UDC 130.2

G. BOLGAUOVA

S. Amanzholov East Kazakhstan State University, Ust-Kamenogorsk, Kazakhstan

NATIONAL AND CULTURAL IDENTITY IN KAZAKHSTAN:
BETWEEN TRADITION, MODERNIZATION AND THE CONSUMER SOCIETY

In the article we have considered the culturological problems of national and cultural identity in modern Kazakhstan at different levels of social consciousness. The main tendencies of identity shaping: archaisation, search of integrity, neotraditionalism. Preconditions and consequences of the problem were analyzed

Keywords: cultural identity, national identity, archaisation, neotraditionalism, modernization.

ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ҰЛТТЫҚ ЖӘНЕ МӘДЕНИ СӘЙКЕСТІЛІК:
ДӘСТҮР, ЖАҢҒЫРУ ЖӘНЕ ТҰТЫНУШЫЛЫҚ ҚОҒАМЫ АРАСЫНДА

Мақалада қоғамдық сананың әртүрлі деңгейдегі ұлттық және мәдени сәйкестіліктің мәдениеттанулық мәселелері қарастырылған. Сәйкестілік қалыптастыру негізгі үрдістер: архаизация, тұтастықты іздеу, неодәстүршілдік. Мәселенің алғышарттары мен салдары талданған.

Түйін сөздер: мәдени сәйкестілік, ұлттық сәйкестілік, архаизация, неодәстүршіл-дік, жаңғыру.

НАЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ И КУЛЬТУРНАЯ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТЬ В КАЗАХСТАНЕ:
МЕЖДУ ТРАДИЦИЕЙ, МОДЕРНИЗАЦИЕЙ И ОБЩЕСТВОМ ПОТРЕБЛЕНИЯ

В статье рассмотрены культурологические проблемы национальной и культурной идентичности в современном Казахстане на разных уровнях общественного сознания. Основные тенденции формирования идентичности: архаизация, поиск целостности, неотрадиционализм. Проанализированы предпосылки и последствия проблемы.

Ключевые слова: культурная идентичность, национальная идентичность, архаизация, неотрадиционализм, модернизация.

National and cultural identity in this article explored from the culturological positions as a result of group identification, as a group identity. National and cultural

identity in modern Kazakhstan society is problematic and controversial. There are a number of historical, objective factors and prerequisites this problem.

The "skeleton" of traditional Kazakh society, that ensured combination of all its parts into an organic unity, was the system of genealogical kinship. It pervaded all levels of the social structure was closed, resistant, impenetrable from the outside. The vertical stratification was weak despite the presence in traditional Kazakh society of a complex estate stratification, differentiation on open and closed "privileged corporations" – "ak suyek and kara suyek, as well as presence of inon-integrated in the main genealogical structure classes – the Tore, the Khozha and the Tolengit. In our opinion, these units probably can be attributed to "introduced" from the outside, assimilated in the nomadic environment social categories (settled societies are characterized by rigid stratification). Constraints and subordination (hierarchy) stemmed from the relations of kinship, not from the attitude of ownership.

So, the original, or first, level of structure in the traditional Kazakh society based on the Patriarchal tradition of blood-kinship. It includes families and clans consolidated on the basis of socio-economic nature. The main form of power is the Council of Elders, and the ideology is the kinship. Kinship relations of the Kazakhs in addition to the patrilineal principle include matrilineal filiation and kinship through marriage.

The second level of the social structure is based on the genealogical community large associations: Taypa (tribe) - tribal alliance – Zhuz. Consolidation occurred on the basis of territorial, administrative and political factors. The form of government at this level was made by the supreme body of the Institute of biy – the Council of biys, an ideology was the common origin of clans and tribes ("Shezhire"). This turn to the universality of the spiritual-ideological orientation led to the generation of more complex, extensive social organizations.

Thus, zhuzes become a step on the way towards integration in a nomadic society through sub-ethnic contacts. There is a real and holistic framework for social and cultural identity, concerted action between members of a single social organism, a common means of relations (language), symbols and values, and stereotypes.

Tribes, tribal enterprises, zhuzes are an improved forms of self-regulation mechanisms of the micro-level functioning in society as a whole. So, if the tasks of the segments of the first level mainly were solving socio-economic issues, the clan groups of the second macro-level were carried out predominantly socio-political functions are concentrated in the traditional Kazakh society is mainly around the administrative-territorial issues.

Thus so-called clan-zhuz structure was formed. It reflected the worldview, and the nature of mentality of the Kazakh society and became the base of identification. The Russian Empire didn't try to change it, unlike the Soviet state, which is actively engaged in nation building.

