

M. Kossyn^{1*}, A. Kulzhanova¹, A. Kabdollanova²

¹Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

²Kazakh-British Technical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

*e-mail: merey.kossyn@gmail.com

‘COLONIAL COMPLICITY’ OR WHAT WAS THE KAZAKH CONTRIBUTION TO THE LOCALIZATION OF MODERNITY?

Contemporary post/decolonial discourses in Kazakhstan have completely excluded the following issues from the field of narrative. First, the issue of ‘colonial complicity’, that is the fact that colonization was carried out with the direct participation of the local population. Second, is the issue of re-evaluation of the pre-colonial political and social structure. In other words, Kazakh society tries to forget that even before colonialism the society already was in a deep crisis. Kazakh society is unwilling to critically reassess the pre-colonial period. A careful look at the historical evidence would show that Kazakh actors were actively participating in the process of localizing modernity and turning modernity into a repressive force. This raises the question of colonial complicity as particularly pertinent. The tendency of some postcolonial theory to explain all issues as a result of colonialism, i.e., to overemphasize the influence of external factors can hinder a correct understanding of the issues under consideration. This article aims to investigate the origins of the issue of ‘colonial complicity,’ that is, the problem of Kazakh complicity in their own colonization. At the same time, this article critically examines post-colonial and decolonial discourses in modern Kazakh society, which often overlook or conceal issues such as ‘colonial complicity’ and the need to re-evaluate pre-colonial cultural structures.

Key words: Postcolonial Kazakhstan; Colonial complicity; Modernity/Coloniality; Pre-colonial political and social structure; Discourse analysis; Rewriting history.

M. Қосын^{1*}, А. Құлжанова¹, А. Кабдолланова²

¹Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы қ., Қазақстан

²Қазақ-Британ техникалық университеті, Алматы қ., Қазақстан

*e-mail: merey.kossyn@gmail.com

«Өзіңді отарлауға қатысу» немесе модернидi жергiлiктендiруде қазақтардың өз үлесi

Қазақтандағы бүгiнгi постколониал, деколониал дискурстар мына екi маңызды мәселенi нарратив алаңынан мүлде шығарып жiбердi. Бiрiншiсi – «өзiңдi отарлауға қатысу» мәселесi, яғни отарлау бұл жергiлiктi халықтың өзiнiң тiкелей атсалысуымен жүзеге асқандығын ескермеуге тырысады. Екiншiсi – бұл отаршылдыққа дейiнгi кезеңдегi мәдени құрылымды қайта бағалау мәселесi, яғни қазақ қоғамы колониализм келмес бұрын өзiнiң әлдеқашан терең дағдарыс iшiнде болғанын ұмытуға тырысады, және оны өзiне сұрақ ретiнде қойғысы келмейдi. Егер тарихи деректерге мұқият үңiлсек, онда қазақ қоғамы модернидi жергiлiктендiруде және оның репрессивтi күшке айналуына өзiнiң қаншалықты белсендi түрде қатысқанын байқар едi. Осы бiр «өзiңдi отарлауға қатысу» мәселесiн бiз салмақты түрде жан- жақты қарастыруымыз керек. Кейбiр постколониал теориялардың барлық мәселелердi отаршылдықтың салдары деп түсiндiруi, яғни, сыртқы факторлардың әсерiн тым жоғары көрсетуi шындығында қарастырылып отырған мәселелердi дұрыс түсiнуге кедергi жасайды. Бұл мақалада «өзiңдi отарлауға қатысу» мәселесi жан- жақтылы зерттеледi. Сондай-ақ, бұл мақалада қазiргi қазақ қоғамындағы постколониал, деколониал дискурстар сыни тұрғыдан қайта қарастырылады, себебi бұл дискурстар «өзiңдi отарлауға қатысу» және отаршылдыққа дейiнгi кезеңдегi мәдени құрылымды қайта бағалау мәселелерiн толық назарға алмай отыр.

Түйiн сөздер: Постколониал Қазақстан; Өзiңдi отарлауға қатысу; Модернитi/Колониалити; Пре-колониал саяси және әлеуметтiк құрылым; Дискурс анализ; Тарихты қайта жазу.

