



DOI: 10.22363/2618-897X-2025-22-4-752-768

EDN: EVVCZS

Research article / Научная статья

## The Intellectual History of Olzhas Suleimenov’s “AZ i IA”

Igor V. Krupko 

The International Centre for the Rapprochement of Cultures under the auspices of UNESCO,

Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

✉ [tengri95hismatulin@mail.ru](mailto:tengri95hismatulin@mail.ru)

**Abstract.** This study examines the intellectual history of Olzhas Suleimenov’s book “AZ i IA” in 1975–1976. The ideological debate surrounding this book became one of the most resonant in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, while its historiosophical framework shaped, for decades to come, the formation of historical narratives in Kazakhstan aimed at overcoming the cultural trauma of “ahistoricity” and at acquiring historical subjectivity for the post-nomadic culture of the Kazakhs. It influenced not only public consciousness, but also the axiology of the academic narrative. The study seeks to explore the sociocultural nature and ideological contradictions of the debate provoked by the book “AZ i IA”, drawing upon archival and narrative sources, as well as the memoirs of the author and his contemporaries. Taking into account the accusations leveled against Olzhas Suleimenov — of pan-Turkism, Zionism, and skepticism — and analyzing them through such documents as the “Memorandum to the State Committee for Publishing” (*Goskomizdat*), letters of the Soviet party leadership, materials from the discussions of the book at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, critical reviews, and the course of the debate itself, we arrive at the following conclusions. First, “AZ i IA” exposed the sociocultural nature of ideological consciousness in Soviet society. Second, it vividly demonstrated the ideological contradictions between two overlapping periods in Soviet history: post-Stalinism and the Thaw. On the one hand, the country’s ideological leadership stimulated the growth of ethnological consciousness; on the other hand, it curtailed manifestations of subjectivity that exceeded the permitted boundaries of the prescribed status of the “younger brother” and suppressed attempts to rethink the dramatic pages of such kinship. The materials of these ideological debates thus allow us to investigate how the Soviet cultural hierarchy — in the Kazakhstani case — contributed to the formation of a subjectivity that sought to overcome the traumas of post-nomadism while engaging in dialogue with world culture.

**Key words:** Africa, Asia, Kazakhstan, Olzhas Suleimenov, literature, mythopoetics, poetry, historiosophy, global history, cultural exchange

**Article history:** received 10.08.2025; accepted 10.10.2025.

**Conflict of interests:** the author declares that there is no conflict of interests.

**Funding.** This article was prepared within the framework of the grant funding from the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan, IRN: AP23488969, “*The Attainment of Historical Subjectivity and the Overcoming of Cultural Traumas in the Historical Narratives of the Creative Intelligentsia of Kazakhstan (1951–1991)*.”

**For citation:** Krupko, I.V. 2025. “The Intellectual History of Olzhas Suleimenov’s ‘AZ i IA’.” *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, 22 (4), 752–768. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-897X-2025-22-4-752-768>

© Krupko I.V., 2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

## Интеллектуальная история книги Олжаса Сулейменова «Аз и Я»

И.В. Крупко 

Международный Центр сближения культур под эгидой ЮНЕСКО, Алматы, Республика Казахстан  
✉ nes.pilawa@gmail.com

