

Zh.Y. Nurbayev, Zh.Zh. Kiyubek*

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: zhaslannurbayev@gmail.com; kiyubek@gmail.com)

Concepts of historical memory and the politics of memory in the context of social and historical-humanitarian studies (historiographic analysis)

The article presents a historiographic review of historical memory and, based on this, examines the meaning and features of the process of rethinking national histories. The relevance of the presented work lies in the fact that today there is a “memorial boom”, which leads to a critical analysis of the past, a revision of the main plots of the history of the state and society. Since gaining independence, the post-Soviet countries have been embraced by the search for national identity. In this search, an important role was played by the reevaluation of one’s own history; based on new methodological approaches, the colonial experience, postcolonial transformations are being investigated. Thus, this paper aims to analyze a wide range of theoretical and historiographic material, the works of the founders of the concept of memory, fundamental works of researchers, from whom new directions came, such as the “politics of memory” or “trauma of memory”, etc. The authors of this article consider the theoretical foundations of memory, which have become significant in such sciences as sociology, history, philosophy, political science, etc. The study uses historical-genetic, historical-comparative, historical-systemic methods, as well as methods of retrospective and prospective analysis. The historiographic review of foreign and domestic authors helped to consider and analyze such concepts as historical memory and historical politics. In the works of French, German, American researchers, the theoretical and methodological foundations of the category of memory were studied. Russian and Kazakh historiography are represented by modern research, which is aimed at studying the processes associated with mythologizing, politicizing these processes, commemorative practices, local and regional aspects.

Keywords: historical memory, politics of memory, identity, historiography, commemoration, reconstruction of the past.

Introduction

The formation of new independent states in the post-Soviet space is significantly associated with the formation of national self-awareness (national identity) of the peoples of the USSR. At the same time, the rallying of “new nations” (Russians, Ukrainians, Kazakhs, etc.) is largely based on the accentuation of historical events and phenomena that contribute to the growth of patriotism, the formation of a new (“non-Soviet”) national identity, etc.

One of the consequences of these processes, initiated mainly “from above” – the political elites of the newly independent states – was the rethinking of national history.

The situation with the introduction and dissemination of new historiography in different countries of the former USSR can be significantly different depending on the extent to which the demand for a “new history” from citizens is widespread, can “new heroes” and a new interpretation of historical events find the response from the population, especially young people, who are the most important object in terms of the formation of a new national identity.

New national historical interpretations can conflict and even with each other, offering alternative versions for once indisputable historical events and phenomena. Thus, the processes of rethinking history in the newly independent states inevitably establish new boundaries and watersheds in the once common cultural and historical soviet space. This will affect the prospects for integration of the post-Soviet countries.

Methods

The conceptual basis of this study is the theories and methodologies of interdisciplinarity developed by the classics of memory M. Halbwachs, P. Nora, J. Le Goffa, J. and A. Assman, P. Hutton, P. Ricoeur, and others.

Historiographic research is a form of reflection on the development of historical knowledge. The range of problems that fall into the field of view of historical memory and the politics of memory is wide: every-

* Corresponding author’s e-mail: kiyubek@gmail.com

thing that has elements of comprehension of the past becomes the object of close attention from the public and the state at the present stage. Based on this, it should be noted that the set of methods of historiographic research is diverse. Among the classical methods, historical-genetic, historical-comparative, historical-system, and other methods can be cited.

The methods of retrospective and prospective analysis make it possible to update the obtained historiographic information. Retrospective analysis consists in a gradual movement from the current state of historical science to the past to isolate the elements of old concepts. The method of perspective analysis (the same process, only in the “opposite” direction) allows us to consider the significance of certain ideas for the subsequent historiographic process. The application of these methods can help to predict the further evolution of knowledge about the concept of memory.

Results and Discussion

The theoretical and methodological foundations of the concept of memory arise from the development of history and related social sciences, as well as the actualization of the principle of interdisciplinarity in Europe. This principle is reflected in the works of M. Halbwachs [1], P. Nora [2], J. Le Goff [3], J. Assman [4], P. Hutton [5], P. Ricoeur [6], L. Wirth [7], A. Megill [8], and others, which are rightfully classical and seem to be basic for the study of memory and commemorative practice.

Like any field of research that is in a state of formation and institutionalization, memory studies actively turn to its origins. More precisely, it is looking for the origins and building its genealogy. According to specialists in cultural (social) memory, the formation of a narrative of one’s origin and history is an integral part of the formation of any identity, including the identity of the scientific community of a discipline claiming academic status. One of the important areas of activity of scientists concerned with the institutionalization and “paradigmatization” of memory studies is the design of a “canonical” set of texts and authors, primarily the founders, around whom the identity of the research community could be built as universally recognized authorities.

The popularity of the study of memory, according to Pierre Nora, is due to the post-imperial, post-colonial, including the post-Soviet transformation of the geopolitical conjuncture. Back in the 1980s, work began on the concept of Places of Memory. Under the leadership of P. Nora, the multivolume work Places of Memory was published, in which famous historians took part: J. Duby, J. Le Goff, F. Furet, M. Musuf, and others [2].

P. Nora contrasts history and memory, substantiating significant differences between them. From his perspective, memory connects with the emotional experiences of the present and considers history as an intellectual reconstruction of the past. Hence, local nation-building presupposes reflection on various variations of the search for national identity. The historical identity of France is based on the representations owing to which it remembers itself.

According to Nora, historians are now turning to “mnemonic places, since there is no more memory space”. On the other hand, his critical position allows us to see that living memory lives in a much larger number of places than historians could have imagined before. What is called history is nothing more than an official memory that society prefers to glorify. In Modern times, this memory was in practice associated with the political history of the state, which, in particular, manifested itself during the French Revolution. The task of historians in the postmodern era is to identify and classify the figurative schemes through which the national past is comprehended under the assortment of mnemonic places. Distinguishing the republic, the nation, and France as categories of memory, Nora shows how national identity is perceived differently within each of them. The separation of history and memory of a separate political tradition, within which it was studied, frees the historian to search for counter-memory and counter-traditions derived from it [2; 17–50]. If P. Nora claims that history destroys information stored by memory, then Dennis Collins, on the contrary, believes that history “rationalizes” memory [9; 134–137].

