

## MUSTAFA SHOKAY IS THE IDEOLOGIST OF THE TURKESTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT

Khazretali Tursun\* Vahdet Tarakchi\*\* Dametken Suleimenova\*\*\*  
 Akkaiyn Balykova\*\*\*\* Zabirash Adilbekova\*\*\*\*\* and Zhumadil Mahabbat\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Abstract:** This article is devoted to the historical figure of the Kazakh people, social and political doer, creative personality of Mustafa Shokay. The authors analyze his activities in the formation of the Turkestan national liberation movement, discuss the history of his struggle against Russian colonialism and struggle for the equality of Muslims. In addition, the emigration creative activity of M. Shokay played a special role in the Turkestan movement. The authors focus on his works, which have become the scientific source of the national liberation movement. In exile, he maintained a political struggle against the national policy pursued by the Soviet Union in Central Asia and Kazakhstan, exposing all the negative aspects of this policy and leaving behind a rich creative heritage that has become an invaluable source revealing the real history of the Turkestan movement.

The article also provides a detailed analysis of the peculiarities and prerequisites for the emergence of the Turkestan national liberation movement, its internal and external factors that are characterized by the political and spiritual diversity of the polyethnic structure of the peoples of the krai, as well as the active modernization of Russian society.

**Keywords:** Historical figure, liberation movement, Turkestan, Muslim, Soviet Union, tsarist colonialism.

### INTRODUCTION

The colonization of Kazakh lands by Russia began in the 30s of the XVIII century and ended in the 80-ies of the XIX century. During this period, Russia seized through military expansion such national state entities as the Kazakh, Kokand, Khiva and Bukhara khanates, destroyed the traditional government institutions of these states and replaced them with colonial ones. As a result, these states have lost their independence and turned into colonial sources of raw materials and markets for the products of rapidly developing Russian capitalism.

---

\* Doctor of historical sciences, professor, International Kazakh-Turkish University named after Kh.A. Yasavi, Turkestan, Kazakhstan. *E-mail: Rusbek\_1492@mail.ru*

\*\* PhD student, International Kazakh-Turkish University named after Kh.A. Yasavi, Turkestan. *E-mail: Rusbek\_1492@mail.ru*

\*\*\* Candidate of historical sciences, professor West Kazakhstan Innovation and Technology University, Uralsk, Kazakhstan. *E-mail: Rusbek\_1492@mail.ru*

\*\*\*\* Candidate of historical sciences, docent, West Kazakhstan Innovation and Technology University, Uralsk, Kazakhstan.

\*\*\*\*\* Candidate of historical sciences, International Kazakh-Turkish University named after Kh.A. Yasavi, Turkestan, Kazakhstan. *E-mail: madina.imanbaeva@mail.ru*

\*\*\*\*\* Candidate of historical sciences, Almaty, Kazakhstan, University named after L.B. Goncharova. *E-mail: madina.imanbaeva@mail.ru*

The first quarter of the XX century is marked by the presence of a large number of events that have influenced the further development of the whole world, determining its future. In this case, revolutions can be called as the main events that arose due to the socio-economic and socio-political contradictions of capitalism. The national liberation struggle against the metropolises embraced approximately all of the colonized countries of the world. The Central Asian regions, subordinated to tsarist Russia, have also stayed on the sidelines. Moreover, the political trends, characterized by the struggle for the independence of the Turkic-Muslim peoples, were held not only in these regions, but throughout Russia.

The scientific analysis of the historical events of the Turkestan national liberation movement, which arose as a struggle against the colonial yoke of tsarist Russia and which later became a force opposing the national policy of the Soviets, has an important cognitive meaning, because the establishment of historical prerequisites for the restoration of national states in the former colonial territories renders invaluable service for the methodological goals. The Turkestan national liberation movement is characterized by some political promiscuity and social diversity. This struggle is an active movement organized by political forces, united ideas of Pan-Turkism and Muslimism on the way to freedom and independence of the country. The first national state entities established in Central Asia and Kazakhstan in 1917 as an alternative to Soviet power - the government of Alashorda and the Turkestan autonomy (Turkiston Mukhtoriati), having common goals and character, became the first major achievement on this path.

In 1991, the collapse of the Soviet empire began, which was a natural conformity to the laws of history, and the formation of such states as Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Tajikistan in the territory of Turkestan was the result of this national liberation struggle, which had a permanent nature.

