



IRSTI19.51.09  
Scientific Article

<https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-7174-2025-151-2-176-196>

## The Ideological Struggle of «Yash Turkistan»: an Alternative Perspective Against Soviet Propaganda (Based on Issues No. 1-13)

U. Saidirakhman<sup>\*1</sup>, G. Akseit<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Shakarim University, Graduate School of Philology, Semey, Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup>L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

(E-mail: <sup>\*1</sup>ushkyn86@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup>gam14031978@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** The function of Yash Turkistan in thwarting Soviet propaganda is examined in this essay. Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, Turkic intellectuals living abroad battled to preserve national consciousness and the aspiration for independence, while the Soviet government used propaganda to silence critics. By developing a counterargument that revealed the harshness of Moscow's rule, they opposed Soviet ideological control. This study analyzes Yash Turkistan's journalistic strategies in opposing Soviet ideology, focusing on its first 13 issues (1929–1930). Using historical-comparative, discourse, and content analysis, it explores how the journal framed Soviet policies as “Red Imperialism” and provided a platform for political awakening. More than an émigré publication, Yash Turkistan functioned as an intellectual platform shaping an alternative historical narrative. Its informational struggle played a key role in preserving national identity. This study examines the efforts of Turkic intellectuals to maintain political consciousness in exile and provides insights into the émigré press's role in opposing Soviet ideological domination by analyzing its resistance tactics.

**Keywords:** Yash Turkistan, Soviet propaganda, émigré press, informational resistance, alternative perspective, Mustafa Shokay.

### Introduction

The émigré press played a significant role in the intellectual opposition to the Soviet state in the first half of the 20th century. These magazines, which operated outside of Soviet Russia, fostered alternative public discourse, critically challenged Bolshevik ideology, and attempted to offset the widespread influence of Soviet propaganda. As anti-Bolshevik sentiment among Russian expatriates increased in the early 1920s, a number of newspapers reflecting a range of ideological viewpoints were founded. One such publication was *Sovremennye Zapiski* (Modern Notes), which functioned as a hub for the larger émigré population. It was later joined by *Obshchee Delo* (Common Cause), which positioned itself as a unifying publication for émigrés of different backgrounds. From 1921 onwards, the *Poslednie Novosti* (Latest News), affiliated

Received: 25.03.2025; approved: 15.04.2025; available online: 28.06.2025

with the left wing of the People's Freedom Party and the Republican-Democratic Association, as well as the monarchist-oriented *Vozrozhdenie (Renaissance)*, further expanded the Russian émigré press landscape [1], [2, 122-125].

Among the Turkic-language émigré periodicals, publications such as *Yeni Türkistan*, *Otly Yurt*, *Bildirish*, *RusInkilabi*, *Amal*, and *Milli Yol* played a significant role. In his research, Professor Kocaoğlu [3, 21-24] was the first to compile a comprehensive list of these newspapers and journals. Each of these publications adhered to its distinct editorial approach while representing the national interests of the Turkic peoples. However, among them, *Yash Turkistan* held a particularly prominent position due to its bold advocacy for the unity and independence of Turkistan [4, 191-192].

Soviet propaganda functioned as a primary tool for strengthening socialist construction and entrenching communist ideology. Rooted in Leninist principles, this propaganda aimed at a fundamental transformation of public consciousness. The Soviet regime interpreted history through a Marxist-Leninist lens, reducing the independence and self-governance rights of national republics to mere rhetorical slogans. In reality, this policy was designed to keep Turkic peoples under Moscow's full control, restricting their political and cultural development [5].

In response, *Yash Turkistan* launched a direct ideological battle against the Soviet information system. The journal encouraged its readers to critically examine the true nature of Soviet propaganda and proposed alternative discursive strategies to counter it.

First, the journal framed Soviet rule in Turkistan as a new form of colonialism. Its authors explicitly labeled the Soviet government as "Red Imperialism," exposing its dominance over the economic and political life of local populations.

Second, *Yash Turkistan* sought to challenge historical distortions by revisiting past events. It disputed the Soviet interpretation of the Alash and Turkistan movements as merely "bourgeois movements," contending that they had strong popular backing.

Third, the publication refuted the Soviet propaganda's "national self-governance" lie. It proved that the so-called national republics were only administrative organizations directly controlled by Moscow and lacked true sovereignty.

In light of this, *Yash Turkistan* developed into more than just a newspaper; it became an essential ideological forum that promoted national awareness, exposed the colonial aspects of Soviet governance, and galvanized political opposition among Turkistan's peoples. The publication, which Mustafa Shokay founded and published, was instrumental in refuting the narratives of the Soviet system, upholding the right of Turkic nations to self-governance, and bringing Turkistan's predicament to the attention of the world.

This study investigates the alternative discourse methods used by the journal and looks at how *Yash Turkistan* resisted Soviet propaganda. Unlike previous research, which often focuses on the historical context of the publication, this study highlights its function as an instrument of informational resistance and publicistic discourse. The research subject is defined accordingly. By focusing on materials published between 1929 and 1930, the study investigates the strategies and methods used by the journal to counter Soviet ideological influence. Thus, the first 13 issues of *Yash Turkistan*, published in 1929-1930, have been selected as the primary research object.

To achieve this objective, the following tasks have been set:

- To describe the ideological foundations and informational mechanisms of Soviet propaganda;
- To identify the discursive strategies employed by *Yash Turkistan* in its resistance against Soviet propaganda;
- To analyze the publication's methods of constructing alternative concepts in opposition to Soviet slogans and ideological formulations;
- To examine the journal's journalistic techniques and rhetorical structure;
- To evaluate the role and significance of *Yash Turkistan* within the émigré press.

The research is based on historical-comparative analysis, discourse analysis, and content analysis. The historical-comparative method allows for a parallel examination of the issues raised in *Yash Turkistan* alongside the policies of the Soviet propaganda system. Discourse analysis helps to scrutinize the publication's ideological stance and counter-strategies against Soviet rule. Meanwhile, content analysis systematically categorizes the journal's materials, identifying key concepts and terminological structures.

Within the scope of this study, the informational strategies employed by *Yash Turkistan* in its struggle against Soviet propaganda are examined in depth. Although earlier studies have examined the publication in relation to Mustafa Shokay's legacy [6, 263-273], [7, 189-203], [8, 105-118], this one focuses on how it shaped a counter-propaganda discourse to Soviet propaganda.

The importance of *Yash Turkistan* in the Turkic émigré movement has been highlighted by international researchers, especially by Tülay Köseoglu [9, 431-443], who conducted a thorough analysis of the journal for her doctoral dissertation [10]. In her monographic research [11], she conducted a detailed analysis of *Yash Turkistan*'s materials. The journal also features research by Çelebi [12] that looks at the Turkistan national struggle through the lens of this publication, as well as pieces by Timur Hocaoglu [3, 25-29] and Tülay Duran [3, 7-11]. Specialized research on the language and historical personalities of *Yash Turkistan* has been carried out by Fatma Açık [13, 23-28], [14, 909-918]. Furthermore, Koç [15, 99-113] has analyzed Soviet Turkistan's indigenization policies through the perspectives of *Yash Turkistan* and *Yeni Türkistan*.

These studies have highlighted the significance of *Yash Turkistan* within the Turkic émigré press and its role in amplifying the voices of Turkic intellectuals striving for independence. Additionally, they have outlined the journal's contribution to shaping political ideas in the pursuit of Turkistan's liberation. However, since all these scholars have examined the publication primarily from a historical perspective, it becomes necessary to analyze *Yash Turkistan* as a journalistic entity to fully comprehend its publicistic discourse. In this regard, the present study takes on particular importance.