The study of memory is an interdisciplinary direction in science. The research focus depends on the nature of the dominant discipline. Features of the study of memory are crystallized under the influence of historical, political, cultural contexts. Thus, the German tradition mainly uses the concept of cultural memory (Jan and Aleida Assmann). The concept developed by J. Assmann made it possible to designate a new area of historical and cultural studies - the study of “memory cultures” of various societies and their comparative analysis. Another aspect of the study of cultural memory is the analysis of the functioning of “memory images” in subsequent cultures, the identification of those cultural meanings that were generated by them in other

contexts. The French school relies heavily on the concept of social and collective memory (Maurice Halbwachs, Pierre Nora).

The correlation of history and memory is another important area of discussion both in historical science proper and in memory studies. M. Halbwachs's idea that the image of the past is socially constructed is popular among modern researchers. At the same time, Halbwachs himself stood on firm positivist position in this regard and clearly opposed historical science and memory. History, in his opinion, should be an objective, impartial, impersonal, absolute picture of the past — such as it was “in fact”, memory is its direct opposite. It is subjective, selective, biased, connected with the interests of groups. History for Halbwachs begins where memory ends.

Trying to overcome the extreme sociologism of Halbwachs, historians began to invent their own alternative concepts: cultural memory, social memory, public memory, historical memory, and even post-memory. Such uncertainty of the basic concept, as well as the variety of competing interpretations in the absence of their own method, serve as one of the main grounds for criticism of memory studies. On the other hand, there are voices claiming that the concept of “memory” is not able to add anything new to historical research compared to such classical concepts as myth, custom, tradition, and historical consciousness. Halbwachs's theoretical position on the problem of memory/history is most easily captured in the summary that he proposed in his book “Collective Memory”. Here he refers to “the ultimate opposition between memory and history”. With this formula, he intended to emphasize the difference between the types of the past that they restore. Memory asserts the similarity between the past and the present. There is a magic of memory that is invoked because it conveys the past as if it had become alive again.

It can be noted that neither the absence of a single universally recognized theory of memory, taken in its collective dimension nor the variety of terms prevents us from talking about the “memory paradigm” in modern socio-humanitarian knowledge. The presence of a common “memorial” perspective, which allows us to consider diverse and still little related phenomena from a single angle, is a sufficient reason for this.

Collective memory forms the consciousness of a common past among members of a social community, causes an emotional experience of a long stay together in time, and transmits values and patterns of behavior. Certain events of the past lose their concrete historical character, turning into symbols of good and evil. Collective memory also preserves and sacralizes the symbols of collective identity, creating a common semiotic space and delineating the boundaries of the group.

Based on the study of memory carriers, memory studies have recently entered into a productive dialogue with another rapidly developing field — research in the field of modern media. Cinema, television, and computer technologies are now also of increasing interest to researchers of collective memory.

Memory research is primarily an interdisciplinary field of modern science and, as in any interdisciplinary project, research perspectives and resources depend on the nature of the dominant discipline. For the current research, such a theoretical, centering factor is the philosophical and anthropological principles of the study of culture as a multi-actor dynamic system, where the processes of various kinds of social interactions, symbolic and situational communications, yielding to the influence of dominant power discourses and everyday attributions intersect in the concepts of cultural practice. The factors that influenced the applied nature of the research are more or less related to the methodologies of social and cultural anthropology. As a result, the concept of practices is considered as epistemological, as a language of self-description, actualized by the collapse of the Soviet, reformatting of state independence; as a possibility of the restoration of the repressed, and the legitimization of not only regional, generic, but also diverse aspects of identity; also as a reaction to the traumatic experiences of the twentieth century.

In addition to the epistemological boundaries of interdisciplinarity, it is necessary to note the historical and sociological studies of memory, which will become the theoretical and methodological basis of this project.

The famous French medievalist Jacques Le Goff, highlighting the main problems of historical science, considers collective memory as a phenomenon that irrevocably connects the present with the past. The International Encyclopedia of Political Science defines “historical memory” by describing the functions of the latter: “The concept of historical memory... deals with the ways in which groups, communities and nations construct and identify themselves with certain historical narratives or events”. Note that a historical narrative is not only an official story (a master narrative), it can also be a storyline, a factography, an interpretive strategy expressed in works of art, visual representations, etc.

The thesis that the problem of historical memory is directly related to the issue of power has become commonplace: both purely political and the power of discourse. The statement of J. Le Goff said that “... col-

lective memory has been and is an important issue in the struggle for power between social groups. For classes, groups, or individuals who have ruled and continue to dominate the history of societies, their power over memory and oblivion remains one of the most important concerns. History should identify and help correct memory errors" [3; 131].

The same opinion is shared by Laurent Wirth, who writes that memory increases and tries to preserve only those moments that are necessary or beneficial to the social groups themselves. This is also a prerequisite for the conflict between history and memory. According to Wirth, the function of "truth procedure" acts against the various growing group memories. There is a dialectical connection between history and memory, they complement each other and develop in two directions: a) the memory of eyewitnesses of events is an important source for historical science. It is difficult to explain the essence of the events without them, that is, memory "strengthens" the history; b) history "gives strength" to memory and provides the basis for the formation of national memory [7; 123–126].

In addition to the relationship between history and memory, Paul Ricoeur in his book analyzes the phenomenon of "oblivion" [6; 128]. When, at the end of the twentieth century, memory in the context of a modern pluralistic vision of the past (we are talking about the recognition of the coexistence of competing "memories of the past") turned into a value, the problems of memory and identity moved to the forefront both in public consciousness and in scientific discussions.

American historian Allan Megill accurately identified this phenomenon of modern cultural life as a "memorial mania" and even postulated the rule: "when identity becomes questionable, the value of memory increases". The "memoriality" that engulfed modern society was perceived as a challenge by rationally thinking professionals, whose position was that "history should not serve memory; it should, of course, take into account the demand for memory, but only in order to turn this demand into history". Continuing the traditions of P. Ricoeur, American researcher Allan Megill emphasizes that the complexity of collective representations is aggravated by the fact that memory contains both positive aspects of social experience (victory, triumph, pride) and negative (guilt, shame, trauma) [8; 212].