Speaking about the political phenomenon called the Turkestan movement, it is necessary to mention the national figures, who came to the political arena at that time and became some kind of generators of national ideas. Among the constellation of these fighters for independence, there is Mustafa Shokay (1890-1941), known at the world level for his socio-political struggle and creative activity.

The historical reconstruction of the struggle of Mustafa Shokay shows that the ideas of the Turkestan national liberation movement, formed at the regional level, have international significance and are directly connected with the world national liberation movement.

### **Characteristic features of the Turkestan national liberation movement**

In the early XX century, in the Turkestan region, various political and educational organizations began to appear among the local population. In the process of socio-political development, such organizations expanded their activities, focused on the struggle against colonial oppression, as a result of which it translated into

the national movement, pervading all segments of the population. The Turkestan national liberation movement can be defined as the general name of the totality of national liberation movements that have operated since the end of the XIX century till the beginning of the XX century, on the basis of modern universal and democratic values and principles. The usurpatory policy of colonial authorities in the region has come face to face with a new strong current that had a serious intellectual, cultural and moral power, led by the Turkestan Jadids. A new generation of Turkestan intellectuals, merchants and religious figures, first began to look at the “legitimacy” of the colonial power with doubt. Representatives of the national elite, who undertook to wake up the forces dormant among the people, in order to restore national statehood and to achieve freedom, through their all-round socio-political activities, brought together the timing of the implementation of the ideas of the Turkestan national liberation movement.

A significant influence on the transformation of small circles into a powerful movement was provided by the Young Turks in Turkey, the Young Persians in Iran and the Young Bukharians in Bukhara. These important eastern factors, which gained an advantage in the national liberation movement, determined three main directions of movements in the country: Jadidism, Muslimism and Pan-Turkism. Each of these directions, depending on the positions they adhered to, had their own characteristic features. For example, the movement of the Jadids, headed by Mahkmudkhodja Behbudiy and Abdurashikhanov Munavvar qori, oriented towards the reform of religious education, aimed at renewing public life through democracy, and later became politically colored. Muslimism, in the renewal of public life, gave preference to confessional values. This movement was divided into two major forces, one of which was conservative, for example, Shuro-i Ulema, which requires during the state formation the guidance of the Koran and the Sharia, and democratic, using religious signs as a means of combating colonialism. Pan-Turkism, in its turn, took a multiethnic unity as a basis for the struggle against colonialism.

Prior to the October revolution of 1917, the national liberation movement, consisting of the above mentioned three main trends, united diverse groups with different social and cultural status and having different experiences of political struggle. We draw attention to this, because by 1917, among the political forces of the Turkestan national liberation movement, there have emerged on the political arena such trends that in their practice of active socio-political development used directly opposite principles and actions, such as “Shuro-i Ulema” and “Ittifaq al-Muslimin” (Council of Muslims). In the same way, as in Islam, some representatives of the political movement, preaching the idea of Turkic unity, took the path of armed confrontation of Soviet power. The Soviet government not only opposed the movement of these fighters, aimed at achieving national independence, national self-determination and so-called “basmachestvo”, but also tried to destroy their political and ideological unity.

The movement, which has the character of armed and political struggle, has several important periods. The first of them covers the late 60s of the XIX century till the beginning of the XX century. The apogee of this period was the Andijan uprising of 1889. The second period continues until 1917 and is characterized by the formation and strengthening of mechanisms for the political struggle of cultural and educational movements such as Jadidism, which had a purpose of the change of power through constitutional means. During this period, it is possible to single out 1916, when the national liberation uprising, which was becoming more and more total, swept the greater part of the region, especially the Syrdarya region. The third period begins in 1917-1918. Its peculiarities are the national and political activities of national parties and movements such as Shuro-i Islam, Shuro-i Ulema and Ittifaq al-Muslimin, as well as the creation of a national state structure called the Turkestan Mukhtariat (Kokand autonomy).

The period of 1918-1924 of the third period is characterized by the struggle of the national communists, who entered the Soviet government - T. Ryskulov, S. Khodzhanov, S. Asfendiyarov and others, who tried to impart the national content to its structure. The apogee of this struggle was in 1920 the adoption at the III Musbureau emergency conference, held in Tashkent, of the decision to create a "Communist Party of the Turkic peoples", formed from the political organization of the future Turkic Soviet Republic, which was part of the RSFSR. The fourth period is characterized by the growth of the Basmachi movement, which became an open armed struggle against Soviet power, and the formation of several national states.