**Аннотация.** Исследована история книги Олжаса Сулейменова «Аз и Я» в 1975–1976 гг. Идеологическая дискуссия вокруг этой книги оказалась одной из самых резонансных в XX в., а ее историософия определила на десятилетия вперед формирование в Казахстане исторических нарративов преодоления культурной травмы «внеисторичности» и обретения исторической субъектности посткочевой культуры казахов, повлияв не только на общественное сознание, но и на аксиологию академического нарратива. Цель и задачи исследования — изучение социокультурной природы и идеологических противоречий дискуссии, вызванной книгой «Аз и Я» на материалах архивных и нарративных источников, а также мемуаров автора и его современников. Исходя из обвинений, предъявленных Олжасу Сулейменову (в пантюризме, сионизме и скептицизме), и анализируя их в таких документах, как «Записка в Госкомиздат», письма высшего партийного руководства СССР, материалы обсуждения книги в Академии наук СССР, критические рецензии и сам ход дискуссии, мы пришли к выводу о том, что «Аз и Я», во-первых, обнажила социокультурную природу идеологического сознания советского общества, а во-вторых, наглядно продемонстрировала идеологические противоречия между двумя дрящимися периодами в истории СССР: постсталинизма и оттепели. Идеологическое руководство страны, с одной стороны, стимулировало рост этнонационального самосознания, а с другой — блокировало проявления субъектности, выходящей за дозволенные пределы предписанного статуса «младшего брата», и пресекало попытки осмысления драматических страниц истории такого родства. Материалы таких идеологических дискуссий позволяют исследовать, как советская иерархия культур в казахстанском случае сформировала субъектность преодолевающую травму постномадизма в диалоге с мировой культурой.

**Ключевые слова:** История Казахстана, советские идеологические дискуссии, Аз и Я, Олжас Сулейменов, историческая субъектность, историография, нарративы, номадизм, седентаризм

**История статьи:** поступила в редакцию 10.08.2025; принята к печати 10.10.2025.

**Конфликт интересов:** автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

**Финансирование.** Статья подготовлена в рамках грантового финансирования Комитета науки Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан ИРН: AP23488969 «Обретение исторической субъектности и преодоление культурных травм в исторических нарративах творческой интеллигенции Казахстана (1951–1991 гг.)».

**Для цитирования:** Крупко И.В. The Intellectual History of Olzhas Suleimenov’s “AZ i IA” // Полилингвильность и транскультурные практики. 2025. Т. 22. № 4. С. 752–768. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-897X-2025-22-4-752-768>

### Introduction

“...We consider it necessary to inform the Central Committee of the CPSU about the serious ideological errors contained in O. Suleimenov’s book “AZ i IA”. *The Book of the Well-Intentioned Reader*. It was published in 1975 by the publishing house “Zhazushy” of the Writers’ Union of the Kazakh SSR (print run:

60,000 copies). The author of the book is a well-known poet, who has published several collections of verse both in Kazakhstan and in Moscow, a secretary of the Board of the Writers' Union of the Republic, and a laureate of the Lenin Komsomol Prize and the State Prize of the Kazakh SSR..."<sup>1</sup>.

Thus, begins file No. 420, preserved in the Russian State Archive of Contemporary History, containing declassified documents of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee. These materials bear witness to the unexpected attention of the Soviet ideological leadership to the new book by the Kazakh poet — a work that, 11 years later, the American journal “Problems of Communism” would list among the five works that had prepared Soviet citizens' consciousness for Perestroika (alongside “The GULAG Archipelago” by A. Solzhenitsyn)<sup>2</sup>.

The result of this attention was a powerful wave of ideological condemnation and debate that swept across the Soviet Union in 1976 in response to the book “*AZ i IA*” — echoes of which can still be distinctly heard today, half a century later. To disentangle the ideological and sociocultural reasons for such extraordinary interest, in “the most reading country in the world”, in a work of this genre — a “linguistic-historiosophical detective” whose main protagonists are peoples, cultures, and ideologies — newly available archival documents, as well as narrative sources, prove indispensable. The present article is devoted to their analysis.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the USSR witnessed several major ideological debates that deeply stirred the consciousness of the intellectual stratum of this “nation of great readers”. The discussion of “*AZ i IA*” — a book that transcended many scientific prohibitions canonized during the ideological disputes of the 1920s–1950s, and that for decades to come would shape the narratives of historical subjectivity for the national intelligentsia of the post-Soviet world — has entered the intellectual history of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Beyond its factual and philological arguments, through its style of exposition and, at times, in explicit terms, a rare and alluring sense of epistemological doubt. It was precisely this doubt that became the principal target of accusations leveled against the author by the ideological guardians of the time.