To alleviate the severity of such experiences, there are sociocultural strategies, like the defense mechanisms of the individual's psyche, - the strategy of forgetting and the strategy of denial. At the junction of the strategies of memory and oblivion, commemoration is formed, events are selected for worship or censure. Commemorative practices affect the preservation of a living connection with the past, and they are used by political forces to manipulate historical consciousness. The relevance of the issue of commemoration is increasing due to its connection with the issue of identity, with the influence of commemoration on the formation of identity, with the current identity crisis.

As a result, J. Assman put forward the project "history of memory" — a discipline that studies the dynamics of memories, cultural memory in general. From the point of view of the history of memory, the past is never transmitted anywhere simply from generation to generation, but is always recreated, again and again, reconstructed based on the needs of modernity.

The history of memory is designed to study the past that remains in the memory of a social group, the processes of its modeling, rediscovery in the present, depending on the current situation. The history of memory asks not about the truth or falsity of certain memories of the past that exist in the collective, but about the reasons for creating, maintaining, or changing a certain image of a historical event, epoch, person. This discipline seeks to discover those circumstances that made a certain image of the past in demand for the current life of a social community, or, on the contrary, led to the loss of its relevance, i.e., to oblivion.

In Russian historiography, issues of historical memory became the subject of special research only in the 1990s. The works of Yu.M. Lotman [10], M. Barga [11], A. Shapiro [12] were aimed at adequate terminological translation and assimilation of scientific discourse, developed in a different historiographic tradition. Yu. M. Lotman says that, from a semiotic point of view, culture is a supra-individual mechanism for storing, transmitting and developing new messages (texts), i.e. collective memory. At the same time, since any culture is internally heterogeneous, then, according to Lotman, we should talk about the coexistence in it of "dialects of memory" corresponding to its subcultures.

Huge contribution in the study of memorial issues in Russia was made by fundamental collective scientific projects led by L.P. Repina [13]. At the present stage, it can be stated that in Russian historiography, memory studies is one of the most actively developing areas of socio-humanitarian science. The number of plots and works on this topic is increasing every year. Kochelyaeva N.A. [14], Titov V.V. [15], Miller A.I., Efremenko D.V. [16], Krasilnikova E.I. [17], Golovnevov E.V. [18], and others are devoted to various as-

pects of the relationship between memory and identity, commemorative practices and the construction of regional identity.

At present, such a direction of social and humanitarian knowledge as the politics of memory is actively developing in Russia, revealing and supplementing its theoretical and practical aspects in the context of the formation of the national-state identity of modern Russia. Russian researchers consider not only the role of historical politics in the construction of political identity, but also the mythologization of this process, its local and regional aspects.

In the post-Soviet Russian academic field, which is heterogeneous and multi-format, one can clearly trace the trends of memory research as an instrument of political criticism, or as a “polyphony” of historical narratives in a specific imperial context, in other words, memory research indicating the “impossibility of a consistent history” about the imperial past. This Russian focus of commemorative research works with the paradox of the irreducibility of memory and history to the same standard, so memory is considered as a signifier of conflicting versions of the imperial, national, and regional past.

In the abundance of the considered research perspectives, there are two dominant positions: the understanding of memory as predominantly national associated with a specific state and the context of the current ideological program, and the understanding of memory as a tool working outside the didactics of state ideology, but covering local practices [19].

The study of historical memory in recent years has become relevant in Kazakhstan too. Back in the 2000s, sociological research was carried out on certain aspects of the perception of history by the population of Kazakhstan. The most prominent of them are the studies of E.S. Omarov [20], G. Ileuova [21], A.P. Konovalova [22], Dunaeva V.Yu., Kurganskaya V.D. [23]. In 2009, the international research agency “Eurasian Monitor” implemented the project “Youth perception of the newly independent states of the history of the soviet and post-Soviet periods” [24].

In recent years, publications devoted to memory problems are fragmentarily encountered. Zh.B. Smagambet indicates the commonality of the social memory of the peoples of Central Asia on the example of the medieval historical monument “Oguzname”. The author characterizes and highlights the importance of studying this direction in political, socio-economic, and spiritual interaction and cooperation [25].

Based on the concept of cultural trauma, the Kazakh researcher Y. Shapoval examines the strategies of survival and preservation of the ethno-confessional identity of Poles deported to Kazakhstan in the second quarter of the twentieth century [26].

Of particular interest is the works of the famous Islamic scholar A.K. Muminov, who studies epigraphs on kulyptases and religious cultural monuments [27]. Sociocultural anthropologist U. Bigozhin studies holy places, mazars, sacred families of Kazakhstan, which in Kazakh culture are associated with the genus skin, the phenomena of kozhalyk, aulie, ziyarat, and shirk [28].

International projects are emerging in Central Asia that bring together researchers from several countries in the region. In 2014, a collective monograph “Identity and Historical Memory in Central Asia” was published in Poland, which presented a variety of topics: from the problems of measuring identity in Central Asia, to specific country frames [29].

As a result of three years of work by researchers from Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and the United States on the project “Afghan War 1979-1989 through the Eyes of Eyewitnesses (Oral history)” in 2016, a three-volume edition “Memory from the Flames of Afghanistan” was published. To preserve the historical memory of this war, the collection of information within the framework of the project was carried out from the direct participants in the events [30].

In his fundamental work “History as the Art of Memory” Patrick H. Hatton presents historical memory as a synonym for historical consciousness. The emergence of the term “historical politics” in the 1990s, its public and academic legitimation coincided with a qualitatively new level of the phenomenon displayed by it. Technological improvements in the transmission, storage and dissemination of information, the development of the sciences of man and his psychological nature, the totality of the penetration of mass media into all spheres of human life and into all corners of the planet have created prerequisites for unprecedented manipulation of the “collective consciousness”. The development of means of communication has dramatically increased the mobilization capabilities of historical politics. The technological and organizational capabilities of the state and other agents of historical politics have increased to unprecedented proportions.