The program documents of the Turkestan Jadids before the First World War clearly show evidence that their struggle was directed against feudalism and colonialism, at the same time, the idea of reforming the institutions of power by constitutional means was developed. The union of the Turkestan peoples around this idea on the basis of Pan-Turkism and Muslimism, directed against colonial oppression, was actively pursued by the tsarist government.

The colonial authorities hung labels on these political ideas - "Pan-Turkism" and "Pan-Islamism" and declared them as dangerous ideologies aimed at the collapse of the Russian state and the establishment of an all-Islamic power under the leadership of Turkey and Iran. In fact, it was an ideological hullabaloo raised by the colonial power to protect its government interests. In reality, the Jadids did not aspire to the disintegration of Russia, the question rested on the unification of the people under colonial yoke, on the basis of Islam. Their main political idea was that the factor of Islam allowed the Central Asian Muslims to feel a spiritual and cultural unity with the Muslims of other regions, and indeed the whole world. This conclusion reveals and shows the real significance of the unification of the peoples of the region for political struggle.

In 1917, serious political upheavals took place in Russia, which strengthened the national liberation movements in the colonies. That year, from 1st to 11th of May, the I All-Russian Congress of Muslims was held in Moscow, where the policy of peaceful solution of socio-political problems was unanimously supported through the Kurultay meeting and the civil consent of the Provisional government. The Muslim peoples gave the advantage for not defending the interests of one class, but for eliminating colonial oppression. The “Shuro-i Islam” regional organization - the Council of Muslims, founded after the February revolution, was created under the influence of the above-mentioned All-Russian Muslim movement. The name of the organization shows that it unites political groups characterized by ethnic diversity. The Mussoviet (chairman M.Shokay), who played an integrative role of the coordinator uniting various organizations and movements, set as his main task to prevent the division of the national democratic forces into separate groups.

In June of the same year, Shuro-i Islam, headed by M. Shokay, M. Behbudiy and M. Abdurashikhanov, separated a new political association - Shuro-i Ulema (the Council of scientists-ulemas), headed by S. Lapin and defended the interests of the group of religious elite. This association adhered to the old traditions, trying to preserve feudal-patriarchal relations in public life. They did not support the educational ideas and political views of the Jadids, opposing their ideas about political power. Thus, the Muslim Council of the Turkestan krai failed to unite the organizations Shuro-i Islam and the Council of scientists-ulemas, trying to influence the worldview of the inhabitants of the whole Turkestan, to achieve a single goal, and this turmoil severely weakened the struggle for independence [1, p.150].

After the victory of the Bolsheviks in Tashkent, the Turkestan national-democratic forces, under the auspices of Shuro-i Islam, launched an unswerving struggle against the new government, showing political courage and determination in achieving by the peoples of the krai of national self-determination and independence. On October 26, 1917, at the IV All-Turkestan Congress of Muslims, the Turkestan autonomy was declared. In the last period of this historical event, the political position of the “Council of scientists”, headed by S. Lapin, continuously hesitated between democratic forces and the Bolsheviks, which led to clashes with both sides. Such political debates could not last long, and as a result, an open confrontation arose. On February 18, 1918, the scientists-ulemas raised the “palace coup” by overthrowing Mustafa Shokay and putting the commander Yergesh in his place, which resulted in the introduction of autonomy into the political stupor and leaving it to the mercy of fate.

Scientific views on the idea of “Muslim unity”, which received a very important content in the history of the Turkestan movement, require careful specification. The religious sign was to become a consolidating factor in the struggle of Muslim peoples under Russian rule against colonialism. In 1908, among the printed publications

of Petersburg, the opinion that “there are no Arabs, Tatars, Bashkirs in Islam, because all Muslims form a single people” [2, p.128-129], which has the character of an appeal for political unity, spread widely in the city. The idea of uniting all the Muslim peoples of Russia into a single nation strengthened the faith in their opportunities among Islamic associations, and political adventurism too exalted this idea. At the moment, we know that the expression of modern Western and Russian theologians about “the idea of the unity of Muslim peoples, which took place at the beginning of the XX century, existed only in dreams”, refers precisely to the idea of uniting all Muslim peoples in a single nation. In reality, the Muslim movement in Russia was not aimed at forming a single “Islamic nation”. But this idea has become a significant factor in the national liberation movement, coordinating the unification of Muslim peoples in their struggle against the colonial power, fulfilling an important political role in this struggle.

