

Problems of National and Language Policy in Historiography

Aiman Zeynelgabdenovna Zhumanova, Rymbek Muratovich Zhumashev

Karaganda State University named after Evnei Arystanovich Buketov, Archeology, Ethnology, and National History Department, apt.28, 5 floor, Universitetskaya Street building 3, 1000028, Karaganda, Kazakhstan
Aiman_jumanova@mail.ru

Abstract: Analysis of language policy of Kazakhstan in Soviet period of time is given in this article. Correlation of language and ethnicity, of language and culture, Kazakhstan historiography of national and language problems and questions of graphic's reformation are considered in it. The publicists and ideologists of national movements told about questions of national and language policy in Soviet period. But scientists-historians and sociolinguists who wrote about "the flourish of languages", about "triumph of national policy of Lenin", about "timeliness of written language transformation into Latin and later - into Russian graphics" were at a loss. Some single publications where the scientists-specialists demonstratively expounded the language policy of the power appeared.

[Zhumanova A.Z., Zhumashev R.M. **Problems of National and Language Policy in Historiography.** *Life Sci J* 2013;10(12s):484-490] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 81

Keywords: National language, national culture, language policy, national and language policy, historiography, education, culture.

1. Introduction

Historiography of problem in content and form of national cultures of our country formed during many decades. Its formation goes back to the first half of far 1920-th years and it was determined with both general course of national and cultural development in multinational and poly-confessional country and with sharp debate of those years about ways of culture and education development in the conditions of social and national inequality.

Two theses have been formed during the discussion: the first (Ter-Vavyanyan and others) affirmed that the statement of the question about national culture was reactionary in the conditions of socialism. But he mechanically moved Lenin's opinion about two cultures in each national culture and about the fact that national culture was not and could not be together with socialism.

The second thesis was represented with ideas of N. K. Krupskaya and A.V Lunacharsky. They have declared that national cultures would not die. N. K. Krupskaya mentioned that it was impossible to construct international culture artificially without national one: "international culture may grow only on a definite base of national cultures' development and it is impossible to construct international culture artificially... International culture may become only certain synthesis of national cultures" [1]. A.V Lunacharsky, protecting peculiarity of national cultures, stressed inevitable character of the process of culture's internationalization showing that its "national basis, of course, will stay for a long time, may be forever" and "internationalism does not

assume national motives and people's symphony but provides their rich and free harmonization" [2].

Problems of national and cultural development were a subject of not less bitter debates in the interparty surrounding. For many people of Russia, invited to national life after 1917-th year, education and culture were the prior tasks of national development. This fact was realized by I. V. Stalin: "that is why he rehabilitated a notion of national culture in 1925-th year" [3]. But he continued seeing an instrument of national outskirts' sotevization in the national culture. He wrote in his letter on the 29-th of May in 1925-th year about a newspaper "Ak zhol" which was a body of main party committee in Kazakhstan: "I am against unaffiliated persons' activity in politic and ideology training of Kirgiz (Kazakh-author) youth. We took power not for politic and ideology training of the youth, provided by bourgeois unaffiliated intellectuals. This front must be fully left for communists" [4].

T. Y. Krasovitskaya bases her vision's interpretation with Stalin's usage of two categories in his national culture – form and content. He supposed, as she writes, that national culture's content changes in the condition of socialism: bourgeois and pre-bourgeois are replaced and changed by socialist one; only the form stays as a national. Finally, form stops being an obstacle for nations' consolidation [3, 284]. Transformation of national culture slogan is given later: "the slogan of national culture which was connected only with nationalism has become acceptable, so, national culture fills with proletarian content (socialist, international, universal – for Stalin all these was the same) under the auspices of Soviet

power. In other words national cultures' development in new conditions was merger according to content for Stalin... Stalin decided strictly practical political task – he needed in a greater amount of “proletarian culture” that would pass the content, had been formulated by Stalin in the name of party, into national surrounding [3,355]. We should note that work of T. Y. Krasovitskaya was one of the first in the latest historiography which analyzed Stalin's formula and had become general-party since 1925-th year. This analysis was done on the basis of both academic disputes and conditions of fractional opposition of that time.

