

A.A. Shakenov^{1*} , B.A. Gabdulina¹ ,
M.U. Onuchko¹ , T.A. Dronzina² 

¹L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan, Astana

²Sofia university St. Kliment Ohridski, Bulgaria, Sofia

*e-mail: alikhan.shakenov@gmail.com

THE ISSUE OF NATION-BUILDING IN INDEPENDENT KAZAKHSTAN IN THE WORKS OF DOMESTIC SCIENTISTS: A POLITICAL ANALYSIS

In this paper Kazakh researches literature review conducted on the topic of nation building in Kazakhstan. Based on articles, books and monographs published in «Bulletin of the L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University», «Journal of Philosophy, Culture and Political Science» of the al-Farabi Kazakh National University, «Kazakhstan-Spekt» of the Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, and e-library of the L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. The purpose of the article is to identify issues of nation-building that have not been considered by Kazakh scientists. The results of the article will serve as the basis for further and in-depth study of aspects of nation building in Kazakhstan.

This article provides an overview of studies of Kazakh scientists dedicated to issues of nation-building in the period after the country gained independence. The work highlights the diversity of aspects associated with the formation of national identity, including both the state-forming ethnic group (Kazakhs) and other ethnic groups living in Kazakhstan. The focus of research in the early 90s was the formation of nations around national identity.

In the following years scientists paid attention to the strategies of nation building – civil or ethnic, as well as the influence of the Internet, globalization and ideology through the education system. Noted that different researchers have identified different aspects, such as strengthening the Kazakh language and economic development as key elements of nation-building.

However, in the reviewed works not all aspects supported by empirical data, and the vastness of the topic makes it difficult to formulate specific conclusions. Some studies rely on regulations and government programs that, which creates difficulties in assessing the nation-building process.

In conclusion, it is emphasized that in the 90s a new stage of research into nation-building began in post-Soviet countries, including Kazakhstan. Despite the extensive study of certain aspects, questions remain unresolved about the formation of a nation, the role of the state language, the interest of other ethnic groups in the language, the impact of the education system and the development of the film industry on national identity.

Key words: memory, historical memory, cultural memory, memory research, memory trauma, nation-building, national identity, national idea, national code, national spirit, national/Kazakh culture, national traditions and customs.

Ә.А. Шәкенов^{1*}, Б.А. Ғабдулина¹, М.Ю. Онучко¹, Т.А. Дронзина²

¹Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Астана қ.

²«Св. Климент Охридски» София университеті, Болгария, София қ.

*e-mail: alikhan.shakenov@gmail.com

**Отандық ғалымдардың еңбектеріндегі Тәуелсіз Қазақстандағы
мемлекет құру мәселесі: саясаттанулық талдау**

Бұл жұмыста Қазақстандағы ұлт құрылысы тақырыбы бойынша қазақстандық зерттеулерге әдеби шолу жүргізілді. «Л. Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің хабаршысы», «ҚазҰУ Хабаршысы», «Қазақстан-Спектр» журналдарында жарияланған мақалалар, кітаптар мен монографиялар, сондай-ақ Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің электрондық кітапхана порталы негізге алынды. Мақаланың мақсаты-қазақстандық ғалымдар қарастырмаған ұлт құрылысы мәселелерін анықтау. Мақаланың нәтижелері Қазақстандағы ұлт құрылысының аспектілерін одан әрі және терең зерттеуге негіз болады.

Бұл мақала ел тәуелсіздік алғаннан кейінгі кезеңдегі ұлттық құрылыс мәселелеріне арналған қазақстандық ғалымдардың зерттеулеріне шолу жасайды. Жұмыс мемлекет құрушы этносты

(қазақтарды), сондай-ақ Қазақстанда тұратын басқа этностарды қоса алғанда, ұлттық бірегейлікті қалыптастыруға байланысты әртүрлі аспектілерді атап көрсетеді. 90-жылдардың басындағы зерттеулердің басты бағыты ұлттық бірегейліктің айналасында ұлттардың қалыптасуы болды.

Кейінгі жылдары ғалымдар ұлтты – азаматтық немесе этникалық қалыптастыру стратегияларына, сондай-ақ білім беру жүйесі арқылы Интернеттің, жаһанданудың және идеологияның әсеріне назар аударды. Әр түрлі зерттеушілер ұлттық құрылыстың негізгі элементтері ретінде қазақ тілін нығайту және экономикалық даму сияқты түрлі аспектілерді атап өтті.

Алайда, қарастырылған жұмыстарда барлық аспектілер эмпирикалық дәлелдермен қамтамасыз етілмейді және тақырыптың кеңдігі нақты тұжырымдарды тұжырымдауды қиындатады. Кейбір зерттеулер ережелер мен мемлекеттік бағдарламаларға сүйенеді, бұл ұлттық құрылыс процесін бағалауда қиындықтар туғызады.