The representative of the left wing of the Turkestan national liberation movement, T. Ryskulov, was aimed at realizing the idea of the United Turkestan, using the methods of the Bolsheviks in his struggle. At the III TCP Congress, T. Ryskulov, on behalf of the Muslim Conference, said the following: “Since we maintain a class struggle on this land together with other nations living in the Turkestan region, we need to unite these nations, because the proletariat does not know the division into nationalities” [3, p.4]. Under the new conditions, this idea directed national forces to struggle against colonialism and Great-Russian chauvinism, because, with the strengthening of the institutions of power of the new society, the open struggle against the Soviet government became extensive. The attraction of the greater part of the illiterate population to their sides by the Bolsheviks through luring class and national ideas greatly weakened the political effectiveness of the open struggle. In this regard, the idea of uniting the peoples of Turkestan into a single nation was first presented by T. Ryskulov as a strategic task. In January 1920, he achieved the fact that at the III Musbureau emergency conference, held in Tashkent, a decision was signed to create the “Communist Party of Turkic Peoples”, formed from the political organization of the future Turkic Republic. However, the first results of the uniting of the Turks were strangled at the dawn of Soviet power.

### **Mustafa Shokay is an ideologist of the Turkestan movement**

The history of Mustafa Shokay’s struggle against Russian colonialism can be conditionally divided into two periods, depending on the nature of the state system. The first period is the struggle against the colonial policy pursued by tsarist Russia in Central Asia and Kazakhstan. The second period is a struggle against the national policy pursued by the Soviet government in this region.

The first active steps of Mustafa Shokay in this area cover 1910-1917. From the time he entered the faculty of Law of St. Petersburg University in 1910, he was influenced by the Turkic-Muslim and democratic-liberal political movements in the city. The beginning of his active participation in the political struggle coincides with spring 1914. Under the patronage of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Black Hundreds and their like-minded people party was created, the “Sirat-ul Mustakim” party, who caused discord and sowed distemper among Muslim political organizations. 31 students, among whom were Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Tatars and Bashkirs, studied in Petrograd, signed a petition against the creation of these parties and went out to the rally [4, L.61v.]. M. Shokay, who took part in this rally, carried out an activity in organizing the First All-Russian Congress of Muslims in June 1914. There he took up with the ex-deputies of the State Duma S. Zhantorin, A. Bukeykhanov and B. Karataev.

After the dissolution of the II Russian State Duma, when forming the third and fourth Duma, deputies were not elected from the inhabitants of the Central Asia. The next place, where the intelligentsia from these places could continue the struggle in the imperial parliament, was the Muslim faction created under the State Duma. At the suggestion of Alikhan Bukeikhanov, M. Shokai was elected as a secretary of the faction [5, p.62]. The activity of this faction was aimed at influencing the adoption of legal documents in the parliament concerning the national policy and interests of Muslim peoples. Even if this political method could not influence the imperial order in the national regions, it would generate public resonance among representatives of the democratic movement in Russia. The Muslim faction has another important historical significance: it later turned into an informal center coordinating the demands of the Turkic peoples for the colonial power to grant autonomous powers. The Tatar political scientist Gayaz Iskaki described the faction as follows: “It was a secret center that ran all the national affairs” [6, p.44].

The Muslim faction directly dealt with the issues of the national liberation uprising of 1916, which ended in merciless suppression. M. Shokay arrived in Turkestan together with members of the faction K.-M. Tevkelev, Sh. Mukhamedyarov and Duma deputy A.F. Kerensky, in order to get acquainted personally with the brutalities of Russian soldiers [7].

On February 25, 1917, M. Shokay perceived the fall of the tsarist government with a hope, after which in the “Kazakh” newspaper, together with A. Bukeykhanov and M. Dulatov, he congratulated the nation with the “first day of freedom and equality”, and also sent a letter where it was said about the need to support the Provisional government, to prepare for the Kurultai and to deal with the land issue.

The growth of political movements, widely spread in all corners of the empire after the February coup in Petrograd, brought Shokay to the forefront of the political struggle. In March of that year, he took part in the rally in Petrograd, after which he

came to the All-Kazakh Congress in Orenburg. Further, on April 16-21, the First All-Muslim Congress, held under the auspices of Shuro-i Islam in Tashkent with the participation of all-Turkistan leaders Munavvar qori and Abdusami qori, was attended by Shokay, where he was elected as a chairman of the Muslim Council.