Stalin stopped party disputes at the XVI-th party congress having formulated the essence of party-state policy in point of national cultures: “What is national culture in dictatorship of proletariat? It is socialist by its content and national by its form culture, which has an aim to train mass in a spirit of internationalism and to strengthen dictatorship of proletariat” [5]. This formula meant that the national culture's content is Marxist-Leninist ideology; the form may have a distinction. It ruled out any national in national culture's content because proletarian ideology is united and solid. All literature of the 1930-th years proceeded from this formula and its one –sided interpretation was characterized for it. It was supposed that the formula “Soviet culture is socialist by its content and national by its form” made it possible to find a forcible answer to any question concerned to the theme of national cultures in a condition of socialism. In a case of questions appearance like: “What may be understood under a term “national culture” specifically?”, “How does it revealed?”, “What elements does it consist of?” there were not answers.

The language was declared a main bearer of all national but it was obvious that it was wrong to reduce national form of the culture only to language. National language as a rule was considered a fundamental principle of fiction. But A.A. Fadeev paid attention to the fact that single language is not enough to national literature specific expression in 1938-th year [6]. An expert in literature D. D. Blagoi noticed after Great Patriotic War that national literature's specific was not only language but also it was national subject matter, national life and way of life reflection. National literature's specific he connected to “mental make-up originality of the nation that is expressed in its culture originality that meant its fiction one” [7].

Fundamental theoretical or specific-historical works in all-USSR and Kazakhstan historiography for national cultures' content disclosure in the 1920-th -1930-th-1940-th -1950-th years were not created. Course of the party and the state to national cultures'

development, to actual culture inequality overcoming usually was in speech of the party leaders of Kazakhstan in a formula of “the national cultures' flourish”, which also came out of Stalin's mouth in 1929-th year, and obviously meant for propagandistic success. But cultures' development in national republics itself and its burning scientific and theoretical comprehension made questions about formula of national cultures' content and form interpretation rather actual.

The conception of “proletarian culture” was fully identified to the notion of “socialist culture” in the first half of the 1930-th years. That is why the concept of socialist by the content and national by the form culture was used for all multinational Soviet culture.

The conception of “culture” itself was interpreted only as the whole scope of spiritual values that restricted opportunity of further development of the problem of the national culture's content and the form.

After the XX-th party congress in 1957-th-1958-th years dispute about national art's and literature's specific was on the pages of journals “Questions of philosophy” and “Friendship of people” that was continued on the pages of other publications [8]. Questions' content on the art and literature discussion went out of art and literature frames. In the result it was reduced to the problem of nations of USSR culture form and content. This problem's discussion on literature materials was not casual. Practice indicated that formula “Soviet culture is socialist by its content and national by its form” was the first of all applied to literature and art process for about three decades. Consequences of straightforward usage of this formula were very painful for Soviet philology that made the experts in literature begin dispute about nations of USSR cultures' form and content. The dispute discussed some principal questions: 1) what is the historical meaning of the formula “Soviet culture is socialist by its content and national by its form”? 2) if the formula able to show all variety of relations in content and form of multinational culture in the conditions of socialism? 3) what is the correlation between content and form, of general and peculiar, of international and national in the culture? 4) what is, actually, the form and the content in socialist culture? 5) what is national culture in the conditions of socialism? 6) what is national cultures' interaction in the conditions of socialism? The main question was at all speeches: if national is possible in the national culture's content? The answer to this question has separated the dispute's participants and has determined their aptitude to other questions. Some dispute's participants considered that this formula

was dogmatic and did not contribute national specific in art and literature coloration. They considered that it impeded development of the questions about content and form of national art cultures.

The others considered that the formula was correct and checked by life and by practice of Soviet national and cultural construction. They referred to its validity of Marxism and Leninism ideas about nations, and of its universal character. It was affirmed that it stayed right as a political slogan and it corresponded to national policy of the party, but it was not an esthetic category [9].

Both critics and commentators of the formula have agreed with the fact that question's transference about content and form to art only complicates the question and they see the withdrawal in national element's recognition in literature and in art together with international features.

The dispute's participants, stood for recognition of the national in art's content, affirmed that the previous interpretation of culture's national form according to which it was connected only with language was devoid of sense. They also pointed out that the following statement was wrong: language, reflecting peculiarity of literature, may not be the single bearer of the national form.

A concept "national peculiarity" of art was offered during the discussion. It was considered that it was possible to show the national in the content only through it and this concept should not be identified to the national form which was only a single element of national peculiarity of art.

The acceptance of the national in art content and the conclusion about the fact that national peculiarity is intrinsic to both the content and the form of art was a positive result of the dispute.