Қорытындылай келе, 90-шы жылдары посткеңестік елдерде, соның ішінде Қазақстанда Ұлттық құрылысты зерттеудің жаңа кезеңі басталды. Белгілі бір аспектілерді кеңінен зерттеуге қарамастан, ұлттың қалыптасуы, мемлекеттік тілдің рөлі, басқа этностардың тілге деген қызығушылығы, білім беру жүйесінің және киноиндустрияның ұлттық бірегейлікке әсері туралы мәселелер шешілмеген күйінде қалып отыр.

Түйін сөздер: жады, тарихи жады, мәдени жады, жадты зерттеу, есте сақтау жарақаты, ұлт құру, ұлттық болмыс, ұлттық идея, ұлттық код, ұлттық рух, ұлттық/қазақ мәдениеті, ұлттық салт-дәстүрлер мен әдет-ғұрыптар.

А.А. Шакенов^{1*}, Б.А. Габдулина¹, М.Ю. Онучко¹, Т.А. Дронзина²

¹Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Казахстан, г. Астана

²Софийски университет «Св. Климент Охридски», Болгария, г. София

*e-mail: alikhan.shakenov@gmail.com

Вопрос нациестроительства в независимом Казахстане в трудах отечественных ученых: политологический анализ

В данной работе проведен литературный обзор казахстанских исследований по теме нациестроительства в Казахстане. За основу взяты статьи, книги и монографии, опубликованные в журналах «Вестник Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева», «Вестник КАЗНУ», «Казахстан-Спектр» Казахстанского института стратегических исследований, а также портал электронной библиотеки Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева». Цель статьи – это определение вопросов нациестроительства, которые не были рассмотрены казахстанскими учеными. Результаты статьи послужат основанием для дальнейшего и глубокого изучения аспектов нациестроительства в Казахстане.

Эта статья представляет обзор исследований казахстанских ученых, посвященных вопросам национального строительства в период после получения страной независимости. Работа подчеркивает многообразие аспектов, связанных с формированием национальной идентичности, включая как государствообразующий этнос (казахи), так и другие этносы, проживающие в Казахстане. В фокусе исследований начала 90-х годов было становление наций вокруг национальной идентичности.

В последующие годы ученые обратили внимание на стратегии формирования нации – гражданской или этнической, а также на влияние интернета, глобализации и идеологии через систему образования. Отмечается, что разные исследователи выделяли различные аспекты, такие как укрепление казахского языка и экономическое развитие, как ключевые элементы национального строительства.

Однако в рассмотренных работах не все аспекты подкреплены эмпирическими данными, и обширность темы затрудняет формулирование конкретных выводов. Некоторые исследования опираются на нормативные акты и государственные программы, что создает сложности при оценке процесса национального строительства.

В заключении подчеркивается, что в 90-х годах начался новый этап исследований национального строительства в постсоветских странах, включая Казахстан. Несмотря на широкое изучение определенных аспектов, остаются нерешенными вопросы о формировании нации, роли государственного языка, интересе других этносов к языку, воздействию системы образования и развитии киноиндустрии на национальную идентичность.

Ключевые слова: память, историческая память, культурная память, исследование памяти, травмы памяти, национальное строительство, национальная идентичность, национальная идея, национальный код, национальный дух, национальная/казахская культура, национальные традиции и обычаи.

Introduction

The nation-building process depends on several factors and aspects, such as cultural, social, political and economic. Studying all these factors and their relationships can be challenging. Today, there is no unified approach to the study of nation-building, so the study of issues of nation formation remains ambiguous and may even be problematic. Another important factor is that the term «nation building» itself was introduced relatively recently. According to Jochen Hippler [1], the term «nation building» or «nation building» began to be used in the mid-20th century, and in the second half of the 1990s the term «nation building» gained widespread acceptance and became a natural part of both political and scientific discussions.

The basis for Kazakh researchers was the experience of countries that have gone through the stages of nation formation and existing foreign research.

An analysis of foreign studies has shown that scientists have different opinions on the approach and methods of studying nation-building.

For example, Jeremy Allouche [2], taking into account the opinion of current research, notes that nation-building or state building are permanent projects; they are never formed once and for all. As postcolonial studies have shown, the processes of nation-building and state-building are inherently violent processes, leading respectively to the dominance of one identity and one institution over others. The researcher suggests that state building is defined as the ability of the ruling elite to accumulate power.

In turn, Gregg [3] believes that nation building is accomplished in several ways. First, governments used the resources of the state, such as education, state media, law, the military, and the bureaucracy, to develop and support programs aimed at building national unity. Second, and equally important, private citizens, together with governments, developed programs aimed at creating a sense of national unity, including symbols, myths, literature, art, capitals, museums, and national parks (Heather Selma Gregg, 2018).