Began in the society of the late XIX – early XX centuries, during the Kazakh Enlightenment, the discourse of national self-determination of Kazakhs, was interrupted by the end of 30-ies. The formation of national identity exclusively carried out by the Soviet government under a clearly defined cultural and national policy. Ethnicity not denied, but is considered as something secondary. The main and the highest community was proclaimed the Soviet people, the main value was an internationalism. This has contributed to the success of modernization, but in the socio-cultural stratification the status of values of ethnicity was lower than the "soviet". Clan relations was declared a relic of the past, the Kazakhs began to involve in structure of the Soviet ethno-political community with the help of the education system and the party system. Part of the population lost its ethnic identity. This caused the discontent of the representatives of almost all ethnic groups, particularly the intelligentsia. Its representatives pointed out that the only area of preserving national traditions and identity to a greater or lesser extent, remained a village.

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the subsequent processes have shown that the constructivist efforts of the state are not able to form new communities of people and strong culture, the process of cultural identitification can be controlled via social engineering only partially.

After independence, Kazakh society has faced a number of challenges. The transition to capitalism has led not only to a complete transformation of the economy, but also to profound changes in the social structure and stratification. The process of social differentiation has affected all dimensions of social structure, including ethnic and social. The specificity of Kazakhstan is that cultural borders are not between ethnic and between language groups.

Kazakhstan has started the socio-economic transformation as a fairly egalitarian society, however, it was quickly transformed into a highly polarized and stratified society.Whole social groups disappered, new ones emerged. Emigration of Russian-speaking population and repatriation of Kazakhs from China, Mongolia and other Central Asian countries greatly changed social and cultural landscape. Political system was entirely transformed. These processes and accompanying large-scale socio-economic crisis, inevitably led to the marginalization of large segments of the population. The intensification of internal migration processes and forced urbanization also contributed to the marginalization, and it always leads to an identity crisis. On the other hand, the attainment of political sovereignty, entry into the system of international relationships requires from the representatives of the ruling elite an understanding the uniqueness of Kazakh society and culture and ability to present it to the world. And the fall of the "iron curtain" and direct confrontation with globalization inevitably led to a culture shock and contributed to the realization of the fragility of their own culture among the ordinary members of society.

Important concept of cultural marginality describes the situation and characteristics of vital activity of individuals, social groups, attitudes, values, behaviors which are simultaneously correlated with a variety of cultural systems. The objective conditions for the formation of cultural marginality are the processes of transformation of the social system, the intensification of social movements in society, to promote intercultural interactions. Marginality is not so much the exception as the norm the existence of cultural systems.

The process of interaction of cultures in Kazakhstan is based primarily on the values and functioning mechanisms of the traditional culture.

Weak structure, the unevenness and contradictions of Kazakhstan's socio-cultural layer that associated with "Soviet" rationalism and at the same time with tradition, this "duality" is, today, defines the marginal status of the culture of the region.

The processes taking place in Kazakhstan now, come into sharp conflict with the values of traditional society. Cultural globalization puts into question the very idea of national development, thereby causing a local reaction, in particular, the intensification of traditionalist sentiment in Kazakhstan.

Thus, by the beginning of the XXI century Kazakh society has changed so much that it requires a new level of identity. A reflection of this problem can be found at all levels of public consciousness – theoretical, everyday, ideological.

We can see a discussion in social networks, the media, at family events and friendly gatherings - discussion about Kazakh traditions and being kazakh. We can consider it as a reflection of the process of searching identity in everyday consciousness, Despite the fact that these disputes often sound and look extremely emotional and irrational, these battles show the relevance of this problem for ordinary members of the Kazakhstan society. This discourse is necessary, it creates the possibility of dialogue between representatives of different social and cultural communities, opposes ghettoization and marginalization.

The main trends in this natural search for identity, we believe the pursuit of integrity, archaization and neotraditionalism.

Archaisation, by definition of A.S. Akhiezer is a "community response to the crisis through a return to old ideas, proven in past crises, ...attempt to return to pre-state forms of activity" [1]. One of the manifestations of archaism is active creating of myths. Clash of archaisation with the desire to reform leads to a split society. Conditions for the domination of archaistic culture is the lack of dialogue in society.