“Historical memory” is a relatively stable set of interrelated collective ideas about the past of a particular group, purposefully constructed by means of historical policy, codified and standardized in social, cultural, political discourses, stereotypes, myths, symbols, mnemonic and commemorative practices. Historical memory is usually presented as a kind of “collective memory”. The boom of research devoted to different types, functions and embodiments of “collective memory”, its consumerization, the emergence of “public history” have increased such a volume of scientific, popular science and pseudoscientific literature that a simple description and enumeration of the main ideas and proposals of different disciplines require a separate study.

For Patrick H. Hatton, “historical memory” is, on the one hand, the result of cultural, social, and political engineering, and, on the other, a tool for constructing cultural, social, political, and religious identities, synthesized into national identity in the era of nationalism [5; 408]. It should be noted that research on historical consciousness in Kazakhstani historiography is not rare. This is confirmed by the works of B.M. Satershinova [31], K.N. Burkhanova [32], S.F. Mazhitova [33], E.A. Abil [34], N.S. Lapin [35], and others.

However, the study of commemorative practices in Kazakhstan has not yet become widespread. One of the first and so far the only comprehensive theoretical and methodological study of memory practices is the project “Actual Memory Practices: Conceptualizing the Past and Constructing Identity in the Contemporary Culture of Kazakhstan” under the leadership of K. Medeuova. In the period from 2015 to 2017, a group of researchers collected empirical material in the regions and museums of the republic. The result of such a large-scale project was the publication of several articles and collective monographs [36]. Within the framework of the mentioned project, U. Sandybaeva analyzes new ways of commemoration on the example of exhibition policy in new museums to victims of political repression [36; 44–68]. Z. Naurzbaeva explores such a classical instrument of cultural memory as the compilation of genealogical shezhire [36; 69–91]. D. Tolgambaeva [36; 151–170], K. Ermaganbetova [36; 123–133], M. Kikimbaev [36; 224–256] are studying mazars and memorial complexes as special sacred places of memory.

Great interest in the academic community was generated by the publication of the collective monograph “Living Memory”, dedicated to the study of the history of Stalinist repressions in Kazakhstan in the 1930–1940s, the memory of them and their understanding by modern Kazakhstani society [37].

In addition to domestic researchers, foreign scientists also show interest in Kazakhstani subjects. Moscow historian E.G. Larina studies the role of sacred places in commemorating the historical past of Kazakhs, characterizing them in historical, spatial, and typological aspects. Providing evidence that reveals the features of historical ideas through the prism of the practices of holy places associated with them [38]. Siberian researcher A.G. Seleznev identifies the factors and conditions for the formation of sacred spaces on the frontier. He explores the traditional Islamic sanctuaries of Siberian Muslims as a hierotopia [39].

Conclusions

The formation of national identity, the preservation of cultural heritage through reproduction in the historical memory of society is an important component of the strategic development of modern Kazakhstan.

Over the period of independence, Kazakhstan has adopted state programs aimed at preserving cultural heritage. Most of the programs focused on factual studies, in which memory and memory practice were associated with artifacts of ethnography or written heritage. Meanwhile, in world social thought, the content of the concept of memory has undergone significant changes.

In this regard, there is an increasing need to address the study of the historical and cultural heritage of Kazakhstan in new conditions, with new approaches to the essence and specifics of historical memory and the formation of national identity. The study of these problems based on extensive historical and field material will provide new opportunities for analyzing and forecasting the current situation in the country and the world.

Historical memory and historical politics act as important factors affecting social stability, perform integrative, consolidating functions between generations, social groups and individuals. Historical memory as a form of collective/cultural memory is both the object and subject of historical politics, the struggle for power and control over society – it is both a goal and a means to achieve the goal. In this sense, historical memory is the main object of historical policy.

In the XIX–XX centuries, the purposeful use of history and collective memory in the assertion of dominant political discourses and the formation of a system of loyalties became an integral part of the domestic and foreign policy of states, a means of forming and legitimizing nations, an instrument of political mobilization.

The “invention of traditions”, ideological unification and mobilization, the achievement of a certain level of cultural homogeneity necessary to ensure collective loyalty to the nation and the state, the conduct of modern warfare would be impossible without the manipulation of history and “collective memory”. In the context of modernization processes within the framework of the implementation of the programs “Mangilik El” and “Rukhani Zhagyr”, it is important to provide an analysis of the existing historical experience, to identify the strengths and weaknesses of both the politics of memory and the myths in the structure of memory construction.

The study of historical memory and the politics of memory in the conditions of the formation of national identity are necessary in connection with changes in ideological attitudes and the intensification of “battles for history” in the post-Soviet space. The Kazakh context and the Kazakh position on these topical issues are poorly represented in the modern world socio-humanitarian science.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. AP08857378).