According to Andreas Wimmer [4], there are two main aspects of nation-building: the spread of political unions throughout the country (the aspect of political integration); and the emergence of a sense of loyalty and identification with the institutions of the state, regardless of who is currently in charge (the political identity aspect).

In addition to the purposeful political or natural formation of a nation, according to Andreas Wim-

mer [5], there is nation-building, in which attempts are made to create or strengthen a stable, and often democratic, government in an internationally recognized territory, under the influence of external forces, occurs against the backdrop of the development of the UN and the spread of the model of sovereign states-states. Moreover, «managed nation-building» may include formal military occupation, counter-insurgency, peacekeeping, national reconstruction, foreign aid, and the use of stabilization forces under the auspices of the United States, Great Britain, France, NATO, the United Nations, or other international or regional organization.

Typically, external control or military occupation occurs in authoritarian or dictatorial countries. Andreas Wimmer [6] argues that countries are considered autocratic in which the process of national formation is unsuccessful and governance is carried out by an elite representing a minority.

Kamrava [7], in turn, states that state building occurs at two levels – at one level, the state attempts to implement policies and regulations that encourage certain identities, cultural symbols, means of social and cultural communication and behavior, as well as demographic norms that Strengthen connections within society while supporting government priorities. At another level, society develops its own dynamics – popular hobbies and trends, means of communication and forms of self-expression, tastes and ideas.

However, as Francis Fukuyama noted, nations are not necessarily created; they develop as a result of unplanned historical-evolutionary processes. Nation building is closely related to state building.

Wimmer [8] also states that an effective nation-building strategy should also promote communication and understanding within the country by supporting a unified educational system. Around the world, countries have come a long way in educating their citizens and encouraging the use of a common language.

Foreign scientists have different points of view of the nation-building process, ranging from the natural evolution of ethnic groups to a single nation, the purposeful activities of the ruling elite to the external intervention of other countries.

Research methodology

The research goal of this article is to analyze the research of domestic scientists on the topic of nation-building in Kazakhstan from the restoration of independence to the present. To achieve this goal, it is necessary to solve the following tasks.

Research objectives:

- identify the gap in the research topics of Kazakh scientists;
- identify niches for further study of the nation-building process in Kazakhstan.

The sources of research were determined by the portal of the electronic library of the Eurasian National University named after L.N. Gumilyov and three magazines:

- 1) Journal «Bulletin of the Eurasian National University named after L.N. Gumilyov»;
- 2) Magazine «Bulletin of KAZNU»;
- 3) Magazine «Kazakhstan-Spectrum» of the Kazakhstan Institute of Strategic Studies.

In total, by searching for the keywords «nation building», «nation building», «nation building», «national identity», about 30 articles and books were found in these journals. After their preliminary study, 20 articles that were relevant to the topic and used in the article were retained for further research.

The article also examined books that were available in the electronic library of the Eurasian National University named after L.N. Gumilyov.

This article uses the method of a systematic literary review of research by Kazakh scientists on the topic of nation-building in the Republic of Kazakhstan from the moment of independence to the present.

Discussion

In the book «National Idea of Kazakhstan: Experience of Philosophical and Political Science Analysis» the authors Nysanbaev A.N., Kadyrzhanov R.K. [9] argue that on the basis of the concept of a nation, a collective self-identification of a community is formed, which in the modern world is usually represented by ethnic or multi-ethnic composition. Without such national self-identification, and therefore without a national concept, the process of national formation becomes impossible.

Scientists also point out that the process of nation formation and national identity in Kazakhstan corresponds to the laws of a non-Western national process.

At the same time, according to researchers, the main ideology of modern non-Western states is nationalism. Support for this ideology is expressed in the desire for nation-building, which ultimately means the development of the state as a key means of national integration and revitalization.

Nation building requires a national cultural and political identity that distinguishes a given nation from its neighbor.

On the other hand, building a full-fledged civil nation is impossible without civil society, as the world experience of nation-building shows.

Nysanbaev A.N., Kadyrzhanov R.K., come to the conclusion that one of the main reasons for ethnic disunity in Kazakh society and one of the main obstacles to the formation of a civil nation in the country is the insufficient development of civil society.

Scientists Ospanov T.T. and Ramazanova A.Kh. [10] also come to similar conclusions, who state that two main strategies for nation-state building have emerged in the Republic of Kazakhstan. The first strategy involves the creation of one Kazakhstani nation based on a multi-ethnic society based on the principle of common citizenship. The second strategy is based on the national identity of the Kazakhs themselves.

Based on the analysis of the survey of respondents, the overwhelming majority believes that ethnicity is the only dominant factor in the issue of identity and in relation to civic identity. However, despite this, the majority of respondents – 79.1% believe that nation-building in Kazakhstan should evolve according to a civil model, in other words, rely on a nation that creates the unity of all citizens of Kazakhstan, regardless of ethnicity.