М. Косын^{1*}, А. Кульжанова¹, А. Кабдолланова²

¹Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, г. Алматы, Казахстан

²Казахстанско-Британский технический университет, г. Алматы, Казахстан

*e-mail: merey.kossyn@gmail.com

«Колониальное соучастие», или современный вклад казахов в локализацию

Современные пост/деколониальные дискурсы в Казахстане полностью исключили из поля нарратива следующие вопросы. Во-первых, вопрос «колониального соучастия», то есть того, что колонизация проводилась при непосредственном участии местного населения. Во-вторых, это вопрос переоценки доколониальной политической и социальной структуры. Иными словами, казахстанское общество пытается забыть, что еще до колониализма общество уже находилось в глубоком кризисе. Казахское общество не желает критически переоценивать доколониальный период. Внимательный взгляд на исторические свидетельства покажет, что казахские акторы активно участвовали в процессе локализации модернити и превращения модернити в репрессивную силу. Это делает вопрос о колониальном соучастии особенно актуальным. Тенденция некоторых постколониальных теорий объяснять все проблемы результатом колониализма, т. е. чрезмерно подчеркивать влияние внешних факторов, может препятствовать правильному пониманию рассматриваемых проблем. Целью данной статьи является исследование истоков проблемы «колониального соучастия», то есть проблемы соучастия казахов в собственной колонизации. В то же время в данной статье критически рассматриваются постколониальные и деколониальные дискурсы в современном казахском обществе, которые часто упускают из виду или скрывают такие проблемы, как «колониальное соучастие» и необходимость переоценки доколониальных культурных структур.

Ключевые слова: постколониальный казахстан; колониальное соучастие; модернити/колониальность; доколониальная политическая и социальная структура; дискурс-анализ; переписывание истории.

Introduction

According to Weber's definition, modernity is first and foremost a bureaucratic system based on principles of rationalism. (1968) The rational exchange that takes place under modernity is supposed to be limiting natural human freedoms through organizing into societies and states in order to obtain civil liberties, justice, and equality. (Ruggerio, 1927: 32) By the time they reached the Kazakh steppes, these Enlightenment ideas at the foundation of modernity had given up on their even nominal promise of rational exchange and civil liberties. On the contrary, the bureaucratic system destroyed the relatively more just social structures that, most importantly, performed functions of sustaining and perpetuating itself. In this article I discuss the interactions between Kazakh history and the notion of modernity, asking what modernity was for Kazakhs. Timothy Mitchell, who criticized Foucault for remaining silent in regards to issues of colonialism, notes that considering modernity to be a universal project is problematic in itself. (2000) Therefore, even the theories that deconstruct this Enlightenment project are lacking in the discussion of Kazakh society and its interactions with modernity. Even though the object of investigation and critique is the same (modernity) these theories fail to fully explain the unique histori-

cal circumstances in which the Kazakh culture developed in early modernity. I would emphasize the importance, in this regard, of considering the internal conditions of the local traditional social and political structures and their transformations in this transitional period. In addition, poststructuralists tend to emphasize the external imposition of structures from institutions of power and overlook the impact of an individual subject on these structures. However, '[s]tructure is not to be equated with constraint but is always both constraining and enabling.' (Giddens, 1984: 25) A careful look at the historical evidence would show that Kazakh actors were actively participating in the process of localizing modernity and turning modernity into a repressive force. This raises the question of colonial complicity as particularly pertinent. The tendency of some postcolonial theory to explain all issues as a result of colonialism, i.e., to overemphasize the influence of external factors can hinder a correct understanding of the issues under consideration. This article aims to investigate the origins of the issue of 'colonial complicity', that is the problem of Kazakh complicity in their own colonization. Post and decolonial discourses in the modern Kazakh society overlook or conceal issues such as 'colonial complicity' and re-evaluation of the pre-colonial cultural structures. Internal self-criticism that comes from within a certain culture

(Dussel, 2012: 45) is the only way in which a culture can survive and develop.