Archaisation in itself is only an indicator of the depth of the crisis, but potentially carries great risks. The main manifestation of archaisation in our society we believe a revival of clan and tribal relations as a culture values. Studies of the KazISS demon-

strate us how topical is zhuz identity. Only 11.1% of Kazakh respondents do not know about zhuz or do not consider themselves to zhuz [2]. 2/3 of the Kazakh respondents know seven generations of his ancestors. At the same time appears the dual dimension of inter-Kazakh identity, since only 0.9% of the Kazakh respondents primarily feel like the representatives of the zhuz and 4.1% feel like the representatives of the clan. But 56.7% of the respondents identify themselves with the people of Kazakhstan, citizens of the Republic of Kazakhstan and 32.9% – with representatives of their nationality [2]. When choosing business partners, 44.6% of respondents give preference to members of clan. On this basis it can be concluded that at the national macro level, the value of zhuzes or tribal belonging is weakened, but its role is growing at the micro level. Revival means not just the existence, but the public proclamation of their significance. Escape to the Gemeinschaft opposes people identification with Gesellschaft. The preservation of these structures for a long time is possible thanks to their strong adaptive capacity, but innovative capacity is completely absent.

Archaisation is based on the collective unconsciousness. It motivates people to active social action, for example, the counteracting to reforms. It has a strong conflict potential.

Unlike archaisation commitment to integrity leads to passivity, retreating, withdrawal from social activity

Commitment to integrity is evident in the constantly reproducing trying to create a modal image of the "true Kazakhs". The worldview of the nomad was syncretic. But the sociocultural world in which our compatriots lived, in the last century several times was destroyed completely, and the destruction was catastrophic. Some of these traumas were not the object of reflection in the public consciousness and for a long time were remaining in the collective subconsciousness. It is not surprising that now people are trying to remember and recover what they had lost, returning to the past. Modern post-industrial world can not be syncretic, it is fragmented and unstable. A more productive strategy is to return to the future, facing reality.

The tendency to return to the integrity of the world, to enchante it is a global trend in reaction to the modernization that gave rise to conservatism and neotraditionalism.

Neotraditionalism is quite different from the archaication phenomenon. The tradition and the language has become almost the main theme of the discourse that accompanies the transition of the Kazakh culture to a new level. But from the point of view of cultural studies, the role of tradition in contemporary culture is changing substantially. We use the concept developed by S.A. Madjukova [3]. Socio-cultural neotraditionalism characterizes the situation, when distorted or even lost tradition is

artificially restored, and the substitution of the sacred content of the tradition for rational explanation of the need for its implementation with the aim of understanding their involvement in the local (ethnic) community. Thus, tradition has the potential of variability, adaptation to new social, economic, and political conditions. Without ceasing to be a tradition it assumes new forms and ways of existence, partially changing its contents. Neotraditionalism is a set of following fashion (in form) and traditions (content), when the regulation of social systems mainly based on tradition or innovative standards is one of the criteria for distinguishing between so-called traditional and modern societies.

Faced with the crisis of identity in the post-Soviet space, post-modern society found itself in the context of increasing mutual repulsion of different social strata, including ethnic fragmentation, in which the subjects of power are based on being revived, or even invented traditions. Socio-cultural neotraditionalism is playing an increasingly important role in contemporary processes of modernization, identification and self-determination of individuals, groups and communities, as well as in the determination of perspectives of their development. Neotraditionalism as a conscious reaction is a phenomenon of evolving, transitional society, not traditional. Tradition in traditional society is a specific inheritance mechanism and mode of development of the cultural experience of past generations, providing diachronic social communication. The specific content of this communication is to reproduce from generation to generation of meaningful actions and perceptions, fixing the accumulated social experience and serving as the regulatory principles of development of new conditions and problems. Neotraditionalism is a kind of nostalgia for the lost integrity, stability and predictability of a society reproducing itself on the basis of tradition and having the legitimacy of historical past, his experience. It appears that the neotraditionalism differs from similar processes leading ultimately to the destruction of traditional culture. Neotraditionalism characterizes the formation of such neotradition, which is based on logic of it's own ethnic culture. Innovation is not detrimental to the tradition. In other words, when there is a continuation of the development of this culture.

One of the most important characteristics of socio-cultural neotraditionalism is that the reasonable, reflective consciousness has a priority over irrational values. We can qualify as a neotraditionalism for instance, rebirthing of tradition of "small Hajj" in various "Holy places", which essentially is the development of certain industries of tourism and entrepreneurship.

Archaisation should be considered as a most dangerous phenomenon from these three tendencies.

Thus, the search for national and cultural identity in modern society is a contra-

dictory process, although inevitable and carries certain risks. One of the risks is the relative weakness of the modernization component of modern Kazakh identity. Kazakhstan for centuries was in relative isolation from the outside world and fell under his influence at a time when capitalism has taken the form of a consumer society. Western society's came to consumption through modernization, turning first from traditional to industrial and urbanized. The rejection of tradition was made possible by the rationalization of all social structures. But this intermediate stage is almost never manifested itself in Kazakh culture. Stalin's modernization coincided with socio-demographic catastrophe of the Holodomor and didn't affect Kazakh culture. Successive waves of industrialization could not deeply affect the predominantly rural population. And urban civilization in Kazakhstan is beginning to emerge only now. Thus, the Kazakh national culture in the twentieth century wasn't profoundly transformed during the modernization process, which involved only a relatively small part of the ethnic group. Impact of this phenomenon is contradiction between the rational and the westernized elite (political, economic, cultural) and some stratas of Kazakh society, focusing on tradition and archaication. In fact, the process of modernization began in Kazakhstan only to the twenty-first century, when most scientists of the global world has abandoned the concept of modernization.

Another risk is the crisis of identity of those who are not focused on tradition and do not belong to the elite. If people don't find value orientations in their society, can not be integrated into the society, they migrate to where their attitudes and lifestyles will not be regarded as a menace to society. We believe that those people involved in the process of "brain drain". As a consequence, this may lead to critical reduction of the innovative capacity of our society.

The spread of extremist religious movements is also a direct consequence of an identity crisis.

At the theoretical level of public consciousness the problem of identity is represented in a huge number of publications of Kazakhstan' scientists on this subject over the last 20 years. The interest of researchers to this subject is stable, in the framework of this article it is impossible to analyze all the results. Let us mention only the works of A. Nysanbaev [4], R. Kadyrzhanov [5] and many others.

On the ideological level, this problem is also reflected. The main goal of the Republic of Kazakhstan is to join the ranks of developed countries. As is clear from strategic documents, national culture and identity is considered by the political elite as an important prerequisite to achieving it. In recent article, "Look into the future: the modernization of public consciousness" [6] the President of Kazakhstan N. A. Nazarbayev presented a frame for the formation of the cultural identity of Kazakhstan. It

includes such values as the market competitiveness, the preservation of national spiritual culture (the best traditions), education, evolutionary development and openness.

In the proposed model we can see the influence of the experience of developed South-East Asian countries such as Japan, South Korea, China. Their political elites were able to use the inevitable crisis of identity for economic mobilization and motivation of the population. But this identity has developed over centuries. Also in these countries due to irrigated agriculture has developed a specific labour culture which became an important resource for their economic development. These societies saved the most deep cultural codes, but ultimately refused to follow the traditions. The Gulf countries go down different path. Preserving tradition, they used foreign workforce for economic development. Kazakhstan, because of its characteristics, cannot directly borrow any of these models. So our society will not be transformed as ready-made designs. This is indicated by the President. In the circumstances the state and society will have to make serious efforts to achieve the goals.

We see that the political elite of Kazakhstan is fully aware of the problem of identity, the danger of archaication, exalted zhuz relations. It realize the need for rationalization. The solution again is proposed in the constructivist way. The emphasis is on children and young people, the main instrument of modernization should be the educational system. But is the society ready to adopt this model?

Traditional culture and rationality are not compatible. The modernization of consciousness requires a much more profound transformation of cultural identity and social structures. It is necessary to work to trust and respect for the state, maintaining dialogue in society, to create effective social mobility and to stimulate innovation.

REFERENCES

1. Ahiezer A.S., *Arhaizacija v rossijskom obshhestve kak metodologicheskaja problema Obshhestvennye nauki i sovremennost'*, **2001,** *2, 89, 90 (in Russ).*

2. *Sotsial'no-politicheskaya stratifikatsiya kazahstanskogo obshchestva, po rezultatam sotsiologicheskogo issledovaniya KISI i nauchno issledovatelskogo proyekta IFIP, Almaty,* **2011,** *70-78 (in Russ).*

3. Madjukova S. A., Popkov Ju. V. *Fenomen sociokul'turnogo neotradicionalizma, SPb. Aletejja,* **2011,** *19, 25 (in Russ).*

4. Nyisanbaev A.N., Shaykemelev M.S., *Metodologicheskie podhody k izucheniyu etnoidentichnosti v postsovetskom gumanitarnom diskurse: kazahstanskiy opyt.* Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya, **2013,** *80 (in Russ).*

5. Kadyrzhanov R., *Konstruktivizm, primordializm i opredelenie nacional'noj identichnosti Kazahstana. Al-Farabi,* **2012,** *4, 40, 86 (in Russ).*

6. Nazarbaev N.A., *Vzgljad v budushhee: modernizacija obshhestvennogo soznanija. Kazakhstanskaja pravda,* **2017,** *12 apr. (in Russ).*