“Shuro-i Islam”, while still in the stage of organizational design, immediately declared itself as a representative body of the Muslim population, called upon to express its will and protect its interests in state bodies of power. In the memoirs of Mustafa Shokay it is noted that “at time dictation, “Shuro-i Islam” entered the political arena with a plan for reforming the living conditions that resulted from the conquest alien to the Turkestan. The reforms of the Shuro-i Islam were based on the experience of the social development of free, independent Muslim states, such as Turkey, Afghanistan, Iran, Egypt, Syria and other Arab countries, which showed what way the national movement in Turkestan need to follow” [8, p.25].

The core threads of management were concentrated in the TurkCommittee, formed by the decree of the central government from April 7, 1917. It should be noted that in the first membership of the Turkestan Committee, 4 of 9 members were representatives of Turkic nationalities: A. Bukeikhanov, member of the State Duma of the I convocation; M. Tynyshpayev, the II convocation Duma member; S. Maksudi, the III convocation Duma member; and major-general A. Davletshin. In all probability, by introducing them into the Turkestan Committee, the Provisional government wished to emphasize the desire to take into account the interests of the indigenous population.

As it became clear shortly, not elected democratically on the spot, but sent from afar new government of the krai carried out almost the same policy towards the indigenous population as the tsarist autocracy [9, p.85.]. As a result, the first composition of the TurkCommittee of the Provisional government, headed by the cadet Shchepkin and wholly connected in its actions with the center, without naturally meeting with the support of local politicians, resigned on July 1, 1917, although in fact, it continued to function for a fairly long time. Mustafa Shokay joined the Turkestan Committee of the second convocation, headed by V.P. Nalivkin. On September 24, a punitive detachment of the Provisional government, headed by General Korovnichenko, arrived from Kazan to Tashkent. A military dictatorship was established in the city. This also meant the disappearance of the TurkCommittee of the Provisional government from the political arena as the supreme authority in Turkestan.

A new chapter in the history of the Russian state and Turkestan opened the “October coup”. On October 25, 1917, in Petrograd, there was the armed uprising. On October 28, the October revolution began in Tashkent, after which all power passed to the Tashkent Soviet.



The viewpoint of the Muslim part of the population of the krai on the national-state reconstruction of Turkestan is presented in the speech of the leader of the ulamists Seraly Lapin. He stated that “Islam could demand to itself all power, but makes an assignment to the alien elements, admits their representatives to the power” [10].

Recollecting those revolution days later, M. Shokay noted that “the Bolshevik power, established by violent means, killed the Turkestanis’ faith in revolutionary-liberation slogans. Soviet power began in Turkestan with a sweeping denial of the right of indigenous people to take part in power” [11, p.17-18]. Such an anti-popular policy of the Bolshevik “disposers” could not but arouse a response. The Bolsheviks’ unwillingness to reckon with the needs of the indigenous population, their frank great-power chauvinism became a priority cause of the formation of an anti-Soviet bloc of forces among the Muslim population.

On November 26, 1917, the first congress of the All-Turkestan Muslims, where M. Shokay presided, was opened in Kokand. About 250 people attended the congress [12].

Among the delegates there were representatives of the city dumas, the Turkestan bureau of the Tatars, the regional Jewish organization Poale Zion, as well as local Jews. So this congress cannot be called only Muslim. “This congress fully demonstrated the Turkestan national unity”, M. Shokai wrote [8, p. 26]. On November 28, the name of the emerging state entity “Turkeston Mukhtoriati” (Turkestan autonomy) was determined. The People’s Council, numbering 54 seats, was supposed to include 4 representatives from city government bodies and 18 from various regional “European” organizations [13]. Mukhametzhan Tynyshpaev was elected as a Prime Minister of the government, later he was succeeded by M. Shokay. The post of the Prime Minister of the government of the Turkestan autonomy became the highest post of M. Shokay in the political field.

Harvard University professor Martin Terry speaks about the Soviet Union as the first empire in the world, characterized by its “positive activities”. The Soviets also manifested themselves as a multiethnic European state, opposed to traditional nationalism. The state kept nationalism under control, isolating and neutralizing it. The author concludes that in Kazakhstan, in 1920-1930, the principle of “positive discrimination” was applied, where the Russian population was maintained, accounting for less than half the total population of the region [14, p. 10, 31-32.].