Methodology

I investigate the colonial/modernity project as it unfolded in the Kazakh steppes with a particular focus on the issue of Kazakh officials' complicity in that project. My analysis in this section is based on historical evidence from the 1822-1824 and 1867-1868 reforms and the writing of Kazakh authors such as Walikhanov, Bokeikhan, Baitursynov, Auezov, Bekmakhanov etc. about these reforms. We learn about the Kazakh steppe of this period mainly from Russian sources. Local sources are either suppressed or limited, or simply say that many do not know a written language and do not have a written culture, so they cannot express their voice, and as a result, these pictures of a monotonous, conventional view of history are formed. (Shablei, 2022) Thus, I give preference to Kazakh authors and perform a discourse analysis of their texts.

The fact is that even the most malicious commands and directives could not have been effective without someone to execute them. But investigating that opens up the question of what role Kazakhs themselves played in collectivization and sedentarization. The narrative of Kazakh victims impedes the study of the famine in several ways. It ignores the fact that Kazakhs participated and were entangled in radical politics that to a great extent triggered the famine. Until that is discussed and studied, there can be no realistic debate on what conclusions may be drawn from this tragedy. (Kindler, translated by Klohr. 2015: 243)

Robert Kindler's book on the events of the Great Famine in Kazakhstan (1931-1933) raises questions relevant to the subject of this article. He notes that 'famines arise from the incongruencies between political, economic, climatic, and social factors'. (2015, p. 9) He also writes that the losses of famine are related to the presence or absence of mechanisms of social self-defense that a community can utilize in the face of such a calamity. Author argues that the Kazakh community did not have such mechanisms, which led to heavy losses for the society. This illustrates that by the time of the Famine Kazakh society had already undergone a thorough disintegration of its abilities to sustain and perpetuate itself. Some tectonic transformations must have taken place before in order to incapacitate the social institutions that would provide these mechanisms of self-defense. The focus, then, should shift to the XIX century. This period covers early modernity brought

through colonialism and the disintegration of traditional social structures. This is a key transitional period between the traditional social structure and the subsequent Soviet period. The period of rejection of traditional values and the absence of new values to replace them constitute a time of anomie (Durkheim, 1969), which lies at the heart of many transformations that took place in this era. In reviewing Ahmet T. Kuru's *Islam, Authoritarianism, and Underdevelopment: A Global and Historical Comparison* Renat Shaykhutdinov writes: 'Since the most widespread arguments explaining underdevelopment and authoritarianism in the Muslim-majority areas revolve around essentialism, on the one hand, and post-colonial approaches, on the other hand, Kuru's novelty lies in challenging them both simultaneously.' (Shaykhutdinov, 2021: 791) Kuru writes: 'Chronologically, the Muslim world's scientific and economic stagnation had already begun long before the widespread colonization of Muslim lands by Western powers or Russia began in the 18th century.' (Kuru, 2019) Kuru's argument, which is based on his new perspective on colonial history, is worthy of our attention.

Conceptualization of the Issue 'Colonial Complicity'

The following passages from Kazakh-Soviet historian Bekmakhanov show that elements of social modernization were present before the Russian colonization of the region and the modernity it brought:

By the first half of the XIX century the former consolidation among the nobles was less noticeable. Historian of the Orenburg region S.N. Sevastyanov writes the following: 'Despite the support from the Russian administration the nobility did not enjoy high prestige among the Kazakh. Some rogue Kazakhs would not only disrespect their rank but go as far as murdering them.' (Bekmakhanov, 1994: 79-128)

One can conclude from the materials published in Bekmakhanov's *'Kazakhstan in the 20-40s of the XIX century'* that the traditional political structures among the Kazakhs started internally disintegrating starting from the middle of the XVIII century, and that the Kazakh society was ready for a new form of political organization. However, since this process coincided with colonization of the Kazakh lands by the Russian Empire, this process of internal reformation was thwarted.