Thus, through the language of philological irony and novel etymology, the Kazakh poet initiated a debate on the nature of historical knowledge — knowledge subjected to the “violence of the patriotic approach” — and on the role of ideology in scholarship. He raised questions about the “obscure passages” of “*The Tale of Igor's Campaign*” and the traumatic historical memory of the peoples of the USSR, as well as about the overcoming of the cultural trauma of “ahistoricity” among post-nomadic societies and the interconnected history of the world.

“*AZ i IA*” encompasses a wide range of themes and narratives (the deciphering of the “obscure passages” of “*The Tale of Igor's Campaign*” through Turkic

<sup>1</sup> Russian State Archive of Contemporary History (RGANI), fond 5, opis' 68, delo 420, list 11.

<sup>2</sup> Snegirev, V.N. 2020. *Olzhas Suleimenov*. Moscow: Molodaya gvardiya / ZhZL: Biografiya prodolzhaetsya...: biogr. ser.; Issue 42. P. 176.

lexemes “invisible” to the monolingual reader; the exposure of paradoxes in imperial literary scholarship; the semiotics of cultural origins in ancient civilizations; explorations of Tengrianism, Sumer, religious symbols, etc.). A detailed analysis of these issues, however, lies beyond the scope of this article. We will focus on those questions that help us better understand the causes and trajectory of the ideological debate surrounding the only Kazakhstani book in history to have touched the consciousness of such a wide audience — from Soviet dissidents to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, from leading academics and writers to the leadership of the KGB and Western Sovietologists.

### **Materials and Methods**

This article investigates the ideological history of how the Kazakh intelligentsia sought to attain historical subjectivity through the linguistic and poetic works of Olzhas Suleimenov, and in particular through his book “*AZ i IA*”. It is a story of how, following the rupture of its indigenous socio-economic and cultural foundations, the historical subjectivity of Kazakhstani society gradually took shape throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, emerging as one of the trajectories of world cultural development within the “dead knot” of sedentary historiosophy and the cultural hierarchy of “nomadic vs. sedentary”, canonized in the ideological debates of the 1920s–1950s [1. P. 266; 2. P. 125].

The rethinking and overcoming of the cultural trauma of the Kazakhs’ “ahistoricity” as a nomadic people was initiated by segments of the scientific and creative intelligentsia of Kazakhstan in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in their search for a new historical subjectivity. This search was conducted both in alignment with the ideological priorities of the Soviet state (for example, through the construction of the archaeological contours of the cultural heritage of the national republics) and in the form of veiled intellectual protests against these priorities. The pursuit of subjectivity through an internal dialogue with world culture brought together Soviet ethnocultural engineering and the production of symbolic resources of historical legitimacy in the works of the Kazakh intelligentsia of the 20<sup>th</sup> century — despite the fact that much of this intelligentsia (as in Russia and other Soviet republics) rarely rose, in their reflections, to a level that allowed them to see beyond the immediate contexts of tribal and intra-ethnic conflicts.<sup>3</sup>

These factors continue to shape the corridor of possibilities and the horizon of expectations of post-Soviet societies to this day.

A decolonial methodological lens is applied to the materials of this article Madina Tlostanova, a scholar of postcolonial and decolonial studies, in analyzing “*AZ i IA*”, describes it as perhaps the first decolonial manifesto of Kazakh culture

---

<sup>3</sup> Suleimenov, O.O. 2023. *Tak bylo...* Almaty: Service press. P. 180.

within the framework of Soviet national policy, articulated through the poetic and etymological dismantling of cultural hierarchies [3. P. 416].

In our own research, we have likewise highlighted the main factor behind the emergence of such intellectual aspirations in Kazakhstani historical science (to a lesser extent) and in the arts (to a greater extent) during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The cultural trauma produced by the long process through which the Kazakh national intelligentsia internalized the Soviet sedentary narrative — and its traumatizing thesis of the “regressiveness” of nomadic culture — was reflected in its works. From the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century onward, a part of the national intelligentsia of which Olzhas Suleimenov was, and remains, the most prominent representative — engaged in an active process of openly overcoming these hierarchies and ideological priorities through dialogue, creative experimentation, and the re-invention of images of historical subjectivity [2. P. 126].