The official line of the Soviet Union was significantly refuted by Mustafa Shokay's works and intellectual position. In order to identify the philosophical underpinnings and strategic approach of the journal, this study considers the viewpoints of its major contributors and analyzes their articles.

By delving into the journal's content, this study assesses its contribution to shaping an alternative discourse in opposition to Soviet propaganda. It also highlights the émigré press's wider function as a weapon of political conflict. Further understanding of the mechanisms of informational resistance and the growth of national consciousness among Turkic populations during the 20th century is also provided by the research findings.

In the end, *Yash Turkistan* is notable for being a key work in the political awakening of the Turkistan people. An intellectual legacy that is still important today, it was crucial in maintaining national identity and expressing a different perspective that directly opposed Soviet ideological hegemony. The ideas and issues raised by the journal remain relevant to this day, as confirmed by the study's findings.

## **Research methods**

This study examines the role of *Yash Turkistan* in shaping an alternative perspective against Soviet propaganda. The Soviet leadership aggressively implemented a pervasive propaganda apparatus in the 1920s and 1930s to solidify its rule and stifle opposing viewpoints. In defiance of this, exiled Turkic intellectuals took on the task of opposing Soviet ideological influence in an effort to provide a different viewpoint that upheld their people's right to self-determination and protected national consciousness. In this regard, *Yash Turkistan* became a crucial forum for revealing and evaluating Soviet policy towards the Turkistan people.

The first 13 issues of *Yash Turkistan*, which were released between 1929 and 1930, are the subject of this study. Specifically, it analyzes 54 political articles, 10 literary works, 2 book reviews, and 22 major news reports (including coverage on Turkistan and foreign affairs). These materials form the foundation for assessing the journal's informational strategies and methods in its struggle against Soviet ideological control.

To conduct a comprehensive analysis of the topic, this study seeks to answer the following key questions:

- What were the ideological foundations of Soviet propaganda concerning the peoples of Turkistan?
- What strategies did *Yash Turkistan* employ to counter Soviet propaganda?
- How did the journal refute Soviet ideological doctrines?
- What alternative historical interpretations did the journal's authors propose in response to Soviet policies in Turkistan?
- What impact did *Yash Turkistan*'s resistance to Soviet propaganda yield?

By addressing these research questions, we put forward the central hypothesis that *Yash Turkistan* played a crucial role in awakening the political consciousness of Turkistan's peoples by constructing an alternative discourse to Soviet propaganda and exposing the true nature of colonial policies. Furthermore, we suggest that the journal's content functioned as a tool of intellectual opposition, methodically demolishing Soviet myths and slogans while promoting the right of Turkistan's peoples to self-governance.

The study uses a variety of methodological techniques to support these two research hypotheses. In particular, *Yash Turkistan*'s texts are examined using discourse analysis to pinpoint the main conceptual frameworks and rhetorical devices employed to challenge Soviet ideology. By methodically classifying the journal's main ideas and metaphors, content analysis enables a more thorough comprehension of the alternative ideological tactics it used to counter Soviet propaganda. The ideological differences and underlying narratives of Soviet propaganda materials and those of the émigré press are also contrasted using historical-comparative analysis.

There are three stages to the research. Press documents from the 1920s and 1930s are examined in the first part. The second phase focuses on analyzing the texts of *Yash Turkistan* to determine the structural framework of its alternative discourse opposing Soviet political doctrines. The third phase explores the ideological confrontation between the journal's ideas and Soviet propaganda.

It is crucial to recognize some of this study's shortcomings. The research does not cover the entire historical development of the journal's ideological position because it only looks at issues 1-13 of *Yash Turkistan* from 1929-1930. Furthermore, it is still methodologically difficult to measure and visually evaluate the degree of Soviet propaganda's impact on the Turkistan audience. Nevertheless, this study highlights the wider relevance of the émigré press as an instrument of political opposition and helps to elucidate the role of *Yash Turkistan* in creating an alternative discourse against Soviet propaganda, despite these limitations.

A thorough and interdisciplinary approach is guaranteed by the methodological framework mentioned above, enabling a nuanced examination of the journal's informational tactics and its role in the larger ideological conflict of the time.

## Findings/Discussion

Soviet propaganda was not just a means of shaping public opinion – it was a core ideological instrument designed to maintain the stability of the regime. Unlike in many other political systems, Soviet propaganda had no strict boundaries. The Bolsheviks consolidated control over all channels of influence, merging them into a single, state-controlled ideological apparatus. Schools and mass media were systematically turned into propaganda tools, a process in which the regime achieved considerable success [16, 503]. Propaganda permeated nearly every aspect of life, from literature and the arts to science and education. Even industry and agriculture were drawn into its orbit, ensuring that Soviet ideological narratives shaped not only political discourse but also daily economic activities. Leisure time, too, was not free from state influence, as Soviet propaganda extended into all spheres of life [17, 272].

Scholar Crystal Dome provides a sharp assessment of this reality: *“This resulted in a vast psycho-political system which operated through press, radio, theater, films, local and factory bulletins, conferences, and meetings. In this sense, the entire life of the citizen became the object of propaganda”* [18].

The Soviet Union promoted the establishment of "national republics" in Turkistan as a significant step toward independence. It claimed that the Kazakh, Uzbek, Turkmen, Kyrgyz, and Tajik Autonomous Republics had been given the right to self-government and portrayed their founding as a significant turning point. Under the 1924 and 1936 Constitutions, official rhetoric defended their entry into the Soviet Union as an essential measure to safeguard the interests of the local populace. The Turkic peoples were guaranteed equality and autonomy under this system, according to Soviet leaders.

In reality, however, these republics functioned under Moscow's strict control, with self-government existing only in name. Local leadership remained subordinate to Soviet directives, and key political and economic decisions were made in the Kremlin. Although the Soviet

leadership continued to portray this system as proof of their commitment to national equality; in fact, it was centralized and designed to maintain Moscow's influence over the region [19, 233]. However, these republics' claims of sovereignty were only symbolic in practice, since Moscow still maintained direct control over them.

*Yash Turkistan*, on the other hand, offered an alternative historical perspective that vehemently challenged the Soviet narrative and revealed weaknesses in Soviet history. According to the publication, the so-called national republics were essentially administrative entities completely under the control of Moscow and were only an extension of Soviet ideology. *"The Bolsheviks saw it as a threat when the historical term 'Turkestan Turks' was used in place of regional names like Uzbek, Kazakh, Turkmen, and Kyrgyz,"* according to a 1930 journal article. It strongly disagreed with the idea that these republics constituted genuine self-governance, arguing that their goal was to artificially divide and erode the unity of the Turkic peoples. *With Russian bayonets, they divided our people and artificially labeled each group with the deceptive title of a 'national republic'"* [20, 2-5]. *Yash Turkistan* described this process as a continuation of the Tsarist-era "divide and rule" strategy, emphasizing that Soviet authorities deliberately used the creation of artificial republics to erode national unity.

*Yash Turkistan* went into additional detail about the goals of this program in issues No. 7-8, emphasizing how the Soviet authorities first pretended to promote Pan-Turkism before condemning it as a threat. The information flow presented in the publication corresponds to the model of political and ideological work related to the emancipation of the Indian people, as developed by the renowned scholar V. Lazaretti [21]. An important event was noted in the magazine when the "Congress of Muslim Communist Organizations" convened in Tashkent in 1919 and formally proposed unifying all Turkic peoples under a single "Turk" moniker. As a result of Red Moscow's influence, the congress decided that "all Turkic peoples – Tatars, Bashkirs, Kyrgyz, Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Turkmens, and others – must unite under the banner of the Turkestan Socialist Soviet Republic with the support of Soviet Russia." However, the Bolsheviks later realized that this so-called "Pan-Turkist" movement posed a direct danger to their rule. They then moved swiftly to dismantle the unified Turkestan region by dividing it into multiple "independent" republics [22, 12-21].