Administrative reforms

'The beginning of the Russian colonial period in Kazakhstan coincided with the Great Reforms of

Tsar Alexander II and a deep economic crisis within the empire proper.’ (Shaukenov, 2013) Since ‘... [the] West [was] convinced that economic development could not occur in the absence of modern property rights’ (Fukuyama, 2012: 69), the first attempts at reforming the Kazakh steppes started with an administrative reform. The colonial administration used local cadres as the main tool of the colonization process. Political scientist Pauline Luong writes: ‘This is not to say that Soviet institutions and policies eliminated pre-existing social and cultural bonds, but rather, that they transformed these bonds by infusing them with a new social, political, and economic meaning.’ (2002, p. 63). A similar process, i.e., adapting local structures to fit the purposes of colonial efforts took place in the Tsarist period as well. These reforms started with the Decree on Siberian Kazakhs of 1822. By this new legislation, the Kazakh steppes were to be ruled not according to tribal divisions, but new territorial-administrative ones. (Zimanov, 1960: 169) This reform project was aimed at weakening the tribal organization and the political structures based on it. (Abenova, 2006: 7). However, these reforms tried to create an illusion of democratization of Kazakh society. (Abenova, 2006: 30) Implemented under the banner of ‘social equality’, these reforms radically changed the ways in which positions of power were obtained within the system. Historian Masanov writes the following on the issue:

Therefore, an effective way in the policy of incorporation of the Kazakh population into the Russian Empire was its social equalization – a gradual elimination of the privileges of the nomadic elite and a subsequent differentiation of the Kazakh society according to some other criteria. (quoted in Shaukenov. [2007] 2013, p. 289)

Although these reforms tried to eliminate the tribal system through different means. ‘...[S]tate action activated the concealable nature of clan division, thereby enhancing their political content.’ (Schatz, 2004: 165) Inter-tribal conflict exacerbated as a result of this new way of distribution of political power. (Chapai, 2008: 228) Eventually this led to a further balkanization among Kazakhs. Kazakh poet and polymath Baitursynuly (2006, p. 194) writes the following:

Since the people under the rule of a *volostnoi* (*regional ruler*) were not of the same origin and every tribe had its own distinct interests, every tribe tried to secure positions of power for their own kinsmen. The calamity of elections arose from this: buying office positions, political murders, etc. all resulted from this.

The officials elected in this manner had one primary function – surveillance. For this end, the number of *auyl* officials was increased. They were compensated not with wages, but with awards for ‘distinct diligence and dedication’ in carrying out their functions. (Aldazhumanov and Assylbekov, 2010: 315) In other words, the bureaucratic system tried to form not only a system of surveillance and rule at a state level, but also a system of invisible surveillance of the everyday. (Foucault, 1980) Thus, the Kazakhs were used for their own colonization. Regarding such complicity with colonialism, historian Bekmakhanov writes: ‘Kazakhs were stuck between two kinds of oppression: one from their local officials, another from the colonial administration’. (1994, p. 142)

Legal reforms

Nietzsche’s most biting critique of modernity has to do with Kantian universalism. ‘There is no such thing as moral phenomena, but only a moral interpretation of phenomena. And how should there be a “common good”! The expression contradicts itself’. (Nietzsche, 1886: 48-80) A similar Nietzschean sentiment of ‘decentralization of truth’ can be observed in the ideas of Kazakh historian Shoqan Walikhanov’s work *Concerning the Reforms of the Judiciary*. ([1864] 2010) According to Walikhanov’s main argument, the seemingly universal modern laws cannot be applied to the nomadic way of life since each culture has its own understanding of crime and punishment. The traditional Kazakh judicial system had a great deal of flexibility, which at times would result in more just sentences. (Kenzhaliyev, 1996: 3-5) Baitursynuly writes: ‘Since there was much communication between villages and traditions like ‘*suinshi*’ (*the tradition of giving gifts to a deliverer of good news*) and ‘*uzyn qulaq*’ (*informal system of communication, gossip*) judges were well aware of the circumstances of an incident and could easily deliberate.’ (2006, p. 198) However, paragraph 182 of the new ‘Law on the Administration of the Turkestan Region’ (based on the ‘Decree on the Administration of the Turkestan Region’ of 1886) states the following: ‘for deliberation on criminal cases each *volost*’ will elect from four to eight judges. Judges (*biys*) were not elected up to that point, nor was the position inherited. They would become judges based on their own merit, which ensured the independence of the judges.’ (ed. by Zimanov, 2004: 74) A founding member of the ‘*Alashorda*’ movement and a notable political figure of the early XX century A. Bokeikhanov writes the following regarding this judicial reform:

Since the beginning of Russian domination over Kazakhs, we don't see exceptional judges anymore. Whoever is well liked by the Russians has the power. The orator-judges of the old are few and far between. The ways of justice are replaced by the judge's bribe. One bribe can convince him to call the white black. (Bokeikhanov, [1914] 2016: 285)

Overall, this new legal system did not aim to ensure order. Its main objective was to fight against rebels opposing the regime. This new legislation in the hands of the colonial administration served not so much to resolve crimes, but to engender them. (Shaukenov, 2014: 94-105) Kazakh writer and honored academician Auezov's following lines serve as an illustration of this: 'One practice that became widespread among people was a false accusation. Cooked up accusations of murder, plunder, defamation of the Tsar would be the frequent reasons why people would end up before the judge.' (ed. by Zimanov, 2004: 79) Auezov, who was a researcher and biographer of Abai and wrote the epic novel *Abai Zholy* (Abai's Path) expresses a similar sentiment regarding Abai's works: 'Abai's poems and words of edification did not directly criticize the Tsarist regime, but rather the minor officials put in place by the colonial administration.' (1967) The following examples will go in-depth into Abai's Words of Edification and illustrate the issue of the local actors that would further the Tsarist interests. The Third and Eighth Word express a following concern:

All the notables among the people at one time get false accusations and criminal cases started on them. The accused gets interrogated. To ensure that this person is ineligible for elections false witnesses were also prepared before time... Who will listen to this wisdom and heed this teaching? One is a volostnoi, another is a judge. They have different concerns: how to stay on the good side of their masters, how to keep the people in control, and how to compensate for their expenses.

As we can see, the locals were used in their own colonization. One could also argue that this trend continued in the Soviet period as well. Non-Russian Soviet nationalities, then, were not simply backward static peripheries kept as cultural 'inferiors' and 'others', but were the targets, means and spaces of the Bolshevik project. (Kassymbekova, 2017: 5)

Shoqan Walikhanov writes:

The Kazakh judicial system of biys is akin to people's own creation. As a system emerging from the people and covering all the peculiarities of that people, this system satisfies all of people's needs...

Whichever stage of development a people can be on, these are necessary for a normal growth of a people: self-development, self-defense, and self-rule. ([1868] 2010, p. 103)

Shoqan in these lines critiques the actions of the colonial administration, which was imposing its modernity-driven "universal" legal logic upon Kazakh society. He argues for each people's right to be governed by their own laws. However, Kazakh society of the period had been in a state of deep crisis and witnessed the disintegration of its traditional political system. The emergence of new political institutions and a new system of values was thwarted by the Russian colonization. I would argue that the complicity of local actors in the colonization process might have been caused by this deep crisis of the traditional systems. From this one may conclude that the cruel and repressive nature of the modernization project as it unfolded in the Kazakh steppes stems not only from the colonial administration, but also from the complicity of local officials. An analysis of the phenomenon of 'colonial complicity' performed from a position of a neutral treatment of this historical period, then, inevitably raises the question of the origins and causes of the deep crisis within the Kazakh social and cultural structures, which led to their internal disintegration even before the arrival of the colonial era.

When collective representations (Durkheim, 1912) that unite the society change, the system of values based on these representations change as well. The administrative and judicial reforms of 1822-1824 and 1867-1868 undeniably affected the traditional social structure and the value systems based on them. When a society faces unexpected and fast economic and social change, it falls into the condition of anomie. Durkheim used this concept to explain the transition of European nations from a tradition to a modern social system, within which he used the concept to study the issue of suicides. 'Such changes put people in new situations in which the old norms no longer apply but new ones have yet to develop. Periods of disruption unleash currents of anomie – moods of rootlessness and normlessness – and these currents lead to an increase in rates of anomic suicide.' (Ritzer, 2010: 95) Under such conditions a society may lose its 'ontological security'. (Giddens, 1991) If we are to assume that complicity in colonization requires denial of one's own Being, this issue is also connected to suicide. It was mentioned earlier that suicide during periods of anomie is born out of social insecurity associated with the transitional period.

Conclusion

The current post/decolonial discourses in Kazakhstan overlook or conceal the issues of ‘colonial complicity’ and the task of re-evaluating the pre-colonial political and social structure. In conclusion, freedom, first of all, is responsibility. In my opinion, contemporary discourses around our colonial history mostly try to shift the responsibility to ‘others’. These discourses to a certain degree hinder the true understanding of certain issues under consideration. That is because these discourses are still ‘full of emotions’. Therefore, the issue of ‘colonial complicity’ allow us to rethink the dominating views

regarding our colonial history. Thus, this research aims to critique postcolonial and decolonial theories that mostly consider political and social problems of a society as a result of colonialism and overemphasize the external factors. Rather, I focused on alternative discourses. As I mentioned earlier, I strongly believe that internal self-criticism that comes from within a certain culture is the only way in which a culture can survive and develop.

Disclosure statement

The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

References

- Abenova, B. 2006. Orynbor olkesindegi akimshılık teritorialyq ozgerister. XIX 60-90 jylgary. [Administrative-territorial changes in the Orenburg region. 1860s to 1890s]. Aktobe: A-Polygraphy.
- Abenova, B. 2006. 1868 jylgy akimshılık reforma jane Orynbor olkesi. 1868-1891. [Administrative Reform of 1868 and the Orenburg region. 1868-1891]. Aktobe: A-Polygraphy
- Asylbekov, M. Aldazhumanov, K. Qozybaev, M. eds. 2010. Qazaqstan tarihy. Jana zamandagy Qazaqstan. [History of Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan in Modern Times] 3 vols. Almaty: Atamura.
- Auezov, M. 2014. Auezov shygarmalarynyn elu tomdyq tolyq jinagy. 7 Tom. [Complete collection of Auezov in Fifty Volumes. Volume 7]. Almaty: Daur/Jibek joly.
- Auezov, M. 1991. Adebiet tarihy. Jogargy oqu oryndarynyn studentterine arналган. [History of Literature. For Students of Higher Education Institutes]. Almaty: Ana tili.
- Auezov, Mukhtar. 1967. Abai Qunanbaiuly: Articles and studies [Abai Qunanbaiuly: Maqalalar men zertteuler.] Almaty: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR.
- Baitursynuly, A. 2006. Alppeler men maqalalar jinagy. 4 Tom. [Collection of Alphabets and Articles. Volume 4]. Almaty: Alash.
- Bekmakanov, E. 1994. Qazaqstan XIX gasyrdyn 20-40 jylgarynda. [Kazakhstan in the 20s to 40s of the XX century]. Almaty: Sanat
- Bukeikhanov, A. 2016. Alihan Bokeihanov shygarmalary. [Writings of Alikhan Bokeikhanov] 2nd ed. 8 vols. Astana: Saryarqa.
- Chapai, M. 2008. Qazaqstan tarihy. Oqulyq. [History of Kazakhstan. Coursebook] 4th ed. Almaty: Norma- K
- Durkheim, E. 1972. Emile Durkheim: Selected Writings. Edited by A. Giddens. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Durkheim, E. 1995. The Elementary Forms of Religious Life. New York: Free Press.
- Dussel, E. 2012. “Transmodernity and Interculturality: An Interpretation from the Perspective of Philosophy of Liberation.” *TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1(3): 28-59. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5070/T413012881>
- Foucault, M. (1966) 1994. The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences. Translated by L. Mott et les choses. New York: Vintage Books
- Foucault, M. 1980. Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1979. Edited by C. Gordon. New York: Pantheon.
- Fukuyama, F. 2012. The Origins of Political Order: From Prehuman Times to the French Revolution. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Giddens, A. (1984) 1986. The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Giddens, A. 1991. Modernity and Self- Identity: Self and Society in the Modern Age. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kassymbekova, B. 2017. “Understanding Stalinism in, from and of Central Asia: beyond failure, peripherality and otherness.” *Central Asian Survey* 36(1): 1-18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634937.2016.1228609>
- Kenzhaliev, Z. 1996. Qazaq adet guryy quqygynyn materialdary. [Materials from Traditional Legislation among Kazakhs]. Almaty: Jeti jargy
- Kindler, R. 2018. Stalin’s Nomads: Power and Famine in Kazakhstan. Translated by K. Cynthia. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Kuru, A. 2022. “What Explains Authoritarianism and Underdevelopment in the Muslim World?” *Central Asia Analytical Network*. <https://www.caa-network.org/archives/23738/what-explains-authoritarianism-and-underdevelopment-in-the-muslim-world>.

- Luong, P. J. 2002. Institutional Change and Political Continuity in Post-Soviet Central Asia: Power, Perceptions, and Pacts. Cambridge: Cambridge University
- Mitchell, T. 2000. Questions of Modernity. First edition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1886) 2006. Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future. Translated by H. Zimmern. New York: Modern Library.
- Ritzer, G. 2011. Sociological Theory. 8th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ruggiero, G. (1927) 1966. The History of European Liberalism. Translated by R.G. Collingwood. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Schatz, E. 2004. Modern Clan Politics: The Power of “Blood” in Kazakhstan and Beyond. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Shabley, P. 2022. “Experiments of the Empire: Adat, Sharia and the Production of Knowledge in the Kazakh Steppe”. Central Asian Analytical Network. <https://www.caa-network.org/archives/24046/eksperimenty-imperii>
- Shaukenov, A. 2013. “Changes in the Political and Legal System of Kazakhstan in the Process of Its Incorporation into the Russian Empire from the Second Half of the 18th Century to the End of the 19th Century.” Asian and African Studies. 22 (2): 279-301. DOI: <https://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.cejsh-4031c0a8-9ae9-451d-9ff0-23c5fa7faa37>
- Shaukenov, A. 2014. “Administrative and Territorial Changes and Legal Reforms in the Kazakh Steppe in the 19th Century.” Asian and African Studies. 23(1): 89-109. DOI: <https://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.cejsh-cfd7eaf6-4f1d-480e-aab0-d3e622d56e7e>
- Shaykhutdinov, R. 2021. Review of Islam, Authoritarianism, and Underdevelopment: A Global and Historical Comparison, by Kuru, Ahmet. International Sociology Reviews 36(5): 790–797. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/02685809211057675>
- Walikhanov, Sh. 2010. Kop tomdyq sygarmalar jinagy. [Collection of Writings in Multiple Volumes]. 4 vols. Almaty: Tolagay
- Weber, M. 1968. Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretative Sociology. New York: Bedminster Press.
- Zimanov, S. 1960. Politicheski stroi kazahsktana konsa XVIII i pervoi poloviny XIX vekov. [The Political Structure of Kazakhstan in the End of XVIII and First Half of XIX Centuries]. Almaty: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR.
- Zimanov, S. 2004. Qazaqtyn ata zandary. Qujattar, derekter jane zertteuler. (Laws of Kazakhs. Documents, Materials, and Investigations) 2nd ed. 2 vols. Almaty: Zheti Zhargy

Information about authors:

Kossyn Merey (corresponding author) – PhD candidate, senior lecturer at Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Department of Philosophy) (Almaty, Kazakhstan, email: merey.kossyn@gmail.com);

Aru Kulzhanova (corresponding author) – Master of Philosophy, assistant professor at Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Philosophy and Political Science) (Almaty, Kazakhstan, email: aru_kul.78@mail.ru; phone: +7 705 550 5588, +7 707 558 8705). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2705-1073>

Kabdollanova Aigerim Askarkyzy – PhD Candidate, Senior-Lecturer of KBTU PhD Candidate, Senior-Lecturer of KBTU, Almaty, Kazakhstan, email: akabdollanova@gmail.ru, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4100-6612>

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Қосын Мерей (корреспондент автор) – PhD кандидат, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, «Философия» кафедрасының оқытушысы. (Алматы қ., Қазақстан, эл.пошта: merey.kossyn@gmail.com);

Ару Құлжанова (корреспондент-автор) – философия магистрі, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің доценті (Философия және саясаттану факультеті философия кафедрасы) (Алматы, Қазақстан, email: aru_kul.78@mail.ru; телефон: + 7 705 550 5588, + 7 707 558 8705). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2705-1073>

Қабдолланова Айгерім Асқарқызы – PhD кандидаты, ҚБТУ аға оқытушысы PhD кандидаты, ҚБТУ аға оқытушысы, Алматы, Қазақстан, электрондық пошта: akabdollanova@gmail.ru, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4100-6612>

Received September 20, 2024

Accepted October 15, 2024