

## **Periodization of national history and national statehood as the priority direction of working out “Otan tarikhy”**

History of Kazakhstan, as the component and integral part of the world civilization, embodied all those tendencies and regulations, which were peculiar for the past of big and little people, for the nomadic and urbanistic civilization, for metropolises and colonies. Diversity of National history was defined, to our opinion, by nature-climate conditions, forming the basics of economic and cultural activities of proto-Kazakhs and Kazakhs, also by geopolitical location of the country. The belonging to the Turkic world, on the one hand, and the neighborhood with such countries as China and Russia, religious-spiritual unity with the people of Central Asia and a group of Islamic countries, on the other hand, objectively formed the directions and results of historical and civilized dynamics in Kazakhstan. Under the influence of global world factors the anthropological type of Kazakhs, their spiritual world and language, statehood, ethnic and state borders, mentality formed.

The most complicated interweaving of factors and fates at the intersection of National history attracted attention of researchers of various epochs and people. History of Kazakhstan, events from its life were reflected in the written monuments and publications of last more than three millennia. Our history was written and re-written by the historians-professionals and amateurs, patriots and ill-wishers in favor of the rulers and party-class ideology. Interpretation of the past of Kazakhstan not seldom contains on the same issue mutually exclusive statements, conclusions and assessments. It is sufficient to recall in this regard the discussion on the forms of property in the Kazakh nomadic society, character of rebellion of K. Kasymov, role and meaning of the “Alash” movement, on the conclusions and lessons of socialistic improvements in agriculture.

Along with that, in the historiography of Kazakhstan one important issue which has a direct and persistent attitude to all the stages of the historical past of the country, exists. This refers to the scientific periodization of National history. It appears that the periodization of history of the country reflects, firstly, the level of development of theory and methodology of historical science, secondly, allows to mark the line between main and auxiliary, principal and derivatives in the whole diversity of historical process.

The periodization of history when it is objective and scientifically justified, widens the horizons and possibilities of scientific cognition, gives a chance to reveal inner logic of historical events, adequately conceive conclusions and lessons of the past and future epochs. The most important – after the designation of the periods of National history, we give the impetus to the creative potential of historical science, because the due new period of self-organization of science has to stimulate the spread of knowledge among people and form the right historical consciousness of masses.

There is a multitude of variants of the periodization of the history of Kazakhstan. Thus, in 30s of previous century S.D. Asfendiyarov, considered that he had to put a question as a whole for the first time, singled out three periods of the history of Kazakhs: “a) the first period – pre-Capitalistic development (till XVIII c.); b) the second – Colonial. Kazakhstan as a colony of tsarism and prerequisites of the October revolution in Kazakhstan; c) the third period – Soviet” [1]. Attempts of the periodization of the history of Kazakhstan occur in the publications of Sh.Kudayberdyev, A.Bukekhanov, M.Tynyshpayev, T.Ryskulov and others. Nevertheless, for a long time the periodization of National history on the formational features dominated for a long time. Each social-economical formation (with the exception for slave-owning) was considered as a full and complete period of the history of Kazakhstan. The classical sample of the formational approach to history, can serve as a five-volume academic edition of the “History of the Kazakh SSR”. Its first volume comprised such issues as the “Primitive communal system. Tribal unions and early feudal states on the territory of Kazakhstan”, second volume – “Development of feudal relations. Formation of the Kazakh nationality and the Kazakh khanate”, third volume – “Joining of Kazakhstan to Russia. Social-economic relations. Revolutionary and national-liberation movement on the eve of the Great October”.

The fourth and fifth volumes were dedicated to the history of the Communist formation in Kazakhstan. The dominant of social-economic formation preserved also in the inner structure of academic edition.

With the crash of the Communist ideas the formational periodization of the history of Kazakhstan became non-topical, old fashioned and fell by the wayside. Today national

historiography did not work out recognized and generally accepted periodization of National history, though the analysis of the common works shows that the periodization of history continues to stay the topical problem of the scientifically historical thought. For the first time ever the new variant of periodization of National history the academician M.K.Kozybayev suggested. He outlined nine periods: 1. Appearance and settlement of the first people on the territory of Kazakhstan. 2. The period of the Sakas, Usuns, Kanguys, Alshyns, Huns. 3. The period of the Turkic tribes. 4. Kypchak period. 5. Mongolian superiority. 6. Kazakh khanates: formation of people, nation. 7. Colonial period. 8. The period of the Soviet empire. 9. The period of independence [2]. In fact, into the basis of the periodization of National history the event-chronological principle. This principle defined the structure of many-volumed “History of Kazakhstan” – the last for today academic edition. The first volume being opened by the section “Earliest Kazakhstan” (the first section of the first volume “History of the Kazakh SSR” was entitled “Primitive communal system and its dissolution”), then comes the section “Kazakhstan in the Saka-Sarmat epoch” (former name “Birth of feudal relations”), in the textbook of A.Abdakimov “History of Kazakhstan (from earliest times till today)”, edited in 1999, we accounted for 13 periods of the National history.

As if foreseeing scientific discussions, the author indicated that there is no unity of opinions in the view at the historical events, and probably can not be. “By suggesting alternatives, I try - he further proceeds, - to avoid categorical reasoning, statements, imposing my own opinion to many readers of the “History of Kazakhstan (from earliest times till our days)” [3].

It is early to say anything about advantages and dignities of the event-chronological principle of the history periodization. We also negate the meaning and positive role of the formational approach to history. The formational principle of scientific understanding and history periodization determined the weighty results in the study of social-economic relations and class structure of the society. Nevertheless, in the background of the formational analysis of history the event-chronological approach loses to a certain extent, because the clearness and definiteness in the revelation of the main content and dominant features of this or that period of history are not characteristic.

