true#>

- 12 «Міржақып Дулатұлы». Алты томдық шығармалар жинағы, Т. VI, құраст.: Г.Дулатова, С. Иманбаева, В.Галиев, (Алматы: Мектеп, 2013), 480.
URL:<https://kazneb.kz/kk/bookView/view?brId=1151757&simple=true>
- 13 Homi K. Bhabha, 'Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse', *Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis*, XXVIII (1984), 125-133. URL:<https://www.jstor.org/stable/778467>
- 14 T. Lothrop Stoddard, 'Pan-Turanism', *American Political Science Review*, 11 (1917), 12-23.
- 15 Alexandre Bennigsen, 'Panturkism and Panislamism in History and Today', *Central Asian Survey*, 3 (1984), 39-49.
- 16 Serge A. Zenkovsky, *Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia (USA: Harvard University Press, 1960)*, 345.
- 17 Мухаметдинов Р.Ф. Зарождение и эволюция тюркизма (Казань: Zaman, 1996), 272.
- 18 Ю.А. Лысенко, Причины и формы участия народов центральноазиатских окраин Российской империи в мусульманском движении начала XX в., *Исторические науки*, IV (2016), 94-100.
URL:<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/prichiny-i-formy-uchastiya-narodov-tsentralnoaziatskih-okrain-rossiyskoy-imperii-v-musulmanskom-dvizhenii-nachala-hh-v>
- 19 О.Н. Сенюткина и Ю.Н. Гусева О.Н. Панисламизм и пантюркизм в осмыслении российских чиновников (начало XX века), *Новый исторический вестник*, II (60) (2019), 21-36.
URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/panislamizm-i-pantyurkizm-v-osmyslenii-rossii-skih-chinovnikov-nachalo-xx-veka>
- 20 С.К.Шілдебай, XX ғасырдың I жартысындағы Қазақстанның ұлт азаттық қозғалысындағы түрікшілдіктің орны мен маңызы (тарихи талдау)' (Автореферат, Алматы, 2001), 31.
URL:<https://nabr.kz/ru/catalog?searchType=simple&field=all&value=%D0%A8%D1%96%D0%BB%D0%B4%D0%B5%D0%B1%D0%B0%D0%B9&operator=AND&page=4>
- 21 Қойгелдиев Мамбет Қазақ елі: Ұлттық бірегейлікті сақтау жолындағы күрес (XIX-XXI ғ. басы), (Алматы: Қаратау, 2014), 431..
URL:<https://kazneb.kz/kk/bookView/view?brId=1177641&simple=true>
- 22 Ауанасова Алина. Национальная интеллигенция Туркестана в первой четверти XX века, (Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 2001), 262. URL: <https://kazneb.kz/index.php/ru/catalogue/view/1625602>
- 23 Миллер А.И. Империя и Современный мир – Некоторые парадоксы и заблуждения. *Политическая наука*, III (2004), 411.
- 24 Adeeb Khalid, *Central Asia: A New History from the Imperial Conquests to the Present*, (Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2021), 556.
- 25 Лыкошин Н.С. Полжизни в Туркестане. Очерки быта туземного населения (Петроград: Слад Т-ва В.А. Березовский, 1916), 415.
- 26 Байтұрсынов А. Оқу құралы: жаңа жолмен тәртіп етілген қазақша әліппе. (Семейпалатинск, 1921), 24.
- 27 Возвращенные имена: Жусупбек Аймаутов, Ахмет Байтұрсынов, Міржақып Дулатов, Мағжан Жұмабаев, Шакарим Құдайбердиев. Сост.: А.Баймуратова, (Алматы: Национальная библиотека, 1994), 49.