In spite of many contentious problems about multinational cultures of USSR people content and form existence some new ones were born: what is correlation of ideological and art content? How are they autonomous and localized?

The supporters' of the national in art of USSR people opponents affirmed that bourgeois and socialist culture differs in their content but had a single national form and former national form was not changed in the conditions of socialism but was enriched with new socialist content.

Broad interpretation of idea and concept national form of art was offered in the course of the dispute. National culture was offered as "art power of nation's representation, natural and organic opportunity of national cultures' existence" [10].

Problem heart of the form and the content of national cultures was more clearly determined, its items were revealed and different point of view were marked during the discussion in the end of the 1950-

th and in the beginning of the 1960-th years in spite of narrow methodological positions.

A dispute about national character of literature hero was at the pages of "Literature newspaper" and a magazine "Friendship of people" in 1965-th-1966-th years. Questions about the content and the form of national cultures were also in the center of this dispute. The dispute's participants marked that the raised questions had not only scientific and theoretical character but they are also were connected with the problem of trends and perspectives of further national cultures of USSR people development definition.

The middle of the 1960-yh years was known as time of new party programmer, taken in 1961-st year, influenced on the people's minds. Ideas about our position at the nations' consolidation, about the fact that national languages would disappear and national cultures would merge appeared and were advocated. It was affirmed that national cultures had already become integrated in the form and the content. And it was necessary to refuse from concept "national form" of culture and to replace it with idea of "international form".

Disputes about problems of national culture took place during a conference devoted to discussion of national relations' development "in the condition of change from socialism to communism". The conference took place in Frunze from the 9-th till the 12-th of October and it was called by Scientific Council at AS USSR about complex problem "The regularity of socialism development and transfer to communism". The closer nations' relations were declared as "the objective regularity of socialism and communism construction". It was marked in M.D. Kammary's report that "international basis of USSR people's culture was not studied enough before the XXII-nd party congress and national peculiarity was studied far thoroughly. This has logically led to national form's hypertrophy and USSR people's culture examination separately from worldwide processes, national relations and influence" [11, 211]. M.S Gunusov has marked in his speech that nation's merge is a long and difficult process and "the nation's merge should not be considered as unfounded denial of everything what was saved by certain nation" [11, 212].

It is interesting that a fruitful idea about specifically-historical decision of the problem about the national cultures' form and content was suggested by N. Gusoiy. He offered to use comparative-historical analysis which would allow the history of culture imagination "in its cross-section and in comparison with other national cultures" [12].

It should be mentioned apparently that such kind of method had been staying unimplemented for

many years that was pointed out in the article of V.T Ermakov [13] in 1984-th year.

Method of comparative-historical analysis in the history of USSR people's culture research was fruitfully used in a book of T. V. Arutuanyan and L.M. Drobizheva "The diversity of USSR people's culture life" [14]. The meaning and the place of education in the system of life preference, the correlation of native and Russian fiction in fictional taste of the readers in those years, the influence of urbanization on the way of Soviet people life were shown in this work. Detailed researches based on ethnical and sociological inquiry, on profound analysis of population census data were not in the history of Kazakhstan historiography.

The problems, made for effect, continued confirming in historiography in the 1970-th-1980-th years; they were about "inviolability" of former imaginations about concept of the problem content and form of USSR people's culture. The statement of the question itself about national component in national cultures content led very often to depreciation of ideological constituent part, to dissolution class part in national one, to cultivation of national limitation [15].

In spite of fact that the dispute of the middle of the 1960-th year did not give answers, it had intensified interest to the problem. The trend of withdrawal from unconditional acceptance of the formula "culture is socialist by content and national by form" in its former interpretation was clearly marked in literature. It was obvious that it meant only one aspect of the problem: national and class, the intention of class and national relations combination. This formula's usage was possible only together with other theoretical positions which reflected a real process of national and cultural construction. An academician N. I. Konrad and an expert in literature L. I. Timofeev pointed out the internal weakness and this formula's clear definition absence [16].

M. P. Kim offered usage of the formula "international form is national form" for elimination of contradiction in the formula "socialist content is national form" in multinational USSR people's culture characterization [17]. Originally, notion of "national" exactly met the concept of "international". But the notion "international" has got equivocality with the lapse of time: 1) common, international, interethnic and 2) internationalists one.

It has become obvious that many contradictions have been saved in former interpretation of the problem about content and form of national cultures by the middle of the 1980-th years. The form isolation off content and content off form must be attributed to them and V. T. Ermakov wrote about it: "if there is nothing national in the

content of culture where will it come from into form?" [13, 92].

The reduction of USSR people cultures' content only to ideological and class basis and national form of culture admission only in a sphere of art, language and everyday culture was considered wrong one.

There was not an answer to a question what happens to progressive elements of pre-revolutionary national culture in the conditions of socialism? What inherits by socialism: their substantial values or complicated national form? If steady traditions' saving in cultural heritage was mentioned in Soviet literature, it did not go beyond saved one in Kazakhstan historiography (scientific idea, folklore, literature heritage of Abai and musical creative work) [18].

Renunciation of nihilistic treatment to national culture, broad and volumetric definition of national culture as a complex of spiritual values created by these people confirmation were the most important results of historiography of the national culture problem. Because of national relations suspense and escalation during perestroika, the power admitted national problems' existence and problems in national and cultural development, having refused from propagandistic slogan about "the flourish of national cultures".

Giving an important role to national cultures in the life of the people in the country and growth in national and peculiar parts in a broadening process of spiritual life of USSR people internalization admitting also were not less important facts. These sides' correlation in development of USSR people national cultures was different in different historical periods but they did not replace each other in the 1970-th -1980-th years.

So, the question about form and content of USSR people national culture was undeveloped in Soviet historiography. The problem about form and content of national cultures in the conditions of socialism was formulated more than 60years ago and it was one of the most important themes of social science and it was reflected in numerous publications – both monographic and certain ones. The fact of real cultural and historical progress of USSR people itself is the richest source about the history of national and cultural construction should have provided scientific and theoretical investigation of the problem.

But the explanations of the problem's non-readiness were not out of scope the difficulty of the problem itself statement, admission or non-recognition national substantial elements in national cultures suspense during the years of Soviet power.

The researchers' idea was not out of problem and theme boards and it was tightly localized in the

limited space of orthodox formula and one – dimensional party aims, born in a narrow circle of departmental scientists, in simplified interpretation of the national cultures in poly-ethnic state problem.

Meanwhile, in the 1980-th years the works showing steadiness of ethno-cultural features in spiritual and material life of ethnos appeared [19]. The results of ethno-sociological research published in a book "Social and cultural image of Soviet nations" [20] indicated about cardinal changes in cultural and educational landscape of Soviet people, about ethnical self-consciousness growth and about active role of culture in this process. The research of national culture's problems demanded scientific search made by many disciplines intensification that would expand our imagination about historical movement of USSR people's national cultures.

The foreign experience of scientific comprehension of the problem correlation national and traditional maintenance and international and modern parts (traditional culture and modernization coordination) did not appear at the pages of scientific publications, with seldom exception [21].

In spite of hue of foreign scientists' world-view they are united with admission of decisive value of any culture, as it is marked in the article. To our mind, direction of the search should not be not only about traditional culture "survival" but also about its strengthening which happens under influence of the process of modernization. The process of modernization should be considered not as simple mechanical ready samples' conversion and adoption but as a process of their transformation and cultural mastering in new conditions depending on local historical and cultural traditions and also to modern tasks of social, economic and cultural development.

Culturological progress will follow in disclosure of definite culture, given by B. Uspensky and Y. Lotman, "as race memory of a group" that has regulating function to individual and group behavior. Culture is a system of prohibitions and limits that orders social reality.

Problem of role of the culture as a factor of maintenance and formation of ethnos is also interesting. It is not inherited genetically but thanks to channels of social heritage it is passed from generation to another one and has a great stock of strength and so it is the most conservative and stable ethnical information. Thanks to culture ethnos maintains even if there are not its other important features.

During the perestroika years the publicists and ideologists of national movements began speaking about questions of national and language policy in Soviet period of time. But scientists-historians and sociolinguists who wrote about "the flourish of

languages", about "triumph of national policy of Lenin", about "timeliness of written language transformation into Latin and later - into Russian graphics" were at a loss. Some single publications where the scientists-specialists demonstratively expounded the language policy of the power, different during different periods of 74 years, appeared [22]. The publicists and ideologists of national movements considered this policy without any differentiation as policy of national and language oppression, induced with angry will or the rulers, exceeded the pre-revolutionary level of Russian language spread. There are many reasons of these ideas appearance but there are few facts confirming them. But all the same it is necessary to get rid of emotions and political situation and examine the problem of historical revolution of national and language policy on the basis of analysis and its objective and subjective side's correlation. Nowadays when transfer of writing into Latin graphic has happened in neighbor with Kazakhstan Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan and the question about transfer to Roman alphabet is discussed in Kazakhstan, the questions about writing transfer from Arabic graphic basis to Roman one and later to Russian one is interesting to the academic circle and all the public.

Historiography of Kazakhstan has inactively reacted to these problems during the years of perestroika. Double Kazakh writing transformation during the pre-war period that has adversely affected continuity of cultural and historical traditions was only seldom an object of scientific analysis. Post-war period was more actively discussed in scientific periodicals and in social and political essays because it was period of land development when more than 700 schools with Kazakh language of teaching were closed in the areas of virgin lands development. This number has grown later [23], but this theme did not get publication any more. Problem of Kazakh schools reduction in the 1950-th- 1960-th years was accompanying of another more critical issue, notably of N. S. Khrushchev's rule estimation. This period of time for people of Kazakhstan was not only a period of land development. A number of territories in the south of Kazakhstan were given to neighbor Uzbekistan; the decisions about oil-and-gas regions in the west transfer to neighbor Astrakhan region were prepared during the years of N.S. Khrushchev rule. Reformation of administrative division in connection with sovnrarkhoz organization and plans of borders redivision in connection with Tselinny area formation took place.

The heads and the intellectuals of the republic were afraid of consequences of N.S. Khrushchev's statements about "growing wish of non-Russian people for Russian language mastering which has

practically become the second native language for USSR people”, “The faster we shall speak Russian the faster we shall have built Communism”. Because of these publications’ resonance the problems of national and language policy of pre-war period, when state policy has greatly changed and the basis for its further operation was put, moved back to the secondary plan.

Meanwhile, historiography of Kazakhstan affirmed many years about “timelessness of Kazakh writing transfer into Latin basis”, “Latin graphics is more modern than Arabic one”, it “promotes influence of Muslim clergy’s and bourgeois nationalists’ in culture disruption” and “Russian alphabet corresponds more to Kazakh language nature” [24].

Questions about graphics’ reformation are considered in the historiography of Kazakhstan in common works of the history of culture construction [25]. T. Y. Krasovitskaya marks that all these works have the same common trait – the authors’ intention to prove the reformations’ progressiveness, “restricted to graphics’ unification and to show progressive advance of “socialist national cultures” on the basis of this unification” [3]. One-side apologetic attitude to the problems of national and language policy in historiography has led to politic fight ignoring around the main directions of writing graphics modernization.

In 1931-st year after opponents’ of Latinization arrest they were known as “Arabists” in Solovky and in Belomorkanal construction (A. I. Solzhenitsyn), Y. E. Polivanov in a collection “For Marxists linguistics” paid attention to conflict character of Arabic writing transfer into Latin graphics in Kazakhstan and Kirgizstan.

According to his opinion, it was not induced with internal needs: “without impetus from without, without example and call of other nations (and Azerbaijan was the first) Kazakhstan would not have enough impulse for change its own writing into Latin”. And that is why the following circumstance is understandable that even after Turkological congress resolution in 1926-th year a strong opposition against Latinization with the leaders of previous reforms in the head (Muslim graphics) appeared. In analogical way may be explained the fact that the second center of anti-Latin opposition (and the strongest one) was Kazan” [3, 364-365].

The period of perestroika should also be mentioned except these two mentioned above periods in national and language sphere. Linguistic heritage together with culture one and historical memory about national statehood have become the main motive power of national and cultural revival these years. Linguistic heritage was in this range because

of it was not a resolution in any republic about improvement of native language teaching at schools. But there were a lot of decrees about improvement of Russian language teaching at schools. For instance, CC CPSU and Supreme Soviet of USSR approved the main directions of comprehensive and professional schools where it was pointed out that “free proficiency in Russian language has to become a standard for the youth finishing schools” (April, 1984-th year). A year before, in May of 1983-th year, politburo of CC CPSU had specially considered a question about additional measures for Russian language studying. It is obviously that the “pressing” political orientation gave not only positive result (the second language as a language of transnational communication) but also negative social and psychological effect. All researches of those years have recorded the fact that national self-identification is firstly based on native language and then on cultural originality and historical past community.

So, historiography of Kazakhstan national and language problems needs in radical revision of all its problematic, in renunciation of apologetic appreciations. Great publishing work is necessary which will allow creating essential and sufficient complex of sources about this theme.

Research of historical trends of native speakers of Kazakh language amount is a topical theme. The fruitful directions may become computer base data usage and quantitative method in data processing of population census in 1926-th, 1939-th, 1959-th, 1970-th, 1979-th, 1989-th years. The data of all-USSR census have recorded the important samples of social and cultural evolution of Kazakhstan society during the policy of rooting implementation and national and language construction.

All stages of national and language policy of both pre-war and post-war periods of time need in revision. These questions have significant meaning in the ways and methods of international coordination determination and ethnic and cultural originality maintenance in poly-ethnic society.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Zhumanova, Karaganda State University named after Evnei Arystanovich Buketov, Archeology, Ethnology, and National History Department, apt.28, 5 floor, Universitetskaya Street building 3, 1000028, Karaganda, Kazakhstan
Aiman_jumanova@mail.ru

References

1. Krupskaya, N.K., 1927. About international and national culture. On the literature post Journal. №19, pp: 16-17.

2. Lunacharsky, A.V., 1967. Collected works in 8 volumes: Moscow. pp:183.
3. Krasovitskaya, T.Y., 1998. Modernization of Russia. National and cultural policy of the 20-th years: Moscow, pp: 284-354.
4. Citation of Stalin against Kazakhstan, 1991. Kazakhstanskaya Pravda Newspaper, pp: 3 – 7.
5. Summary report to XVI-th congress of GCP. XVI congress. Verbatim record, 1931. pp: 53.
6. Fadeev, A.A., 1939. Literature and life.: Moscow, pp: 51.
7. Blagoi, D.D., 1951. About national peculiarity of literature (to statement of a question), Bolshevik Newspaper. № 18, pp: 36.
8. Bocharov, A., 1957. To a question about national peculiarity of literature. Drujba narodov Journal. №1, pp: 8.
9. Skocyrev, P., 1957. Socialist art is national one. Drujba narodov Journal. №5, pp: 55.
10. Lomidze. G., 1957. If is it a way of national literature questions' decision? Drujba narodov Journal. №3, pp: 193.
11. Development of national relations in the conditions of transfer from socialism to communism. 1964. Nations of Asia and Africa Journal. №2, pp: 211.
12. National and international, 1967. Drujba narodov Journal. №1, pp: 253.
13. Ermakov, V.T., 1984. To a question about content and form of national socialist cultures: Moscow, pp: 90-92.
14. Arutuanyan, Y.V., L.M.Drobizheva , 1987. Variety of cultural life of USSR people. Moscow, pp: 284-354.
15. Golovnev, A.I., 1974. International and national in socialist culture development. Minsk. pp: 72.
16. Konrad, N.I., 1971. October and philological science. New world Journal. №1, pp: 215.
17. Kim, M.P., 1978. Problems of socialist culture development. Moscow, pp: 22.
18. Suleimenov, R.B., 1972. Lenin's ideas about culture revolution and their implementation in Kazakhstan (Historical experience of socialist people's culture development, escaped a stage of capitalism). Alma-Ata, pp: 489.
19. Arutuanyan, Y.V., Social and professional structure development and ethno-cultural features firmness in Soviet society (Soviet culture. 70 year of development. To 80-year anniversary of academician M.P. Kim). Moscow, pp: 230-236.
20. Social and cultural temper of Soviet: according to ethno-sociological research, 1986. Moscow, pp: 86.
21. Traditional culture and modernization coordination, 1977. Nations of Asia and Africa Journal. №1, pp: 21.
22. Alpatov, V.M., 1993. Language policy in USSR in the 20-30th years: utopia and reality. Vostok Journal. №5, pp: 113-127.
23. Abzhanov, H., 1993. "White spots" of culture construction. Kazakh tarihi Journal. №3, pp: 47-50.
24. Suleimenov, R.B., 1972. Lenin's ideas about culture revolution and their implementation in Kazakhstan (Historical experience of socialist people's culture development, escaped a stage of capitalism). Alma-Ata, pp: 365.
25. Kanapin, A., A.Yandarov, 1977. Flourish of Kazakh people culture. Alma-Ata, "Kazakhstan" pp: 63.

29/11/2013