

## **Yash Turkistan as a Source of Historical Consciousness and Civic Identity: A Historical-Discursive Analysis of Émigré Intellectual Discourse Using Fairclough's Framework**

Ushkyn Saidirakhman<sup>1</sup>, Assem Kassymova<sup>2</sup>, Karlygash Aubakirova<sup>3\*</sup>, & Yeldos Toktarbay<sup>4</sup>

### **Abstract**

This study examines how Yash Turkistan (1929–1939), a major periodical of Turkestan émigré political journalism, constructed an alternative intellectual discourse on colonial power, historical memory, national identity, statehood, and political agency. The analysis draws on the full collection of 117 issues and combines historical contextualization, thematic analysis, and critical discourse analysis (CDA). Texts directly relevant to the research questions were examined to identify recurring conceptual themes, narrative structures, rhetorical strategies, symbolic contradictions, and appeals to historical power. The findings suggest that Yash Turkistan interpreted imperial and Soviet power within a continuous colonial framework, linked national continuity with language, knowledge, and intellectual responsibility, and presented statehood as a project of organized political self-determination. The magazine challenged Soviet views through factual correction, irony, re-semanticization of the official political vocabulary, and recurring contradictions such as nation and empire, freedom and dominance, historical truth and ideological distortion. Through these strategies, Turkestan emerged as a historically conscious political community capable of interpreting its past and determining its political future. This study contributes to the study of émigré media, historical consciousness, and the formation of the political subject.

**Keywords:** *Yash Turkistan, émigré press, historical consciousness, civic identity, counter-discourse, political subjectivity.*

### **Introduction**

The intellectual history of Kazakhstan and the wider Turkestani region cannot be reconstructed solely from political, cultural, and educational developments within the Soviet public sphere. From the early twentieth century onward, debates on historical memory, national identity, language, statehood, and political responsibility were also pursued by émigré intellectuals, journalists, and activists working beyond Soviet borders (Aktailak et al., 2024; Karim, 2003; Yerdembekov et al., 2025). Under conditions of censorship and ideological control, the émigré press created a

<sup>1</sup> Shakarim University, Kazakhstan; [ushkyn86@gmail.com](mailto:ushkyn86@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Dr., Shakarim University, Kazakhstan; [assemzere.ak@gmail.com](mailto:assemzere.ak@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> Dr., Corresponding Author, Shakarim University, Kazakhstan; [kz.aubakirova@gmail.com](mailto:kz.aubakirova@gmail.com)

<sup>4</sup> Shakarim University, Kazakhstan; [yeldos@toktarbay.com](mailto:yeldos@toktarbay.com)

transnational space in which interpretations excluded from official discourse could be preserved, reformulated, and circulated (Khalid, 2007; Rogaar et al., 2025).

Among these publications, *Yash Turkistan* (1929–1939) occupied a central place in Turkestani émigré political journalism. Published outside the Soviet Union, the journal addressed Soviet colonial policy, historical interpretation, national self-determination, language, education, cultural continuity, and the political future of Turkestan (Saidirakhman & Akseit, 2025). Although its political vocabulary was organized around the broader concept of Turkestan rather than the later territorial boundaries of independent Kazakhstan, its discussions intersected with questions that remain significant to the intellectual history of Kazakhstan and Central Asia.

The central research problem concerns not only the political positions expressed in *Yash Turkistan*, but also the intellectual and discursive mechanisms through which those positions were constructed. The journal did more than report on Soviet policies or document the experience of exile. It participated in a struggle over who possessed the authority to interpret the past, define the nation, evaluate political legitimacy, and imagine the future of Turkestan. Examining these mechanisms makes it possible to approach the émigré press as a site of knowledge production and political meaning-making rather than merely as a supplementary historical source.

Existing studies have made important contributions to the history of Turkestani emigration and the political legacy of Mustafa Shokai. Nevertheless, much of this scholarship remains biographical, historical, or descriptive in orientation. Less attention has been paid to how *Yash Turkistan* organized its major concepts into an alternative intellectual discourse and how its rhetorical and narrative practices challenged Soviet representations of history, identity, and political authority. The construction of Turkestan as a politically conscious community within the journal's discourse also requires more systematic examination.

The present study therefore aims to investigate how *Yash Turkistan* interpreted colonial rule, national identity, statehood, and political agency, and how these interpretations were articulated through specific rhetorical, narrative, and argumentative practices. The journal constitutes the primary research object and the core empirical source base of the study; other émigré publications are considered only where they clarify the broader historical and intellectual context. By focusing on the relationship between media discourse, historical consciousness, and political subjectivity, the study contributes to research on émigré journalism, postcolonial memory, nationalism, and civic identity. It also clarifies the value of émigré periodicals for social studies education,

particularly for examining competing historical narratives and the civic meanings assigned to the past. This educational relevance is also consistent with contemporary approaches to multicultural education that emphasize contextual relevance, critical reflection, and the integration of culturally diverse perspectives into educational practice (Ünal & Durmuşoğlu, 2026; Yussupova & Tarman, 2025). Such analyses are also important for understanding and interpreting social issues in social studies education (Demir et al., 2026; Lintner & Reeves, 2026).

### Research Questions

Against this background, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. How did *Yash Turkistan* develop an alternative intellectual discourse on colonial rule, national identity, statehood, and the political future of Turkestan?
2. How did the journal employ rhetorical, narrative, and argumentative strategies to contest Soviet representations of history and political legitimacy and to construct Turkestan as a collective political subject?

### Theoretical Framework

Research on Turkestani émigré journalism has focused mainly on Mustafa Shokai, the political activities of the Turkestani émigré movement, and the publications associated with them. These studies have established the importance of the émigré press in criticizing Soviet rule, defending national self-determination, and preserving political ideas excluded from the Soviet public sphere (Aktailak et al., 2024; Saidirakhman & Akseit, 2025). Within this field, *Yash Turkistan* is recognized as a major platform for debates on colonial domination, repression, language, education, autonomy, independence, and the political future of Turkestan.

Previous research has shown that Turkestani émigré journalism played an important role in criticizing Soviet rule, defending national self-determination, and preserving political ideas excluded from the Soviet public sphere. Existing studies have also demonstrated the significance of *Yash Turkistan* as a major platform for debates on colonial domination, repression, language, education, autonomy, and the political future of Turkestan. However, less attention has been paid to the discursive mechanisms through which the journal connected these themes within a coherent alternative intellectual framework and challenged dominant Soviet interpretations of history, identity, and political legitimacy.

The concepts of émigré and alternative media help explain the journal's communicative and political position. Media produced in exile operate beyond the control of the domestic information system and provide a space for ideas excluded from the homeland's public sphere (Karim, 2003; Ristow, 2011). In politically repressive contexts, such publications do more than preserve cultural affiliation: they challenge official narratives, question the legitimacy of the ruling regime, and construct alternative interpretations of political reality (Atton, 2003; Fuchs, 2010). This perspective is directly relevant to *Yash Turkistan*, whose discourse sought not only to describe Soviet rule, but also to redefine it through a vocabulary of colonial domination, national resistance, and political self-determination.

Postcolonial approaches further clarify the journal's struggle over historical meaning. Political domination is sustained not only through institutions and territory, but also through control over the interpretation of the past and the classification of legitimate political aspirations (Ashcroft et al., 2007). Soviet historiography frequently represented national movements and autonomy projects as forms of bourgeois nationalism or counterrevolution. Against this official framework, *Yash Turkistan* used historical interpretation to expose ideological distortion, connect Tsarist and Soviet domination, and restore political legitimacy to suppressed national movements. Historical memory therefore functioned in the journal as a form of counter-discourse rather than as a neutral recollection of the past. This emphasis on excluded interpretations also corresponds with research in history education showing that hegemonic historical narratives may marginalize alternative perspectives. In contrast, engagement with multiple accounts can broaden the understanding and evaluation of the past (Chaves-Guerrero et al., 2024).