The journal's articles consistently framed this division of "national republics" as a deliberate political manipulation aimed at weakening the historical, cultural, and economic ties among the Turkestan peoples. *Yash Turkistan* exposed the policy's underlying purpose with the following assessment: *"Under the shadow of Russia's 'divide and rule' policy, every part of Turkestan was severed from its historical connections to surrounding regions and placed under direct dependency on Moscow. The Bolsheviks tirelessly promoted these actions as great achievements in the struggle for the liberation of Eastern peoples"* [23, 16-20].

Synthesizing these perspectives, *Yash Turkistan* viewed the Soviet policy of establishing "national republics" as a disguised form of Bolshevik colonialism under a new name. While the Bolsheviks initially appeared to support the unity of Turkic peoples, *Yash Turkistan* argued that their true aim was to divide them into multiple political entities, ensuring their direct subordination to Moscow. Although the Soviet government justified these actions with ideological slogans such as "national self-governance" and "national equality," the journal

sought to expose the colonial essence hidden behind these policies. The Soviet authorities claimed to have granted independence to the peoples of Turkistan, yet *Yash Turkistan* refuted this narrative, portraying these so-called republics as administrative structures without genuine political or economic autonomy. It condemned this system as a new form of "Red Imperialism." By presenting a different viewpoint against Soviet control, *Yash Turkistan* established itself as a vital forum for Turkic intellectuals living abroad.

Soviet propaganda brushed aside the Turkistan peoples' 1917 fight for the establishment of the Turkistan Republic and the Alash Autonomy as a purely "bourgeois movement," depriving it of its importance for national independence. These initiatives were depicted by Soviet ideologues as an attempt to reinstate the previous feudal system by Turkistan's intellectual elite. They asserted: "*With Shokay at the helm, Turkistan's capitalist intellectuals sought to re-establish the Kokand Khanate and form a government. They took up arms and rebelled against the Turkistan Republic*" [24]. The Soviet press also justified the 1918 Kokand Massacre, branding it as a necessary measure to suppress a "counterrevolutionary uprising."

However, *Yash Turkistan* actively rejected these Soviet narratives. Mustafa Shokay provided a counterargument, explaining the root causes of the national movement in Turkistan. He recognized two essential elements: first, that Turkistan's citizens were a separate nation from Russians, and second, that Turkistan's economic and national interests were inherently at odds with Russia's. According to Shokay, anyone who recognized and defended these interests was labeled a "Shokayist" by the Soviet regime [25, 5-16].

*Yash Turkistan* exposed Soviet colonial policies in Turkistan not only through its own analyses but also by referencing non-Soviet sources. For instance, the journal cited a statement from *Turkestanskiy Kuryer*, published on September 5, 1917: "*The functions previously carried out by Russian groups in Turkistan during the old Tsarist era have now been transferred to the Soviets of workers, soldiers, and peasants*" [26, 2-6]. This statement clearly reflected the reality that Soviet rule in Turkistan was merely a continuation of colonial governance under a new ideological framework. By publishing such references, *Yash Turkistan* actively countered Soviet propaganda, correcting distorted narratives and reinforcing the historical struggle of the Turkistan peoples through documented evidence.

Mustafa Shokay's use of *Turkestanskiy Kuryer* as a source to expose the colonial nature of Soviet rule in Turkistan was far from coincidental. This argument offers deeper insight into the true nature of Bolshevik governance in the region. The Soviet Union's takeover of Turkistan was more than just a change of regime; it was the continuation of a colonial system under a different name. The Soviet government successfully preserved the imperial domination that the Tsarist government had previously held, despite its socialist rhetoric. The quote from *Turkestanskiy Kuryer* stands as an open acknowledgment of this reality.

Further reinforcing this argument, *Turkestanskiy Kuryer* also published the observations of Yu. "Can the Soviet of Soldiers, Workers, and Peasants' Deputies in Turkistan be considered a truly democratic organization that reflects the will of the broad masses?" Poslavsky asked, questioning whether the Soviet Councils in Turkistan represented the majority of the local population. *The answer can only be one: it cannot.*" He argued that these Soviets were completely detached from the indigenous people of the region, as their membership was composed exclusively of Russian

soldiers, workers, and peasants. This composition, according to Poslavsky, was clear evidence of the colonial nature of Soviet rule in Turkistan. Rather than introducing socialist equality and justice, the Bolsheviks established a new system of governance that prioritized the interests of Russian worker-soldiers over those of the local population.

A similar critique appeared in *Turkestanskiye Vedomosti*. In its issue dated August 8, 1917, the newspaper described Bolshevik policies as follows: *"Bolshevik-Leninist organizations, through all their actions during the revolution, have positioned themselves outside the framework of social democracy as a proletarian class party. Their activities have been limited to promoting expropriation and destruction, inciting discord within the armed forces... harmful to both the people and the working class."*

These accounts demonstrate that even contemporary sources acknowledged that Soviet rule in Turkistan was not an emancipatory project but rather an extension of colonial domination under a new ideological banner. *Yash Turkistan* established itself as a critical voice opposing the Soviet-imposed historical narrative and promoting the actual political and national rights of the Turkistan peoples by drawing attention to such facts.

According to these reports, Soviet policies in Turkistan were created to benefit Russian settlers rather than the native populace. The Soviet administration maintained colonial control under a new ideological framework while marginalizing indigenous communities with the help of the Russian working class. This proves that the Bolshevik government was really a rebranding of the Tsarist one, using new ideological slogans, and was not inherently different from it. Lewis's assertion that "colonial power often shifts and transforms from one form to another" [27] reflects one of the historical realities that characterizes the political situation in Turkistan. *Yash Turkistan* conducted a thorough analysis of the statements published in *Turkestanskiy Kuryer* and *Turkestanskiye Vedomosti*, using them to emphasize that the peoples of Turkistan did not experience true freedom under Soviet administration. Mustafa Shokay's article "How the Bolsheviks Write 'History'" [28, 31-33] is a notable illustration of this criticism. Despite being only 273 words long, this article was very influential in revealing how the Soviets distorted Turkistan's history. Shokay maintained that Soviet authorities purposefully manipulated historical facts and misrepresented events to fit their own narrative by rewriting history through the prism of communist ideology to justify their rule.

To defend its authority, denounced movements it called "bourgeois" or "colonial," and portrayed the Soviet revolution as a natural manifestation of the will of the people, the Soviet leadership deliberately rewrote history. Through this approach, the political movements of the peoples of Turkistan were reframed as counterrevolutionary actions against Soviet power, and their aspirations for self-governance were rejected. *Yash Turkistan* was essential in opposing Soviet historical misinformation and promoting the actual political and national rights of Turkistan's indigenous peoples by dismantling these official myths.

M. Shokay exposed the manipulative tactics of Soviet historiography by using the history of the 1917 Kokand Autonomy as a case study. He argued that Soviet historians not only distorted historical facts but also fabricated entire events, even inventing fictional figures to construct a "manufactured history." Shokay specifically analyzed Soviet historian Alekseenkov's article on the Kokand Autonomy, demonstrating that several of the names listed in it had no basis in reality.