In his 1977 article “*Nomads and Culture: The Kazakh Experiment*”, published in UNESCO’s journal *Culture* just a year after the ideological campaign against “*AZ i IA*” and the withdrawal of much of its circulation, Olzhas Suleimenov continued his attack on the sedentary ideology of historical narratives: “Who is the nomad? For a mind shaped by historical scholarship, nomads are wandering hordes who have no concept of borders or land ownership. Cities that were unfortunate enough to stand in their path disappeared from the face of the earth, and everywhere they passed, there left behind a desert. They were unfamiliar with morality or law. And, naturally, they had no knowledge of such lofty categories as faith, honor, conscience, or love...”

I speak as a condemned nomad who demands the right to a final word after the sentence pronounced by historians”<sup>4</sup>.

In “*AZ i IA*”, the author demanded precisely this right to speak, by tracing within the entanglements of world history the cultural trajectory of nomadism — a trajectory that, at different historical stages, influenced not only military and political developments but also the cultural history of the world. The poet explored an alternative history of human thought — counterposed to the ideological directives of official narratives — embodied, no less than in other traditions, in the signs of the unobjectified culture of nomads. Of course, many genuine scholars who had long engaged with the problems of Turkic nomadism had, since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, been overcoming sedentary and Eurocentric prejudices towards their object of study.<sup>5</sup> Yet in the narratives of historical memory, among the wider reading public, in the sphere of public consciousness, such a hierarchy of cultures, modes of subsistence, and historical “superiority” continued to dominate almost entirely.

---

<sup>4</sup> Suleimenov, O. 1990. “Nomads and Culture: The Kazakh Experiment.” *Essay, journalism. Poems, epics. AZ i IA*. Alma-Ata: Zhalyyn. P. 38.

<sup>5</sup> Potanin, G.N. 1893. *Eastern Motifs in Western European Medieval Epic*. Moscow; Radlov, V.V. 1989. *From Siberia. Pages of a Diary*. Moscow: Nauka. 752 p.

In our research we relied on several groups of sources, divided into the following categories:

1) *academic (scholarly) works* — ranging from external descriptions of the historical subjectivity of the Kazakhs to the writings of internal producers of historical knowledge and cultural paradigms;

2) *texts constituting the public narrative of memory* — publications of the intelligentsia, literary works attempting to comprehend the central problems of Kazakhstan's historical memory, memoirs of representatives of the intelligentsia, and ego-documents;

3) *texts of the official narrative (the language of power)* — including certain state programs and national projects that reflected and directed the emphases of historical policy.

All three categories are also represented in archival materials preserved in the holdings of the Central State Archive of Film, Photo, Phonographic Documents and Sound Recordings of the Republic of Kazakhstan (TsGA KFDZ RK) and the Russian State Archive of Contemporary History (RGANI).

## Discussion

Over the past half-century, numerous works have sought to engage with “*The Book of the Well-Intentioned Reader*”, attempting to grasp the heuristic and existential potential of scholarly and creative freedom embedded in the paradoxes of Olzhas Suleimenov's most candid work.

It is striking how a single book generated a kaleidoscope of polar ideological interpretations — among the “civilian literary critics” of the anti-Suleimenov campaign of 1975–1976, as well as in the writings of later sympathetic scholars. Whereas in the years of ideological persecution the author was simultaneously accused of pan-Turkism, Zionism, and skepticism, in the later historiographic multiverse “*AZ i IA*” has been studied as a linguistic-philosophical treatise on the national self-consciousness of Turkic peoples, the spiritual autobiography of a thinker at the boundary of cultures, the intellectual debut of Central Asia's decolonial turn, and even a manifesto of Eurasianism. Each interpretation reflects the intellectual disposition of its author, just as the negative reviews once mirrored the fears and “-isms” of Soviet society. In “*AZ i IA*”, as in a mirror of art, the reader sees themselves: in the historical “Az” — the contemporary “Ya”.