The journal's discourse also involved constructing Turkestan as a political community. National communities are sustained through shared narratives, historical memories, and communicative practices, particularly when territorial or institutional unity is absent (Anderson, 2006; Smith, 1998). For émigré intellectuals, the press became a space in which collective identity, political responsibility, and the prospect of statehood could be articulated. In *Yash Turkistan*, Turkestan was presented not simply as a cultural or geographical region, but as a community capable of political organization, collective agency, and self-determination.

Taken together, the existing literature provides the historical and conceptual background for understanding *Yash Turkistan*, but leaves two related problems unresolved. First, the journal has not been sufficiently examined as a producer of an alternative intellectual discourse linking

colonial rule, historical memory, national identity, and statehood. Second, its rhetorical, narrative, and argumentative strategies have not been systematically analyzed in relation to the construction of Turkestan as a collective political subject. These gaps define the specific analytical focus of the present study.

## Methods

### Research Design

The study adopts a research design grounded in an approach to historical discourse analysis informed by Fairclough and examines how the journal *Yash Turkistan* constructed discourses of historical memory, national identity, statehood, language, and political subjectivity between 1929 and 1939. In this research design, the journal texts are treated not merely as discrete linguistic material, but as a discursive practice through which meanings concerning national identity, colonial rule, statehood, and political subjecthood were constructed within a specific historical and political context. While historical analysis makes it possible to situate the journal's discourse within the political and social conditions of 1929–1939, qualitative discourse analysis is used to examine how that historical context was interpreted in the journal and how related political and social meanings were constructed through particular concepts, evaluations, rhetorical strategies, and forms of argumentation. From this perspective, the analysis focuses on how the language of the journal interpreted relations of power and ideological positions, how it redefined official political concepts, and what alternative meanings it articulated in opposition to official Soviet interpretations. The study also examines both continuity and change in these meanings over time by comparing the journal's discourse across different periods.. Within this broader research design, Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was employed as the principal theoretical and analytical framework for examining discourse. Historical contextualization was used to relate the texts to their relevant historical and political circumstances, while thematic analysis served to identify and systematically organize recurring themes and key concepts across the research dataset. Since the available sources do not provide sufficient evidence to reconstruct audience reception systematically, the study focuses primarily on textual production, intertextual relations, and the social contexts in which political meanings were constructed. The primary aim of the study is to examine how power relations and ideological positions were interpreted in émigré political

journalism, and how, in this process, alternative historical and political meanings were constructed and articulated in opposition to the official discourse of Soviet power.

### **Data Sources and Sampling**

The study draws primarily on the complete collection of 117 issues of *Yash Turkistan* published between 1929 and 1939. The research made use of materials held by the Center for Islamic Studies (İSAM) in Istanbul, the Berlin State Library, the Rare Books and Manuscripts Collection of the National Library of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Myrzatay Zholdasbekov Collection at the National Academic Library of the Republic of Kazakhstan, and the private archive of Abdolvahap Kara. The issues held by the Berlin State Library and İSAM were examined in their original printed form, while materials from the Myrzatay Zholdasbekov Collection were consulted as reproduced copies, and those from Abdolvahap Kara's private archive were used in electronic form. Taken together, these complementary collections made it possible to cover all 117 issues of the journal published between 1929 and 1939.

On this basis, an analytical database consisting of 71 unique texts was created through purposive sampling. Individual materials published independently in the journal were taken as the unit of analysis. Each part of a series published in several issues as a continuation of one topic was considered a separate bibliographic unit.

The selection included materials directly related to the research questions. These included editorials and analytical publications that addressed issues of Soviet colonial and socio-economic policy, historical memory and the reinterpretation of official history, national statehood and political orientation, language, education, and cultural policy, political repression, national identity, and political subjectivity. In addition, brief reports that provided specific data, explanations, or political assessments relevant to at least one of the research questions were included.

Texts were included if they met at least one of the following criteria:

1. they discussed Soviet colonial policy, repression, or ideological control;
2. they addressed national identity, Turkestani unity, or the political future of Turkestan;
3. they dealt with language, education, cultural memory, or historical continuity;
4. they offered explicit or implicit alternatives to Soviet interpretations of history and statehood;
5. they contributed to debates on civic responsibility, political agency, or democratic values.

Purely informational notices, brief announcements, and materials without clear relevance to the study's research questions were excluded. Contextual references to other émigré publications were used only to clarify the broader historical background and were not treated as part of the primary dataset.

Archival correspondence between Mustafa Shokai and the editorial staff was used separately. They served as additional contextual data that clarified the journal's editorial practices, methods of accessing information, and use of sources. Therefore, the archival letters were not included in the primary dataset and were not considered at the same analytical level as the journal materials.

### **Data Collection**

First, all 117 issues of the journal were reviewed in full, and a thematic inventory of the published materials was compiled. The materials were then assessed for their relevance to the research questions on the basis of predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria, resulting in the selection of 71 texts for the analytical dataset. For each selected text, the following metadata were recorded: title, author or pseudonym where available, issue number, date of publication, genre, main theme, key concepts, and relevant historical references. This procedure helped establish a structured analytical dataset and ensured that the analysis was based on clearly defined selection criteria rather than on arbitrarily chosen illustrative examples.

Coding and discourse analysis were conducted on the basis of the original texts published in Yash Turkistan. The English translations were not used for analytical purposes; they were prepared solely for presenting quotations from the primary sources in the article. All quotations from Yash Turkistan were translated into English by the authors. Article titles were rendered in a consistent Latin transliteration adapted to the journal's original Turkic orthography, while historically established personal and geographical names were retained in their commonly used English forms. Unless otherwise indicated, all English translations of primary-source passages are the authors' own.

### **Data Analysis**

The analysis followed Fairclough's three-level model, applying its three levels to the journal texts and the historical conditions in which they were produced. At the textual level, the study examined how political meanings were defined and contested through language. The analysis focused on

evaluative labels, recurring semantic oppositions, the use of quotation marks to distance the journal from Soviet terminology, and the renaming or resemanticization of political concepts. Particular attention was paid to terms such as red, patriotism, nationalism, autonomy, and freedom, and to oppositions such as nation/empire, freedom/domination, and truth/propaganda, where shifts in wording also marked shifts in political interpretation.

At the level of discursive practice, the study traced how *Yash Turkistan* drew on Soviet newspapers, official reports, statistics, and historical works and recast this material within a different argumentative setting. The analysis also examined practices of quotation, comparison, juxtaposition, and recontextualization, particularly where official Soviet evidence was set against other official sources or used to support an interpretation different from the original. Archival correspondence was used only as contextual evidence for the editorial routines through which such materials were obtained and used; audience reception was not analyzed systematically.

At the level of social practice, the journal's arguments were read in relation to the political conditions in which they were produced. The analysis considered the journal's treatment of colonial rule, political legitimacy, national identity, and the construction of Turkestan as a political subject in relation to collectivization, forced sedentarization, national-territorial delimitation, language policy, political repression, and émigré political struggle.

The coding scheme combined deductive and inductive procedures. Initial codes were derived from the research questions and theoretical framework, while concepts and argumentative patterns that repeatedly emerged from the texts were added during analysis. All texts in the analytical dataset were coded independently by three coders; the coding was then compared, and disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Codes that addressed related issues were then grouped into broader analytical categories: colonial domination and Soviet policy, historical memory and alternative history, national identity, language and culture, statehood and political orientation, political subjectivity, and repression. Three recurring discourse strategies cut across these categories: narrative, rhetorical, and evidence-based argumentation. A text could be assigned to more than one category when it addressed several issues, while multi-part series were also read for the argumentative pattern that connected the individual installments.

To examine continuity and change over time, the texts were compared across two periods: 1929–1934 (Nos. 1–61) and 1935–1939 (Nos. 62–117). The year 1935 was used as a provisional

analytical boundary because the initial review showed a broader thematic range and more developed forms of argumentation from that point onward, not because it marked the emergence of a different political discourse. The first period contained 25 texts and the second 46. This imbalance reflects purposive qualitative sampling: the comparison concerned changes in concepts, argumentative patterns, and discourse strategies rather than differences in topic frequency.

