

A.M. Turlybekova^{1*} , A.M. Sadykova² , A.G. Shabambayeva¹ 

¹Toraigyrov University, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan;

²Pavlodar Pedagogical University named after Alkey Margulan, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan
E-mail: turlybekovaam@mail.ru; avgulsadyk@mail.ru; shabambaeva.anar@mail.ru

Theoretical Foundations of the Phenomenon of Ethnos and National Culture

Perestroika in the last thirty years of modern society's consciousness, as we know, contributed to the change of scientific historical views. Historical events began to be rethought, and the results of the ongoing "transformations," including the era of the Soviet leadership of the country, were evaluated in a new way. In this sense, the study of the problem of ethnicity, and national culture in the Soviet period is even more relevant, which is associated with the processes of ethnic identification, etc. The presented work reflects some concepts and approaches of the methodology of historical science put forward by domestic researchers. An important aspect of modern history is the study of national culture, for a long time clothed under the form of "international," which did not allow either studying or developing it from the point of view of a distinctive, characteristic of a separate ethnos culture. At the same time, it is necessary to realize that the appeal to the cultural past of ethnic groups of Kazakhstan corresponds to the requirements of modern education of the younger generation, built on the ideas of national origins. The paper attempts to generalize the available conceptual approaches of domestic authors on the issues of ethnicity and national culture. In addition, there is a comparative analysis of the interpretation of the above-mentioned concepts in Soviet historiography, which allows us to trace the fallacy of stereotypes about the problem of ethnicity.

Keywords: history, historical science, methodology, historiography, ethnicity, national culture, internationalism, Soviet culture, ideology, identification.

Introduction

"History is a witness to the times and the spiritual and social experience of a people, their "self" in the epochal dimension. Man cannot understand himself, his purpose, and the goal of his life if he does not delve into his process of becoming. The task of historical science is not only to cognize and reconstruct the picture of the past but also, to no lesser extent, to facilitate the task of self-knowledge of the people, and their responsibility to their ancestral homeland and Fatherland. Hence the enormous spiritual and educational value of history and historical science". This statement of academician S. Zimanov allows us to realize the role and purpose of history as a science in the modern conditions of self-identification of Kazakhstan society. Such great importance of the humanities, including history, has become realized only in the last thirty years, and the foundations for a radical rethinking were laid in the course of socio-political changes in the country at the end of the twentieth century.

The theoretical Marxist ideology spread during the long Soviet period did not give the slightest opportunity for the free development of social sciences and humanities, restraining any of their intentions to serve the interests of people. It turned out that the sciences, especially the humanities, served not for society, but only to align with the expectations of the political regime. As a result, there was an impression that the sciences were perceived rather as service tools, following a strict course set by the state itself. At the same time, there was a misconception that history could be rewritten to meet political needs and interests of the existing authorities.

In the current conditions of revaluation of values in the early 90s of the twentieth century, the attitude in determining the importance of social and humanitarian disciplines changed. The necessity of historical, cultural, philosophical, political science, sociological, and sociological knowledge for the most adequate perception of the environment began to be felt. It has become clear that without knowledge of the basics of these sciences and the forecasts outlined by them, it is impossible to objectively determine the current situation in the economy, culture, and social sphere. There are, of course, positive trends in historical science as well.

It must be recognized that history as a science occupies a special place among the humanities. History, in its essence, forms the basis of the entire state structure. Perhaps, it is impossible to imagine a state whose government has not tried to use historical science for certain purposes, since the ideological component of

* Corresponding author's e-mail: turlybekovaam@mail.ru

this science and its enormous impact on public consciousness is obvious. It is another matter when no strict restrictions are placed in front of scientists who strive to get to the truth and put forward, sometimes, bold hypotheses and concepts of little-studied pages of the past. Nowadays, the study of national history has become a duty and responsibility of any citizen of our country. However, its deepest understanding is largely determined by the achievements of scientists who introduce new sources, methodology, and historical analysis, assessment of events and processes into the scientific turnover.

Materials and Methods

The transformation of historical knowledge paradigms and its study methodology in Kazakhstan is closely linked to the rethinking of national identity and the recognition of the role of ethnic and cultural uniqueness.

Academician Manash Kozybayev holds a central position in the study of the problems of historical science in Kazakhstan. His works, *Historiography of Kazakhstan: Lessons of History* [1], *Kazakhstan at the Turn of the Century: Reflections and Searches* [2], and *Problems of Methodology, Historiography, and Source Studies of the History of Kazakhstan* [3] laid the foundation for understanding national history. In his research, he criticized Soviet historiography, which ideologically distorted national history, and proposed a new perspective on the methodology of historical science. Special attention was given to source studies, particularly the analysis of national sources as an alternative to Soviet interpretations. He emphasized the necessity of an interdisciplinary approach in studying ethnicity and national culture. That is, the works of Kozybayev and his followers demonstrate the prospects for reinterpreting historical knowledge through the prism of national uniqueness and the rejection of Soviet methodology.

The issues of ethnicity and national culture are examined in various contexts, ranging from Marxist theory to modern concepts of national identity and cultural globalization. The works of A.I. Arnoldov, *Socialist Culture: Theory and Life* [4] (1984) and *National Cultures: A Modern Vision* [5], reflect the Marxist-Leninist perspective on ethnicity and culture. In 1984, Arnoldov studied socialist culture as a unified model, emphasizing its supranational character. By 1992, he partially revised these views, noting the increasing prominence of national cultural features following the collapse of the USSR. A. Kanapin's [6] study, *Cultural Development in Kazakhstan*, also reflects the Soviet discourse, focusing on the formation of a unified cultural space under the influence of socialist ideology.

With Kazakhstan's transition to independence, research on ethnic identity and national culture took on a new direction. Modern studies have moved away from the concept of "Soviet internationalism" and have focused on examining national uniqueness, intercultural interactions, and the mechanisms of preserving ethnic identity in the context of globalization. M. Auezov in his work *Eurasian Spiritual Tradition and the Continuity of Kazakh Culture*, analyzes Eurasian traditions and their influence on Kazakh culture [7]. R.Sh. Zhumadilova provides a systematic study of Kazakhstan's national culture, highlighting key elements of cultural identity [8].

One of the key issues is the impact of social and political transformations on culture and historical consciousness. R.M. Zhumashev [9] in his dissertation *Historiography of the Formation and Development of Culture in Kazakhstan (1936–1991)*, provides a detailed analysis of changes in Soviet Kazakhstan's cultural policy, revealing the process of forming a new cultural identity under a totalitarian regime. B. Suzhikov [10] (2006) examines the role of historical knowledge in shaping cultural values and moral guidelines in Kazakhstani society.

Modern historiography focuses on the dynamics of cultural transformations, the influence of ideological factors on cultural and historical development, and the rethinking of national heritage in the face of global challenges. Overall, historiography demonstrates a rejection of dogmatic Soviet concepts and a search for new methodological foundations that allow for a deeper understanding of the processes of national culture and formation of historical consciousness in Kazakhstan.

The study of the transformation of historical science, as well as the theoretical foundations of the phenomenon of ethnicity and national culture, requires a comprehensive approach based on the combination of various methods and methodological principles. The research methodology is based on an interdisciplinary approach, incorporating elements of historical, sociological, philosophical, and cultural analysis.

The key methodological principles include: *Historicism* — considering the transformation of historical science and national culture dynamically, taking into account changes in the political and social context. *The Systematic Approach* — analyzing ethnicity and national culture as an integral system that includes historical, social, political, and cultural components. *Comparative Analysis* — comparing different theoretical con-

cepts of ethnicity and national culture and interpreting them within the context of Kazakhstan. Methodological Pluralism — using various research methods depending on the aspect under study. Chronological Method — identifying the stages of historical science transformation and the evolution of concepts of ethnicity and national culture. Historiographic Analysis — studying the contributions of researchers (S. Zimanov, K. Aldazhumanov, etc.) to the development of Kazakhstani historiography. Comparative-Historical Analysis — allowing for the comparison of different approaches to understanding national culture and ethnic identity across historical periods [11], [12].

