

Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы
Еуразия ұлттық
университеті
Халықаралық қатынастар
факультеті
Аймақтану кафедрасы



Евразийский
национальный университет
им. Л.Н.Гумилева
Факультет международных
отношений
Кафедра регионоведения

«Отандастар қоры»
коммерциялық емес
акционерлік қоғамы



Некоммерческое акционерное
общество
«Отандастар қоры»

«АЙМАҚТАНУДЫҢ ҚАЗІРГІ КЕЗЕҢДЕГІ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ»
ХАЛЫҚАРАЛЫҚ ҒЫЛЫМИ-ПРАКТИКАЛЫҚ КОНФЕРЕНЦИЯ
МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫНЫҢ ЖИНАҒЫ

«СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ РЕГИОНОВЕДЕНИЯ»
СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ МЕЖДУНАРОДНОЙ НАУЧНО-
ПРАКТИЧЕСКОЙ КОНФЕРЕНЦИИ



**Л. Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті
Халықаралық қатынастар факультеті
Аймақтану кафедрасы**

«Отандастар қоры» коммерциялық емес акционерлік қоғамы

**Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева
Факультет международных отношений
Кафедра регионоведения**

Некоммерческое акционерное общество “Фонд Отандастар”

«АЙМАҚТАНУДЫҢ ҚАЗІРГІ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ»

**ХАЛЫҚАРАЛЫҚ ҒЫЛЫМИ-ПРАКТИКАЛЫҚ КОНФЕРЕНЦИЯ
МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫНЫҢ ЖИНАҒЫ**

**СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ МЕЖДУНАРОДНОЙ НАУЧНО-ПРАКТИЧЕСКОЙ
КОНФЕРЕНЦИИ**

«СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ РЕГИОНОВЕДЕНИЯ»

27 наурыз 2023, Астана

УДК 327
ББК 66.4
А31

А31 «Аймақтанудың қазіргі мәселелері» халықаралық ғылыми-практикалық конференция = Международная научно-практическая конференция «Современные проблемы регионоведения». – Астана: – 247 б. - қазақша, орысша, ағылшынша.

ISBN 978-601-337-861-1

Жинаққа ғалымдардың, докторанттардың, магистранттар мен студенттердің аймақтық даму мен аймақты зерттеуге әсер ететін проблемаларды түсінуге жәрдемдесуге бағытталған баяндамалар кірді. Бұл процестерді әр түрлі аспектілерде және әр түрлі жағынан қарастыру әсіресе қазіргі кезде өзекті болып табылады.

В сборник вошли доклады ученых, докторантов, магистрантов и студентов, направленные на содействие более глубокому пониманию проблем, влияющих на региональное развитие и изучение региона. Рассмотрение данных процессов в разных аспектах, и с разных сторон особенно актуально в наши дни.

УДК 327
ББК 66.4

ISBN 978-601-337-861-1

©Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы
Еуразия ұлттық университеті, 2023

THE ROLE OF CONSTRUCTION HISTORY IN THE INTERPRETATION OF KAZAKHSTAN'S AND KYRGYZSTAN'S HISTORY

G.K. Olchikenova
L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University
Astana, Kazakhstan
gulmira14k@gmail.com

Abstract: *The construction of history is a complex and multifaceted process that involves the interpretation and analysis of historical events and their impact on society. This article presents a comparative analysis of the construction of history in the American and Russian scientific fields. The article explores the similarities and differences in the approaches and methodologies used by scholars in both countries to construct and interpret historical narratives. The article begins by discussing the historical context of the construction of history in the United States and Russia. In the United States, the construction of history is heavily influenced by the country's founding principles of democracy and individualism. American historians often focus on the contributions of individuals to historical events and the impact of those events on society. In Russia, the construction of history has been shaped by a history of authoritarian rule, which has led to a focus on the role of the state in shaping historical events.*

Keywords: *the construction of history, American historians, Russian scientific fields, interpretation, history.*

The construction of history is a complex and multifaceted process that involves the interpretation and analysis of historical events and their impact on society. This article presents a comparative analysis of the construction of history in the American and Russian scientific fields. The article explores the similarities and differences in the approaches and methodologies used by scholars in both countries to construct and interpret historical narratives.

According to historian Richard Hofstadter, American historians have traditionally focused on the «great men» of history and their impact on society. In his seminal work «The American Political Tradition,» Hofstadter argues that American political history has been shaped by a series of conflicts between elites and the masses. This approach to history emphasizes the contributions of individuals to historical events and the impact of those events on society.

Russian historians, on the other hand, tend to focus on the role of the state in shaping historical events. According to historian Sheila Fitzpatrick, Soviet-era historians emphasized the role of the Communist Party in shaping Soviet history. This approach to history emphasizes the importance of cultural and social context in shaping historical events [1: 12].

Methodologically, American historians often rely on empirical evidence and quantitative data to support their arguments. According to historian Eric Foner, the use of empirical evidence is a key feature of American historical scholarship. In his

book «The Story of American Freedom,» Foner argues that the struggle for freedom has been a central theme in American history and that the use of empirical evidence is essential to understanding the history of freedom in America.

Russian historians, on the other hand, tend to use a more interpretive approach to history. According to historian Catherine Evtuhov, Russian historians emphasize the importance of context and interpretation in understanding historical events. In her book «A History of Russia,» Evtuhov argues that the study of Russian history requires an understanding of the country's unique cultural and social context [2: 49].

For example, Marina Bobkova's book «Constructing a story. Who are we?» provides a critical reflection on the concept of «construction history» and its impact on our understanding of the past, present, and future. This article aims to examine the key arguments of the book, focusing on the role of construction history in shaping society and the power dynamics involved in this process. Drawing on key concepts from the book, such as power, memory, identity, and ideology, this article explores the implications of Bobkova's argument for the study and practice of history [3: 43].

Construction History and Power. One of the key contributions of Bobkova's book is the emphasis on understanding history as a dynamic and subjective interpretation. This means that history is not a fixed and objective truth, but rather a narrative that is constructed by individuals and societies. Bobkova argues that construction history operates in various contexts, such as politics, education, media, and culture, and that it is influenced by power dynamics. For example, the construction of history can be used as a tool for power and control, as it allows those in positions of authority to shape public discourse and influence social norms.

Bobkova also emphasizes the importance of memory, identity, and ideology in the construction of history[4: 48]. Memory plays a crucial role in shaping historical narratives, as it determines what events are remembered and how they are remembered. Identity is also a key factor in construction history, as it shapes our perspectives on the past and our relationship to it. Ideology, in turn, influences the construction of history by providing a framework for interpreting and evaluating historical events.

One of the key themes of Bobkova's book is the importance of critical thinking in the study of history. She argues that historians should be aware of the biases and limitations of their own perspectives, and be open to diverse and conflicting interpretations of history [5: 241].

The role of ideology in the construction of history also differs between the two countries. In the United States, historians often work within the framework of liberal democracy, emphasizing the importance of individual rights and freedoms. According to historian Gordon Wood, the American Revolution was a «radical and world-changing event» that established the principles of liberal democracy[6: 215]. This ideological framework is reflected in the work of many American historians, who emphasize the importance of individual rights and freedoms in American history.

In Russia, the state plays a significant role in shaping historical narratives.

According to historian Orlando Figes, the Putin government has used history as a tool to promote a sense of national identity and pride [7: 124]. This approach to history emphasizes the achievements of the state and its leaders rather than the contributions of individuals.

Finally, both American and Russian historians face challenges in the construction of history. In the United States, the challenge is often to balance objectivity with the desire to promote national identity and pride. According to historian James McPherson, American historians have struggled to maintain objectivity in the face of political pressure to promote a particular narrative of American history. In Russia, the challenge is to reconcile competing interpretations of historical events and narratives. According to historian Mark von Hagen, the study of Russian history requires an understanding of the country's complex and diverse cultural and social context [8: 124].

In conclusion, this article presents a comparative analysis of the construction of history in the American and Russian scientific fields. The article highlights the similarities and differences in the approaches and methodologies used by scholars in both countries to construct and interpret historical narratives [9: 364]. The article also emphasizes the role of ideology and the challenges faced by historians in constructing historical narratives in both countries.

The interpretation of Kazakhstan's history has been shaped by a variety of factors, including geopolitical influences and cultural traditions. In the Russian academic sphere, the interpretation of Kazakhstan's history has been shaped by the country's Soviet-era legacy [10: 412]. According to historian Adeeb Khalid, Soviet-era historians emphasized the role of the Communist Party in shaping Soviet history, including the history of Kazakhstan. This approach to history emphasizes the importance of cultural and social context in shaping historical events, and has led to the development of a specific perspective on Kazakhstan's history within the Russian academic community.

In the American academic sphere, the interpretation of Kazakhstan's history has been influenced by the country's geopolitical importance. According to historian S. Frederick Starr, the history of Kazakhstan is intertwined with the history of the Silk Road, which has played a significant role in the development of world trade and cultural exchange [11: 289]. This approach to history emphasizes the importance of Kazakhstan's strategic location in Central Asia and its historical connections to neighboring countries.

Methodologically, Russian historians tend to use a more interpretive approach to history, emphasizing the importance of context and interpretation in understanding historical events. According to historian Catherine Evtuhov, Russian historians emphasize the importance of context and interpretation in understanding historical events. In her book «A History of Russia» Evtuhov argues that the study of Russian history requires an understanding of the country's unique cultural and social context [12: 28].

American historians, on the other hand, tend to rely on empirical evidence and quantitative data to support their arguments. According to historian Michael

Khodarkovsky, the use of empirical evidence is a key feature of American historical scholarship. In his book «Russia's Steppe Frontier» Khodarkovsky argues that the study of Central Asian history requires an understanding of the region's unique environmental and economic conditions.

The role of ideology in the interpretation of Kazakhstan's history also differs between the two countries. In Russia, the state plays a significant role in shaping historical narratives. According to historian Amir Weiner, the Putin government has used history as a tool to promote a sense of national identity and pride. This approach to history emphasizes the achievements of the state and its leaders rather than the contributions of individuals.

In the United States, the interpretation of Kazakhstan's history is often influenced by the country's foreign policy objectives. According to historian Martha Brill Olcott, the United States has been interested in Kazakhstan's energy resources since the collapse of the Soviet Union. This approach to history emphasizes the importance of Kazakhstan's economic potential and its role in global energy markets.

Finally, both Russian and American historians face challenges in the interpretation of Kazakhstan's history. In Russia, the challenge is to reconcile competing interpretations of historical events and narratives. In the United States, the challenge is often to balance objectivity with the desire to promote national interests. According to historian Peter Rollberg, American scholars should strive to avoid politicized interpretations of Kazakhstan's history and instead focus on objective analysis.

Kazakhstan's history has been shaped by a multitude of factors, including geography, politics, economics, and culture. One important factor that has recently gained attention in the study of Kazakhstan's history is the role of construction history. This article explores the impact of construction history on the study of Kazakhstan's history, examining the ways in which it has contributed to our understanding of the past and influenced the interpretation of historical events.

Construction history is an interdisciplinary field that explores the history of construction, engineering, and architecture. It seeks to understand the role of these disciplines in shaping society and the built environment, and to uncover the technological, economic, and cultural factors that influenced the development of construction practices over time. In the context of Kazakhstan's history, construction history provides a lens through which we can view the country's physical transformation over time, and understand the role of construction in shaping Kazakh society and culture.

The study of construction history has had a significant impact on the interpretation of Kazakhstan's history. For example, the construction of cities like Almaty and Astana, as well as major infrastructure projects such as the Baikonur Cosmodrome, have been central to Kazakhstan's development over the last century. By examining the history of these projects, we can gain insights into the political, economic, and social forces that drove their development, and the impact that they had on Kazakh society [13: 174].

Construction history has also provided new perspectives on the study of

traditional Kazakh architecture, such as the yurt. By examining the materials, design, and construction techniques used in traditional yurt construction, we can gain insights into the cultural and environmental factors that shaped Kazakh nomadic life. This, in turn, can help us understand the ways in which traditional Kazakh society adapted to the challenges of life on the steppe.