In several studies, the arguments of the book are interpreted by researchers as a continuation of the intellectual history of Eurasianism [4]. However, in their article ““*AZ i IA*” by Olzhas Suleimenov in the Context of Eurasian Discourse”, I.V. Likhomanov and V.A. Boiko question the correlation between the author's cultural-historical conception and the Eurasian ideology of the 1920s–1930s [5]. While acknowledging a number of factual parallels, they nevertheless conclude that there are fundamental ideological differences between the two intellectual traditions:

whereas the roots of early 20<sup>th</sup>-century Eurasianism are traced by scholars to the post-imperial political revanchism of a segment of the Russian elite, Suleimenov's Eurasianism represents an overcoming of post-imperial hierarchies and the search by the Kazakh intelligentsia for historical subjectivity within the labyrinth of Eurasia's interdependent history, along the pathways leading towards a universal human future.

According to the scholar L.G. Frizman, the book was subjected to ostracism for its highly appealing experiment in free thought, which rejected ideological supervision and internal censorship: "its suppression became an organic part of the total struggle against any manifestations of dissent".<sup>6</sup> This dissent is revealed in the book with utmost candor, at times inaccessible even to contemporary historians. By expressing skepticism towards the "patriotic" interpretation of the content of *The Tale* canonized by the academic community, the Kazakhstani poet deconstructed one of the most sacred texts of the canon of historical memory<sup>7</sup>.

This provides an answer to the question posed by Afanasy Mamedov in the discussion of "*AZ i IA*": "Why did a book that says nothing about dissidents, Stalin's camps, psychiatric prisons — a poet's book about *The Tale* — enter the famous group of five books that prepared the transformation of the Soviet person's consciousness during perestroika?" [3. P. 416]. The book embodied an authorial poetics of deconstruction and reconstruction of historical foundations, which in the 1970s chose as the object of its etymological analysis the very basis of Russian written culture's self-consciousness [6].

Scholars suggest that by uncovering the history of cultural interdependence between the Slavic and Turkic worlds — between settled agrarian and nomadic civilizations — Olzhas Suleimenov was "expanding the cultural-historical foundations of the unity of the Soviet people" [5. P. 141], while simultaneously intruding upon ancient Slavic unity with a reinvented Turkic nomadologos. Makhanbet Dzhusupov draws attention to the "bilingual approach of interpreting the essence of the content of 'The Tale of Igor's Campaign'", which thereby reveals previously hidden possibilities for mutual hermeneutics between languages and epochs [7].

In his study of strategies for the search for subjectivity embodied in Kazakhstani literature of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Dmitry Melnikov characterizes Suleimenov's strategy of acquiring a voice in the ideological debates over historical problems as "a manifesto of a special type of thinking — a multilingual imagination that enhances the reflexive and intuitive meta-level of the literary text" (Melnikov, 2023). Here, seemingly different linguistic and semiotic

<sup>6</sup> Frizman, L. 2000. "The Troublemaker. O. Suleimenov's Book "AZ i IA" under Ideological Criticism." *Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie*, no. 55. Available at: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2002/55/friz.html>

<sup>7</sup> Suleimenov, O.O. 1975. *AZ i IA*. Alma-Ata: Zhazushy. 304 p. P. 16.

systems, “encountering one another within a single text, create its additional complex dimensions... The languages, as it were, translate each other and generate a supra-language...” [8. P.120].

However, the Soviet ideological language of the hierarchy of ethnocultural subjectivities rejected the very possibility of such intercultural dialogue and of any influence upon the ethnocentric hegemon from the side of the “younger brothers” of the past — particularly within the sacral chronotope of events central to historical memory.