References

- 1 Хальбвакс М. Социальные рамки памяти / М. Хальбвакс; пер. с фр. и вступ. ст. С.Н. Зенкина. — М.: Новое издательство, 2007. — 348 с.
- 2 Нора П. Франция — память / П. Нора, М. Озуф, Ж. де Пюимеж, М. Винок; пер. с фр. Д. Хапаевой; Науч. конс.; пер. Н. Копосова. — СПб.: Изд-во СПб. ун-та, 1999. — 328 с.
- 3 Ле Гофф Ж. История и память / Ж. Ле Гофф; пер. с фр. К.З. Акопяна. — М.: Рос. полит. энцикл. (РОССПЭН), 2013. — 303 с.
- 4 Ассман Я. Длинная тень прошлого: Мемориальная культура и историческая политика / Я. Ассман. — М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 2014. — 328 с.
- 5 Патрик Х. Хаттон. История как искусство памяти / Х. Патрик. — СПб.: Изд-во «Владимир Даль», 2004. — 422 с.
- 6 Рикёр П. Память, история, забвение / П. Рикёр; пер. с фр. И.И. Блауберг и др. — М.: Изд-во гуманитар. лит., 2004. — 728 с.
- 7 Вирт Л. История и память / Л. Вирт; пер. с фр. Л.В Горпыченко, Н.Кураева. — Майкоп: ОАО «Полиграф-ЮГ», 2015. — 160 с.
- 8 Мегилл А. Историческая эпистемология / А. Мегилл. — М.: «Канон+», 2007. — 480 с.
- 9 Коллинз Д. История или память? / Д. Коллинз; пер. с фр. Л.В Горпыченко, Н.Кураева. — Майкоп: ОАО «Полиграф-ЮГ», 2015. — 160 с.
- 10 Лотман Ю.М. Семиосфера. Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки / Ю.М. Лотман. — СПб.: Искусство-СПб., 2001. — 703 с.
- 11 Барг М.А. Эпохи и идеи. Становление историзма / М.А. Барг. — М.: Мысль, 1987. — 348 с.
- 12 Шапиро А.Л. Русская историография с древнейших времен до 1917 г.: учеб. пос. / А.Л. Шапиро. — СПб.: Изд-во «Культура», 1993. — 763 с.
- 13 Диалоги со временем: память о прошлом в контексте истории / под ред. Л.П. Репиной. — М.: Круг, 2008. — 800 с.
- 14 Культурная память в контексте формирования национальной идентичности России в XXI веке / отв. ред. Н.А. Кочеляева. — М.: Совпадение, 2015. — 168 с.
- 15 Титов В.В. Политика памяти и формирование национально-государственной идентичности: российский опыт и новые тенденции / В.В. Титов. — М.: Типогр. «Ваш формат», 2017. — 184 с.
- 16 Методологические вопросы изучения политики памяти: сб. науч. тр.; под ред. А.И. Миллера и Д.В. Ефременко. — М.-СПб.: Нестор-История, 2018. — 224 с.
- 17 Красильникова Е.И. Памятные места и коммеморативные практики в городах Западной Сибири (конец 1919–середина 1941 г.): дис. ... д-ра ист. наук. Спец.: 07.00.02 — «Отечественная история» / Красильникова Екатерина Ивановна. — Новосибирск, 2016. — 554 с.
- 18 Головнева Е.В. Конструирование региональной идентичности в современной культуре (на материале Сибирского региона): дис. ... д-ра филос. наук: Спец. 09.00.13 — «Философская антропология, философия культуры (философские науки)» / Головнева Елена Валентиновна. — Екатеринбург, 2018.
- 19 Гигаури Д.Г. Политический миф в структуре исторической памяти / Д.Г. Гигаури, В.А. Гуторов // Вестн. Моск. ун-та. — 2017. — № 2. — С. 24–45.
- 20 Омаров Е.С. Казахская цивилизация в оценках алматинцев / Е.С. Омаров // Социологические исследования. — 2006. — № 6. — С. 69–72.
- 21 Илеуова Г. Основные исторические события Казахстана в восприятии населения страны [Электронный ресурс] / Г. Илеуова. — ОФ ЦСПИ «Стратегия». — Режим доступа: <http://www.ofstrategy.kz>
- 22 Коновалов А.П. Оценки уровня исторического сознания (исследования в Восточном Казахстане) [Электронный ресурс] / А.П. Коновалов. — GISAP. — Режим доступа: <http://gisap.eu>.

- 23 Дунаев В.Ю. Формирование общекзахстанской идентичности как предмет преподавания истории Казахстана / В.Ю. Дунаев, В.Д. Курганская. Историческая память как источник конструирования казахстанской идентичности: материалы науч.-практ. конф. Научно-экспертной группы АНК г. Алматы (26 ноября 2015 года). — Алматы: Дом Дружбы, 2016. — С. 44, 45.
- 24 Восприятие молодежью новых независимых государств истории советского и постсоветского периодов. Краткий аналитический отчет по результатам массовых опросов населения 2009 г. [Электронный ресурс]. / под общ. рук. И.В. Задорина. — Евразийский монитор. — 2009. — Режим доступа: <http://www.eurasiamonitor.org>.
- 25 Смағамбет Б.Ж. Көне түркі әдеби мұралары және Орталық Азия халықтарының әлеуметтік жады / Б.Ж. Смағамбет / Түркітілдес елдер дамуының ұлттық стратегиялары. Түркітілдес елдер әлеуметтанушыларының V Конгресс материалдарының жинағы (25–26 сәуір, 2014 жыл). Алматы, 2014. — Б. 516–523.
- 26 Шаповал Ю.В. Этничность и религия у депортированных народов (на примере поляков в Казахстане) / Ю.В. Шаповал // Аль-Фараби. — 2016. — № 3. — С. 47–61.
- 27 Ғылмани С. Заманымызда болған ғұламалардың ғұмыр тарихтары / С. Ғылмани; ред. Ә.Қ. Муминов, А.Дж. Франк. — Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2015. — Т. 1. — 576 б.
- 28 Bigozhin U. Shrines and Neopatrimonialism in Kazakhstan / U. Bigozhin // in Kazakhstan in the Making: Legitimacy, Symbols, and Social Changes, Marlene Laruelle (ed.). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2016. — P. 89–110.
- 29 Идентичность и историческая память в Центральной Азии / под науч. рук. П. Залэнски. Варшава. — 2014. — 392 с.
- 30 Память из пламени Афганистана: Интервью с воинами-интернационалистами Афганской войны 1979–1989 годов / под ред. М. Ларюэль, Б. Ракишевой, Г. Ашкеновой. — Астана: КИСИ при Президенте РК, 2016. — 216 с.
- 31 Сатершинов Б.М. Тарихи сана — тәуелсіздіктің рухани тұғыры / Б.М. Сатершинов. — Алматы: ҚР БҒМ ҒК ФЖСИ КБО, 2011. — 291 б.
- 32 Бурханов К.Н. Историческое самосознание как основа становления государственных патриотов / К.Н. Бурханов. История борьбы за независимость в Северном Казахстане: материалы Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. — Алматы: Қазақ энцикл., 2011. — С. 23–36.
- 33 Мажитов С.Ф. Историческая наука Казахстана: современное состояние и тенденции развития / С.Ф. Мажитов // Изв. НАН РК. Сер. обществ. наук. — 2011. — № 1. — С. 16–33.
- 34 Абиля Е.А. Формирование исторического сознания как фактор межэтнического согласия в Казахстане [Электронный ресурс] / Е.А. Абиля. — G-Global. Режим доступа: <http://group-global.org/ru/publication/3422-formirovanie-istoricheskogo-soznaniya-kak-faktor-mezhetnicheskogo-soglasiya-v>
- 35 Лапин Н.С. Президент Республики Казахстан Н.А. Назарбаев и формирование исторического сознания казахстанцев / Н.С. Лапин. — Астана: «БиКА», 2017. — 296 с.
- 36 Медеуова К.А. Практики и места памяти в Казахстане: моногр. / К.А. Медеуова, У.М. Сандыбаева, З.Ж. Наурызбаева, Д.Т. Толгамбаева, К.С. Ермагамбетова, Д.Н. Мельников, М.Ж. Кикимбаев, А.Ч. Рамазанова, А.Б. Тлепбергел, Е.Ж. Жетібаев, Д.Е. Оразбаева, К.А. Полтавец. — Астана: ЕНУ им. Л.Н. Гумилева, 2017. — 318 с.
- 37 Живая память. Сталинизм в Казахстане — Прошлое, Память, Преодоление / под ред. Ж.Б. Абылхожина, М.Л. Акулова, А.В. Цхай. — Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2019. — 272 с.
- 38 Ларина Е.И. Сакральные пространства казахов: историческая память, иеротопия и идентичность / Е.И. Ларина // Электрон. науч.-обр. журн. «История». Россия-Казахстан: вехи истории. — 2019. — № 1 (75). — С. 399–423.
- 39 Селезнев А.Г. Исламские культовые комплексы Астана в Сибири как иеротопии: сакральные пространства и религиозная идентичность / А.Г. Селезнев // Вестн. археол., антропол. и этногр. — 2013. — № 2. — С. 111–119.