It seems that the events whatever important they were, can not designate chronological frames of the history periods in general, and National history, in particular. The periodization of the history of Kazakhstan must be built on those tendencies and processes, which compose the essence and content of the development of the whole society, not its separate social groups, political institutes and economic relations. The main criteria allowing to define starting and finishing dates of the periods, it is necessary to recognize ethnical, spiritual and political processes.

By advancing these basic notions we are reasoning from the fact that, firstly, the creator of history is the certain unity of people (tribe, peoples, ethnic group, nation), secondly, its unity, difference from others, the social unity expresses only through spiritual values, thirdly, the political organization of the unity of people by reaching the pick in its development, summarizes the past, is responsible for the present and future of each and all the sources of power. Within the framework of the given methodical conclusion we suggest the following periodization of the history of Kazakhstan:

1. Earliest Kazakhstan.
2. Kazakhstan in the period of the Turkization, Islamization and ethnopolitogenesis (VI c. BC -XV c.).
3. Period of the Kazakh khanates (XV-XVIII cc.).
4. Colonial Kazakhstan.
5. Soviet Kazakhstan.
6. Independent Kazakhstan.

As the archeological researches testify that the ancient inhabitants of Kazakhstan lived and created their history according to the same rules and canons which were specific for the primitive people of Africa, Asia and Europe. Subsistence economy, “neolithic revolution”, the exploration of the metal caused at the initial period of the enlargement of the geography of inhabitation of the first people, formation of their anthropological type, choice of culture of the economy in accordance with the fauna, flora and mineral resources of Kazakhstan.

Chronologically, the second period of the National history is from the Saka times to the movement of Kerey and Zhaibek. The Sakas are the ancestors of the Kazakhs. The Saka culture is integrated into the spiritual world of tribes which lived on the territory of Kazakhstan at the turn of the first decade AD. The second half of the millennium was significant for the rise of the Turkic kaganates. The peculiarities and unique nature of the Turkic idea was clearly expressed in the monuments of the Orkhon-Yenisei writing. Today, it is definitely stated that the powerful empire of Genghis khan was created mainly on the basis of the Turkic tribes of Central Asia [4].

The Turkization of the Kazakh steppe went almost in a parallel way with the Islamization of population by ceasing the early spread of the Christian religion and Buddhism on the one hand, and not eliminating the Tengriism on the other hand. By the moment of the creation of the Kazakh khanate the belonging to the world of the Turkic people and fidelity to Islamic religion became the significant features of the ethnic identity of the Kazakhs. The keystone of political and ethnical processes of two millennia was the end of the formation of the Kazakh ethnic group and emergence of the Kazakh khanate.

The period of the Kazakh khanates has got, in our opinion, three main conclusions. First, the process of the formation of traditional Kazakh culture finished. Second, there legal basics of the functioning of the Nomadic civilization of the Kazakhs were put. Third, the Kazakhs, finding themselves on the verge of extinction after “Great Disaster” of 1723, managed to stand up for the ethnic, territorial integrity and state independence. But not for long. In the historical literature there is the conception that as a result of inter-feudal strife, lack of stable political-economic ties among regions, the united Kazakh khanate was divided into zhuzes. In fact, in 1781 the khan of the Younger zhuz became Abulhair, even earlier the Middle zhuz was headed by Kaip.

At the modern stage the prerequisites and conditions of the emergence of the Kazakh zhuzes are conceptually reviewed. Academician M.K.Kozybayev, writer A.Kekilbayev point to the natural-historical and objective character of the zhuz division of the Kazakhs [5]. By joining to that conclusion, we would like to emphasize that in XVII – early XVIII centuries the formation and functioning of the Kazakh zhuzes were not the factor destroying the unity and strength of the society, disorganizing the mechanisms of life and safety of the state. Most probably, by the end of XVII century both economically, and ethnically, each zhuz was strong and independent, that inner dynamics of development of the Kazakh society allowed to sustain the catastrophe of 1723 y. After the year of the “Great Disaster” the Kazakhs did not leave the stage but strengthened their unity. Ch.Valikhanov said, “No Kirgiz khan had such an unrestricted power as Ablay. He was the first to allow to his arbitrary actions the death penalty, that earlier was performed on the statement of the people’s seim and the pacified the despotism of strong forebears and sultans who limited by the council the power of the khan” [6].

Colonial and Soviet periods of the history of Kazakhstan have one common feature - power destroy of the basics of traditional Kazakh society and destroy of the progress of natural-historical development of national state. The main peculiarity of the periods is in that the colonial policy of tsarism turned Kazakhstan into the market outlet and source of getting excess profit.

The new period of National history started in December 1991 y. The essence and content of the modern processes in the country can be indicated with the words “revival”, “renovation”, and “integration into the universal order”. We consider that the periodization of the history of Kazakhstan is not the aim itself of historical science. It is needy for the achievement of objective truth. Only truth would assist the effective solution of contemporary problems.

#### **Literature:**

1. S.D.Asfendiyarov. O nekotoryh osnovnyh voprosah istorii kazahov // Bolshevik Kazahstana. - 1933. - №10. - S.29-37.
2. M.K.Kozybayev. Ata tarihy turaly syr // Izv.NAN RK. – Seriya obsch.nauk. - 1993. - №1. - S.4-18
3. A.Abdakimov. Istoriya Kazahstana (s drevneyshih vremen do nashih dney). – Astana. 1999. - S. 10.
4. A.Sh.Kadyrbayev. Kitayskie istochniki po istorii tyurok XII-XVI vekov. - A., 1991. – S. 32-33
5. M.K.Kozybayev // Ush paygambar. - A. 1992; Izv. NAN RK. – Seriya obsch.nauk. - 1993. - №1. -C.13.
6. Ch.Valikhanov. Soch. –T.4 – S.116