Naomi Caffee, a literary scholar and specialist in Slavic languages and literatures, professor at Reed College (USA), in her article “*Between the First, Second, and Third Worlds: Olzhas Suleimenov and Soviet Postcolonialism*” refers to him as an architect of postcolonial Kazakh identity. Examining his shift in the 1970s from cosmic themes to the linguo-historical focus of “*AZ i IA*”, she notes how the poet “assembled a vast corpus of information on ancient Turkic-centered culture and linguistics, linking the Kazakh steppes and their inhabitants to cultures such as ancient Mesopotamia” [9. P. 91–118]. The author is correct in stressing that all these phenomena cannot be considered outside the ideological context of the “*shestidesiatniki*” movement, the “*thaw*”, and the broader sociocultural processes of the postcolonial world, in which Olzhas Suleimenov actively participated during the 1960–1970s in his capacity as Deputy Chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with the Countries of Asia and Africa.

According to researchers, the subsequent reaction to the book on the part of the country’s leadership also reflects the contradictions between the late-Stalinist ideological canon (ethnocentrism, imperial orientation, the “reprimanding of nationalities”) and the “left renaissance” of the short-lived thaw, symbolized by the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress of the CPSU (1956), the support of liberation movements in Asian and African countries, the World Youth Festival in Moscow (1957), and Yuri Gagarin’s flight into space (1961), celebrated in the poem “*Earth, Bow to Man!*” The process of fleeting moments of creative emancipation and cultural rapprochement was a global phenomenon, yet “its Soviet variant possessed specific distinctions determined by the enduring nature of the political regime” [5. P. 141; 10. P. 8].

In 1976, at the height of the ideological campaign condemning “*AZ i IA*” — in the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, at a meeting of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, and in both printed and unprinted interventions — the journal “*Prostor*” removed an article by Murat Auezov entitled “*Inspired by the Breath of Eternity*”, devoted to the analysis of “*The Book of the Well-Intentioned Reader*”. In this piece, the young candidate of philological sciences, son of the classic Kazakh writer and an emerging public figure, identified the central axiological nerve of the principal monument of Old Russian literature as revealed through the intercultural reading of “*AZ i IA*”: “Stripped of accretions, *The*

*Tale* appears as a monolithic work of high dramatic resonance. Its universal human significance, as Suleimenov convincingly demonstrates, lies in a central moral problem: “one’s own injustice” (!). This is an exceedingly rare case in world medieval literature of transcending ethnic partialities — an achievement possible only for a truly great artist who loves his people as a part of humankind as a whole”<sup>8</sup>. It should be noted here that the problem of “one’s own injustice” is indeed inconceivable within the group-centered framework of agrarian-traditional consciousness [10. P. 208].

Shortly after the removal of Auezov’s article from print, in a similar manner and within the framework of the anti-Suleimenov campaign, a print run of three thousandth copies of the scholarly volume “Aesthetics of Nomadism”, edited by Murat Auezov and published by the Institute of Philosophy of the Kazakh SSR, was likewise withdrawn — apparently out of excessive precaution — and destroyed on the printing press known as the “Guillotine”.

Equally telling and precise is the characterization of the book offered by Afanasy Mamedov — one that, we are convinced, would be endorsed by all of its reflective readers: “I return to it whenever my ‘self’ treacherously slips away from me” [3. P. 416].

## Results

Olzhas Suleimenov deconstructs post-imperial hierarchies of ideologically constructed knowledge about nomadic culture simultaneously on a factually concrete (denotative) and historiosophical (connotative) levels. This is evident even in his reconstruction of a phrase from *The Tale* describing how, after his defeat by the Polovtsians, Prince Igor was forced to move “from the golden saddle to the slave’s saddle”<sup>9</sup> and to wander with the Polovtsians. The poet’s interest in this example emerged after studying a debate between the Imperial Academy scholars Korsh and Melioransky, which was devoted to clarifying the origin of the term *koshchiy* in *The Tale*. The general conclusion of the scholars was that *koshchiy*, in their view, derived from the word *koshchi* — “slave”, which had been introduced into Old Rus’ through one of the Turkic dialects.