He wrote: *"The Bolshevik 'historian' Alekseenkov claims that eight individuals were members of the Kokand government. However, five of them are entirely his inventions. These fabricated names are: Potilakhov, Miralay (Colonel) Chanyshhev, Zigel, Vadyaev, and Yusup Davidov. None of these individuals were ever part of the government."*

Shokay emphasized that these figures never played a role in the leadership of the Kokand Autonomy and that Soviet historians deliberately introduced them to portray the autonomy as a movement controlled by external forces. He also pointed out another falsehood in Soviet historical accounts – the claim that an individual named Chanyshhev was a leader of the Kokand Autonomy. Shokay refuted this outright, writing: *"There was no such person as Miralay (Colonel) Chanyshhev or anyone else by that name among us. In fact, because of his close ties to the Bolsheviks, I ordered that he not be allowed to enter the government building."* His arguments reveal how Soviet historians manipulated facts, inventing figures to rewrite the history of the Kokand Autonomy in a way that aligned with their ideological objectives.

So, who were the actual leaders of the Turkistan Autonomy (Kokand Autonomy)? Mustafa Shokay addressed this question in another of his writings. He explained that during the IV Extraordinary Regional Congress, which proclaimed the autonomy, a 54-member People's Council was elected, consisting of 36 representatives from Turkistan and 18 from the Russian population. Listing the members of the Autonomous Government, Shokay provided the following names: *"Mukhamedzhan Tynyshbay (engineer, former member of the Russian State Duma), Haditbek Iorgolo Agha (engineer, agronomist), Gubaidolla Khoja, Gabdyrakhman Bek Orazai (lawyer), Gabdizhan Makhmud (Deputy Mayor of Kokand), Mirgadil (Mayor of Janamargulan and Chairman of the National Council of Fergana Province), Nasirkhan (from Namangan), Mustafa Shokayuly (lawyer, Chairman of the Turkistan National Council), and Solomon Hartisfeld (Jewish)"* [29, 6-8].

Shokay's meticulous documentation of the actual leadership of the autonomy stood in stark contrast to Soviet attempts to rewrite history. His efforts exposed the deliberate distortions in Soviet historiography, particularly how fabricated figures were inserted into official narratives to delegitimize the Turkistan movement and present it as an externally influenced endeavor. By implementing these changes, Yash Turkistan was able to preserve the historical authenticity of Turkistan's independence movement while also challenging Soviet propaganda.

The 1917 establishment of the Turkistan Autonomy was one of the first political campaigns in favor of the Turkistan peoples' right to self-governance. The Soviet administration dismissed this movement as a "bourgeois-nationalist rebellion," framing it as a protest against the Soviet revolution. Soviet historians attempted to portray the autonomy as a counterrevolutionary movement rather than as a natural expression of the Turkistan peoples' desire for self-government. The desire of the local populace to govern itself gave rise to the Kokand Autonomy, which was a legal and natural movement. However, Soviet officials classified the event as an armed rebellion against Soviet rule and refused to recognize its popular nature.

This inconsistency in Soviet historiography was brought to light by Mustafa Shokay. Despite its efforts to portray itself as a supporter of "national self-determination," the Soviet leadership also labeled the Turkistan peoples' earnest quest for self-governance as a rebellion. Shokay employed a variety of techniques to expose the inconsistencies in the Soviet narrative and disprove historical inaccuracies. To show how Soviet historians created persons and

misrepresented them as the leaders of the autonomy, he provided particular facts and names. He also demonstrated how the communist government altered history to suit its ideological objectives, exposing the ideological motivations underlying Soviet historiography. Shokay offered an eyewitness narrative supported by verifiable historical facts because he was both a direct participant in the Kokand Autonomy and its second president.

Mustafa Shokay's article *"Большевиктер «тарихты» қалай жазады?" (How the Bolsheviks Write 'History')"* [28, 31-33] stands as a crucial source in uncovering how Soviet historiography manipulated historical narratives to shape public perception. In his work, Shokay exposed the deliberate spread of misinformation, the false narratives propagated by the Soviet press, and the fact that the Kokand Autonomy was, in essence, a genuine grassroots movement. By doing so, he constructed an alternative historical discourse that countered Soviet propaganda and sought to preserve the historical truth of the Turkistan peoples. This article remains a valuable resource for studying historical objectivity and understanding the mechanisms of ideological distortion in historiography.

The article *"Түркістандықтар – бастарын имегендер" (Turkestanis – The Unbowed)*, published in issues No. 3-4 of *Yash Turkistan*, stands as one of the journal's most notable publications. It vehemently denounces the Soviet authorities for feeding foreign communists misleading information about Turkistan. The essay emphasizes how Soviet officials gave the outside world a skewed account of events that did not accurately represent the actual circumstances on the ground. *"These Soviet guests, who are not familiar with our people's language and customs, have spread throughout the world the lies and weak narratives fabricated by Moscow's Bolsheviks and their deceitful agents,"* says *Yash Turkistan*, condemning this deception.

The journal did not merely critique this issue but also actively exposed the biased nature of Soviet propaganda by countering it with alternative foreign sources. It cites American journalist Lindsay Hobson, who described the reality of Soviet rule in Turkistan: *"Turkistan is the heart of Asia and was only conquered by the Russians at the end of the last century... The Uzbeks, Turkmens, and other indigenous people of the region never voluntarily submitted to Russian rule. Now, they are not just under Russian control, but under the domination of Russian Bolsheviks who seek to dismantle their national identity. As a result, their resistance to Russian authority is growing stronger by the day."* By referencing such external perspectives, *Yash Turkistan* reinforced its arguments and strengthened the credibility of its position against the Soviet narrative.

On its pages, *Yash Turkistan* systematically dismantled Soviet historiography's distortions through three main aspects:

1. The Popular Character of the Turkistan Autonomy. The publication underlined that the Turkistan Autonomy was a true grassroots rebellion that involved farmers, peasants, and religious leaders rather than only being an intellectual movement. Soviet propaganda, which attempted to present the autonomy as a bourgeois movement divorced from the people, was clearly refuted by this.

2. The Soviet Union's oppressive policies. The repressive practices of the Soviet administration in Turkistan, including its use of force during the Kokand Massacre, were made public by *Yash Turkistan*. Terms like *"Red Massacre"* and *"Red Terror"* were used in the magazine to describe these acts and highlight the violence committed against the local populace.

3. History was manipulated by the Bolsheviks. Historical events were methodically rewritten by Soviet historians to conform to socialist ideology. This method was made public by the journal, which claimed that its ultimate objective was to stifle the truth and obliterate historical memory.

By means of its research methodology and dependence on external resources, *Yash Turkistan* was essential in refuting Soviet disinformation and maintaining a different historical narrative that faithfully captured the hardships of the Turkistan peoples.

One of *Yash Turkistan*'s most important works in creating a counter-Soviet discourse was the article "Түркістандықтар – бастарын имегендер" (Turkestanis – The Unbowed). It aimed to present the true conditions in Turkistan, refute Soviet propaganda using foreign sources, and advocate for national independence and unity. The article directly called upon the youth of Turkistan to resist colonial oppression and outlined the political, social, and cultural stakes of the Turkistan peoples.

From the perspective of journalism studies, the article carries a strong ideological and propagandistic tone. It was not merely an informational piece but also served as an instrument of mobilization, urging readers to take active steps in the struggle for national liberation. The closing section of the article explicitly calls for national resistance. It implies that the struggle against Soviet control ought to progress beyond ideological disagreement and turn into open warfare. There is a noticeable change from passive protest to active engagement in the phrase, "Destroying the 'Red Fortress' that the Muscovites have built around our homeland is our sacred duty." Additionally, emotionally charged terminology is used in the statement "Let the fire of national freedom burn with strong flames!" to further emphasize the demand for national independence.

*Yash Turkistan* consistently portrayed Soviet rule in Turkistan as a new form of colonialism. The journal's authors referred to this system as "Red Imperialism", framing it as a continuation of Tsarist Russia's colonial policies. Throughout its publications, *Yash Turkistan* denounced the oppressive and exploitative nature of Soviet policies through various rhetorical strategies. One of the most striking linguistic patterns was the frequent use of terms associated with the word "red" to describe the destructive aspects of Soviet rule (see Table 1).