Kaliev D.S. and Ventsel A. [11] have similar conclusions, they indicate that at the dawn of independence in Kazakhstan, the construction of a national state was laid out on the basis of the indigenous ethnic group – the Kazakhs. Accordingly, Kazakhstan positioned itself in the international arena as a national state. At the same time, one of the main goals of the ruling elite of Kazakhstan was to maintain a balance between the civil and ethnic identity of Kazakhstanis.

Moreover, researchers point out that the national nation-building policy of the ruling elite was aimed at uniting all ethnic groups of Kazakhstan into a single civil society. The goal of this approach was to form the civic identity of Kazakhstan on the basis of ethnic diversity. From this, scientists draw a conclusion and recommend forming a national identity, but at the same time creating the necessary conditions for the development of the language and culture of each ethnic group in the state.

Since gaining independence, the ruling elite has tried to make issues of national unity, sovereignty and mutual consent the main values of the country. It should be noted here that it is difficult for a multi-ethnic country to form a single nation. It is believed that successful nation-building is based on the

recognition of all ethnic groups as their homeland, Kazakhstan, as well as its language and history.

Kovalskaya S.I., Akanov K.G., [12] cite research by E. Shats, who argues that in Kazakhstan three aspects are used to form loyalty to the «nation» used by the elite – this is ethnic diversity, appeal to groups of the titular nation and designing national symbols that are accepted by the population.

At the same time, ethnic diversity created the danger of separatism in Kazakhstan, starting from the 1990s, since when the Republic of Kazakhstan gained independence, it was the only post-Soviet state where, due to the historical symbiosis of peoples, representatives of the Kazakh nation did not constitute the majority.

Therefore, the transfer of the capital of the «nation-building position» served as a motivation for Kazakh representatives to move to the northern regions of Kazakhstan, and as a result, «to keep under control the territories in the north of the state, in the places where irredents, potentially prone to separatism, live» [13].

Moreover, the transfer of capitals in countries that gained independence due to the collapse of the state, empire, union, etc., is a requirement for the formation of a nation and state, while the old capitals did not meet these requirements. The ruling elite needed to move and create new capitals, which performed the functions of forming and controlling loyalty [14].

According to Kovalskaya S.I. and Akanova K.G., [15] «since the transfer of the capital, the demographic appearance of both the capital and the surrounding regions: Northern, Central and Eastern Kazakhstan has changed significantly».

The article also notes that the process of adopting state-important documents reflected the transition from the initial formation of a mono-national «Kazakh» nation to a multi-national «Kazakh» nation.

Toktarov E.B., Altaev Zh.A. [16] note that the Internet contributes to the rapprochement, integration and consolidation of the population, as it serves as the basis for the transformation of the nation from an imaginary into a tangible one. Moreover, uniting people into one community on social networks affects the political activity of citizens, and therefore their national identity.

Other scholars argue that the national idea is formed along with the creation of a nation. Because the national idea and the process of nation-building and institutionalization of national relations are interconnected. At the same time, the national idea cannot be formed by regulations or by force.

According to Musatayev and Mendigaliev [17], the national idea comes from historical events, stages of state development, cultural characteristics, psychological and mythological aspects of the nation. For a government policy or program to be successful, it must be seen as an expression of this national idea.

Despite the different points of view of researchers, it should be noted that a certain part of the scientific works studied during the writing of this article considers the nation and its language as fundamental for nation-building.

For example, Sakbekova A.B., Musataev S.Sh., [18] note that there are many mechanisms for the formation of national-cultural identity that are of greater importance in a certain historical period: language, traditions, values, ideologies, common territory, level economic development, natural conditions, religion, etc. The Kazakh language as part of culture should become an additional factor in the unification of all Kazakhstanis. There is no doubt that it is the basis for introducing all nations and peoples to the culture, traditions, customs and way of life of the Kazakh people.

The basis of national identity is the state language, therefore every citizen living in Kazakhstan must learn the state language. Indeed, there are enough multinational states like ours in the world. But in many foreign countries, if you don't know the state language, you can't get citizenship, you don't have a good job, and it's hard to live. However, no one accuses such states of «nationalism».

Researchers Balapanova A.S., Asyltaeva E.B., [19] say that in Kazakhstan there are such ideas as «Unity of the people of Kazakhstan» and «Unity in diversity». And maintaining peace in a state consisting of more than a hundred nationalities is not easy, so ways to maintain consensus between them are being considered. Thanks to this idea, the «Kazakhstan Nation» project came to life. It must be admitted that the contribution of this ideology to maintaining stability in Kazakhstan is immeasurable.

At the same time, Balapanova A.S., Asyltaeva E.B., present the argument of Alimkhanuly E., who argues that now the moment has come when this ideology should be abandoned, given the growing importance of the Kazakh nation as a state builder. Kazakhs in the 21st century are rising to a new milestone as a nation of state building, becoming a strong core and reliable support of the people of Kazakhstan. For the future independence of Kazakhstan, for its growth and strengthening, we need the unity of the Kazakhs – our nation.

Nasimov M.Ө., [20] argues that the education system is the basis of nation-building: in the process of nation formation, various aspects of nationalism and self-identification, including education, became key. Through the education system, the political elite supports and transmits dominant ideological attitudes.

The scientist notes that national identity is formed through national education. Middle and high schools can be considered as an ideological state apparatus that reproduces the ideology of the state. In the process of education, great opportunities open up for effective use as a means of modernization, paying special attention to national ideology. In the process of education, we not only form a national worldview, but also explain the policy of state homogeneity in the course of nation building.

On the other hand, in order for the people to support nation-building, it is necessary to see real economic and political reforms of the state. The unity of a nation is related not only to the state structure, but also to the economic principles and political aspects of the national structure. Therefore, we can call the economy the most stable unifying force.

Nasimov M.Ө. In her article, she cites the conclusions of Davenel Jane Yim, who argue that nation-building in modern Kazakhstan is characterized as a complex process of 1) promoting an inclusive civil state in official discourses, granting equal rights to all citizens, postponing real democratic reforms until economic development; 2) pursuing a policy of nationalization officially by popularizing the Kazakh language, culture and historiography and unofficially by discriminating against non-Kazakhs on the basis of knowledge of the Kazakh language; 3) monopolization of the political field of the Kazakh elite, consisting of various simultaneous factions, and the exclusion from the political environment of non-Kazakh minorities, «ordinary» representatives of the titular nation. In fact, until now, special attention has been paid to the economy in the country, and the development of democratic processes has been hampered. However, we do not see the country's economy developing. It therefore seems right that democratic reform and economic development go hand in hand.

According to the definition of R. Isaacs [21, p. 138-139]: «... in the post-Soviet period, the rise of creative film production gave birth to a «new Kazakhstan wave». Young Kazakh filmmakers depicted the disunity, vacuum and instability of late Soviet and first post-Soviet society. These works were an important channel of expression against the outdated and decaying Soviet system. After an initial lull in the industry during the post-Soviet period, the

government of Kazakhstan turned the state-owned film company Kazakhfilm into a joint-stock company in 2005.

Since then, the state has used the company as a vehicle to create films that reinterpret the history of Kazakhstan. The government's goal is to use cinema as an «official» tool to explain the Kazakh nation [22].

Kalashnikova K.A. [23] in his work generalizes, systematizes and substantiates the seven stages of building the Kazakh model of social harmony and intercultural dialogue.

The first stage – the stage of formation of the ethnopolitics of Kazakhstan – lasted from the moment of independence until 1995.

The second stage – from 1995 to 2002. marked by the designation of the priorities of Kazakhstan's identity, based on the Concept of the formation of the state identity of the Republic of Kazakhstan adopted in 1996.

The third stage – from 2002 to 2007. marked by the consistent and logical formation of a unique model of tolerance in interethnic relations and social harmony, now known as Kazakhstan.

The fourth stage – from 2007 to 2010. characterized by the continuation of a consistent integration process among Kazakh society, the transition from a rapid response to events in the ethno-confessional sphere to the structuring of an integral system in the ethnopolitics of the state.

The fifth stage – starting from 2010, is marked by modernization processes of state policy in Kazakhstan. The program documents adopted during this period were the Strategic Development Plan of the Country until 2020 and the Concept of Legal Policy for the period from 2010 to 2020.

The sixth stage – from 2018, is associated with the adoption of the «Kazakhstan – 2050» Strategy.

The seventh stage – from 2020, is aimed at changes and additions made to the legislation on the ANC, emphasizing the democratic and managerial principles of the sphere of interethnic relations and ethnic management, which need to be constantly improved.

Results

This study examines the research of Kazakh scientists on the issue of nation-building in Kazakhstan after gaining independence. As you can see, the aspects raised in the studies are quite diverse. At the same time, many scientific works examined nation-building from the very foundations, that is, the national identity of the state-forming ethnic group – the Kazakhs, and other

ethnic groups living on the territory of Kazakhstan after the restoration of independence. At the beginning of the 90s, this was a hot topic of research.

In subsequent years, researchers wondered about the strategy of nation formation – civil or ethnic. The influence of the Internet and globalization in general on the formation of a nation, as well as the power of ideology through the education system in middle and high schools.

Some scientists argued their conclusions regarding the construction of a nation around the Kazakh ethnic group and the strengthening of the Kazakh language as the only tool for nation-building.

Other researchers suggest first paying attention to economic development, since only through stable financial prosperity will the ethnic groups living in Kazakhstan trust the ruling elite and accordingly accept the ideas of nation-building.

In general, it should be noted that some of the reviewed works lack empirical data. Also, the issues addressed in the studies are quite large-scale, which makes it difficult to draw definite conclusions on specific issues of nation-building in Kazakhstan.

The conclusions of some studies are based on adopted regulations and government programs, that is, on decisions (regulations) of the ruling elite, which also makes it difficult to assess the nation-building process.

Conclusions

Research into the issue of nation-building in the world received a new impetus in the 90s of the last

century, at a time when post-Soviet countries were experiencing a period of independence. Despite the fact that this research topic was new for Kazakh scientists, over the past two decades, domestic scientists have quite widely studied issues of national identity, nation-building and aspects influencing the formation of a nation.

At the same time, not all aspects of nation-building in Kazakhstan have been studied, so the scope of research on all issues remains quite large for future scientific work.

For example, the ways of forming a nation are civil or ethnic. The role of the state language and the level of interest in studying it by representatives of other ethnic groups living in Kazakhstan. The role of the education system, the development of the film industry of Kazakhstan in the formation of the nation and much more.

Financing

This article «The issue of nation-building in independent Kazakhstan in the works of domestic scientists: political science analysis» was prepared within the framework of the financing of the project IRN BR21882266 «Study of the historical memory of the population and the policy of national building in Kazakhstan during the years of Independence» and the affiliation of the organization: RSE at the PVC «Scientific Institute for the Study of Ulus Jochi» of the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Литература

- Hippler, Jochen. *Nation-Building: A Key concept for peaceful conflict transformation?* – London: Pluto Press, 2005
- Allouche, Jeremy. «State building, nation making and post-colonial hydrogeopolitics in India and Israel: Visible and hidden forms of violence at multiple scales» // *Political Geography*, №75, 2019. – pp. 31-33
- Gregg, Heather Selma. *Building the Nation: Missed Opportunities in Iraq and Afghanistan*. – Lincoln, NE: Potomac Books, 2018
- Wimmer, Andreas. «Nation Building: Why Some Countries Come Together While Others Fall Apart» // *Survival*. Princeton University Press, №4, 2018. – pp. 151–164
- Berger, Mark T. «From Nation-Building to State-Building: the geopolitics of development, the nation-state system and the changing global order» // *Third World Quarterly*, №1, 2006. – pp. 5 – 25
- Wimmer, Andreas. «Nation Building: Why Some Countries Come Together While Others Fall Apart» // *Survival*. Princeton University Press, №4, 2018. – pp. 151–164
- Kamrava, Mehran. «Nation-Building in Central Asia: Institutions, Politics, and Culture» // *Muslim World*, №1, 2020. – pp. 6-23
- Wimmer, Andreas. «Nation Building: Why Some Countries Come Together While Others Fall Apart» // *Survival*. Princeton University Press, №4, 2018. – pp. 151–164
- Нысанбаев А.Н., Кадыржанов Р.К. *Общенациональная идея Казахстана: Опыт философско-политологического анализа*. – Алматы: Компьютерно-издательский центр Института философии и политологии МОН РК. – 2006. – 45 с.
- Оспанов Т.Т., Рамазанова А.Х. *Влияние глобализационных процессов на национальную идентичность в современном Казахстане* // *Вестник КазНУ. Серия философии, культурологии, политологии*, №1, 2015. – С. 69-73.

- Калиев Д.С., Вентсель А. Тәуелсіздіктің алғашқы жылдарындағы қазақстанда ұлт құрылысы // ҚазҰУ хабаршысы. Философия, мәдениеттану, саясаттану сериясы, №1, 2022. – С. 54–64.
- Ковальская С.И., Аканов К.Г. Перенос столицы как инструмент политики нацистроительства и миграционная динамика населения Астаны // Вестник Томского государственного университета, № 412, 2016. – С. 54–64.
- Wolfel, Richard L. North to Astana: Nationalistic motives for the movement of the Kazakh(stani) capital // Nationalities Papers, № 3, 2010. – pp. 485-506.
- Edward Schatz. What Capital Cities Say About State and Nation Building // Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, № 9, 2004. – pp. 111–140.
- Ковальская С.И., Аканов К.Г. Перенос столицы как инструмент политики нацистроительства и миграционная динамика населения Астаны // Вестник Томского государственного университета, №412, 2016. – С. 54–64.
- Токтаров Е.Б., Алтаев Ж.А. Интернет и национальная идентичность казахстанцев // Вестник КазНУ. Серия философия. Серия культурология. Серия политология, №3, 2015. – С. 65 – 70.
- Мұсатаев С.Ш., Мендіғалиев Қ.С. Біріктіруші жалпыұлттық идеяны қалыптастырудың әлемдік саяси тәжірибесі // ҚазҰУ хабаршысы. Философия сериясы. Мәдениеттану сериясы. Саясаттану сериясы, №1, 2014. – С. 96-106.
- Сақбекова Ә.Б., Мұсатаев С.Ш. Ұлттық бірегейліктің этносаяси тұжырымдамалары: Ұлттық бірегейліктің этносаяси тұжырымдамалары: әлемдік тәжірибе және қазақстандық үлгі // Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ. Философия, мәдениеттану, саясаттану сериясы, №1, 2023. – С. 81 – 91.
- Балапанова А.С., Асылтаева Ә.Б. Қазақстан Республикасындағы бірегейлену үдерісінің кезеңдері // ҚазҰУ хабаршысы. Философия сериясы. Мәдениеттану сериясы. Саясаттану сериясы, №1, 2013. – С. 72 – 79.
- Насимов М.Ө. Ұлтшылдық және ұлттық құрылыстың өзара байланыстары: сапалық контент-талдау // ҚазҰУ хабаршысы. Философия, мәдениеттану, саясаттану сериясы, №2, 2023. – С.72 – 86. doi.org/10.26577/jrscp.2023.v.84.i2.8.
- Isaacs R., Polese A. Nation-building and identity in the Post-Soviet space: New tools and approaches. – London: Routledge. – 2016. – 272 p.
- Насимов М.Ө. Ұлттық құрылыстың мәні және негізгі түсініктері // Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің хабаршысы. Саяси ғылымдар. Аймақтану. Шығыстану. Түркітану сериясы, № 2, 2023. – С.70 – 81.
- Калашникова Н.П., Байтурсева К.А. Нацистроительство в Казахстане: этноконфессиональные контексты // Евразийская интеграция: экономика, право, политика, № 3, 2023. – С. 159-167.

References

- Hippler, Jochen. Nation-Building: A Key concept for peaceful conflict transformation? – London: Pluto Press, 2005
- Allouche, Jeremy. «State building, nation making and post-colonial hydropolitics in India and Israel: Visible and hidden forms of violence at multiple scales» // Political Geography, №75, 2019. – pp. 31-33
- Gregg, Heather Selma. Building the Nation: Missed Opportunities in Iraq and Afghanistan. – Lincoln, NE: Potomac Books, 2018
- Wimmer, Andreas. «Nation Building: Why Some Countries Come Together While Others Fall Apart» // Survival. Princeton University Press, №4, 2018. – pp. 151–164
- Berger, Mark T. «From Nation-Building to State-Building: the geopolitics of development, the nation-state system and the changing global order» // Third World Quarterly, №1, 2006. – pp. 5 – 25
- Wimmer, Andreas. «Nation Building: Why Some Countries Come Together While Others Fall Apart» // Survival. Princeton University Press, №4, 2018. – pp. 151–164
- Kamrava, Mehran. «Nation-Building in Central Asia: Institutions, Politics, and Culture» // Muslim World, №1, 2020. – pp. 6-23
- Wimmer, Andreas. «Nation Building: Why Some Countries Come Together While Others Fall Apart» // Survival. Princeton University Press, №4, 2018. – pp. 151–164
- Nyisanbaev A.N., Kadyirzhanov R.K. «Obschenatsionalnaya ideya Kazahstana: Opyit filosofsko-politologicheskogo analiza [The national idea of Kazakhstan: Experience in philosophical and political science analysis]». Almaty: Kompyuterno-izdatelskiy tsentr Instituta filosofii i politologii MON RK, (2006) – (in Russian)
- Ospanov T.T., Ramazanova A.H. «Vliyaniye globalizatsionnykh protsessov na natsionalnyuyu identichnost v sovremennom Kazahstane [The influence of globalization processes on national identity in modern Kazakhstan] // Vestnik KazNU. Philosophy series. Culturology series. Political Science Series, No. 1, 2015. – С. 69-73 – (in Russian)
- Kaliev D.S., Ventsel A. «Tauelsizdiktin algashky zhyldaryndagy Kazakstanda ult kurylysy [Nation building in Kazakhstan in the first years of independence]» // Kaznu bulletin. Philosophy, cultural studies, political science series, No.1, 2022. – С. 54–64 – (in Kazakh)
- Kovalskaya S.I., Akanov K.G. «Perenos stolitsyi kak instrument politiki natsiestroitelstva i migratsionnaya dinamika naseleniya Astanyi [The transfer of the capital as an instrument of nation-building policy and migration dynamics of the population of Astana]» // Bulletin of Tomsk State University, No. 412, 2016. – С. 54–64 – (in Russian)
- Wolfel, Richard L. «North to Astana: Nationalistic motives for the movement of the Kazakh(stani) capital» // Nationalities Papers, № 3, 2010. – pp. 485-506.
- Schatz, Edward. «What Capital Cities Say About State and Nation Building» // Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, № 9, 2004. – pp. 111–140.

Kovalskaya S.I., Akanov K.G. «Perenos stolitsyi kak instrument politiki natsiestroitelstva i migratsionnaya dinamika naseleniya Astani [The transfer of the capital as an instrument of nation-building policy and migration dynamics of the population of Astana]» // Bulletin of Tomsk State University, No. 412, 2016. – С. 54–64 – (in Russian)

Toktarov E.B., Altaev Zh.A. «Internet i natsionalnaya identichnost kazahstantsev [Internet and national identity of Kazakhstan]» // Scientific journals of Kazakh National University. Philosophy. Culturology. Political Science Series, No. 3, 2015. – С. 65 – 70 – (in Russian)

Musataev S.Sh., Mendigaliev K.S. «Birktirushi zhalpyulttyk ideas qalyptastyrudyn әлемдік sayasi tәzhiribesi [World political experience in the formation of a unifying nationwide idea]» // Scientific journals of Kazakh National University. Kaznu bulletin. Philosophy, cultural studies, political science series, No. 1, 2014. – С. 96-106 – (in Kazakh)

Sakbekova A.B., Musataev S.Sh. «Ulttyq biregeiliktіn etnosaiasi tujyrymdamalary: Ulttyq biregeiliktіn etnosaiasi tujyrymdamalary: әлемдік tәjiribe және qazaqstandyq ұlgi [Ethnopolitical concepts of national identity: ethnopolitical concepts of National Identity: world experience and Kazakhstan model]». Scientific journals of Kazakh National University. Kaznu bulletin. Philosophy, cultural studies, political science series, No. 1 (2023): 81 – 91 – (in Kazakh)

Balapanova A.S., Asyltaeva E.B. «Qazaqstan Respýblikasyndaғы biregeilený úderisiniń kezeńderi [Stages of the process of unification in the Republic of Kazakhstan.]» Kaznu bulletin. Philosophy, cultural studies, political science series, No.1 (2013): 72 – 79 – (in Kazakh)

Nasimov M.Ó. «Ultshyldyq және ulttyq qurylystýn ózara baılanystary: sapalyq kontent-taldaý [Relations of nationalism and national construction: qualitative content analysis.]» Kaznu bulletin. Philosophy, cultural studies, political science series, No.2 (2023): 72 – 86. doi.org/10.26577/jpcp.2023.v.84.i2.8 – (in Kazakh)

Isaacs R., Polese A. Nation-building and identity in the Post-Soviet space: New tools and approaches. London: Routledge, 2016.

Nasimov M.Ó. «Ulttyq qurylystýn máni және negizgi túsinikeri [The essence and basic concepts of national construction.]» Bulletin of L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. Political Sciences. Regional Studies. Oriental Studies. Turkology series, No. 2, 2023. – С. 70 – 81 – (in Kazakh)

Kalashnikova N.P., Baitýreeva K.A. «Natsiestroitelstvo v Kazahstane: etnokonfessionalnyie konteksty [Nation-building in Kazakhstan: ethnoconfessional contextual.]» Eurasian integration: economics, law, politics, No. 3, 2023. – С. 159-167 – (in Russian)

Information about authors:

Shakenov Alikhan (corresponding author) – doctoral student at the Department of Political Science, Faculty of journalism and political science, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Astana, Kazakhstan, email: alikhan.shakenov@gmail.com)

Gabdulina Bagysh – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Political Science, Faculty of journalism and political science, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Astana, Kazakhstan, email: bagish68@yandex.ru).

Onuchko Marina – Candidate of Political Sciences, Acting Professor of the Department of Political Science, Faculty of journalism and political science, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, (Astana, Kazakhstan, email: onuchko@mail.ru)

Dronzina Tatyana – Ph.D. Full professor at the Department of Political science of Kliment Ohridski University of Sofia (Sofia, Bulgaria, email: Dronzina@phls.uni-sofia.bg)

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Шәкенов Әлихан (корреспондент автор) – Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия Ұлттық университеті Журналистика және саясаттану факультеті Саясаттану кафедрасының докторанты (Астана қ., Қазақстан, электронды пошта: alikhan.shakenov@gmail.com)

Гадулина Бағыш – тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, доцент, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия Ұлттық университеті Журналистика және саясаттану факультеті Саясаттану кафедрасы (Астана қ., Қазақстан, email: bagish68@yandex.ru);

Онучко Марина – саясаттану ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, доцент, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия Ұлттық университеті Журналистика және саясаттану факультеті Саясаттану кафедрасы (Астана қ., Қазақстан, email: onuchko@mail.ru);

Дронзина Татьяна – Ph.D, «Әулие Климент Охридский» София университетінің Саясаттану кафедрасының профессоры (Sofia, Bulgaria, email: Dronzina@phls.uni-sofia.bg)

Received: February 20, 2024

Updated: March 12, 2024

Accepted: May 20, 2024