The poet refined the translation of the ancient phrase by proposing an etymology of the word “*koshchiy*” from the archaic Turkic “*köşsi*” — “nomad”. Such a rendering — “he moved from the golden saddle to the nomad’s saddle” — was, of course, far more logical, given that *Konchak*, into whose saddle Igor was forced to move, was both a khan and the prince’s father-in-law. This, in turn,

<sup>8</sup> Auezov, M. 2006. “Inspired by the Breath of Eternity—the Tale.” *Central Asia Monitor: The Book “AZ i IA” of Olzhas as a Forerunner of Kazakhstan’s Sovereignty*, no. 19, p. 8

<sup>9</sup> Suleimenov, O.O. 2025. *AZ i IA. The Book of the Well-Intentioned Reader*. Almaty: Service Press. P. 15.

became the proto-form of the Old Rus' designation for a representative of the "Wild Steppe", a figure that, in the era of the "three-hundred-year yoke" acquired a fabulous figurativeness. In this way, conceptions of the indestructible nomad were embodied in the folkloric image of *Koshchei the Deathless*, superimposed upon older archetypes.

The rejection of the definition "slave", even at the level of mistranslations of the ancient text, becomes one of the ways in which post-nomadic culture acquires historical subjectivity.

One of the problems of this semiosis, still insufficiently recognized, was the so-called Sogdian theory of the genesis of Turkic script — refuted in "*AZ i IA*" and in the author's later works. This theory, formulated in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, reflected the same sedentary perspective on the nomadic Turkic peoples. Old Oghuz or Old Turkic, as it was termed by scholars before the First Turkological Congress (Baku, 1926), was considered to have been borrowed in the 5<sup>th</sup> century CE from Sogdian merchants, whose caravans from Central Asia reached the Mongolian steppes (despite the fact that the Sogdian and Old Turkic alphabets shared only one common letter — **М** (h)). Within the sedentary worldview, however, the nomadic Turkic peoples were deemed "incapable" of inventing their own writing system.<sup>10</sup> Some contemporary researchers reinforce this skepticism by drawing attention to the numerous descriptive-pictorial and associative-mnemonic signs that could have served as the basis for the earliest logograms, as well as to the fact that Turkic script incorporated certain autochthonous symbols containing genealogical, magical, and cosmogonic semantics [11. P. 5].

The materials of such ideological debates make it possible to examine how the Soviet hierarchy of cultures, aimed at the "instruction of ethnicity," shaped a traumatized subjectivity of overcoming the "dead-end historical role" imposed by sedentarist historiography.

These examples make it possible to explore the dialectics of the internal boundaries of such historical subjectivity, which balanced within the sedentarist trap between notions of a primordial inability for historical creation (the Sogdian theory of the invention of writing, the stigmatization of nomads as primordial barbarians, etc.) and the appropriation of the cultural heritage of the cities of Central Asia that came to be located within the territory of the Kazakh SSR.

In the ideological foundations of the post-imperial architecture of the first state of universal brotherhood, a hierarchy of destructive inequality was embedded, with a chronometer set for decades of creative unfreedom.

In the most candid chapter of the proscribed book "*AZ i IA*" entitled "*The Right to Error*", Olzhas Suleimenov returns to the definition of "slave" (a passage readily legible through the lens of subaltern studies), offering an utterly honest delineation

---

<sup>10</sup> Suleimenov, O.O. 2002. *Turkic peoples in prehistory: On the origins of ancient Turkic languages and scripts*. Almaty: Atamura. P. 5.

of the role of the creator under conditions of ideocracy: “...Here I depend on no one; *here it is interesting to be a slave...*”<sup>11</sup>

The sensitivity with which the ideological system reacted to such revelations is evidenced by the powerful campaign that unfolded in 1975–1976. In addition to severe reprimands, two public condemnations (the first at Academy of Sciences of the USSR, the second at the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan), and numerous critical publications in journals and newspapers, the author and the book’s publishers were spared more serious consequences thanks to the active stance of D.A. Kunaev, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Kazakh SSR. Having secured Brezhnev’s support in his confrontation with M. Suslov, Secretary of the Central Committee for Ideology, Kunaev preserved not only the disgraced author and the team that published the book, but also himself as the head of the most international of republics – dubbed the “laboratory of the friendship of peoples”.<sup>12</sup>

On February 4, 1976, a congress of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan was held in Alma-Ata, at which Olzhas Suleimenov was elected a candidate member of the Central Committee. Immediately after this election, the CPSU Central Committee could no longer apply harsh repressive measures (so as to avoid a “violation of party ethics”). Suslov was forced to shift the condemnation to the level of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. By that time, however, the wave of discussions had already swept across the “country of the great reader”, reaching even its highest leadership and representatives of diverse professional spheres.