Through this publication and similar writings, *Yash Turkistan* played a critical role in countering Soviet narratives, exposing the colonial nature of Bolshevik policies, and inspiring resistance among the Turkistan peoples.

**Table 1. Soviet Authority Descriptions Using the Term "Red" in Issues No. 1-13 of *Yash Turkistan***

	Phrase	Author	Title of the Material	Journal Issue
1	Red Russian Imperialist, Red Russian Imperialist Commissars	A Turkestan	Патшалық Россия министрік ривошей-нің түркістан мақташылығына көзқарасы" (Tsarist Russia's Minister Krivoshein's View on Turkistan's Cotton Industry)	No. 1
2	Red Russian Atrocities	Altai Noyan	"Советтік Россия "қылмыстан" аулақ" (Soviet Russia is "Free from Crime")	No. 1

3	Red Colonizers	Janai	“Түркістанда жергіліктендіру неден көрініс береді?” (How is Indigenization Reflected in Turkistan?)	No. 2
4	Red Imperialists	Young Turkestani	“Орыс езгісіндегі түркістандықтардың ұлттық әрекеттерінен” (On the National Actions of Turkistanis Under Russian Oppression)	No. 2
5	Moscow’s Red Imperialists	Timuruly	“Түркістанда мектеп мәселесі” (The Issue of Schools in Turkistan)	No. 2
6	The Poisonous Claws of Red Imperialism, Red Imperialism	M. Sh.	“Мақта атырабындағы күрес” (The Struggle in the Cotton Region)	No. 3-4
7	The Oppression of Red Russia	Turkistan Independence Advocate	“Үндістанда” (In India)	No. 3-4
8	The Bloody Bayonet of the Red Army	M. N.	“Қызыл тәшкенттік мырзалар” (The Red Lords of Tashkent)	No. 3-4
9	Red Imperialists	Iirtem	“Бұхарлықтар қайғысы” (The Sorrow of the Bukharans)	No. 3-4
10	Red Russian Imperialists		“Түркістан шайырларынан” (From the Poets of Turkistan)	No. 3-4
11	Russian Red Spears		“17 февраль” (February 17)	No. 5-6
12	Red Russians' Falsehoods, Russian Red Imperialism	N. M.	“Большевиктердің түркістандағы саясатына бір алман назары” (A German Perspective on the Bolsheviks' Policy in Turkistan)	No. 5-6
13	Red Moscow Agents	Mysh	“Сағидолла қасым соты” (The Trial of Sagidolla Qasym)	No. 7-8
14	Russian Red Colonizers	Young Turkestani	“Алман қаламгерінің түркістан әсерлері” (A German Writer's Impressions of Turkistan)	No. 9-10
15	Red Thorny Propaganda Under Our Feet	Iyilter	“Түркістан құрбашыларына” (To the Turkistan Rebel Leaders)	No. 11
16	The Crimson Lies of the Red Devils		“Түркістан хабарлары” (Turkistan News)	No. 11
17	Moscow’s Red Colony, Red Moscow Dictatorship	M. Sh.	“Түркістан партия құрылтайларында” (At the Turkistan Party Congresses)	No. 12
18	Red Bloodthirst, Red Russian Imperialism	Mustafa Shokayuly	“Идеология майданындағы күрес”(The Struggle on the Ideological Front)	No. 13

19	Red Russian Fanatics, Red Russian Imperialism	Timuruly	“Россияның бүгінгі жағдайы жәнәтүр-кістандықтардың міндеті” (The Current State of Russia and the Responsibilities of the Turkistanis)	No. 13
----	---	----------	--	--------

As seen in the table, *Yash Turkistan* systematically employed the term “red” in various negative contexts to describe the colonial nature of Soviet rule. This rhetorical strategy served as a means of publicly denouncing Bolshevik rule. The writers of *Yash Turkistan* purposefully reinterpreted the word “red” as a sign of Soviet oppression, colonialism, and cruel control, in contrast to Soviet propaganda that portrayed it as a symbol of revolution, advancement, and a new age.

In our view, this strategy served multiple purposes. First, phrases such as “Red Imperialism,” “Red Russian Imperialists,” and “The Bloody Bayonet of the Red Army” directly condemned Soviet colonial policies and acts of violence, exposing the true nature of Soviet governance. In this regard, the journal aimed to reveal the reality behind Soviet rule.

Second, by deconstructing the positive connotations of “red” within Soviet rhetoric, the journal’s authors offered an alternative interpretation that exposed the reality of communist rule. The second function of these “red”-based expressions, therefore, was to establish a counter-discourse that directly opposed Soviet propaganda.

Third, we believe that the editorial team of *Yash Turkistan* deliberately used these phrases to evoke an emotional response from readers and strengthen anti-Soviet sentiment. The repeated use of such descriptions intensified the journal’s ideological stance and reinforced its portrayal of the Soviet regime as an oppressive colonial power.

One of *Yash Turkistan*’s core informational strategies was the construction of an alternative discourse that directly challenged Soviet ideological terminology. The journal actively rejected Soviet propaganda terms and replaced them with terminology aligned with national interests. By characterizing Soviet rule with phrases such as “Red Imperialism,” “Red Colonizers,” and “Red Colony,” the journal sought to prove that Soviet policies were simply a continuation of Tsarist Russian colonialism (see Table 2).

This approach was aimed at dismantling the one-sided nature of Soviet discourse and exposing its colonial foundations. Furthermore, *Yash Turkistan* highlighted the contradiction between Soviet slogans promoting “national self-determination” and the reality of a centralized colonial system imposed on Turkistan. Through this alternative framework, the journal effectively countered Soviet claims and reinforced the idea that Soviet governance in Turkistan was an extension of previous imperial domination rather than a system of genuine national autonomy.

**Table 2. Yash Turkistan’s Counter-Discourse Against Soviet Propaganda**

Soviet Political Discourse	Alternative Discourse in Yash Turkistan		Concepts in Yash Turkistan’s Discourse	Function of the Concept in the Publication
----------------------------	---	--	--	--

Proletarian Friendship	"Falseagents" "Deceptive propaganda"		Red Russian Imperialists	Describes the Soviet Union's policy of Russification and economic dominance
			Red Imperialists	
Soviet Rule	"Red Fortress"		Red Colonizers	Demonstrates that Turkistan peoples lost genuine autonomy under Soviet rule
			Russian Red Colonizers	
Socialist Development	"Communist Yoke"		Moscow's Red Colony	Illustrates Turkistan's complete political and economic dependence on Moscow
The Soviet Union as a Liberator	"Russian troops – the enforcers of Moscow's power and law in crushing the Turkistanis"		Red Moscow Dictatorship	Exposes the Soviet Union as an oppressive force rather than a liberator

The alternative discourse terms presented in the table illustrate how *Yash Turkistan* actively rejected the Soviet government's portrayal of the so-called "independence" granted to national republics. The journal's authors viewed this concept as entirely false, arguing that Soviet rule in Turkistan was nothing more than a continuation of Russian imperialism under a new ideological guise.

In addition, *Yash Turkistan* investigated and condemned in detail the brutality and repression of the Bolshevik regime. Strong terms like "The Bloody Bayonet of the Red Army" were employed in the publication to describe Soviet military aggression, even as phrases like "Red Bloodthirst" and "The Atrocities of Red Russia" demonstrated the savagery of Bolshevik authority. Using phrases like "The Crimson Lies of the Red Devils" to illustrate the deceitful nature of Soviet propaganda, the magazine emphasized how manipulative and misleading Soviet ideological discourse was. These rhetorical strategies demonstrate that *Yash Turkistan* saw the Soviet system as more than just a political adversary; it was an existential threat to the Turkistan peoples. The publication highlighted the Soviet Union's larger attempt to eradicate the region's political, cultural, and economic independence as well as the devastation of the local political elite through various expressions.