Results

The study of the transformation of historical science, as well as the theoretical foundations of the phenomenon of ethnicity and national culture, has revealed several key aspects. Kazakhstan's historical science has undergone significant changes, especially after the collapse of the USSR, shifting from ideologically driven Soviet historiography to nationally oriented research.

Modern domestic historians have played a key role in shaping Kazakhstani historiography by proposing new approaches to studying national history based on the principles of historicism, objectivity, and multifactorial analysis.

The study of ethnicity and national culture has experienced methodological changes: from the concept of socialist internationalism to the exploration of ethnic identity, cultural interactions, and the impact of globalization. Contemporary approaches to the study of Kazakhstan's national culture emphasize its interaction with global civilizational processes, as well as the preservation of traditional values in the context of globalization.

The novelty of the research lies in the development of a comprehensive approach to studying the transformation of Kazakhstan's historical science, taking into account political, social, and cultural factors, as well as in the systematization of modern concepts of ethnicity and national culture, their evolution, and adaptation within Kazakhstani academic discourse.

The aim of the study was to identify key trends in the transformation of historical science and to examine the theoretical foundations of the phenomenon of ethnicity and national culture. The obtained results align with the stated goals and objectives, namely: an analysis of the evolution of Kazakhstani historiography has been conducted, identifying its stages of development. The theoretical foundations of ethnicity and national culture have been examined in the context of modern scientific paradigms. The influence of ideological, political, and social factors on the perception of national culture has been demonstrated.

The main concept confirmed during the research is the idea of national culture as a dynamic and adaptive phenomenon influenced by both internal and external factors. Kazakhstan's historical science is transforming towards a multifaceted analysis of national experience, combining traditional and modern research approaches. Ethnicity is considered not only as a biosocial but also as a cultural phenomenon that shapes national identity.

National culture is not a static but an evolving phenomenon capable of preserving traditions while adapting to new realities. This study contributes to the development of modern historiography, cultural studies, and ethnology, and it can also be utilized in state policy to preserve and promote Kazakhstan's national heritage.

Discussion

History itself begins with a person whose fate is one of the elements of the general mass of the development of the country's history. When we mean society, history acquires a global meaning, there is a need for a deep study of events and processes of the past, comparison with modern realities, and based on the analysis made laying the foundation for the future, determining the directions of further development of history. It is in history still occurs a harmonious combination of scientific knowledge, which represents history diversified, versatile, and in many ways, contributes to the disclosure of historical facts.

Throughout history, people have recognized its significance, repeatedly turning to past experiences — learning from both its mistakes and achievements to guide their development. Even then, society recognized the profound power of history — shaping ideology and exerting a psychological influence on the people. Unfortunately, this very factor could compromise true historical science, when the principles put forward by the state and proclaimed ideals were reflected on the pages of historical books, thus putting science in the position of a servant of the state machine. A similar situation was observed with the advent of the Soviet leadership when the role of historical and social sciences could be enhanced by their uncomplaining adherence to

the imposed dogma and ideological stereotypes. As a result, being in a desperate situation, history as a science was forced to develop in a unilinear manner. This situation, as academician M. Kozybaev rightly pointed out, reduced the attempts of objective study and determination of the future path of development of the state, including the use of new conceptual frameworks [1; 92]. Any manifestations of Kazakhstan scientists in the study of new facts were considered as pseudoscientific, and anti-populace — mere attempts to stand out and distance themselves from other nations.

Today, the methodology of patriotic history has also undergone the process of rethinking. The class-social approach, once the basis of the methodology of historical science, distorted the study of the true process of development. Today, almost every historian uses their methodology, developed independently. This is understandable since no single principle is binding for all. Although not fully developed, there should, at the very least, exist a broadly recognized methodology of history — one rooted in its profound significance for education and the upbringing of young people. The main principle of the modern study of the historical process should be the interplay between facts and historical sources. After all, only then, as it is known, any concept, or theory, given the opportunity to rely on the available facts can be presented proven, and deeply argued. In this case, the probability of achieving the truth increases, which is the ultimate goal of historical research.

The next principle of methodology is to recognize the relationship between society and the individual. It is necessary to take into account the fact that, sometimes, many things can be understood just from the correlation of different kinds of phenomena. When studying the historical process, it is necessary to be guided by the principle of taking into account the peculiarities of a particular stage of development. Each event, depending on social conditions, can be interpreted differently, since no phenomenon in history can exactly repeat itself.

In addition, other principles of methodology can be applied, these are the relationship between socio-economic development in society and its consciousness, the spiritual needs of people, the relationship between power and man, and its assessment in different periods. As we can see, history in its methodology is based on political science, sociological, cultural, and other knowledge. Perhaps the most important in this case will be the principle of integrity and unity in the historical interpretation of all levels of life. History is called to summarize the knowledge and experience of all fields of science and to reveal the optimally characteristic development of mankind.

Instead of all these methods of cognition that could create an objective picture of the past, the Communist Party imposed a worldview that determined the fateful role of Russia in the history of national minorities [2; 132]. After the collapse of the Soviet ideology, new conceptual possibilities for studying the historical past opened up to researchers [13; 67]. Today, the state unity of the republic, and national and spiritual harmony formed through comprehensive study is a priority [12; 55]. Scientists got an opportunity, without forgetting the correlation of themselves with the common history, to discover a treasure trove of previously unknown facts of their ethno-historical process of development. Already in the last years of the existence of the union state, “the national intelligentsia began to declare ideas not of amorphous Soviet patriotism, but of moderate and enlightened nationalism.” The works of M. Kozybaev played a significant role in the objective reconstruction of the history of the Kazakh people and the departure from the Russocentric worldview [10; 75].

The work started by famous scientists of Kazakhstan was continued in the XXI century domestic historical science, where the principles of objective and impartial assessment of historical events and processes have become indispensable. Undoubtedly, problems remain, including financial ones. It is clearly understood that no other ideological form can once again exert a destructive influence on the course of the historical process.

Scientists have also helped to conceptualize in science the problems of ethnicity, “without limiting themselves to Kazakhstan specificity, without self-isolating national exclusivity.” The researcher pointed out that “any nation must rise to the level of awareness and protection of national honor. A nation that has risen to the level of comprehension of its national honor can be considered a nation. Without a sense of this feeling, the nation is doomed to be a subject, and all the ills and misfortunes will cling to it.”

The problem of the nation’s development and generational continuity is one of the complex challenges in the study of the theory of nation. For this purpose, it was necessary to reveal the dialectics of the development of different generations of ethnos and their interaction with the cultural processes that have passed through the centuries. That is why it is necessary to study the genesis and potential of the cultural patrimony of Kazakhstan as a self-sufficient state [14; 93].

Because Kazakhstan has become a homeland for many ethnic groups over time, the importance of a detailed study of the cultural past of their representatives increases. Especially since the issue of cultural self-identification has always been topical [8; 15]. Meanwhile, the role of the factor of culture for the country as “a universal instrument ennobling human souls and socio-natural environment” becomes obvious today. “Culture, being a product of human life activity, nourishes it, pushes it to new fruitful accomplishments. Moreover, this process is endless and should not be interrupted, because the evolutionary path of development of the whole society will be hindered.”

Appeal to the cultural past of ethnic groups of Kazakhstan is also relevant because the requirements for modern education of the younger generation contain the ideas of building upon the finest achievements of culture and drawing inspiration from national origins. Knowledge of the historical past and respect for the historical and cultural traditions of their own and other peoples is the key to progress [7; 36].

Realizing the legitimacy of the put-forward provisions, it is necessary to determine the further way the study of urgent and time-demanded historical problems aimed at studying the history of the cultural heritage of ethnic groups of the republic, as well as the use of the modern methodological approach in their study, based on the principles of objective analysis and objective historical assessment.

Thus, at first glance, the concepts, which are close in content, contain certain differences and characterize those complex ethnic processes that took place on the territory of the republic in the Soviet years. Not only the policy of mixing nations into a single community of people, the so-called Soviet ethnos (people), artificially imposed by the ruling authorities but also the implementation of cultural policy in this direction was observed.

In the 1930s, all people living on the territory of the Soviet Union were referred to as the “Soviet people.” However, up until the early 1960s, the concept did not carry the burden of an ideological cliché. In 1961, speaking at the XXII Congress of the CPSU, N.S. Khrushchev proclaimed: “A new historical community of people of different nationalities with common characteristic features has formed in the USSR — the Soviet people.”

The legitimacy of the realization of the idea of international culture was firmly established in the mass consciousness. In this case, the form of international culture was to be determined by national cultures proper, and the content — by socialist ideals. However, theory in this case turned out to be incompatible with practice, as history proved.

The culture of each nation includes a system of spiritual and material values and norms of behavior. But, in the Soviet period, the definition of national culture became unthinkable in its realization without the term of international culture, which blurred the boundaries of differences between nations and was shaped, in turn, by the rigid ideology of the ruling party [15; 8].

Finding themselves in Kazakhstan, not on the territory of their ethnic homeland, representatives of many national groups, as well as the Kazakh ethnos also, despite the proclaimed policy of “internationalization,” made attempts to preserve cultural identity. The idea of creating a “common” national culture was widely propagandized in the country not in content, but rather in form [6; 33]. Thus, the national policy of the state contradicted the previously declared principles of freedom of self-determination.

The ideas of the new Soviet culture permeated all spheres of social life, including the way of life of the population. Changes in the lives of millions of people were to contribute to the realization of the tasks assigned by the Communist Party to attract people to the active creative work of material, political and spiritual culture, to develop new scientific principles of cultural construction management and cultural planning, to turn the country into a country of continuous literacy, a high level of education, etc. The new Soviet culture was associated with socialist culture.

In the vast majority of positions of Soviet historians and social scientists, socialist culture was associated with “a powerful factor in the development and improvement of the way of life of the Soviet people.” Moreover, in their opinion, the culture developing under different conditions was able to accumulate the spiritual values of representatives of other peoples of the Soviet Union and absorb the best world cultural experience [5; 93]. And in the new form of national culture, namely socialist culture, the dialectic of the universal and class began to manifest itself in a new way. The explanation of such inferences could be the teachings of Marxists, which, many authors cited as the main theoretical and methodological basis.

Conclusions

Thus, in the course of overly forced internationalization in the conditions of the Soviet reality, the desire to accelerate the formation of the Soviet people as a single community by bureaucratic and voluntaristic

methods, without taking into account national-specific interests led to the fact that the national policy miscalculations, distortions and serious mistakes were made. The peculiarities of life activity, mentality, and education were not taken into account. The authors of modern historical science have recognized the illegality of the implemented policy based on the class approach and limiting the through language, traditions, and artistic heritage. The fact that the natural need to study the culture of the native people is a natural necessity has not been taken into account. Since the manifestation of interest in the study of the history of the Fatherland, its cultural and historical heritage is an indispensable part of national self-consciousness. The study of the transformation of historical science and the theoretical foundations of the phenomenon of ethnicity and national culture allows us to draw several key conclusions:

Firstly, Kazakhstani historiography has undergone significant changes, especially after the collapse of the USSR, when there was a shift from the ideologized approaches of Soviet science to a nationally oriented, objective, and multifactorial analysis. Modern research focuses on reinterpreting historical experience, restoring historical truth, and studying national identity in the context of global trends.

Secondly, methodological approaches to the study of ethnicity and national culture have evolved from Marxist-Leninist theories to interdisciplinary research, incorporating historical, sociological, philosophical, and cultural analysis. National culture is seen as a dynamic system influenced by political, social, and economic factors while preserving traditional values.

It can be stated that modern historical science in Kazakhstan is moving towards the integration of traditional and innovative research approaches, allowing for a deeper understanding of the processes of national culture formation and ethnic identity. Further research in this area should focus on an in-depth analysis of the impact of contemporary global processes on historical consciousness and Kazakhstan's cultural heritage, as well as the development of new methodological foundations for studying ethnic and national processes.

References

- 1 Козыбаев М. Историография Казахстана: уроки истории / М. Козыбаев. — Алма-Ата: Рауан, 1990. — 136 с.
- 2 Козыбаев М. Казахстан на рубеже веков: размышления и поиски [в 2-х кн.] / М. Козыбаев. — Алматы: Гылым, 2000. — Кн. 2 — 388 с.
- 3 Козыбаев М.К. Проблемы методологии, историографии и источниковедения истории Казахстана / М.К. Козыбаев. — Алматы: Гылым, 2006. — 272 с.
- 4 Арнольдов А.И. Социалистическая культура: теория и жизнь / А.И. Арнольдов. — М: Политиздат, 1984. — 174 с.
- 5 Арнольдов А.И. Национальные культуры: современное видение / А.И. Арнольдов— М: Издательство МГИК, 1992. — 29 с.
- 6 Канапин А. Культурное строительство в Казахстане / А. Канапин. — Алма-Ата, 1964. — С. 33.
- 7 Ауэзов М. Евразийская духовная традиция и преемственность казахской культуры. Культура Казахстана: традиции, реальности, поиски: сб. науч. трудов / М. Ауэзов. — Алматы, 1997. — 164 с.
- 8 Жумадилова Р.Ш. Культура Казахстана: учебн. пос. / Р.Ш. Жумадилова. — Семей, 2001. — 48 с.
- 9 Жумашев Р.М. Историография становления и развития культуры Казахстана. 1936–1991 гг.: дис. ... д-ра ист. наук / Р.М. Жумашев. — Москва, 2004. — 466 с.
- 10 Сужиков Б. Академик Манаш Козыбаев и культурно-нравственный потенциал исторического знания. Манаш Козыбаев — человек в истории / Б. Сужиков. — Алматы: Гылым, 2006. — 232 с.
- 11 Зиманов С. Феномен академика М.К. Козыбаева. Манаш Козыбаев — человек в истории / С. Зиманов. — Алматы: Гылым, 2003. — 232 с.
- 12 Алдажуманов К. Академик М. Козыбаев и историческая наука Казахстана. Манаш Козыбаев — человек в истории / К. Алдажуманов. — Алматы: Гылым, 2006. — 232 с.
- 13 Гуревич Л. История Отечества. Манаш Козыбаев — человек в истории / Л. Гуревич. — Алматы: Гылым, 2006. — 232 с.
- 14 Мажитов С. Академик М.К. Козыбаев — основатель историософии независимого Казахстана, ученый-гуманист. Манаш Козыбаев — человек в истории / С. Мажитов. — Алматы: Гылым, 2006. — 232 с.
- 15 Турлыбекова А.М. Искусство Казахстана в 20–80-е гг. XX века: истоки и тенденции развития / А.М. Турлыбекова. — Павлодар, 2014. — 180 с.

А.М. Тұрлыбекова, А.М. Садыкова, А.Г. Шабамбаева

Этнос пен ұлттық мәдениет феноменінің теориялық негіздері

Қазіргі қоғам санасының соңғы отыз жылындағы қайта құру ғылыми тарихи көзқарастардың өзгеруіне ықпал еткені белгілі. Тарихи оқиғалар қайта қарастырыла бастады, жүргізіліп жатқан «қайта құрулардың» нәтижелері, соның ішінде елдің кеңестік басқару дәуірі жаңа жолмен бағаланды. Осы тұрғыда кеңестік кезеңдегі этнос, ұлттық мәдениет мәселесін зерттеу одан да өзекті болып отыр, бұл ұлттық өзіндік сананы, этникалық бірегейлікті және т.б. жандандыру процестерімен байланысты. Мақалада отандық зерттеушілер ұсынған тарих ғылымының әдістемесіне қатысты кейбір тұжырымдамалар мен көзқарастар көрсетілген. Ұзақ уақыт бойы «интернационалдык» кейіпте болған ұлттық мәдениетті зерттеу қазіргі заманғы тарихтың маңызды аспектісі болып табылады, бұл оны жеке этносқа тән төл мәдениет тұрғысынан зерттеуге де, дамытуға да мүмкіндік бермеді. Сонымен қатар, Қазақстан этностарының мәдени өткеніне үндеу ұлттық түпдеректің идеяларына негізделген өскелең ұрпақтың қазіргі заманғы тәрбиесінің талаптарына сәйкес келетінін түсіну қажет. Мақалада отандық авторлардың этнос және ұлттық мәдениет мәселелеріне қатысты қалыптасқан концептуалды көзқарастарын жалпылауға талпыныс жасалған. Сонымен қатар, кеңестік тарихнамада жоғарыда аталған концепцияларды түсіндірудің салыстырмалы талдауы бар, бұл этностар мәселесіне қатысты қалыптасқан стереотиптердің қателігін анық байқауға мүмкіндік береді.

Кілт сөздер: тарих, тарих ғылымы, әдістеме, тарихнама, этнос, ұлттық мәдениет, интернационализм, кеңестік мәдениет, идеология, сәйкестендіру.

А.М. Тұрлыбекова, А.М. Садыкова, А.Г. Шабамбаева

Теоретические основы феномена этноса и национальной культуры

Перестройка за последнее тридцатилетие сознания современного общества, как известно, способствовала изменению научных исторических взглядов. Стали переосмысливаться исторические события, по-новому оцениваться результаты проводимых «преобразований», в том числе эпохи советского руководства страной. В этом смысле исследование проблемы этноса, национальной культуры в советский период приобретает еще большую актуальность, что связано с процессами этнической идентификации и пр. В статье нашли отражение некоторые концепции и подходы методологии исторической науки, выдвинутые отечественными исследователями. Важным аспектом современной истории является исследование национальной культуры, долгое время облаченной под форму «интернациональной», не позволявшей ни исследовать, ни развивать ее с точки зрения самобытной, характерной для отдельного этноса культуры. Вместе с тем, необходимо понимать, что обращение к культурному прошлому этносов Казахстана соответствуют требованиям современного воспитания подрастающего поколения, построенного на идеях национального первоисточка. В статье предпринята попытка обобщить имеющиеся концептуальные подходы отечественных авторов по вопросам этноса и национальной культуры. Кроме того, имеет место сравнительный анализ трактовки вышеобозначенных понятий в советской историографии, что позволяет наглядно проследить ошибочность сложившихся стереотипов в отношении проблемы этносов.

Ключевые слова: история, историческая наука, методология, историография, этнос, национальная культура, интернационализм, советская культура, идеология, идентификация.

References

- 1 Kozybaev, M. (1990). *Istoriografiia Kazakhstana: uroki istorii* [Historiography of Kazakhstan: History Lessons]. Alma-Ata: Rauan [in Russian].
- 2 Kozybaev, M. (2000). *Kazakhstan na rubezhe vekov: razmyshleniia i poiski* [Kazakhstan at the Turn of the Century: Reflections and Searches]. (Vols. 1–2; Vol. 2). Almaty: Gylym [in Russian].
- 3 Kozybaev, M.K. (2006). Problemy metodologii, istoriografii i istochnikovedeniia istorii Kazakhstana [Problems of Methodology, Historiography and Source Studies of the History of Kazakhstan]. Almaty: Gylym [in Russian].
- 4 Arnoldov, A.I. (1984). *Sotsialisticheskaia kultura: teoriia i zhizn* [Socialist Culture: Theory and Life]. Moscow: Politizdat [in Russian].
- 5 Arnoldov, A.I. (1992). *Natsionalnye kultury: sovremennoe videnie* [National Cultures: Modern Vision]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo MGIK [in Russian].
- 6 Kanapin, A. (1964). *Kulturnoe stroitelstvo v Kazakhstane* [Cultural construction in Kazakhstan]. Alma-Ata [in Russian].
- 7 Auevov, M. (1997). *Evrasiiskaia dukhovnaia traditsiia i preemstvennost kazakhskoi kultury. Kultura Kazakhstana: traditsii, realnosti, poiski* [Eurasian spiritual tradition and continuity of Kazakh culture. Culture of Kazakhstan: traditions, realities, searches]. Almaty [in Russian].

- 8 Zhumadilova, R.Sh. (2001). *Kultura Kazakhstana [Culture of Kazakhstan]*. Semei [in Russian].
- 9 Zhumashev, R.M. (2004). *Istoriografiia stanovleniia i razvitiia kultury Kazakhstana. 1936–1991 gg [Historiography of the formation and development of the culture of Kazakhstan. 1936–1991]. Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis*. Moscow [in Russian].
- 10 Suzhikov, B. (2006). *Akademik Manash Kozybaev i kulturno-nravstvennyi potentsial istoricheskogo znaniia. Manash Kozybaev — chelovek v istorii [Academician Manash Kozybaev and the cultural and moral potential of historical knowledge. Manash Kozybaev — a man in history]*. Almaty, Gylym [in Russian].
- 11 Zimanov, S. (2003). *Fenomen akademika M.K. Kozybaeva. Manash Kozybaev — chelovek v istorii [Phenomenon of Academician M.K. Kozybaev. Manash Kozybaev — a Man in History]*. Almaty: Gylym [in Russian].
- 12 Aldazhumanov, K. *Akademik M. Kozybaev i istoricheskaiia nauka Kazakhstana. Manash Kozybaev — chelovek v istorii [Academician M. Kozybaev and Historical Science of Kazakhstan. Manash Kozybaev — a Man in History]*. Almaty: Gylym [in Russian].
- 13 Gurevich, L. (2006). *Istoriia Otechestva. Manash Kozybaev — chelovek v istorii [History of the Fatherland. Manash Kozybaev — a Man in History]*. Almaty: Gylym [in Russian].
- 14 Mazhitov, S. (2006). *Akademik M.K. Kozybaev — osnovatel istoriosofii nezavisimogo Kazakhstana, uchenyi-gumanist. Manash Kozybaev — chelovek v istorii [Academician M.K. Kozybaev — the Founder of the Historiosophy of Independent Kazakhstan, a Humanitarian Scientist. Manash Kozybaev — a Man in History]*. Almaty: Gylym [in Russian].
- 15 Turlybekova, A.M. (2014). *Iskusstvo Kazakhstana v 20–80-e gg. XX veka: istoki i tendentsii razvitiia [Art of Kazakhstan in the 20–80s. XX century: origins and development trends]*. Pavlodar [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Turlybekova Aigul — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of History of Kazakhstan, Toraigyrov University, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5671-9119>

Sadykova Aigul — PhD, Associate Professor of the Educational Program “History,” Pavlodar Pedagogical University named after Alkey Margulan, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5671-9119>

Shabambaeva Anara — Master of Humanitarian Sciences, Senior Lecturer of the Department of History of Kazakhstan, Toraigyrov University, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3663-1368>