The comparison was interpretive rather than quantitative. Changes between the two periods were assessed in terms of how particular concepts and themes were used, how they related to other issues, and what role they played in the journal's argumentation. These patterns were read in relation to the changing political setting, including collectivization and its social consequences in the earlier period and the consolidation of Soviet rule and mass political repression in the later 1930s.

## **Findings**

### **1. Construction of an Alternative Intellectual Discourse**

In relation to the first research question, the findings demonstrate that Yash Turkistan constructed an alternative intellectual discourse by addressing colonial rule, national identity, statehood, and the political future of Turkestan as closely interconnected issues.

The analysis showed that the discourse of Yash Turkistan did not undergo a fundamental transformation between 1929 and 1939; rather, the methods used to explain and substantiate its principal political ideas gradually expanded. The chronological and thematic review of the complete run, together with the discourse analysis of the selected texts, provides no basis for treating the differences between 1929–1934 and 1935–1939 as a replacement of one discourse by another. Instead, the changes are evident in the expansion of themes and the increasing sophistication of argumentative techniques within a continuous political and ideological core.

Several major lines of argument were common to both periods: the political independence of Turkestan, the continuity between Tsarist and Soviet colonial domination, national unity, historical memory, and cultural continuity. The difference lay not in whether these ideas were present, but in the issues to which they were connected and in the evidence and argumentative techniques used to substantiate them. Accordingly, the comparison between the two periods prioritized the substantive expression of themes, the articulation of key political concepts, and changes in argumentation strategies rather than the numerical frequency of topics.

During the first period, 1929–1934, the journal devoted greater attention to defining its political program, substantiating the case for Turkestan's independence, and portraying Soviet rule as a new form of Russian colonialism. Oppositional concepts such as autonomy versus independence, the national state versus the Soviet republic, and freedom versus colonial domination were among the principal means by which the journal articulated its political position. Demonstrating the continuity of colonial influence from Tsarist to Soviet governance likewise emerged as a consistent ideological theme during this period.

Simultaneously, even during the initial period, the journal's scope of issues gradually expanded. From 1932 onward, the publication increasingly focused on themes such as exile, famine, the dire living conditions of the population, and the social repercussions of the Five-Year Plans, which are documented as distinct thematic concerns ("Surgunder Hali [Meshhedten]," 1932, pp. 31–33; T. D., 1932, pp. 13–16; Timuroglu, 1932, pp. 9–14). During the years 1933–1934, these topics were further supplemented by coverage of the Basmachi movement, cotton policy, refugee displacement, and the ramifications of Soviet economic policies on Turkestan ("Basmashylar haqynda bir bolshevik serkesi," 1933, pp. 6–8; "Basmashylyk (1919 II/20–1933)," 1933, pp. 1–6; "Qaraqumda basmashylyk areketi," 1933, p. 1; Timuroglu, 1933a, pp. 21–25; Timuroglu, 1933b, pp. 8–14; Yash Turkistandyk, 1934, pp. 12–18).

During the second period, 1935–1939, the idea of Turkestan's independence and criticism of Soviet colonialism remained central. However, the journal's agenda became more closely aligned with current political developments, and a more systematic approach to following particular issues across several consecutive numbers became increasingly evident. In 1935, materials on the policy of localization became more frequent ("Mekemelerdi zhergiliktendiru isi," 1935, pp. 41–42; Timuroglu, 1935a, pp. 14–17; Timuroglu, 1935b, pp. 13–17), while in 1936 education and language issues moved to the forefront (Esen Tursun, 1936, pp. 18–22; M., 1936, pp. 30–35; Tashbalta, 1936, pp. 22–27). From the second half of 1937 onward, political accusations, judicial proceedings, and the death penalty received greater attention ("Pravda Ekmal Ikramdy ayiptady," 1937, pp. 40–42; "Turkistanda burzhuaziya ultshyldary soty (alty adam)," 1937, pp. 17–18; "Turkistanda repressiya," 1937, pp. 34–37). In 1938, this thematic line developed into sustained coverage of the mass persecution and execution of intellectuals (Oktay, 1938a, pp. 11–18; Oktay, 1938b, pp. 12–18; Oktay, 1938c, pp. 9–14; Oktay, 1938d, pp. 27–34; Oktay, 1938e, pp. 27–36).

Another distinguishing feature of the later period was the growing systematization of methods for working with official Soviet information. The journal made frequent use of official reports, quantitative data, and lists of individuals and events, placing greater emphasis on comparing these materials. As a result, materials from the Soviet press became not merely sources of information but an important component of the journal's system of argumentation.

### 1.1. Alternative Historical Narratives and Historical Memory

A review of the publication's complete run and an in-depth analysis of the selected materials showed that presenting historical events in ways that differed from official Soviet interpretations was a persistent feature of *Yash Turkistan*. In 1929–1934, this tendency was expressed primarily by demonstrating the colonial continuity between Tsarist and Soviet rule, reconsidering the political assessments of national movements in Soviet historiography, and offering alternative interpretations of Turkestan's political fate.

This position is clearly evident in the article “White Russian, Red Russian – All the Same Russian.” The author does not treat Tsarist Russia and the Soviet government as entirely opposed systems in their policies toward Turkestan. Rather, they are described as two historically distinct yet politically continuous forms of Russian domination (Baysungur, 1930, pp. 25–31).

Soviet historiography likewise became a recurring target of criticism in the journal. Mustafa Shokay's article “How Do the Bolsheviks Write ‘History’?” is structured around a point-by-point examination of information presented in a Soviet work on the Kokand Autonomy. By comparing the facts, the author identifies historical distortions and specific factual errors (Shoqaiuly, 1930a, pp. 31–33). Information on the composition of the Kokand government is also re-examined, and several figures introduced by the Soviet author are shown to have been entirely fabricated (Shoqaiuly, 1930a, pp. 31–33). Such polemics with Soviet historiography continued in later articles, including “Against a Scholarly Falsehood” (Shoqaiuly, 1931a, pp. 4–11).

Between 1935 and 1939, the scope of the historical-memory theme broadened. Alongside written historiography, museums, monuments, anniversaries, and official representations of historical figures drew attention. For example, the 1935 article “The Bolsheviks Do Not Love Historical Truth” criticized the exhibition at the Museum of the History of the Khorezm Revolution and examined how the past was interpreted within museum space (Yash Turkistandiyk, 1935, pp. 14–20).

The juxtaposition of competing historical dates is particularly evident in materials marking the twentieth anniversary of the 1917 events. Issue No. 96 of 1937 contained an article devoted to the twentieth anniversary of Soviet rule. In contrast, the following issue, No. 97, opened with a text marking the twentieth anniversary of the Kokand Autonomy ("Sovet ukimetinin 20-zhyldygyna orai," 1937, pp. 7–10; Shoqaiuly, 1937, pp. 2–4). The same issue also commemorated the anniversary of the Crimean Kurultai ("Qyrym quryltaiy ashyluynyn 20 zhyldygyn eske alu," 1937, p. 42). In this way, the history of national political institutions was deliberately recalled alongside that of Soviet statehood.

This approach persisted into 1938. In the article "On the 21st Anniversary of the Soviet Government (1917–1938)," the twenty-one years of Soviet rule were described as "21 years of mourning" for Turkestan. The journal thus offered a political interpretation that directly opposed the official anniversary narrative, contrasting the revolution's promises of national freedom with the repression that followed ("Sovet ukimetinin 21-zhyldygyna orai," 1938, pp. 5–10).

Overall, during the first period, historical themes were directed primarily toward demonstrating the colonial continuity of Tsarist and Soviet rule and toward revisiting official interpretations of national movements. In the second period, this line of argument remained intact, but the journal's engagement with historical memory expanded to include museums, anniversaries, memorial politics, and official representations of historical figures.

The reinterpretation of the historical past was also directly tied to the question of national identity. For Yash Turkistan, the integrity of the national community was not defined solely by a shared historical memory. Language, education, the intelligentsia, and cultural heritage were also regarded as essential foundations for preserving that community. Consequently, alongside historical narratives, the social and cultural supports that sustained national identity became a persistent theme in the journal's discourse.