*Yash Turkistan* publicly discussed the disastrous effects of Soviet economic policy on the Turkistan region in addition to its political criticisms. The article described how Moscow used Turkistan's natural riches to turn the country into a supply of raw materials for the Soviet economy. This economic servitude was summed up in phrases like "The Yoke of Red Russia," which portrayed the region's complete economic dependence on Moscow, and "The Poisonous Claws of Red Imperialism," which emphasized how Soviet policies stifled economic advancement in Turkistan.

By employing these rhetorical techniques, *Yash Turkistan* sought to reveal the true nature of Soviet authority and educate its audience about the terrible realities imposed on the Turkistan

peoples. These language strategies were not just polemical, but also essential to the journal's broader effort to create a counter-narrative that directly challenged Soviet propaganda and supported the cause of national liberation.

## Conclusion

This study looked at the journal's function in revealing Soviet policies regarding the Turkistan peoples, the ideological underpinnings of Soviet propaganda, and the tactics and discursive techniques used by *Yash Turkistan* to combat it. According to this perspective, *Yash Turkistan* was one of the most important émigré newspapers that aggressively supported the idea of national independence while simultaneously exposing the colonial aspect of Soviet administration.

A number of important conclusions can be made in light of the research findings: First, the examples from *Yash Turkistan* analyzed in this study allow us to identify the following characteristics of Soviet propaganda and discourse:

- The Soviet government selectively presented historical events, concealing those that contradicted its ideological narrative while glorifying episodes that aligned with its political agenda.

- Soviet historiography created new narratives that suited Soviet ideological goals by purposefully fabricating historical characters and events to influence records.

- One version of history was enforced by the Soviet government, which created an official version that stifled other viewpoints.

- To defend Soviet power, the national liberation efforts of the Turkistan peoples were purposefully distorted as "*bourgeois uprisings*" or "*counterrevolutionary rebellions*."

Second, the study revealed that *Yash Turkistan* employed several key informational strategies to counter Soviet propaganda:

- The newspaper exposed the Soviet government's actual colonial goals and the harsh character of Soviet administration in Turkistan by portraying it as "*Red Imperialism*."

- It posed a direct challenge to Soviet historiography, which characterized the Kokand Autonomy as a "*bourgeois movement*," rather than as the rightful result of the national liberation fight of the Turkistan people. To refute Soviet lies, the publication aggressively reinterpreted historical events.

- *Yash Turkistan* constructed an alternative discourse by offering counter-definitions to Soviet ideological concepts, particularly exposing the falsehood behind the slogan of "*national self-determination*". The journal tried to reframe ideological terminology to better serve the nation's interests.

Through the frequent use of the word "red" in derogatory settings, such as "Red Imperialism," "Red Oppressors," and "The Bloodstained Red Army," the publication aimed to create a counter-discourse and undermine Soviet propaganda. This rhetorical strategy sought to arouse readers' emotions, reveal the colonial character of Soviet rule, and call into question the validity of communist ideology.

Third, *Yash Turkistan* employed powerful journalistic and rhetorical tools to resist Soviet ideological influence:

- By methodically dissecting official Soviet slogans and storylines, the publication extensively employed rhetorical techniques to reveal the fallacy of Soviet propaganda.
- The fundamental contradictions and inconsistencies of Soviet political institutions and ideological frameworks were exposed through critical analysis.
- The publication proved that Soviet policies in Turkistan were a clear continuation of colonial rule by Tsarist Russia by using historical facts.
- Yash Turkistan's distinct approach represents a unique discursive model in the struggle against Soviet propaganda. In addition to providing facts, the journal served as an ideological tool that stoked the Turkistan peoples' desire for independence and preserved their historical consciousness.

Fourth, this study showed how important émigré journalism was in thwarting Soviet propaganda. In addition to being a source of information, Yash Turkistan was a political forum that supported independence and preserved national identity. The ideas put forward by Mustafa Shokay and the émigré intellectuals remained relevant not only in the first half of the 20th century but also in later periods.

Fifth, the study's conclusions advance our knowledge of Soviet information policy during the 20th century and the potential for resistance. This study also establishes the foundation for future research on the function of émigré journalism and how it affects ideological resistance. Comparative analyses of *Yash Turkistan* and other émigré magazines, including *Yeni Turkistan*, could be useful for future research in order to offer a more comprehensive viewpoint on the fight against Soviet propaganda.

To sum up, *Yash Turkistan* was crucial in forming the Turkistan peoples' political consciousness. It acted as an intellectual and ideological platform supporting Turkistan's political independence and offered an alternative viewpoint to Soviet propaganda. The content of the journal demonstrates that it was not merely a medium for disseminating information but also a spiritual foundation for the national liberation movement. Despite distortions in Soviet historiography, the ideas promoted by the journal remain relevant today.

This study contributes to a deeper understanding of the information struggle between the émigré press and Soviet authorities, offering a reassessment of this critical period in Turkistan's history.

This study was conducted within the framework of the scientific project of the grant funding of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan, AP25796077 «The role of the Kazakh emigration press in the formation of intellectual discourse».

#### **The contribution of the authors.**

**Akseit G.M.** – coordinator of the research group, participant administration.

**Saidirahman U.** – literature review, organization and structuring of the material, text editing, correspondence with the editorial office.



### Әдебиеттер тізімі

1. Веред Ю.Т. Журналисты и литературные деятели как участники и посредники межкультурного диалога эмигрантской России и Франции в 1920-х гг. Вестник Московского университета. Серия Журналистика. – 2019. – №4. – С.126–143. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30547/vestnik.journ.4.2019.126143>
2. Кутаренкова Т.С. Русская периодическая печать во Франции в 1920-х гг.: Типология и проблемы развития. Вестник РГГУ. Серия: История. Филология. Культурология. Востоковедение. – 2012. – №13(93). – С.117–129
3. Kocaoğlu T., Duran T. Yaş Türkistan: Türkistan milli istiklal fikrige hizmet edüci aylık mecmua. – İstanbul: Ayaz Tahir Türkistan İdil Ural Vakfı, 1997. – Vol. 1, No.1–13, 1929–1930
4. Karasar H.A. The early Turkestan emigre struggle and Turkestanism: Nation-imagining in emigration: 1925–1940. Bilig. – 2016. – №76. – P. 179–204
5. Martin T. The affirmative action empire: Nations and nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939. – Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2017. – 528 p.
6. Қара Ә. Мұстафа Шоқай: Өмірі, шығармашылығы, күресі. – Алматы: Арыс, 2004. – 320 б.
7. Қыдырәлі Д.Қ. Мұстафа. – Астана: Деловой мир Астана, 2012. – 280 б.
8. Садыкова Б.И. Мустафа Чокай в эмиграции. – Алматы: Мектеп, 2009. – 240 с.
9. Köseoğlu T. Hariç'te Türkistan Millî Mücadelesinin Sesi: Yaş Türkistan Dergisi (1929-1939). Journal of Turkish Research Institute. – 2019. – №65. – P. 431–443. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14222/Turkiyat3947>
10. Köseoğlu T. Sovyetler'in Türkistan'ı dönüştürme siyasetine muhalefet: Yaş Türkistan dergisi, 1929-1939.– Marmara Üniversitesi, Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, Türk Tarihi Ana Bilim Dalı, Genel Türk Tarihi Bilim Dalı. – doktora tezi.– 2014. – 340 с.
11. Köseoğlu T. Sovyetler'inTürkistan'ı dönüştürme politikasına muhalefet: Yaş Türkistan Dergisi (1929-1939). – Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2020. – 350 p.
12. Çelebi E. Türkistan millî mücadelesi: Yaş Türkistan dergisine göre. – İstanbul: Hiperlink, 2018. – 298 p.
13. Açıк F. Yaş Türkistan dergisi'nde dil meseleleri. Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi. – 2006. – №22. – P. 23–38
14. Açıк F. Nevai şahsında Sovyet bakış açısının Yaş Türkistan Dergisi'nde eleştirisi. AÜ Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi. – 2009. – №39. – P. 909–918
15. Koç K. Yeni ve Yaş Türkistan dergileri ışığında sovyetlerin Türkistan'da uyguladığı yerlileştirme politikaları. Asya Araştırmaları Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. – 2023. – №7(Cumhuriyet'in 100. Yılına Armağan Özel Sayısı). – P. 99–113. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58640/asyar.1411071>
16. Mikheyev D. The Soviet Mentality. Political Psychology. – 1987. – Vol. 8, №4. – P. 491–523. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3790919>
17. Domenach J.-M. Leninist Propaganda // The Public Opinion Quarterly. – 1951. – Vol. 15, №2. – P. 265–273. – URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2746168>
18. Dome C. A Timid Flock: Investigating Propaganda Under Stalin. 18th Annual REECAS-NW Conference, Evergreen State College, Washington. – 2012. – [Электронныйресурс]. – URL: [https://jsis.washington.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2016/05/dome\\_REECASNW.pdf](https://jsis.washington.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2016/05/dome_REECASNW.pdf)
19. Stern B.J. Soviet policy on national minorities. American Sociological Review. – 1944. – Vol. 9, №3. – P. 229–235. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2086074>