The national policy, pursued by the Soviet authorities in Kazakhstan, does not correspond to the conclusions of M. Terry. In this regard, we can give two examples. First: the party authorities looked at the national elite with a strong distrust. In September 1919, one of the party functionaries, Lukashev wrote to the Central Committee of the RCP (B): “And if now the Kyrgyz mass is shouting about autonomy, absolutely not knowing what autonomy is, and not knowing what it is

carrying ... it still as one person exclaims “autonomy”, “autonomy”, it does not mean that this mass is for the Soviet power, and even more so for communism ...” [15, L.112]. These words can be perceived as a subjective view of party functionaries on the desire of the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) intelligentsia for autonomy, and this view was clearly manifested in the national policy of the party throughout its entire existence.

The highest echelon of party power paved the way for such distrust. Nevertheless, I.V. Stalin, in a note to E.D. Stasova immediately after the formation of KyrMRC, loyally spoke about Akhmet Baytursunov, as “one of the leaders of the Kazakh national-bourgeois Alash party and the Alash Orda autonomy”, which the central government dissolved in summer 1919: “I did not consider and do not consider him as revolutionary or sympathetic, nevertheless, his presence in the Revolutionary Committee is necessary” [16, p. 1]. This situation is not accidental, it represents a continuation of the implementation of the strategic goals of the Soviet government in national politics.

Secondly, M. Shokay writes that in 1916 the governor-general of the Turkestan krai Kuropatkin could not put the national interests of the Turkestanis on a par with the interests of Russia and the Russians, in turn, the Moscow Bolsheviks cannot place local and national interests above the interests of the revolutionary center, that is, again, above the Russian interests, because the interests of the Russian proletariat are higher than all the others, and thus tsarist colonialism was replaced by Great-Russian chauvinism [17, p.50]. He makes the following comparison: the Hindus, whom the Bolsheviks consider to be in “colonial slavery,” can openly declare their desire to gain independence for India. While the related peoples of the “Soviet National Republic” have no right to say anything about “independence”. They can only voice what Moscow has approved and authorized [17, p.243]. Thus, it can be concluded that the national policy of the Soviet Union towards the Kazakhs had no “positive discrimination”, but a real negative discrimination.

### **Works of Mustafa Shokay as a source of the history of the Turkestan movement**

In recent years, in Kazakhstan, the works of M. Shokay, which turned into a scientific source of the history of the Turkestan national liberation movement, were published in the form of a full academic collection. In addition, the collection included 586 materials in English, French, German and Polish languages, 488 materials in Russian, and the total volume of the collection is 430 typographical pages. Most of the materials in the collection were first introduced into the scientific circulation in the original with explanations. So far, such a volume of information was not available to the scientific community. When creating the collection, the authors had to apply to libraries and archival funds of the far and near abroad. The materials, included in the collection, were obtained from more than twenty archives and

libraries of Kazakhstan, Russia, Germany, France, Poland, Turkey, and Uzbekistan. Perhaps, there are archival materials in countries such as the United States, Britain, Switzerland and Romania.

Mustafa Shokay was a polyglot who spoke several languages. Along with Kazakh, he could communicate in Uzbek, Turkish, ancient Chaghatay languages. He wrote articles in Russian, French and English. In his works, he used three types of alphabet: Arabic, Cyrillic and Latin. His articles were translated and published in Urdu, as well as in Indian, Arabic, Georgian, etc. The originals of works written and published in various languages, and some facsimiles included in the collection, make it even more significant and valuable.

In 1919, M. Shokay moved to Georgia, where in the “Borba”, “On the Border”, “Shefak”, “The Free Mountaineer” - “The Independent Mountaineer”, “Yangi Dunya” newspapers he published articles on the sorrows and sufferings of the people, which the October Revolution brought with it [18, p.6].

Shokay’s articles, exposing Soviet national policy, show their historicity. The main feature of historical works is subjectivism. The subjectivism of Mustafa Shokay is generated by his patriotic outlook and political views. The historical events and phenomena that took place in Central Asia and Kazakhstan, were assessed by M. Shokay from the standpoint of the Turkic unity and struggle for independence. Representatives of the political elite were assessed by him depending on how truly and faithfully they served the national interests.