### 1.2. National Identity, Language, and Cultural Continuity

In the discourse of Yash Turkistan, the question of political independence was closely tied to national identity, language, education, the intelligentsia, and cultural continuity. During 1929–1934, this dimension was expressed primarily through discussions of the formation of a national intelligentsia, education, and the training of national cadres.

In the article "The National Intellectual," the principal criterion for an intellectual is not defined solely by level of education. The central requirement is service to the people's political and cultural

interests (Shoqaiuly, 1931b, pp. 3–9). Likewise, the articles “The Policy of Training National Specialists” and “Soviet Schools and the Youth of Turkestan” do not treat education and professional training merely as matters of schooling. They connect them to the population’s participation in public life and to the capacity to develop the necessary specialists from within the national community (Bilgen, 1930, pp. 22–27; Yash Turkistandyk, 1931, pp. 12–16).

Between 1935 and 1939, language and schooling took on a more prominent place in discussions of national identity. Materials on “Language Policy in Turkestan” analyzed the role of Russian in education and state service, as well as the allocation of instructional hours to language subjects in Kazakh and Russian schools. These articles did not treat language policy separately from the education system; rather, they linked it directly to the formation of national cadres (Esen Tursun, 1935, pp. 10–15; Tashbalta, 1935, pp. 38–42).

During these years, the journal also devoted particular attention to the reintroduction of national literary and cultural heritage. In Tahir Chagatai’s series “The National Ideal of the Turks of Turkestan and Alisher Navoi” and the later “Alisher Navoi and the Soviet Government,” Ahmad Yasawi and Alisher Navoi were presented as historical representatives of Turkic language, literature, and cultural tradition (Tahir, 1938a, pp. 5–23; 1938b, pp. 17–27; 1938c, pp. 7–15; Tahir, 1939a, pp. 20–33; 1939b, pp. 10–20; 1939c, pp. 11–19). In the article “Sultan Babur and the Patriotism of the Turks of Turkestan,” published in the journal’s final double issue, Nos. 116–117, Babur was likewise situated within this historical and cultural continuity (Tahir, 1939d, pp. 16–26). These materials presented national cultural heritage not as separate from language and education but as an integral component of a unified historical and cultural space.

The periodic comparison indicates that in the early years, national identity was expressed primarily through issues concerning the intelligentsia, education, and the training of national cadres. Between 1935 and 1939, this thematic field broadened, bringing language, schooling, the alphabet, historical place names, and cultural heritage to the fore.

At the same time, the journal did not separate the preservation of national identity from the idea of political statehood and an organized national movement. Language, education, and cultural continuity were seen as foundations for maintaining the internal cohesion of the national community. At the same time, its political expression was evident in the aspiration to create an independent state, to formulate a common program, and to pursue organized action.

### 1.3. Statehood and Political Subjectivity

As the analysis demonstrates, in the discourse of Yash Turkistan, the idea of independence was closely connected to questions of statehood, political organization, and national unity. During 1929–1934, this line of argument was expressed primarily through the transition from autonomy to full independence, the justification of a unified Turkestan state, and the organization of the national movement.

In “Our Path,” published in the journal's first issue, the liberation of Turkestan was defined as the publication's principal political objective. It was linked to the creation of an independent national state (Basqarma, 1929, pp. 1–3). This position was further elaborated in “From Autonomy to Independence.” The Kokand Autonomy was assessed as the first political experience of the national movement, while the ultimate objective was to establish statehood independent of Moscow (Basqarma, 1930, pp. 1–5).

During the first period, political organization was repeatedly presented as an essential condition for achieving independence. “From Movement to Organization (From Uprising to Organization)” argued for the need to move from spontaneous resistance to an organized movement, while “From the Soviet Central Asian Federation to a Unified National State of Turkestan” proposed a unified Turkestan state as an alternative to the Soviet national-territorial division (Shoqaiuly, 1930b, pp. 1–7; M. C., 1931, pp. 4–9). The article “Turkestan and Bukhara? Or Turkestan Directly?” advanced the idea of a common Turkestani political unity that transcended regional classifications (Shoqaiuly, 1932, pp. 1–4).

Between 1935 and 1939, the idea of independent statehood retained its earlier importance. Greater attention, however, was now devoted to the political organizations capable of realizing this goal, the interaction among national forces, and organizational experience within émigré communities. For example, the 1935 report “From the Life of Turkestan Émigrés in India” stated that Turkestani émigrés in Bombay had established contact with compatriots in other cities, founded the “Union of Turkestan Émigrés,” and launched a publication to promote the national movement (“Undistandagy Turkistan muhazhyrlary turmysynan,” 1935, p. 32).

This tendency became especially evident in 1937, when several materials on a political program and national unity were published in succession. The articles “For Our Organization of National Unity,” “The Political Program in Turkestan: Its Meaning and Significance,” “The Political Program in Turkestan,” “Victims of the Political Program,” and “The Political Program Continues” systematically addressed the content of a common political program, the necessity of

a national organization, and the condition of the cadres expected to implement it ("Sayasi programma qurbandary," 1937, pp. 11–16; "Sayasi programma zhalgasuda," 1937, pp. 14–18; "Turkistanda sayasi programma," 1937, pp. 2–7; "Turkistanda sayasi programma, onyn mani men manyzy," 1937, pp. 2–7; "Ulttyq birlik uyymymyz ushin," 1937, pp. 5–9). "Victims of the Political Program" also examined the persecution of national cadres and intellectuals in relation to this political orientation ("Sayasi programma qurbandary," 1937, pp. 11–16).

A different pattern emerges for statehood mainly around the transition from autonomy to independence, the conceptualization of a unified Turkestan state, and the formation of an organized national movement. Between 1935 and 1939, this line was enriched by concrete political experience, with the activities of émigré organizations, the maintenance of a common political program, the condition of national cadres, and cooperation with other national movements coming to the forefront.

## **2. Discursive Strategies of Contestation and Political Subject Formation**

In response to the second research question, the findings show that *Yash Turkistan* employed a combination of rhetorical, narrative, and argumentative strategies to challenge Soviet representations of history and political legitimacy while simultaneously constructing Turkestan as a collective political subject. Building on the preceding thematic analysis, *Yash Turkistan* relied on several interrelated discursive strategies to construct an alternative political perspective. One of these was the placement of historical events within a continuity that differed from Soviet interpretation. The journal juxtaposed official anniversaries with alternative dates from national political history and linked events that Soviet historiography evaluated differently, such as the Kokand Autonomy and the Basmachi movement, within a common national movement.

Another important feature of the journal's critique of Soviet power was its regular use of official information as a source base. The editorial staff systematically monitored Soviet publications issued in Moscow and Turkestan, including *Pravda*, *Enbekshi Qazaq*, *Sotsialistik Qazaqstan*, *Qyzyl Ozbekstan*, *Sovet Turkmenstany*, *Turkmenskaya Iskra*, *Pravda Vostoka*, and others.

Information drawn from the Soviet press was often used comparatively. One early example is the 1930 item "Turkestan News: Eltai Ernazaruly's Lie." It compared Eltai Ernazaruly's official report that 84,340 nomadic and semi-nomadic households had been transferred to sedentary settlement with information previously published in *Enbekshi Qazaq*. Whereas the earlier report stated that the plan had not been fulfilled, the later account presented the same figure as an achieved result.

By placing these two pieces of information from the same publication side by side, the journal drew attention to distortion within official reporting ("Ernazaruly Eltaidyn otirigi," 1930, pp. 39–40).

This method continued in the later period and became increasingly systematic. In the 1938 series "Victims of the Struggle," names, court cases, political accusations, and records of punishment were compiled across several issues (Oktay, 1938a, pp. 11–18; 1938b, pp. 12–18; 1938c, pp. 9–14). In the 1939 article "Bolshevik Lies," statements by Soviet officials concerning education, public administration, and the national press were compared, and inconsistencies among them were identified ("Bolshevik otirikteri," 1939, pp. 19–22). One example involved two different official figures for the number of newspapers published in the Turkmen language in Turkmenistan. Working with evidence proceeded in parallel with the resemanticization of political concepts. Even in the first period, the article "White Russian, Red Russian – All the Same Russian" displaced the political distinction between "white" and "red" to a secondary position and interpreted both as historical continuations of Russian colonialism in Turkestan (Baysungur, 1930, pp. 25–31). Similarly, in "The Red Gentlemen of Tashkent," the concept of "red," which in Soviet discourse signified liberation and renewal, was used in the journal to denote a new political form of colonial domination (M. N., 1930, pp. 20–25).

Between 1935 and 1939, this method continued through the reinterpretation of Soviet political slogans and official rhetoric. In "From Soviet Patriotism to Russian Nationalism," the Soviet concept of "patriotism" was equated with Russian nationalism ("Sovet patriotizminen orys ultshyldygyna," 1936, pp. 2–7). Assigning political meanings that opposed those of official anniversaries was another manifestation of this rhetorical strategy.

Comparison of the materials revealed several recurrent semantic oppositions in the journal's discourse: nation/empire, freedom/domination, truth/propaganda, and national will/political subordination. These oppositions are evident in article titles, in the placement of official terms within quotation marks, and in the attribution of alternative political meanings to Soviet concepts. Comparing the two periods shows that these methods did not emerge fully formed at once. During 1929–1934, the basic patterns of setting official information against other official information and resemanticizing Soviet political concepts took shape. Between 1935 and 1939, systematic monitoring of the official press, side-by-side comparison of multiple sources, identification of statistical inconsistencies, and recontextualization of political terms became regular editorial

practices. Together, these three strategies produced a discursive position that challenged Soviet interpretations of the historical past, national identity, and political legitimacy.

Taken together, these three strategies created an alternative discursive space that challenged official Soviet interpretations. The narrative strategy reconstructed Turkistan's past within a framework of national political continuity, while evidence-based argumentation re-examined the Soviet authorities' own data to expose internal contradictions. The rhetorical strategy, in turn, assigned alternative meanings to official political concepts. Through the interplay of these approaches, Turkistan was represented not as a passive object defined by an external power, but as a collective political subject capable of interpreting its own past, articulating its political interests, and formulating its vision of future statehood.

### **Discussion**

The findings provide grounds for characterizing the development of *Yash Turkistan's* discourse between 1929 and 1939 not as a shift in political orientation, but as a gradual expansion of the methods used to explain, substantiate, and demonstrate that orientation. The ideas of Turkestan's political independence, the continuity between Tsarist and Soviet colonial domination, national unity, and unified statehood, which had been clearly articulated from the journal's first issue, persisted throughout the decade. What changed was not the ideas themselves, but how they were connected to specific social conditions and supported by evidence. Whereas programmatic statements, historical comparisons, and political oppositions predominated in the first half of the 1930s, in later years more specific fields—such as language policy, education, cultural heritage, repression, Soviet administration, and official statistics—became important sources of evidence for the journal's original political theses.

For this reason, 1935 should not be understood as a boundary separating two distinct political discourses. In this study, the year serves as a conditional analytical marker. The principal concepts and argumentative patterns established in the first period did not subsequently disappear. On the contrary, under new historical conditions, they were supplemented by a broader evidentiary base, more detailed comparisons, and the practice of following particular topics over longer periods. From this perspective, *Yash Turkistan* was not an unchanging émigré political platform, but a political medium that continuously refined its argumentative repertoire in response to external political pressures and social changes in Turkestan.

This conclusion also broadens approaches that explain the function of the émigré press solely in terms of maintaining communal ties. Anderson (2006) demonstrates how periodical print enables people who do not know one another personally to imagine themselves as members of a shared community, while Georgiou (2006) emphasizes the role of diaspora media in sustaining connections and a sense of commonality among communities living in different places. The experience of Yash Turkistan suggests that under conditions of political emigration this function was considerably more complex. The journal did not limit itself to imagining Turkestan as a shared symbolic community. It also offered systematic answers to questions concerning how that community should understand its past, by what criteria it should evaluate the present, what evidence could be regarded as reliable, and on what historical foundations future statehood should be imagined. In other words, the publication sought to shape not only a shared identity, but also the epistemic and political orientations of that identity.

Fairclough's model of critical discourse analysis enables examination of this process at three interconnected levels (Fairclough, 1995). At the textual level, the journal developed its own interpretive system through evaluative labels, semantic oppositions, quotation marks, and the renaming and resemanticization of political concepts. At the level of discursive practice, Soviet newspapers, official reports, statistics, and historical works were drawn from other textual environments, compared with one another, and placed into new relationships. At the level of social practice, these techniques were connected to the conditions of collectivization, forced sedentarization, national-territorial delimitation, language policy, repression, and émigré political struggle. Periodic changes in the journal's discourse are therefore more accurately described not as mere stylistic maturation, but as the increasing complexity of the means through which political meaning was produced in response to changing historical conditions.

#### Historical Memory: From Interpreting the Past to Political Legitimacy

One important phenomenon identified in the study is that the journal's historical memory was not limited to remembering the past or correcting errors in official historiography. At the core of publications on the Kokand Autonomy, the Basmachi movement, the events of 1917, political anniversaries, historical figures such as Amangeldi Imanov, museums, and historical monuments lay a broader question: "Who has the right to interpret the political history of Turkestan, and based on what historical continuity?"

Foucault's concept of "counter-memory" helps explain an important dimension of this practice. Within this framework, events excluded from dominant historical narratives are reintroduced into history and placed within a different continuity (Foucault, 1977). However, it would be insufficient to understand counter-memory in Yash Turkistan merely as an act of remembrance intended to recover a lost past. The journal's historical argumentation consistently maintained a connection among past, present, and future. The experience of Tsarist colonization served as a historical basis for interpreting the Soviet present. At the same time, the Kokand Autonomy, the Basmachi movement, and national congresses were invoked to demonstrate a tradition of national political subjectivity. An independent Turkestan, in turn, was presented as a future orientation arising from this historical continuity. From this perspective, historical memory was not simply an archive of the past, but a resource for asserting political rights to the future.

This finding resonates with Connerton's (1989) argument concerning recurrent commemorative practices and the social establishment of memory. In the case of Yash Turkistan, however, commemoration was carried out not through state institutions but within a political-émigré environment outside the state. This distinction is significant. While the Soviet state institutionalized its version of the past through museums, schools, anniversaries, and official historiography, the émigré journal constructed an alternative textual and memorial infrastructure. Anniversary articles, returns to earlier publications, and the incorporation of historical figures into a shared Turkestani space served to maintain the continuity of this alternative memory.

#### From National Identity to Political Subjectivity

The reconstruction of historical memory naturally led to the question of national identity. Yash Turkistan did not treat the nation merely as an ethnic designation or a political slogan; rather, it interpreted the relationships among historical memory, language, the education system, the intelligentsia, cultural heritage, and statehood as an integrated whole. The early discussions of the "national intellectual," national cadres, and education, together with later debates on language, schooling, the alphabet, historical place names, and cultural heritage, are therefore better understood not as separate themes replacing one another but as different aspects of a single underlying question: "Through which institutions does a nation preserve its capacity to exist as a political community?"

At this point, Wodak et al.'s (2009) account of the discursive construction of national identity provides a useful framework for interpreting the findings. The Yash Turkistan material, however,

adds a dimension specific to the émigré condition. Outside state territory and political institutions, it was insufficient for a community to name itself to preserve national identity. The journal had to preserve the community's historical memory, cultural canon, and linguistic boundaries while also imagining its future political structure. Identity thus moved beyond the question "Who are we?" and became part of the answer to another question: "On what historical basis can we become a political community?"

The question of political subjectivity emerges from the same logic. The journal displays a clear conceptual movement from autonomy to independence, from spontaneous uprising to organization, from regional division to a unified Turkestan, and from dispersed émigré groups to a common political program. This rhetorical trajectory presented the nation not as a passive object of power, but as a subject capable of defining its own political aims. The increasing prominence in 1935–1939 of émigré organizations, national unity, political programs, and cooperation with other national movements therefore did not signify a weakening of the original political objective. Rather, it indicates that the objective was acquiring increasingly concrete organizational content.

#### Making Soviet Evidence "Speak" Again: Editorial Practice and Epistemic Competition

One of the study's important findings is that Yash Turkistan did not criticize Soviet power solely by relying on oppositional information obtained from outside the Soviet system. The editorial staff continuously monitored the Soviet press itself, rereading its quantitative indicators, administrative statements, court reports, personnel changes, and political terminology. It is therefore overly simplistic to describe the journal's attitude toward Soviet information as mere "distrust" or "denial." A more complex method was at work: official information was first accepted as evidence, then compared with other official materials, placed in a new context, and transformed into an argument that functioned contrary to its original political purpose.

The 1930 item "Turkestan News: Eltai Ernazaruly's Lie" provides a clear early example of this method. In a report delivered in Moscow, Eltai Ernazaruly, chairman of the Kazakh Central Executive Committee, stated that in 1929–1930 a total of 84,340 nomadic and semi-nomadic Kazakh households had been transferred to sedentary settlement. By the end of September, this information was published in the Kazakh party newspapers *Enbekshi Qazaq* and *Sovetskaya Step*. The editors of Yash Turkistan compared it not to an external source but to an editorial published in *Enbekshi Qazaq* on September 11, which stated that the plan to settle 84,000 households had failed due to the inactivity of the responsible institutions. Thus, within the same official

information environment, the same indicator was first presented as an unfulfilled plan and, shortly thereafter, as an accomplished result (Ernazaruly Eltaidyn otirigi, 1930, pp. 39–40).

The analytical significance of this example lies not in determining the exact number of households that were settled. The journal did not conduct an independent statistical verification of this kind. Its attention was instead directed to the temporal and logical inconsistencies within the official system itself. The issue therefore extends beyond whether a single administrative report was correct or incorrect: if a single state information system can circulate two contradictory statements within a short period, the question arises as to whether the function of official reporting is to present the situation neutrally or to demonstrate to higher authorities that policy is being implemented successfully. “Eltai Ernazaruly’s Lie” can thus be read not merely as a journalistic exposé, but as a critique of the political representational function of Soviet reporting.

This method may be provisionally termed “evidentiary inversion”. Information published by the authorities to strengthen their own legitimacy is turned into evidence against those same authorities by exposing its internal contradictions. The official evidence is not discarded; rather, its function is transformed. This process can be explained through Fairclough’s concept of intertextuality. According to this approach, the ideological meaning of a text is not determined solely by the context in which it originated. When introduced into a different discursive environment, the same text may perform a new function (Fairclough, 1995). Statistics published in a Soviet newspaper to demonstrate the success of official policy could, when placed alongside another official indicator in Yash Turkistan, become evidence that cast doubt on the informational credibility of the authorities.

Archival correspondence indicates that this practice was not the accidental ingenuity of individual authors, but an established component of editorial work. In a letter dated January 20, 1938, A. Oktay stated in detail that he had received from Mustafa Shokay ten 1937 issues of *Qyzyl Ozbekstan*, four issues of *Sotsialistik Qazaqstan*, four issues of *Sovet Turkmenstany*, and eleven issues of *Turkmenskaya Iskra*. He specifically noted delays in the arrival of previously dispatched newspapers, asked that they be traced through the postal service, and emphasized that the inability to receive the “newspapers from home” promptly and systematically was harmful to the publication process. This shows that the Soviet press was not merely supplementary reading for the editorial staff, but a regular information resource necessary for their day-to-day work (Oktay, 1938f, p. 160).

Other letters clarify how these materials were used within the editorial office. On October 8, 1938, A. Oktay discussed the possibility of preparing an article based on science and education reports in newspapers from the homeland (Oktay, 1938g, pp. 31–32). On July 22, 1939, he wrote that he had reviewed state newspapers, prepared selected reports for publication, and considered it necessary to inform readers about changes in the composition of commissariats in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan (Oktay, 1939c, pp. 127–128). Other letters show that bundles of newspapers arriving from Turkestan were distributed among members of the editorial staff and that relevant materials were marked in advance (Oktay, 1939a, pp. 90–91; Oktay, 1939b, pp. 125–126).

Foucault's concept of the "regime of truth" helps illuminate the political character of this relationship more deeply (Foucault, 1977). The publication of information by a state institution does not in itself confer upon it the status of neutral truth. Its credibility depends on the institutions that produce the information, the information system that reproduces it, and the political authority attached to it. Yash Turkistan sought precisely to disrupt this relationship. Although it accepted official texts as evidence, it did not accept their official interpretation as obligatory truth. This was one of the important methods available to an émigré press operating under conditions of limited access to information. Unable to maintain a network of independent correspondents within Soviet territory, the editorial staff transformed information scarcity into an interpretive advantage by reanalyzing the openly published data of its political opponent.

#### Linguistic Resemanticization and Interpretive Boundaries

The struggle over evidence proceeded in parallel with a struggle over political language. Concepts such as "white," "red," "patriotism," "nationalist," "autonomy," and "freedom" were not accepted in the journal with the meanings they had already assumed in Soviet discourse. The formula "White Russian, Red Russian – All the Same Russian" subordinated ideological differences between political systems to the colonial continuity in their relationship with Turkestan. Titles such as "From Soviet Patriotism to Russian Nationalism" called into question the all-Soviet meaning of official "patriotism" and sought beneath it an imperial-national hierarchy. The use of quotation marks around Soviet accusatory terms likewise signaled authorial distance: the editorial staff repeated the official term while refusing its official definition.

The alternative discourse constructed by Yash Turkistan therefore cannot be treated as a closed ideological system that emerged independently of Soviet texts. It existed in a continuous intertextual relationship with the dominant discourse. Soviet historiography supplied the contested

past, the official press provided the data for comparison, and state rhetoric produced the concepts to be resemanticized. The paradox lies precisely here: by continuously using the material of the discourse it opposed, the journal constructed from that material a system of meanings that contradicted it. Counter-discourse was therefore created not through complete rejection of the dominant language, but through the reappropriation of its evidence and categories.

#### The Structure of Yash Turkistan's Counter-Discourse

These findings make it possible to integrate the journal's diverse themes and methods within a single analytical framework. In this study, counter-discourse is treated as a higher-order category denoting a system of meaning that is an alternative to Soviet historical and political interpretation. Within this system, three principal strategies performed distinct functions.

The first was the narrative strategy. It placed historical events within a continuity different from Soviet chronology, interpreted the Kokand Autonomy and the Basmachi movement as interconnected stages of a common national movement, counterposed official anniversaries with alternative dates from national political history, and incorporated historical figures into a different political and cultural canon. In this way, counter-memory and alternative historical legitimacy were produced.

The second was the evidence-based argumentative strategy. Information, statistics, court reports, and official statements from Soviet newspapers were collected and compared. Their temporal and substantive contradictions were exposed. Through this method, the journal did not simply reject official information; it made the reliability of that information itself an object of contestation. The result was an epistemic competition over the right to define public reality.

The third was the rhetorical strategy. By renaming political concepts, placing official terms in quotation marks, and constructing evaluative labels and recurrent oppositions, the journal altered the conceptual boundaries of Soviet discourse. This strategy offered readers not only a sequence of facts, but also a conceptual framework through which those facts were to be interpreted.

The three strategies are difficult to separate in practice. Incorporating the Kokand Autonomy into the history of national statehood was a narrative act; substantiating this interpretation by comparing it with information from Soviet historiography was an evidentiary act; and renaming it through concepts such as "autonomy," "national movement," and "colonialism" was a rhetorical act. Likewise, identifying a contradiction in Soviet statistics was not merely fact-checking. It activated the truth/propaganda opposition and fed into a broader narrative concerning the political

legitimacy of official power. *Yash Turkistan*'s political effect, therefore, rested not on a single method but on the mutually reinforcing interaction of narrative, evidence, and language.

From this perspective, describing the journal simply as a collection of anti-Soviet views does not fully capture its journalistic character. *Yash Turkistan* did more than declare opposition to Soviet power. It constructed an alternative historical continuity that substantiated that position, articulated the cultural foundations of the national community, developed a political model of future statehood, and established its own argumentative procedures for testing the reliability of evidence. This is the defining feature of the journal's counter-discourse.