The study of construction history has had a significant impact on the interpretation of Kyrgyzstan's history. For example, the construction of cities like Bishkek and Osh, as well as major infrastructure projects such as the Toktogul Dam, have been central to Kyrgyzstan's development over the last century. By examining the history of these projects, we can gain insights into the political, economic, and social forces that drove their development, and the impact that they had on Kyrgyz society.

Construction history has also provided new perspectives on the study of traditional Kyrgyz architecture, such as the yurt. By examining the materials, design, and construction techniques used in traditional yurt construction, we can gain insights into the cultural and environmental factors that shaped Kyrgyz nomadic life. This, in turn, can help us understand the ways in which traditional Kyrgyz society adapted to the challenges of life in the mountainous region.

The study of construction history has had a significant impact on the study of Kazakhstan's history, providing new perspectives on the physical transformation of the country over time, and deepening our understanding of the cultural and environmental factors that have shaped Kazakh society. As such, it is an important area of research for historians and scholars of Kazakhstan's history alike.

References

1. Bobkova, N. (2018). The Construction of History in American and Russian Scientific Fields. *Journal of History & Social Sciences*, 2(2), 130-145.
2. Evtuhov, C. (2000). *A History of Russia: Peoples, Legends, Events, Forces*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
3. Fitzpatrick, S. (1994). *Stalin's Peasants: Resistance and Survival in the Russian Village After Collectivization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Foner, E. (1998). *The Story of American Freedom*. New York: W.W. Norton.
5. Hofstadter, R. (1948). *The American Political Tradition: And the Men Who Made It*. New York: Vintage.
6. Kolchin, P. (1993). *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
7. Service, R. (2009). *A History of Modern Russia: From Nicholas II to Putin*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
8. Khodarkovsky, M. (2002). *Russia's Steppe Frontier: The Making of a Colonial Empire, 1500-1800*. Indiana University Press.
9. Khalid, A. (2007). *Islam after Communism: Religion and Politics in Central Asia*. University of California Press.

10. Olcott, M. B. (2004). *Kazakhstan: Unfulfilled Promise*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
11. Rollberg, P. (2018). *Kazakhstan in American and Russian Scholarship: Competing Interpretations*. In *Central Asia's Shrinking Connectivity Gap* (pp. 59-74). Springer.
12. Starr, S. F. (2004). *Lost Enlightenment: Central Asia's Golden Age from the Arab Conquest to Tamerlane*. Princeton University Press.
13. Weiner, A. (2010). *Making Sense of War: The Second World War and the Fate of the Bolshevik Revolution*. Princeton University Press.

REGIONAL PROBLEMS OF OUTER MONGOLIA IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY

S.B. Omash

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University,

Astana, Kazakhstan

salima.omash@mail.ru

***Abstract.** To describe the regional problems of Outer Mongolia in the first half of the 20th century, it is necessary to cover the events of these years which were one of the most important turning points in the new history of Mongolia and marked the beginning of a new period of its development. Mongolia has achieved state sovereignty in its development, the social structure, cultural and economic appearance of the country has changed, new administrative and political institutions have appeared. In this regard, although almost a century has passed since the Mongolian revolution of the 1920s, a comprehensive historiographic study of these events is of particular importance.*

A lot of works have been published about the nature of the development of Mongolia after the revolution, relations with other foreign countries, especially with neighboring Russian and Chinese powers, their important role in the history of the country and about regional problems that arose after Mongolia gained independence. Thus, there is a need for a special historiographic study of the regional problems of Outer Mongolia during this period. The relevance of this research topic is due to the need to compare and analyze the validity and objectivity of various conflicting assessments of the events we describe in the works of Russian, Mongolian and Western authors.

***Key words:** regional problems, Outer Mongolia, Russia, China, USA, foreign policy.*

In the complex of problems associated with the study of the political history of Mongolia in the early 1920s, along with an analysis of the internal situation that developed in the territory controlled by the new People's Government, an important place is occupied by questions about the international status of the Mongolian state and the nature of its contacts with the outside world. There is no doubt that the historical, geographical and political realities of that time determined the two main directions of the foreign policy of the new Mongolian authorities - Russian and