20. 17 февраль // Яш Түркістан. – 1930. – №5–6. – Р. 2–5
21. Lazzaretti V. The afterlives of repatriation: heritage, emancipation and violence in Hindu nationalist India. International Journal of Heritage Studies. – 2025. – Vol. 1. – P. 1–26. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2025.2496881>.
22. Мыш. Сағидолла Қасым соты. Яш Түркістан. – 1930. – № 7–8. – Р. 12–21
23. Н.М. Большевиктердің Түркістандағы саясатына бір алман назары. Яш Түркістан. – 1930. – № 5–6. – Р. 16–20
24. Еңбекші қазақ. – 1930. – 12 қыркүйек.
25. Шоқайұлы М. Түркістан лениншілдеріне жауап. Яш Түркістан. – 1930. – №5–6. – Р. 5–16
26. Он үш жыл. Яш Түркістан. – 1930. – №12. – Р. 2–6
27. Lewis S.L. Decolonising the history of internationalism: transnational activism across the South. Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. – 2024. – Vol. 2. – P. 345–369. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0080440123000233>.
28. Шоқайұлы М. Большевиктер «тарихты» қалай жазады? Яш Түркістан. – 1930. – №3–4. – Р. 31–33
29. Тарихи еске алулар. Яш Түркістан. – 1930. – №13. – Р. 6–8

**Ұ. Сәйдірахман<sup>1</sup>, Ғ. Ақсейіт<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*«Шәкәрім университеті» КЕАҚ, Филология жоғары мектебі, Семей, Қазақстан*

<sup>2</sup>*Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан*

### **«Яш Түркістан» журналының идеологиялық күресі: кеңестік насихатқа қарсы балама көзқарас (1-13 сандары материалдары негізінде)**

**Аңдатпа.** Мақалада «Яш Түркістан» журналының кеңестік насихатқа қарсы балама пікір қалыптастырудағы орны қарастырылады. XX ғасырдың 1920-30 жылдары кеңес билігі өз идеологиясын орнықтыру үшін пәрменді үгіт-насихат жүргізді. Осы кезеңде эмиграцияға кеткен түркі зиялылары ұлттық сананы сақтау әрі тәуелсіздік идеясын өшірмеу үшін кеңес билігінің тоталитарлы ақпараттық ықпалына балама көзқарас ұсынды. Зерттеу «Яш Түркістанның» кеңестік үгіт-насихатқа қарсы қандай ақпараттық стратегиялар қолданғанын анықтай отырып, оның публицистикалық әдістерін талдауды, сол арқылы «Яш Түркістан» журналының тарихи балама көзқарас қалыптастырудағы маңызын бағалауды мақсат етеді. Журналдың 1929-1930 жылғы алғашқы 13 нөмірі негізінде басылымның кеңес билігіне қарсы жүргізген ақпараттық күресі зерттелді. Мақалада талдау әдісі: атап айтқанда, тарихи-салыстырмалы талдау, дискурсивті талдау және контент-талдау әдістері қолданылды. Кеңестік насихаттың Түркістан халықтарына қатысты идеологиялық ұстанымдары зерделеніп, «Яш Түркістан» журналының оған қарсы ұстанған стратегиялары жүйеленді. Басылым кеңес үкіметінің отаршылдық саясатын «қызыл империализм» деп атап, оның Түркістан халқына жүргізген саясатын әшкерелеуге тырысты. «Яш Түркістан» тек эмиграциялық басылым ғана емес, кеңестік насихатқа қарсы балама дискурс қалыптастырған интеллектуалды платформа ретінде ерекшеленеді. Зерттеу нәтижелері ұлттық бірегейлікті сақтау жолындағы ақпараттық күрестің маңызын айқындайды.

Бұл зерттеу эмиграциялық журналистиканың кеңес билігімен ақпараттық күресін тереңірек түсінуге көмектеседі. Сондай-ақ XX ғасырдағы түркі халықтарының саяси санасының қалыптасу үдерісін жаңаша пайымдауға жол ашады.

**Түйін сөздер:** «Яш Түркістан», кеңестік насихат, эмиграциялық баспасөз, ақпараттық күрес, балама көзқарас, Мұстафа Шоқай.

**У. Сайдирахман<sup>1</sup>, Г. Акseit<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>НАО «Университет Шакарима», Высшая школа филологии, Семей, Казахстан

<sup>2</sup>Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан

### **Идеологическая борьба журнала «Яш Туркестан»: альтернативный взгляд против советской пропаганды (на основе материалов в номерах 1-13)**

**Аннотация.** В статье рассматривается роль журнала «Яш Түркістан» в формировании альтернативного мнения в противовес советской пропаганде. В 1920-1930-е годы XX века советская власть активно продвигала свою идеологию посредством агитационно-пропагандистской кампании. В этот период представители тюркской интеллигенции, оказавшиеся в эмиграции, стремились сохранить национальное самосознание и не дать угаснуть идее независимости, предлагая альтернативную точку зрения на фоне информационного воздействия советской власти. В исследовании ставится цель определить, какие стратегии использовал «Яш Түркістан» против пропаганды, проанализировать его публицистические методы и оценить значение журнала в формировании альтернативного взгляда. Анализ борьбы издания с властью проведен на основе первых 13 номеров журнала, вышедших в 1929-1930 годах. В статье применены различные методы, включая историко-сравнительный, дискурсивный и контент-анализ. Рассмотрены идеологические установки пропаганды в отношении народов Туркестана, а также систематизированы стратегии, использованные журналом в ответ. Издание критиковало колониальную политику, называя ее «красным империализмом», и стремилось разоблачить политику, проводимую в отношении народов Туркестана. «Яш Түркістан» выступал не просто как эмигрантское издание, но как интеллектуальная платформа, сформировавшая альтернативный дискурс. Результаты исследования подчеркивают значимость борьбы в сохранении национальной идентичности. Данный анализ способствует пониманию противостояния эмигрантской журналистики советской власти, а также открывает новые перспективы в осмыслении процесса формирования политического сознания тюркских народов XX века.