The unequal number of texts in the two periods reflects the study's qualitative purposive sampling strategy: priority was given not to numerical balance, but to the fullest possible coverage of substantively and discursively relevant material addressing the research questions. The number of texts in the first and second periods is unequal, and the study does not aim to establish the statistical frequency of themes. It is therefore more appropriate to speak of changes in the discursive weight of a particular issue, its relationship to other themes, and its argumentative function than to make categorical claims that a given issue "increased numerically" in the later period. This is also where the scholarly value of the periodic comparison lies: it demonstrates not the number of individual topics, but the linguistic, evidentiary, and narrative means through which a single ideological core was rearticulated under new historical conditions.

Thus, the experience of *Yash Turkistan* reveals two interrelated functions of émigré political journalism. On the one hand, for a national community located outside its territory, the journal preserved historical memory, cultural continuity, and an understanding of political futures. On the other hand, under conditions of Soviet informational dominance, it created an epistemic space in which the authorities' own openly published data could be reread and assigned alternative meanings. The journal's historical significance should therefore be understood not only in terms of its role as the voice of political emigration, but also in its construction of an autonomous interpretive system linking Turkestan's past, present, and future.

The novelty of this study lies in examining *Yash Turkistan* not only as a historical source or émigré political publication, but as a producer of an alternative intellectual discourse in which historical memory, national identity, statehood, and political agency were interconnected. By combining historical contextualization, thematic analysis, and Critical Discourse Analysis, the study addresses the gap in previous research that has largely focused on biographical, descriptive, or

political-historical interpretations of the journal. The findings demonstrate how *Yash Turkistan* constructed and sustained alternative interpretations of Soviet rule through specific narrative, rhetorical, and evidence-based argumentative strategies. The study therefore contributes to the scholarship on émigré media, historical consciousness, and political discourse by showing how émigré journalism functioned as a space for the production, preservation, and transformation of political meanings under conditions of censorship and political displacement.

### Conclusion

The study demonstrated that although *Yash Turkistan* preserved the integrity of its political and ideological core throughout 1929–1939, the methods used to explain and substantiate that core became increasingly complex over time. The political independence of Turkestan, the continuity between Tsarist and Soviet colonial domination, national unity, historical memory, and cultural continuity were persistent themes throughout the journal's entire publication history. The differences between 1929–1934 and 1935–1939 are therefore better understood not as a change in political orientation, but as an expansion of the thematic and argumentative capacity of a continuous ideological position.

The analysis also showed that historical memory, national identity, and statehood formed an inseparable system of meaning in the journal. By situating historical events within a continuity distinct from Soviet interpretation, *Yash Turkistan* constructed a distinct political past for the national movement. At the same time, language, education, the intelligentsia, and cultural heritage were presented as the foundations of the community's historical and cultural viability. The ideas of an organized movement, a common political program, and an independent state, in turn, represented the community as a political subject capable of determining its own future. From this perspective, cultural and political issues in *Yash Turkistan* were not separate themes that replaced one another, but rather interconnected components in the historical, cultural, and political substantiation of a unified Turkestan community.

These findings show that it is insufficient to assess *Yash Turkistan* solely as an émigré publication disseminating anti-Soviet views. The journal engaged continuously with the dominant Soviet discourse and constructed its own counter-discourse by reinterpreting Soviet historical narratives, political terminology, and official data. Its distinctiveness lay not in repeating ready-made political ideas but in integrating them into a coherent interpretive system through historical memory,

national identity, political subjectivity, and evidentiary argumentation. From this perspective, the study's principal scholarly conclusion is not that Yash Turkistan's discourse changed fundamentally over the course of ten years, but that its analytical and argumentative capacities gradually expanded and matured.

Because the study is based on qualitative historical-discursive analysis and a purposively selected corpus, the findings do not describe the statistical distribution of the journal's themes. Rather, they identify the principal semantic, narrative, and argumentative patterns that remained persistent in Yash Turkistan's journalism and became more developed over time.

### Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan under Project No. BR28712491 "The comprehensive literary, cultural, historical, ethnographic, geographical, and linguistic study of Shakarim Kudaiberdiuly's spiritual heritage: digital integration and ethnotourism."

### References

- Aktailak, B., Ibraemova, M., & Nabiyeu, S. (2024). Perception of Soviet Kazakhstan in emigrant publicism: An analysis of the works of Hasan Oraltay. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. History. Philosophy Series*, 29(3), 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.31489/2024hph3/41-51>
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Rev. ed.). Verso.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2007). *Post-colonial studies: The key concepts* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Atton, C. (2003). What is "alternative" journalism? *Journalism*, 4(3), 267–272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14648849030043001>
- Bas mashylar haqynda bir bolshevik serkesi. (1933). *Yash Turkistan*, (39), 6–8.
- Bas mashylyk (1919 II/20–1933). (1933). *Yash Turkistan*, (39), 1–6.
- Basqarma. (1929). Bizdin zhol. *Yash Turkistan*, (1), 1–3.
- Basqarma. (1930). Muhtariyattan istiqlalga. *Yash Turkistan*, (13), 1–5.

- Baysungur. (1930). Ak Rus; kızıl Rus bari bir Rus. *Yash Turkistan*, (3–4), 25–31.
- Bilgen. (1930). Ul'ttyq mamandar zhetistiru sayasaty. *Yash Turkistan*, (7–8), 22–27.
- Bolshevik otirikteri. (1939). *Yash Turkistan*, (114), 19–22.
- Chaves-Guerrero, E. I., Triviño-Cabrera, L., & Martínez-Enamorado, V. (2024). Historical narratives of trainee teachers: Action research regarding the visibility of the legacy of Al-Andalus in the local museum. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 15(4), 262–288. <https://jsser.org/index.php/jsser/article/view/5064>
- Connerton, P. (1989). *How societies remember*. Cambridge University Press.
- Demir, S., Tarman, B., Kilinc, E., & Yussupova, S. (2026). Exploring the Bidirectional Relationship Between Global Citizenship and Social Media Competence. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 13(4), 343–370. <https://doi.org/10.66815/ejecs/2754>
- Ernazaruly Eltaidyn otirigi. (1930). *Yash Turkistan*, (12), 39–40.
- Esen Tursun. (1935). Turkistanda til sayasaty. *Yash Turkistan*, (63), 10–15.
- Esen Tursun. (1936). Turkistanda til sayasaty. *Yash Turkistan*, (77), 18–22.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews* (D. F. Bouchard, Ed.; D. F. Bouchard & S. Simon, Trans.). Cornell University Press.
- Fuchs, C. (2010). Alternative media as critical media. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 13(2), 173–192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431010362294>
- Georgiou, M. (2006). *Diaspora, identity and the media: Diasporic transnationalism and mediated spatialities*. Hampton Press.
- Karim, K. H. (Ed.). (2003). *The media of diaspora*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203380642>
- Khalid, A. (2007). *Islam after communism: Religion and politics in Central Asia*. University of California Press.
- Lintner, T., & Reeves, E. (2026). Using scenario-based generative AI to prepare the next generation of social studies educators. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 11(2), 53–65. <https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2026.9>
- M. (1936). 1936'inchil zhyl astanasynda beynelmilel vaziyet. *Yash Turkistan*, (74), 30–35.

- M. C. (1931). “Sovet Orta Azia Federatsyonynan “Ulttyq birtutas Turkistan memleketine”. *Yash Turkistan*, (16), 4–9.
- M. N. (1930). Kızıl Tashkenttik myrzalar. *Yash Turkistan*, (3–4), 20–25.
- Mekemelerdi zhergilitendiru isi. (1935). *Yash Turkistan*, (64), 41–42.
- Oktaý. (1938a). Kures kurbandary. *Yash Turkistan*, (98), 11–18.
- Oktaý. (1938b). Kures kurbandary. *Yash Turkistan*, (99), 12–18.
- Oktaý. (1938c). Kures kurbandary. *Yash Turkistan*, (100), 9–14.
- Oktaý. (1938d). Turkistanda öltiruler, surgin zhane kamaular. *Yash Turkistan*, (104–105), 27–34.
- Oktaý. (1938e). Turkistanda Turikshildik. *Yash Turkistan*, (106), 27–36.
- Oktaý. (1938f, January 20). [Letter to Mustafa Shokay concerning the receipt and circulation of Soviet newspapers]. *Archives Mustafa Chokay Bey* (Carton VI, Dossier 3b, p. 160), Bibliothèque universitaire des langues et civilisations, Paris, France.
- Oktaý. (1938g, October 8). [Letter to Mustafa Shokay concerning the preparation of an article based on newspapers from Turkestan]. *Archives Mustafa Chokay Bey* (Carton VI, Dossier 3c, pp. 31–32), Bibliothèque universitaire des langues et civilisations, Paris, France.
- Oktaý. (1939a, April 25). [Letter to Mustafa Shokay concerning the review of Soviet state newspapers and preparation of reports for publication]. *Archives Mustafa Chokay Bey* (Carton VI, Dossier 3b, pp. 90–91), Bibliothèque universitaire des langues et civilisations, Paris, France.
- Oktaý. (1939b, May 16). [Letter to Mustafa Shokay concerning the review of Soviet state newspapers and preparation of reports for publication]. *Archives Mustafa Chokay Bey* (Carton III, Dossier 1d, pp. 125–126), Bibliothèque universitaire des langues et civilisations, Paris, France.
- Oktaý. (1939c, July 22). [Letter to Mustafa Shokay concerning the review of Soviet state newspapers and preparation of reports for publication]. *Archives Mustafa Chokay Bey* (Carton III, Dossier 1d, pp. 127–128), Bibliothèque universitaire des langues et civilisations, Paris, France.
- Pravda Ekmal Ikramdy ayiptady. (1937). *Yash Turkistan*, (94), 40–42.
- Qaraqumda basmashylyk areketi. (1933). *Yash Turkistan*, (40), 1.
- Qyrym quryltaiy ashyluynyn 20 zhyldygyn eske alu (1937). *Yash Turkistan* (97), 42.

- Ristow, B. (2011, June 15). *Independent media in exile: A report to the Center for International Media Assistance*. Center for International Media Assistance.
- Rogaar, E., Lenkart, J., & Ashcraft, K. (Eds.). (2025). *Peripheral narratives and knowledge production in Soviet and contemporary Central Asia, 1917–present*. Publishing Without Walls. <https://doi.org/10.21900/pww.24>
- Saidirakhman, U., & Akseit, G. (2025). The ideological struggle of “Yash Turkistan”: An alternative perspective against Soviet propaganda (based on issues No. 1–13). *Bulletin of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. Journalism Series*, 151(2), 176–196. <https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-7174-2025-151-2-176-196>
- Sayasi programma qurbandary. (1937). *Yash Turkistan*, (96), 11–16.
- Sayasi programma zhalgasuda. (1937). *Yash Turkistan*, (97), 14–18.
- Shoqaiuly. (1930a). Bolshevikter “tarihty qalay zhazady? *Yash Turkistan*, (3–4), 31–33.
- Shoqaiuly. (1930b). Qozgalystan quryluga (kóterilisten uiymga). *Yash Turkistan*, (9–10), 1–7.
- Shoqaiuly. (1931a). Bir “gilmi” zhalganga karsy. *Yash Turkistan*, (25), 4–11.
- Shoqaiuly. (1931b). Ulttyq ziyaly. *Yash Turkistan*, (18), 3–9.
- Shoqaiuly. (1932). Turkistan nemese Buhara ma? Alde turadan tura Turkistan? *Yash Turkistan*, (28), 1–4.
- Shoqaiuly. (1937). Hokand muhtariyeti. *Yash Turkistan*, (97), 2–4.
- Smith, A. D. (1998). *Nationalism and modernism*. Routledge.
- Sovet patriotizminen orys ultshyldygyna. (1936). *Yash Turkistan*, (76), 2–7.
- Sovet ukimetinin 20-zhyldygyna orai. (1937). *Yash Turkistan*, (96), 7–10.
- Sovet ukimetinin 21-zhyldygyna orai. (1938). *Yash Turkistan*, (108), 5–10.
- Surgunder Hali [Meshhedten]. (1932). *Yash Turkistan*, (37), 31–33.
- T. D. (1932). Turkistandagi ashtyqtyñ sebepteri. *Yash Turkistan*, (35), 13–16.
- Tahir. (1938a). Turkistan Turkileriniñ ulttyq muraty zhane Alisher Navoi. *Yash Turkistan*, (104–105), 5–23.
- Tahir. (1938b). Turkistan Turkileriniñ ulttyq muraty zhane Alisher Navoi II. *Yash Turkistan*, (106), 17–27.

- Tahir. (1938c). Turkistan Turkileriniñ ulttyq muraty zhane Alisher Navoi III. *Yash Turkistan*, (107), 7–15.
- Tahir. (1939a). Alisher Navoi zhane Sovet ukimeti. *Yash Turkistan*, (112), 20–33.
- Tahir. (1939b). Alisher Navoi zhane Sovet ukimeti II. *Yash Turkistan*, (113), 10–20.
- Tahir. (1939c). Alisher Navoi zhane Sovet ukimeti III. *Yash Turkistan*, (114), 11–19.
- Tahir. (1939d). Sultan Babyr zhane Turkistan Turk otansuigishtigi. *Yash Turkistan*, (116–117), 16–26.
- Tashbalta. (1935). Agartu maidanynda. *Yash Turkistan*, (71), 38–42.
- Tashbalta. (1936). Agartu maidanynda. *Yash Turkistan*, (75), 22–27.
- Timuroglu. (1932). Ekinshi bes jyldyq plan. *Yash Turkistan*, (30), 9–14.
- Timuroglu. (1933a). Mahta egini plany kandy atqaryluda? *Yash Turkistan*, (45), 21–25.
- Timuroglu. (1933b). Tagi mahta atyabynda. *Yash Turkistan*, (40), 8–14.
- Timuroglu. (1935a). Zhergiliktendiru isiniñ ayagi. *Yash Turkistan*, (62), 14–17.
- Timuroglu. (1935b). Zhergiliktendirudiñ 1935'inchy zhylygi hâli. *Yash Turkistan*, (67), 13–17.
- Turkistanda burzhuaziya ultshyldary soty (alty adam). (1937). *Yash Turkistan*, (96), 17–18.
- Turkistanda repressiya. (1937). *Yash Turkistan*, (97), 34–37.
- Turkistanda sayasy programma, onyñ mani men mañyzy. (1937). *Yash Turkistan*, (95), 2–7.
- Turkistanda sayasy programma. (1937). *Yash Turkistan*, (96), 2–7.
- Ulttyq birlik uyymymyz ushin. (1937). *Yash Turkistan*, (94), 5–9.
- Ünal, H. B., & Durmuşoğlu, M. C. (2026). From theory to design: Developing a multicultural education teacher training framework. *Theory and Practice in Child Development*, 6(1), 80–99. <https://doi.org/10.46303/tpicd.2026.5>
- Undistandagy Turkistan muhazhyrlary turmysynan. (1935). *Yash Turkistan*, (65), 32.
- Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (2009). *The discursive construction of national identity* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh University Press.

- Yash Turkistandyk. (1931). Sovet mektebteri zhane Turkistan zhastary. *Yash Turkistan*, (25), 12–16.
- Yash Turkistandyk. (1934). Rusya muhazheryat sayasatina bir qush qarasy. *Yash Turkistan*, (53), 12–18.
- Yash Turkistandyk. (1935). Bolshevikter tarihi aqiqatty suimeidi. *Yash Turkistan*, (68), 14–20.
- Yerdembekov, B., Kassymova, A., Aubakirova, K. & Tulebayeva, K. (2025). Implementation of the Alash Idea in Literary Translations (On the Example of Contemporary Kazakh Literature). *Open Cultural Studies*, 9(1), 20250052. <https://doi.org/10.1515/culture-2025-0052>
- Yussupova, S., & Tarman, B. (2025). Cultural Empathy and School Climate in Kazakhstan: A Factor and Cluster Analysis of Students' Perceptions. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*, 7(1), 47-65. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcsr.2025.3>