Ж.Е. Нурбаев, Ж.Ж. Киюбек

Тарихи жады және жады саясаты бойынша әлеуметтік пен тарихи-гуманитарлық зерттеулер контексіндегі түсініктер (историографиялық талдау)

Мақалада тарихи жадқа тарихнамалық шолу ұсынылған және осының негізінде ұлттық тарихты қайта қарау процесінің мәні мен ерекшеліктері қарастырылған. Ұсынылған жұмыстың өзектілігі бүгінгі күні өткенді сын тұрғысынан талдауға, мемлекет пен қоғам тарихының негізгі сюжеттерін қайта қарауға әкелетін «мемориалдық бұмның» болуында. Посткеңестік елдер тәуелсіздік алғаннан бері ұлттық бірегейлікті іздеуді мақсат етті. Бұл ізденісте өз тарихын қайта бағалау маңызды рөл атқарады; жаңа әдістемелік тәсілдердің негізінде отаршылдық тәжірибе, постколониалдық өзгерістер мен трансформациялар зерттелуде. Жұмыстың негізгі мақсаты — теориялық және тарихнамалық материалдардың кең спектрін, жады ұғымының негізін қалаушылардың еңбектерін, зерттеушілердің ең алғашқы зерттеулерін талдау, олардан шыққан «жад саясаты» немесе «жад жарақаты» және т.б. ұғымдарға баға беру. Сонымен қатар социология, тарих, философия, саясаттану және т.б. сияқты ғылымдарда маңызды бола бастаған жадының теориялық негіздері қарастырылған. Зерттеуде тарихи-генетикалық, тарихи-салыстырмалы, тарихи-жүйелік әдістер, сонымен қатар ретроспективті және перспективалық талдау әдістері қолданылған. Мақалада ұсынылған шетелдік, орыс және отандық авторлардың тарихнамалық шолуы тарихи жады мен тарихи саясат сияқты ұғымдарын қарастыруға және талдауға көмектесті. Француз, неміс, американдық зерттеушілердің еңбектерінде жады категориясының теориялық және әдістемелік негіздері зерттелген. Ресей және қазақстандық тарихнама қазіргі заманғы зерттеулермен ұсынылған, олар мифологизациямен, осы процесі

саясаттандырумен, коммеморативтік практикамен, жергілікті және өңірлік аспектілермен байланысты процестерді зерделеуге бағытталған.

Кілт сөздер: тарихи жады, есте сақтау саясаты, бірегейлік, тарихнама, еске алу, өткенді қалпына келтіру.

Ж.Е. Нурбаев, Ж.Ж. Киюбек

Концепции исторической памяти и политики памяти в контексте социальных и историко-гуманитарных исследований (историографический анализ)

В статье представлен историографический обзор исторической памяти, и на основе этого рассматриваются значение и особенности процесса переосмысления национальных историй. Актуальность представленной работы заключается в том, что сегодня происходит «мемориальный бум», который приводит к критическому анализу прошлого, пересмотру основных сюжетов истории государства и общества. С обретением Независимости, постсоветские страны были охвачены поиском национальной идентичности. В данном поиске важную роль играла переоценка собственной истории, на основе новых методологических подходов исследуются колониальный опыт, постколониальные трансформации и преобразования. Основной целью работы послужил анализ широкого круга теоретического и историографического материала, трудов основателей концепции памяти, фундаментальные работы исследователей, от которых исходили новые направления, такие как «политика памяти» или «травмы памяти» и др. Авторы данной статьи рассмотрели теоретические основы памяти, которые стали значимыми в таких науках, как социология, история, философия, политология и др. В исследовании использованы историко-генетический, историко-сравнительный, историко-системный методы, а также методы ретроспективного и перспективного анализа. Представленный в статье историографический обзор трудов зарубежных, российских и отечественных авторов помог рассмотреть и проанализировать такие концепции, как историческая память и историческая политика. В трудах французских, немецких, американских исследователей были изучены теоретические и методологические основы категории памяти. Российская и казахстанская историография представлена современными исследованиями, которые направлены на изучение процессов, связанных с мифологизацией, политизацией данного процесса, коммеморативными практиками, локальными и региональными аспектами.

Ключевые слова: историческая память, политика памяти, национальная идентичность, историография, коммеморация, реконструкция прошлого, современное казахстанское общество.

References

- 1 Halbwachs, M. (2007). *Sotsialnye ramki pamiati [Social framework of memory]*. (S.N. Zenkina, Transl.). Moscow: Novoe izdatelstvo [in Russian].
- 2 Nora P., Ozuf M., De Piuimezh, Zh., & Vinok, M. (1999). *Frantsiia — pamiat [France is a memory]*. (D. Khapaeva, Transl.). Saint-Petersburg: Izdatelstvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta [in Russian].
- 3 Le Goff, J. (2013). *Istoriia i pamiat [History and memory]*. (K.Z. Akopiana, Trans). Moscow: Rossiiskaia politicheskaia entsiklopediia [in Russian].
- 4 Assman, Ya. (2014). *Dlinnaia ten proshlogo: Memorialnaia kultura i istoricheskaia politika [The Long Shadow of the Past: Memorial Culture and Historical Politics]*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie [in Russian].
- 5 Patrik Kh. Khatton. (2004). *Istoriia kak iskusstvo pamiati [History as an art of memory]*. Saint-Petersburg: Izdatelstvo «Vladimir Dal» [in Russian].
- 6 Ricoeur, P. (2004). *Pamiat, istoriia, zabvenie [Memory, history, oblivion]*. (I.I. Blauberg, Transl.). Moscow: Izdatelstvo gumanitarnoi literatury [in Russian].
- 7 Wirt, L. (2015). *Istoriia i pamiat [History and memory]*. (L.V. Gorpychenko, N. Kuraeva, Trans). Maikop: Poligraf-YuG [in Russian].
- 8 Megill, A. (2007). *Istoricheskaia epistemologiia [Historical epistemology]*. Moscow: Kanon+ [in Russian].
- 9 Kollinz, D. (2015). *Istoriia ili pamiat? [History or memory?]*. Maikop: Poligraf-YuG [in Russian].
- 10 Lotman, Yu.M. (2001). *Semiosfera. Kultura i vzryv. Vnutri mysliazhchikh mirov. Stati. Issledovaniia. Zametki [Semiosphere. Culture and explosion. Inside thinking worlds. Articles. Research. Notes]*. Saint-Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPb [in Russian].
- 11 Barg, M.A. (1987). *Epokhi i idei. Stanovlenie istorizma [Eras and ideas. The rise of historicism]*. Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].
- 12 Shapiro, A.L. (1993). *Russkaia istoriografiia s drevneishikh vremen do 1917 g. [Russian historiography from ancient times to 1917]*. Saint-Petersburg: Kultura [in Russian].
- 13 Repina, L.P. (Ed.). (2008). *Dialogi so vremenem: pamiat o proshlom v kontekste istorii [Dialogues with Time: Memory of the Past in the Context of History]*. Moscow: Krug [in Russian].

- 14 Kocheliaeva, N.A. (Ed.). (2015). *Kulturnaia pamiat v kontekste formirovaniia natsionalnoi identichnosti Rossii v XXI veke [Cultural memory in the context of the formation of Russia's national identity in the 21st century]*. Moscow: Sovpadenie [in Russian].
- 15 Titov, V.V. (2017). *Politika pamiati i formirovanie natsionalno-gosudarstvennoi identichnosti: rossiiskii opyt i novye tendentsii [The politics of memory and the formation of national-state identity: Russian experience and new trends]*. Moscow: Tipografiia «Vash format» [in Russian].
- 16 Miller, A.I., & Efremenko, D.V. (Eds.). (2018). *Metodologicheskie voprosy izucheniiia politiki pamiati [Methodological issues of studying the politics of memory]*. Moscow–Saint-Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriia [in Russian].
- 17 Krasilnikova, E.I. (2016). Pamiatnye mesta i kommémorativnye praktiki v gorodakh Zapadnoi Sibiri (konets 1919–seredina 1941 g.) [Memorable places and commemorative practices in the cities of Western Siberia (late 1919 – mid 1941)]. *Doctor's thesis*. Novosibirsk [in Russian].
- 18 Golovneva, E.V. (2018). Konstruirovaniie regionalnoi identichnosti v sovremennoi kulture (na materiale Sibirskogo regiona) [Construction of regional identity in modern culture (based on materials from the Siberian region)]. *Doctor's thesis*. Ekaterinburg [in Russian].
- 19 Gigauri, D.G., & Gutorov, V.A. (2017). Politicheskii mif v strukture istoricheskoi pamiati [Political myth in the structure of historical memory]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta – Bulletin of Moscow University*, 2, 24–45 [in Russian].
- 20 Omarov, E.S. (2006). Kazakhskaiia tsivilizatsiia v otsenkakh almatintsev [Kazakh civilization in the assessments of Almaty residents]. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia – Sociological research*, 6, 69–72 [in Russian].
- 21 Ieuova, G. (2019). Osnovnye istoricheskie sobytiia Kazakhstana v vospriiatii naseleniia strany [The main historical events of Kazakhstan in the perception of the country's population]. *ofstrategy.kz*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ofstrategy.kz> [in Russian].
- 22 Konovalov, A.P. (2019). Otsenki urovnia istoricheskogo soznaniia (issledovaniia v Vostochnom Kazakhstane) [Estimates of the level of historical consciousness (studies in East Kazakhstan)]. *gisap.eu*. Retrieved from: <http://gisap.eu> [in Russian].
- 23 Dunaev, V.Yu., & Kurganskaia, V.D. (2016). Formirovanie obshchekazakhstanskoi identichnosti kak predmet prepodavaniia istorii Kazakhstana [Formation of a common Kazakhstan identity as a subject of teaching the history of Kazakhstan]. Proceedings from Historical memory as a source of construction of Kazakhstani identity: *Nauchno-prakticheskaiia konferentsiia. Nauchno-ekspertnaia gruppa Assamblei naroda Kazakhstana goroda Almaty (26 noiabria 2015 goda) – Scientific and Practical Conference. Scientific and Expert Group of Assembly of Peoples of Kazakhstan*. Almaty: Dom Druzhby, 44, 45 [in Russian].
- 24 Zadorina I.V. (Ed.). (2019). Vospriiatie molodezhiu novykh nezavisimykh gosudarstv istorii sovetskogo i postsovetskogo periodov. Kratkii analiticheskii otchet po rezultatam massovykh oprosov naseleniia 2009 g. [Youth perception of the newly independent states of the history of the Soviet and post-Soviet periods. A brief analytical report on the results of mass polls of the population in 2009]. *Evraziiskii monitor – Eurasian monitor*. Retrieved from: <http://www.eurasiamonitor.org>. [in Russian].
- 25 Smağambet, B.Zh. (2014). Köne türki ädebi müralary zhāne Ortalyq Aziia khalyqtarynyñ äleumettik zhady [Ancient Turkic literary heritage and social memory of the peoples of Central Asia]. *Türkütüdes elder damyynyñ ültiy strategialary. Türkütüdes elder äleumettanushylarynyñ V Kongress materialdarynyñ zhinağy – National development strategies of Turkic-speaking countries. Collection of materials of the V Congress of sociologists of Turkic-speaking countries*. (pp. 516-523). Almaty [in Kazakh].
- 26 Shapoval, Yu.V. (2016). Etnichnost i religiia u deportirovannykh narodov (na primere poliakov v Kazakhstane) [Ethnicity and religion among deported peoples (on the example of Poles in Kazakhstan)]. *Al-Farabi*, 3, 47–61 [in Russian].
- 27 Ğylmani, S. (2015). *Zamanyyzda bolğan ğulamalarynyñ ğümyr tarikhtary [Biographies of ancient scholars]*. F.Q. Muminov, A.Dzh. Frank (Eds.). Almaty: Daik-Press [in Kazakh].
- 28 Bigozhin, U. (2016). Shrines and Neopatrimonialism in Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan in the Making: Legitimacy, Symbols, and Social Changes, Marlene Laruelle (ed.). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 89–110.
- 29 Zalenski, P. (Ed.). (2014). *Identichnost i istoricheskaiia pamiat v Tsentralnoi Azii [Identity and Historical Memory in Central Asia]*. Varshava [in Russian].
- 30 Lariuel, M., Rakisheva, B., & Ashkenova, G. (Eds.). (2016). *Pamiat iz plameni Afganistana: Interviu s voynami-internatsionalistami Afganskoi voiny 1979–1989 godov [Memory from the Flames of Afghanistan: Interviews with Internationalist Soldiers of the 1979-1989 Afghan War]*. Astana: Kazakhstanskii institute strategicheskikh issledovaniia pri Prezidente Respubliki Kazakhstan [in Russian].
- 31 Satershinov, B.M. (2011). *Tarikhii sana – tauelsizdiktin rukhani tugyry [Historical consciousness is the spiritual basis of independence]*. Almaty: QR BGM ĞK FzhSI KBO [in Kazakh].
- 32 Burkhanov, K.N. (2011). Istoricheskoe samosoznanie kak osnova stanovleniia gosudarstvennikov-patriotov [Historical self-awareness as a basis for the formation of statesmen-patriots]. Proceedings from History of the struggle for independence in Northern Kazakhstan: *Mezhdunarodnaia nauchno-prakticheskaiia konferentsiia (2011 g.) – International Scientific and Practical Conference*. Almaty: Qazaq entsiklopediiasy, 23–36 [in Russian].
- 33 Mazhitov, S.F. (2011). Istoricheskaiia nauka Kazakhstana: sovremennoe sostoiianie i tendentsii razvitiia [Historical science of Kazakhstan: modern state and development trends]. *Seriia obshchestvennykh nauk – Social Science Series*, 1, 16–33 [in Russian].
- 34 Abil, E.A. (2013). Formirovanie istoricheskogo soznaniia kak faktor mezhetnicheskogo soglasiia v Kazakhstane [Formation of historical consciousness as a factor of interethnic agreement in Kazakhstan]. *group-global.org/ru*. Retrieved from: <http://group-global.org/ru/publication/3422-formirovanie-istoricheskogo-soznaniia-kak-faktor-mezhetnicheskogo-soglasii-v> [in Russian].
- 35 Lapin, N.S. (2017). *Prezident Respubliki Kazakhstan N.A. Nazarbayev i formirovanie istoricheskogo soznaniia kazakhstantsev [President of the Republic of Kazakhstan N.A. Nazarbayev and the formation of the historical consciousness of Kazakhstanis]*. Astana: BiKA [in Russian].
- 36 Medeuova, K.A., Sandybaeva, U.M., Nauryzbaeva, Z.Zh., Tolgambaeva, D.T., Yermagambetova, K.S., Melnikov, D.N., Kikimbaev, M.Zh., Ramazanova, A.Ch., Tlepbergen, A.B., Zhetibaev, E.Zh., Orazbaev, D.Ye., & Poltavets, K.A. (2017). *Praktiki i mesta pamiati v Kazakhstane: monografiia [Practices and places of memory in Kazakhstan: Monograph]*. Astana: L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University [in Russian].
- 37 Abylkhozina, Zh.B., Akulova, M.L., & Tskhai, A.V. (Eds.). (2019). *Zhivaia pamiat. Stalinizm v Kazakhstane – Proshloe, Pamiat, Preodolenie [Living memory. Stalinism in Kazakhstan - Past, Memory, Overcoming]*. Almaty: Daik-Press [in Russian].

38 Larina, E.I. (2019). Sakralnye prostranstva kazakhov: istoricheskaia pamiat, ierotopiia i identichnost [Sacred Spaces of Kazakhs: Historical Memory, Hierotopy and Identity]. *Rossiiā–Kazakhstan: vekhi istorii — Russia–Kazakhstan Milestones in history*, 1 (75), 399–423 [in Russian].

39 Seleznev, A.G. (2013). Islamskie kultovye komplekсы Astana v Sibiri kak ierotopii: sakralnye prostranstva i religioznaia identichnost [Islamic cult complexes Astana in Siberia as hierotopias: sacred spaces and religious identity]. *Vestnik arkhologii, antropologii i etnografii – Bulletin of archeology, anthropology and ethnography*, 2, 111–119 [in Russian].

Букеетов университет