**Ключевые слова:** «Яш Туркестан», советская пропаганда, эмиграционная пресса, информационная борьба, альтернативный взгляд, Мустафа Шокай.

### **References**

1. Vered Y.T. Zhurnalisty i literaturnye deyateli kak uchastniki i posredniki mezh kul'turnogo dialoga emigrantskoi Rossii i Frantsii v 1920-kh gg. [Journalists and Literary Figures as Participants and Mediators of the Intercultural Dialogue of Emigrant Russia and France in the 1920s] // [Bulletin

of Moscow University. Series Journalism]. 4. 126–143(2019). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30547/vestnik.journ.4.2019.126143> [in Russian]

2. Kutarenkova T.S. Russkaya periodicheskaya pechat' vo Frantsii v 1920-kh gg.: Tipologiya i problem razvitiya [Russian Periodical Press in France in the 1920s: Typology and Development Issues] // [Bulletin of the Russian State University for the Humanities. Series: History. Philology. Cultural Studies. Oriental Studies]. 13(93). 117–129 (2012) [in Russian]

3. Kocaoğlu T. Yaş Türkistan'ın Türkistan Basın Tarihindeki Yeri [The Place of Yaş Türkistan in the History of Turkistan Press] // YaşTürkistan. 1. 1929–1930(1997) [in Turkish]

4. Karasar H.A. The early Turkestan emigre struggle and Turkestanism: Nation-imagining in emigration: 1925–1940 // Bilig. 76. 179–204(2016) [in English]

5. Martin T. The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923-1939. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2017. 528 p.) [in English]

6. Qara A. Mustafa Shokay: Omiri, shyğarmashylygy, küresi [Mustafa Shokay: Life, Works, and Struggle]. (Almaty: Arys, 2004. 320 p.) [in Kazakh]

7. Qydyräli, D.Q. Mustafa. (Astana: Delovoy Mir Astana, 2012. 280 p.) [in Kazakh]

8. Sadykova B.I. Mustafa Chokay v emigratsii [Mustafa Chokay in Emigration]. (Almaty: Mektep, 2009. 240 p.) [in Russian]

9. Köseoğlu T. Hariç'teTürkistan Millî Mücadelesinin Sesi: Yaş Türkistan Dergisi (1929 –1939) [The Voice of the Turkistan National Struggle Abroad: The Yaş Türkistan Journal (1929 –1939)] // Journal of Turkish Research Institute. 65. 431–443(2019). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14222/Turkiyat3947> [in Turkish]

10. Köseoğlu T. Sovyetler'in Türkistan'I dönüştürmesiye setine muhalefet: Yaş Türkistan dergisi, 1929–1939 [Resistance to the Soviet transformation of Turkestan: Yash Turkestan, 1929–1939]. [Marmara University, Türkiyat Research Institute, Türk Tarihi Ana Bilim Dalı, Genel Türk Tarihi Bilim Dalı. - Doctoral thesis]. (İstanbul, 2014. 340 p.) [in Turkish]

11. Köseoğlu T. Sovyetler'in Türkistan'ı dönüştürme politikasına muhalefet: Yaş Türkistan Dergisi (1929–1939) [Opposition to the Soviet Policy of Transforming Turkestan: The Yaş Türkistan Journal (1929–1939)]. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2020. 350 p.) [in Turkish]

12. Çelebi E. Türkistan millîmücadelesi: Yaş Türkistan dergisine göre [The National Struggle of Turkistan: According to Yaş Türkistan Journal]. (İstanbul: Hiperlink, 2018. 298 p.) [in Turkish]

13. Açık F. Yaş Türkistan dergisi'nde dil meseleleri [Language Issues in the Yaş Türkistan Journal] // [Turkish World Language and Literature Journal]. 22. 23–38(2006) [in Turkish]

14. Açık F. Nevaişahsında Sovyet bakış açısınınYaşTürkistan Dergisi'nde eleştirisi [The Soviet Perspective on Navoi Criticized in the YaşTürkistan Journal] // [AU Turkish Studies Institute Journal]. 39. 909–918(2009) [in Turkish]

15. Koç K. Yenive Yaş Türkistan dergileri ışığında Sovyetlerin Türkistan'da uyguladığı yerlileştirme politikaları [The Indigenization Policies Implemented by the Soviets in Turkistan in the Light of Yeni and Yaş Türkistan Journals]. [International Journal of Social Sciences of Asian Studies]. 7. 99–113(2023), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58640/asyar.1411071> [in Turkish]

16. Mikheyev D. The Soviet Mentality // Political Psychology. Vol. 8. 4.523(1987). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3790919>

17. Domenach J. M. Leninist Propaganda // The Public Opinion Quarterly. Vol. 15. 2. 265–273(1951) Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2746168> (accessed at: 12. 12. 2024)

18. Dome C. A Timid Flock: Investigating Propaganda Under Stalin // 18th Annual REECAS-NW Conference, Evergreen State College, Washington. – 2012. Available at: [https://jsis.washington.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2016/05/dome\\_REECASNW.pdf](https://jsis.washington.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2016/05/dome_REECASNW.pdf) (accessed at: 14. 12. 2024) [in English]
19. Stern B. J. Soviet Policy on National Minorities // American Sociological Review. 9. 229–235(1944). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2086074>
20. 17 fevral'. [February 17] // Yash Turkistan. 5–6. 2–5(1930) [in Kazakh]
21. Lazzaretti V. The afterlives of repatriation: heritage, emancipation and violence in Hindu nationalist India // International Journal of Heritage Studies. 1. 1–26(2025). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2025.2496881>
22. Mysh. Sagidolla Qasym soty [The Trial of Sagidolla Qasym] // Yash Turkistan. 7–8. 12–21(1930) [in Kazakh]
23. N.M. Bolshevikterdiń Turkistandaghy sayasatyna bir alman nazary [A German Perspective on Bolshevik Policies in Turkistan] // Yash Turkistan. 5–6. 16–20(1930). [in Kazakh]
24. Eńbekshi qazaq. 12 qyrkúiek. (1930) [in Kazakh]
25. Shokayuly M. Turkistan leninshilderine zhauap [Response to Leninists of Turkistan] // Yash Turkistan. 5–6. 5–16 (1930) [in Kazakh]
26. On üshzhyl [Thirteen Years] // Yash Turkistan. 12. 2–6(1930) [in Kazakh]
27. Lewis S.L. Decolonising the history of internationalism: transnational activism across the South // Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. 2. 345–369(2024). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0080440123000233>
28. Shokayuly M. Bolshevikter “tarihty” qalayjazady? [How Do the Bolsheviks Write "History"?] // Yash Turkistan. 3–4. 31–33(1930) [in Kazakh]
29. Tarihieske alular [Historical Memoirs] // Yash Turkistan. 13. 6–8(1930) [in Kazakh]

#### Information about the authors:

**Сәйдірахман Ұ.** – әлеуметтік ғылымдар магистрі, «Шәкәрім университеті» КЕАҚ, Филология жоғары мектебі, Семей, Қазақстан

**Ақсейіт Ғ.М.** – филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, баспасөз және баспа ісі кафедрасының аға оқытушысы, Астана, Қазақстан

#### Сведения об авторах:

**Сайдирахман У.** – магистр социальных наук, НАО «Университет Шакарима», Высшая школа филологии, Семей, Казахстан

**Аксеит Г.М.** – кандидат филологических наук, старший преподаватель кафедры печати и издательского дела, Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан

#### Information about the authors:

**Saidirakhman U.** – Master of Social Sciences, Shakarim University, Graduate School of Philology, Semey, Kazakhstan

**Akseit G.M.** – candidate of philological sciences, senior lecturer, department of printing and publishing, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan