



New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences



Volume 4, Issue 6, (2017) 151-157

ISSN 2547-8818

www.prosoc.eu

Selected Paper of 6th International Conference on Education (IC-ED-2017), 26-28 June 2015, University of Zagreb
Zagreb – Croatia

1937 - The year: Fate and tragedy of the Kazakh intelligentsia

Darkenov Kurmangali Gazezovich^{a*}, Faculty of International Relations, L. N. Gumilev Eurasian National University, Almaty 020550, Kazakhstan

Abzhapparova Bibihadisha Zhursinkizy^b, Faculty of International Relations, L. N. Gumilev Eurasian National University, Almaty 020550, Kazakhstan

Aitbai Roza Tuimebaikizy^c, Social and Humanitarian Faculty, Kazakh State Womens Teacher Training University, Almaty 020550, Kazakhstan

Zibagul Suleimenovna Ilyasova^d, Faculty of International Relations, L. N. Gumilev Eurasian National University, Almaty 020550, Kazakhstan

Suggested Citation:

Gazezovich, D. K., Zhursinkizy, A. B., Tuimebaikizy, A. R. & Ilyasova, Z. S. (2017). 1937 - The year: Fate and tragedy of the kazakh intelligentsia. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. [Online]. 4(6), 151-157. Available from: www.prosoc.eu

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Milan Matijevic, University of Zagreb, Croatia

©2017 SciencePark Research, Organization & Counseling. All rights reserved.

Abstract

This article considers the fate and tragedy of the Kazakh intelligentsia in 1937, which was the peak year of Stalin's repression that occurred in the Soviet Union. Kazakhstan as a republic of the Soviet Union from the repression could not just stay aside. In the years of Stalinist repression, the Kazakh state lost several thousands of educated people, among whom were well-known figures and intellectuals who were a part of the 1917 revolution. The repressive totalitarian state machine destroyed the cream of Kazakh intelligentsia such as Bukeyhanova, Baytursinova, Dulatov, Zhumabayev and Seifullin. During these years, betrayal, fear and accusation in the population were pronounced. Unfounded accusations of each other and stigmas of 'nationalist', 'bourgeois elements', 'defender of the interests of the feudal lords' among the intelligentsia were widespread. The author reveals the essence of the problem, the meaning of repression and the powerless and defenceless position of Kazakh intelligentsia.

Keywords: Repression, the Kazakh intelligentsia, nationalist, bourgeois element, class approach, the soviet union, Kazakhstan.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Darkenov Kurmangali Gazezovich**, Faculty of International Relations, L. N. Gumilev Eurasian National University, Almaty 020550, Kazakhstan.

E-mail address: k_darkenov@mail.ru / Tel.: +7 7172 709500.

1. Introduction

The moral and spiritual crisis of creativity of Kazakh intellectuals was noticeable in 1937, the advanced years of the repression. In 1937, well-known Kazakh literary intellectuals were accused and there began repression and interference in all ways of development of their creativity; each one's opinion was considered as Nazism and against the Soviet power. According to Sheila Fitzpatrick's article, the revised version in 'Stalin's Peasants' went to press, and correspondence between Stalin and a local authority over sentencing had already surfaced from the archives. While it was not the purpose of the article to explore the role of the centre in the rural show trials, the starting point of the author's argument was that the trials were the product of central rather than local initiative (Fitzpatrick, 2002). Beginning from charging against members of Alashorda who had already left from a history scene, even those who were supported by communications earlier and people who watched kindly to those members of Alashorda accused of complicity and in an agency. The soviet government found the works of writers doubtful, and they were accused of having deviated from the direction of party and society. Thus critics arrived, on the one hand promoting finding of enemies of the people. Secondly, they demanded that they adhered and so earned bonuses for themselves. People in their company were not only accused of affairs of exposure of enemies of society but also joined the highest ranks.

'The issue of members Alashorda' was a story that was last raised in 1937. After publishing the essay of Commissar of Education of the Kazakh SSR, a member of the bureau of the regional party of Kazakhstan Zhurgenov 'Cleanse our cultural maidan from the Nazis', became a factor in the emergence of opinion that there are still Nazis and their followers thus intensified repression against the Nazis. After one week was past, the published essay of R. Zhamankulov. 'Let's improve the press' made problems not only in literary situation but also in the political-ideological situation inside the country. R. Zhamankulov called members of Alashorda 'enemy of class'. In addition, he said that they still had agents. This 'enemy of class' became as a new cause of searching and arresting supporters of Alashorda. Direction and steps of Regional Party of Kazakhstan added temps.

Temps increased after publishing the essay 'Let's destroy Nazis-fascist's in imaginative literature'. Really, this essay criticised the members of Alashorda by permanent rules, but in really they made guilty the main characters of Nazis 'Nazis-fascists' Saken, Iliyas and Beimbet.

May be they had known that the days of Saken, Iliyas and Beimbet were passed on, they published many essays blaming three of them. Published at that time were editions of 'The mistakes and non-quality in imaginative literature', 'Kazakh writers against decease among them was said 'There are mistakes in works of writers, they don't know the life of workers, they can't exit from old themes and they appluse Troicki who is the enemy of people' those were identified as a minuses (Beiskulov). Saken's poem 'Kara Burkit (Black Eagle)' (to Arystan Dautuly – Lev Davidovich Troicki) (Makhat) which was published in 1923 for many years took place for blaming and for bursting out and to continuing to disappear. The poem of Saken to Troicki who was sent abroad from country was like old injure. It hurt him to much again and again. Critics of Saken's didn't let Saken forget about Troicki and always reminded him about it. This bothered to Saken a lot.

Political-ideal situation on that time made literature to go into spiritual crisis. It let be for not trusting each for each other, not only each other they began to doubt on their own works. They walked with a fear 'when and how they would be arrested'. Fear lowered their activity. They were away from talking about policy. It burnt carelessness to works. It was limited to execute only special tasks which were given by the party and the government. But, and it didn't remain under a vigilant look of critics.

Seyfullin during this period of life characterised thus: 'I refused to talk politics at this time, at all avoided visits of some friends. He wanted to deal only with a literature issue. Those also didn't had a confusion. That way also step by step made me not to take part on anything. It adapted for concern and decadence. For my situation Enemies of Soviet government anticipated saying like 'burn and

burn'. These thoughts pulled me down, words of the appeal of enemies put me to concern. some turned places in my compositions of a way to parties at this time, at this fruit of a state' – wrote like this (Kozhakeev).

From the composition of poets and writers, stay charge I cling on individual, it outgrew to a political-ideal campaign against them.

In May, 1937 several times were published publications in the newspaper 'Socialist Kazakhstan' that S. Seyfullin didn't participate in meeting of pistols about destruction of shortcomings of writers which passed on April 5–7, having made thus it accused in nonparticipation in destruction of shortcomings of writers.

Performance and participation in the report of party of the Union of writers generated still a great difficulty in the head. Saken, Iliyas and Beimbet who participated in Meeting acted about the made mistakes in the works and about the made mistakes of critics. Saken who met many critics was acquitted: but it intended the verse to the gangster (it is told about L. D. Trotsky). At this time he wasn't a bandit, and the member of the politburo. If he is a bandit, I would begin to write? Critics didn't consider this moment. And also there was a word 'about Dombyra'. To wash away fault from itself to wine I intended in 1924 'Dombyra' to Trotsky. 1928 having recognised that it is a mistake I wrote article. I wrote and in the magazine. It was told to 1932 in KAZPI. It was told to 1932 and in Dzhamankulov's report. In this year I complained to this and on elections of party. I complained to winter and to Regional committee. Therefore critics had to consider date. Whether and therefore it is necessary to beat again' he told with bitterness. The voice of soul was reflected at S. Seyfullin for unfair test. But, noticing as critics are hooked spoke drew on the that that companion Saken still didn't notice the mistakes.

Iliyas and Beimbet felt that affairs become started. They recognised the mistakes. Beimbet 'I had big mistakes, that is truth. I will look for correction all measures' it was compelled to tell so. On meeting adopted the resolution under three individual articles from now on if they repeat such mistakes that the most drastic measures will be taken told as in the prevention. To the Resolution on the direction of withdrawal and their distribution (Iliyas's, Beimbet's, Saken's) of harmful books entered into the article.

Some articles were published in the months of June–July, which accused Saken. Примянив he constructed 'Hlestakov's method in fiction' to himself an image of 'the fighter in a way of revolutionary business', I specify 'enemies of the people' of the friends Ryskulov, Nurmakov, Sadybakasov, Asylbekov from a positive side. To praise himself and enemies he wrote 'counterrevolutionary works' as 'Тар жол, тайғақ кешу', 'Домбыра', etc. – him accused. Brought charge to Saken about that that he wrote the composition 'against revolution' in open form. Started calling 'Nazi fascist'.

And also, Saken who wasn't opening eyes from criticism was accused that 'His coordinating works went to other course, the last year didn't write anything sensible, the relation with society decreased'. The Kazakh intellectuals, including inside between писателем began to accuse of political ideological views, charge began to take strong speed at this time though Saken was criticised, called 'the Enemy of the people' it didn't begin to write against those who accused him. But, and it in vain didn't remain.

He was blamed: 'Companion Saken instead of daily struggling with enemies of the people, it shows tolerance to their actions. Nowadays, when the Kazakh nationalism became the main threat, former biases, opponents of party were going to one canal when prevryashchatsya in nazisfascists, silence and Saken's inaction is considered as not the help to party and not execution of its party debt'.

2. Conclusion

At this time, which didn't know that is correct that isn't present not only which had no thought opinion, not formed outlooks and views young poets and writers, even showed weakness and eminent

persons in the Kazakh literature. In most, since 1928 S. Mukanov and I. Zhanugurov which exchanged critics, generated a reasoning, in 1937 became started. Slightly if we make retreat, in 1928 the editor-in-chief of the Kazakh edition Mukanov wrote criticism that 'a group of a surface isn't obvious' to the collection of works of IZhansugurov 'Betashar'. Being indignant Ilyas wrote the volume article 'My Conscience Not Such, Such'. After that and some year in a row they exchanged bilateral charges and wrote articles accusing each other of Nazism.

But, whether he noticed where time slides, I. Zhansugirov giving intention to Sabit to reconciliation published the article 'We Will Strengthen against an Inaccuracy Bolshevik Test'. In article 'in the verses of commitment of wealth, sometimes from hopelessness, sometimes I recognised mistakes that didn't notice the best parties of new life. Sabit excessively I show the mistakes, he also recognised that that in some places agreed that he was right. When mutual estrangement it began to razveyavatsya, in 1937 when began a gloom S. Mukanov again touched I. Zhansugurov. Not only creative, and the individual head it appeared for discussion. 'After the historical resolution' in article which speaks, Dzhansugurov left 1935 edition the book of nationalism of Suynbay. In this book of Kazakhs teasing guided against Kyrgyz' I brought charge to its creative work, at meeting of writers'. Dzhansugurov left the wife and two children. Not only I released, he didn't even recognise as the debt to send lawful money to children' having interfered in its family business and to him accused him. It yet not to a trifle S. Mukanov 'In a verse written to death of Kirov made political a mistake. This mistake not such small mistake, but a big mistake' having written he accused Ilyas that it didn't correct this error.

I. Zhansugurov's charge was taken by political character that in his compositions began to look for hostility more strongly so that his art compositions being distorted began to take in discussion. NasayetSbornika I. ZhansugirovaDaukenovKarizhan noticed a special flaw. He: Dzhansugurov shows nazi ideology in the early collection 'Mergen and Boken' showing to the Kazakh workers the Soviet government bad and I do from it the monster... And Dzhansugurov strongly got under influence of the Kazakh nationalists. That made by 'sniper' thus the Soviet power, and workers of the Kazakh 'antelope'. The word isn't present, this – real counterrevolutionary, the Soviet power and Kazakh the working intermediate hostile fire work of Alashordinets.

This book won't give to pupils of any advantage and not only the advantage, causes negative opinion in the pupil, pulls to counterrevolutionary idea. Forms enemy elements in party system as the collection', he wrote. This article exposed I. Zhansugirov like unreliable, casting doubt person, and also 'the enemy of the nation', the opponent of the Soviet Union and the author counterrevolutionary work which propagandise Alashorda's ideology. Those gloomy years this political charge was very strict punishment. Ilyas was on the edge of an abyss. In two weeks, on the night of August 13–14, Ilyas was arrested.

After that case in the press appeared more and more articles accusing all famous writers and young writers who brought the contribution in prosperity of the Kazakh literature in infliction of harm to all Soviet Union and that they cooperate with enemies of the people. Writers also participated in it.

The young writer Kalkaman Abdikadirov wrote about M. Auyezov: 'Passed 5 years since Mukhtar entered in a row the Soviet writers. He was given all help as to the Soviet writer. Mukhtar wrote 3–4 quite good works. And also he started publishing the works of alash-orda's ideology doing harm to the Soviet Union written till this time. He also didn't tell anything about it. In additives to it it is very suspicious, that when old alash-orda's nationalists were detained as agents of fascism, it made nothing and didn't tell to open their secret. In my opinion, Mukhtar has to know their many secrets. Mukhtar had to help to learn about thoughts of the enemy. But Mukhtar doesn't do it'.

After a while this article was republished from Kazakh Literature newspaper editorial office. It was called 'Why the Auyezov's word and business aren't identical?'. 'Passed more than five years as Auyezov came to council and became the Soviet writer. But we don't see any worthy work or Auyezov's work, written in the true Soviet direction. It still goes, repeating that promise which he made everything in 1932: 'test me, I am that person which broke all the communications with

nationalists and ideology of adherents of Bay...'. We can choose only one thing like a good one and in a Soviet ideology from his books since 1932 which is called 'A night tune', and that it was Aueyev's attempt the old tune on the Soviet scene. Plays 'Apple-tree Garden' and 'Tas Tulek' completely are an slandering of life of the Soviet youth, intervention in the truth of the Soviet Union. In this play that Aueyev wrote with implication is clear, accused the Soviet youth and Alash Orda tried to support adherents. It is masking of old commitment of ideology of Bays and nationalism by use of the Soviet work... We can see and understand that Aueyev 'is mistaken' only in some works, but also of all the works accuses the Soviet youth and the public'. It is a sign of that M. Aueyev wasn't discharged of alash-orda and he is thinking about a justification of the Kazakh intellectuals, such as A. Baytursynov, M. Dulatov, Zh. Aymaulytov who were accused of a supporting of alash-orda's ideology and nationalism.

S. Mukanov says that S. Seyfullin 'was mistaken and failed', Mailin and Donentayev in initial years of revolution were mistaken, praising the enemy of the people of alash-orda, 'Mailin's mistake was deeper than Seyfullin's mistake', and 'Sabit Donentayev was mistaken more than Mailin' and all of them came to the Soviet literature. In the conclusion S. Mukanov says that 'The fault of the Mukhtar Aueyev before the Soviet history is heavier than these writers. If to believe his letter, published in 1932, it is possible to understand that it was against a way of Marxism-Leninism and did everything to resist to its prosperity' (Kakishev, 1994).

Every day the accusing and criticising articles were published in newspapers and magazines. And Dikhan Abilev told the names of the Kazakh intellectuals in the articles, speaking, '... The press wasn't completely cleared of malefactors and wreckers'. Also I criticised Aueyev, speaking that 'he strongly was mistaken when published the collection which was called 'In an ancient shadow' and Mukhtar has to correct this error itself'.

I.H. Zhusipbekov showed vigilance and was engaged in affairs of nationalists, saying that '... Recently, using political carelessness of Community of writers, enemies of the nation Sultanbekov and Zhumabayev brought the translations of fiction. Ualiakhmetov, Konyratbayev, Aysarina once participated in works of the management of Community of writers. Bekov and Gataulins were close to literature. These writers did considerable harm to fiction. Therefore is more main than ours a task is opposition and fight against counterrevolutionary Kazakh nationalists'.

Whether being afraid of a cold wind of that time, whether wanted to show the activity or for the unclear reasons, ZhumagaliSain spoke sharply and firmly and in the open accused and exposed the companions 'enemies of the nation'. 'Enemies of the nation, hounds dogs of fascism did much harm not only to economy, culture, but using the hypocrisy and duplicity, wanted to open the wings everywhere. Their gray puppies, such as Togzhanov and Zhansugirov still take places at the front of literature'.

In the second half of 30 years even those noticeable persons who left the trace in the Kazakh literature, endured crisis. If criticised each other on a class and ideological and political look in works earlier, now they started reproaching and accusing each other even if knew that are innocent in anything. To tell the truth, all started caring of the lives. It led to inflating of bad qualities, unscrupulousness, indecision, subservience between people. Repression of 1937 became still a bigger problem. Old clannishness, regionalism, commitment of the patrimonial relations and rivalry rose to a new level. Now there was accusing and pursuing of colleagues. They supported repression and measures of punishment in the press. Today they accused others and for tomorrow became accused. They were afraid to be caught. People thought only of that to survive and they were won by slave mentality. Especially 'slanderers... cared of rescue of the heads. Were afraid to remain without everything and to be accused that at them 'Vigilance hasn't enough. For the sake of good reputation were ready on everything, oppressed honest people, made cry, expelled and brought on execution. Exposing others, wanted to look workers for the good of the people and tried not to lose the positions. Thus saved the lives' (Zaual).

Charge and punishment brought the Kazakh intellectuals into fear. They didn't try to support each other and were afraid to show resistance, were afraid to support the rights accused even if they saw a crime and violence. The academician and historian R. B. Suleymenov wrote that 'The trace of repressions of 30th and 50th is swept up and today. In a consequence inappropriate and ridiculous persecution our intellectuals felt a strong fright which began to pass from father to son'. G. Musrepov thought that '20th and 30th... weren't lungs... if not today, tomorrow, if not tomorrow, the day after tomorrow is banished. Therefore collected 1–2 couples of clean clothes, a towel, socks, the razor, soap, a hairbrush and other accessories in a suitcase and put a suitcase near a door and was looking at the door. Understanding that he would be caught sooner or later, he refused the work which investigators against could use and every day started writing opinions which would help him to solve business to his advantage. Surprisingly one not to inflate any scandal that others didn't translate, distorting data, he wrote some opinions, 'recognitions' in Russian. For example, in the drama 'KyzZhibek' which was printed with Latin letters, on the third page there are such words which he wrote with own hand: 'I ask all, men and women, real and future, i.e. nowadays well and future born if this most stupid thing falls of somebody into hands, don't read it further this page. Are written disgustingly, silly, dully, even unscrupulously!' The author Musrepov' (Kadyr Myrza Ali). The fear to be caught was not only at G. Musrepov, but also at all Kazakh intellectuals.

To tell the truth, in the 30th years when measures of punishment started amplifying, all Kazakh intellectuals including what were known works, were led fear and a panic. All on the first place had one question: 'What to make to survive?'. Thus there were opinions that probably and on the truth they also are 'enemies of the people', the party and People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs can't be mistaken. And probably therefore representatives of the Kazakh intellectuals supported all in Trotsky's charge.

In Moscow in 1937 the court in the matter of 'The anti-Soviet trotskissky Center' was carried out on January 23–30. Were condemned Pyatakov, Sokolnikov, Radek and others and are sentenced to execution. At this time I. Zhansugirov wrote the poem, supporting Pyatakov's execution:

Great, my people court, the face has spoke!

The public with power consoled discovery.

Already was Stalin's shoot my people loved

The especially Pyatakovs face has shot! After a while I. Zhansugirov was accused of 'nationalism and fascism' and arrested.

During courts when 'enemies of the people' were caught, in the press there were many articles supporting this business. The intellectuals which understood all this as a policy of the party, didn't lag behind and were compelled to support this policy. Zh. Zhabayev in the epos 'Indignation' ('Kektiashu') described Trotsky, Zinovyev, Kamenev with the words 'dog, dishonored, a wolf' and finished the epos with words 'Let will be shot!', 'Long live, Stalin'. And to the Stalin People's commissar Ezhov who found and punished 'enemies of the people' then itself fell a victim of the same mechanism of punishment, Zh. Zhabayev devoted the poem:

The flower shine, the fashion correlate town, nature

The gold attention dressing-gown already carried ravine and sleeve.

Will love You whole Ezhov friend,

The Kazakhstan friend old man and child.

This period became the bitter truth of totalitarian system, and also the awful period for the Kazakh intellectuals. Of course we have no purpose to accuse the Kazakh intellectuals which underwent this torture in 1937. To weigh all parties of history and to draw conclusions falls to the share of today. Along with it, each person knowing history will ask a question 'Why so happened?'. We too will join.

References

Beiskulov, T. Zhantallasomir. Almaty: issue Arys, 302.

Fitzpatrick, S. (2002). A reponse to Michael Ellman. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 54(3), 473–476.

Kadyr Myrza Ali. Yirim. Almaty: Atamura, 360.

Kakishev, T. (1994). Shyarmalar. Almaty: Ana tili baspasy. 336. Kakishev, T. Eskermeidi estelik. Almaty, 432.

Kozhakeev, T. Kym kuatizder. Oku kuraly. Almaty, Sanat, 400.

Makhat, D. Kazakh ziyalylyrynynkasireti. Almaty: Sozdik Slovar, 304.

Zaual. Almaty: zhazushy, 272.