Mustafa Shokai was primarily a fighter, and only then - a creative person. His struggle became a stimulus for creativity, and creativity, in turn, strengthened the foundation of his political struggle. Such representatives of the national elite are only a few. At the same time, he is the only exponent of the national elite, who is known all over the world. Thus, Shokay’s works primarily express his struggle as a politician embraced by the ideas of Turkic unity and independence, and, therewith, they fully disclose the meaning and content of his political journalism as a stratagem that has become a life credo. His encyclopedic knowledge and political foresight allowed to make an invaluable contribution to the independence of the Turkic peoples. He was the organizer of newspapers and magazines such as the “Banner of Unity”, “Young Turkestan”, “New Turkistan”, “Turkestan”, he was a member of the editorial boards of many newspapers and magazines, the author of articles, continuing his fight in foreign independent publications.

The publication of the collection makes it possible to widely publicize the Kazakh emigratory journalism. K. Yesmagambetov speaks about Mustafa Shokay as one of the founders of Western Sovietology. Most of the founders of Western Sovietology are representatives of “white emigration”. One of them, the philosopher N. Berdyayev, preached Pan-Slavism abroad, another - A.F. Kerensky supported the

return of former power to Russia, fomenting the fire of Great-Russian chauvinism. While the importance of Sovietology of M. Shokay was a disclosure of the eyewash of the national policy of Soviet power in Central Asia, acting on the principle of “externally national, in fact - socialistic”. From this point of view, the activity of M. Shokay occupies a special place. In exposing Soviet power, M. Shokay publishes articles in European languages, raising topical issues and attracting the attention of state leaders and political scientists of European countries, thus paving the way for information struggle against the usurpation policy of the Soviet Union. One of these topics was the artificially created mass famine created in Kazakhstan in 1932-1933. Mustafa Shokay conducted lectures, made reports and wrote articles, drawing the attention of the European public to this scandalous thing.

I. Stalin also believed that the struggle of M. Shokay against the Soviets, carried out in emigration, brings a great ideological danger for the country. In his letter to the members of the bureau of the Kirghiz regional committee of the party from May 29, 1925, concerning the Ak Zhol newspaper, he writes: “I recalled in this connection some articles of the notorious Chokaev in the White Guard press and opened to my horror some spiritual, so to speak, unity “between these articles and the “Ak Zhol” magazine. Unbelievable, but it is true. “Ak Zhol”, of course, in addition to its will, gives a huge amount of material to Chokaev. Chokaev, not by a jugful, besides his own will, generalizes these materials and presents them to the public”[19, L.1-2.]. This letter concerns the articles of M. Shokay in the “Days” newspaper. Here we fully agree with Stalin’s assessment of his political opponent.

The party-state nomenklatura took this letter from the leader of the Bolsheviks as a signal to the beginning of the company to discredit Shokay. After this policy, scientists and writers, in order to curry favor with the authorities, started labeling the world-famous Mustafa Shokay, such as “Pan-Turkist”, “nationalist”, “fascist”, “Nazi”, “alash-ordinets”, “traitor of Homeland”, “henchman of the fascists”, “member of the Turkestan legion”, etc. Thus, his name was carefully vilified among the people, which continued until our country gained independence. In the era of the “Great Terror”, Soviet legal structures claimed that Mustafa Shokay had established contacts with prominent political figures. Based solely on this statement, they deprived the lives and freedoms of innocent people.

The collection reveals many such stories. An example is the secret order of the Minister of State Security of the RSFSR of 1948 to the Second Division of the 4th Operational Sector in Berlin to find materials discrediting M. Shokay. In response to this task, the mentioned department reported that there was no such information in the Berlin operational reference card [18, p.484]. K. Yesmagambetov says that this document was kept for a long time by the Soviet government in the secret department of the Russian State Military Archive.

Another accusation against M. Shokay is the assertion that he conducted secret talks with representatives of the Japanese government. Looking at the content of documents and letters of 12-volume collection, there is a thought to study more thoroughly the reality of the grounds that Shokay, as well as S. Seifullin, T. Ryskulov and others, were “Japanese spies”.

The results of the studies, conducted in Independent Kazakhstan, prove the groundlessness of accusations of the Soviet totalitarian system against M. Shokay. At the end of the 1980s, the following conclusion was intuitively concluded: “There is no need to whitewash Mustafa Shokay. He rehabilitated himself with his works, his heroism and courage. History and time will put everything in its place”. The collection of 12 volumes, created by K. Yesmagambetov, became scientific proof that the real story is not mistaken and puts everything in its place.

## CONCLUSION

The peculiarities of the Turkestan national liberation movement arise, first of all, from internal factors characterizing the political and spiritual diversity of the polyethnic structure of the peoples of the krai, and, secondly, from external factors in the form of active modernization of Russian society. Under the influence of the first factors, in the formation of the ideology of the national liberation movement, the main role was played by the Jadids, based on the unification of the people for the sake of independence under one name: Muslims, Turks, Turkestanis. Regarding the second factor: the changes introduced by the colonial power in the life of society and the economy, chauvinistic slogans that affect the way of life and consciousness of the inhabitants of the krai have led to an increase in the national discontent of all segments of the population. After the collapse of a strong national-democratic structure - the Turkestan autonomy, which was once a major achievement of the national elite, the nature of the national liberation movement in the province has changed dramatically.

Mustafa Shokay, who joined the Turkestan movement as an ordinary participant, eventually rose to the level of its organizer and ideological mastermind. In emigration, he conducted a political struggle against the national policy pursued by the Soviet Union in Central Asia and Kazakhstan, exposing all the negative aspects of this policy and leaving behind a rich creative heritage that has become an inestimable source revealing the real history of the Turkestan movement.

Today, sovereign Kazakhstan follows the path of independence and national revival. The life and patriotic feat of the participants in the autonomist movement in the region serve as an inspiring example for the present generation of Kazakhstanis.

*References*

- Shokaj M. Izbrannoe. -Almaty: Kajnar, 2 t.-1999. 520 s. (in Russ.).
- Saidbaev T.S. Islam i obshhestva. Opyt istoriko-social'noe issledovanie. -M.: Nauka, 1984. – 302 s. (in Russ.).
- Trudy 3-go s#ezda Kommunisticheskoj partii Turkestanskoj respubliki RSFSR. -Tashkent: 1919. -68 s. (in Russ.).
- (Gosudarstvennyj istoricheskij arhiv Rossijskoj Federacii) GARF. F.102, Op.246, D.74(in Russ.).
- M.Shokaj. Izbrannoe. –Almaty: «Kajnar». I T. -1998. – s.512. (in Russ.).
- Ishaki G. Idel'-Ural. Naberezhnye Chelny. Gazetno-knizhnoe izdatel'stvo "KAMAZ", 1993. -63 s. (in Russ.).
- Chokaev M. Otryvki iz vospominanii o 1917 g. Sostavlenie, predislovie, primechanie S.Ishakova. –Tokio-Moskva. 2001. -100 s. (in Russ.).
- Dvizhenie Alash. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov. Aprel' 1901 g.- dekabr' 1917 g. – Almaty: Alash, 2004.-T 1.-552s. (in Russ.).
- Agzamhodzhaev S. Istorija Turkestanskoj avtonomii: (Turkeston Muhtorijati). –Tashkent: Izd.-poigr. Ob'edinenie «Toshkent islom universiteti», 2006 – 268s. (in Russ.).
- Svobodnyj Samarkand. 1917. 25 dekabrja. (in Russ.).
- Chokaj-ogly M. Turkestan pod vlast'ju Sovetov (K karakteristike diktatury proletariata). –Parizh: "Jash Turkestan", 1935, -148 s. (in Russ.).
- Ulug Turkiston. 1917. 9 dekabrja. (in Russ.).
- Jel' Bajrogi. 1917. 22 dekabrja. (in Russ.).
- Martin T. Imperija «polozhitel'noj dejatel'nosti». Nacii i nacionalizm v SSSR. 1923-1939 / T.Martin; [per. s angl. O.R.Shhelokovoj]. M.: Rossijskaja politicheskaja jenciklopedija (ROSPJeN) : Fond «Prezidentskij centr B.N.Elcina», 2011. – 855 s. (in Russ.).
- (Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj arhiv social'no-politicheskoi istorii) RGASPI. F.86. op. 1, d.129. (in Russ.).
- RGASPI. F.558. op. 1. d. 5057(in Russ.).
- Shokaj M. Izbrannye proizvedenija: v treh tomah. 1-t. – Almaty: Izd. «Kajnar». – 2007. – 352 str. (in Russ.).
- Shokaj M. Polnyj sbornik proizvedenij v 12 tomah. 1 tom. –Almaty: Dajk-Pres, 2012. 640 p. (in Russ.).
- (Arhiv Prezidenta Respublika Kazahstan) APRK. F.141. Op.1 D.479a. (in Russ.).