In a memorandum preserved in the Russian State Archive of Contemporary History (RGANI), Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR V. Semenov wrote to M.V. Zimyanin, Secretary the CPSU Central Committee: “In fact, this is a genuine sortie of a nationalist, pan-Turkic character, directed against the CPSU line on the further consolidation of the friendship of peoples and Soviet patriotism. O. Suleimenov writes that he has “followers” among the writers of Kazakhstan. This may be aimed at rallying nationalist dissidents.”<sup>13</sup>

In a memorandum to the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee, the Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Publishing, B.I. Stukalin, set out in detail all the ideological “errors” of O. Suleimenov (dated November 26, 1975, No. 354/18). What outraged the ideologists was that the author had questioned the interpretation of the monument as an ancient patriotic epic and “attempts to assert that patriotism is incompatible with objective scientific research”, referring also to “the violence of the patriotic approach” and to “the swamp of patriotic scientific works”. The Chairman of the State Committee for

<sup>11</sup> Suleimenov, O.O. 2025. *AZ i IA. The Book of the Well-Intentioned Reader*. Almaty: Service Press. P. 196.

<sup>12</sup> Kunaev, D.A. 1992. *About my time: Memoirs*. Alma-Ata: Daur, MP “Yntymak”, 1992. 312 p.

<sup>13</sup> *Russian State Archive of Contemporary History (RGANI)*, fond 5, opis’ 68, delo 420, list 11.

Publishing expressed concern that the book might attract the attention of “various anti-Soviet centers abroad”<sup>14</sup>, which could use it to critically highlight Soviet nationalities policy. The vigilant Stukalin further listed by name all those “responsible” for the positive assessment of the published book — academic reviewers and journalists: R. Zueva, S. Shteingrud, V. Zlobin, Dzhukebaev and Vladimirov<sup>15</sup>.

According to the Chairman of the State Committee for Publishing, a particular insult was inflicted by Olzhas Suleimenov upon Karl Marx, who had once written that “the essence of the poem lies in the calls of the Russian princes for unity in the face of the Mongol invasion”.<sup>16</sup> The poet compared this assertion to a “universal skeleton key” that generations of scholars had employed since their youth to unlock whichever doors they required.

What aroused the indignation of the author of this memorandum was Olzhas Suleimenov’s assessment of historians and Turkologists, whom he regarded as “unable to keep their trousers on without the suspenders of devoted discipleship, endlessly and blindly repeating the offensive truths of their respectable teachers.”<sup>17</sup>

It was precisely these individuals who, in close ranks, came on February 13, 1976 to the building of the Department of Social Sciences of the Academy on Volkhonka Street to condemn the author’s scholarly and ideological errors — 47 full members, corresponding members, and doctors of science. The author was accompanied by Sanzhar Zhandosov, head of the Science Department of the Central Committee, and Gennady Tolmachev, deputy editor-in-chief of the publishing house “Zhazushy.”<sup>18</sup>

In total, according to the memorandum, 17 speakers took the floor. Notably, D. Likhachev — the leading specialist on *The Tale* — was absent from the discussion. It is possible that, understanding the nature of the forthcoming event, he chose not to participate, mindful of his own experience of censure, but instead submitted a rather restrained written review.<sup>19</sup>

The discussion lasted from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. When, at the end, the author was granted the right to a “final word”, he replied that he agreed with some of his opponents’ remarks, but not with all of them. He categorically rejected the assessment offered by Academician Rybakov: “My entire book is a confession of love for *The Tale*, for Russian culture, to which I myself belong largely through my

<sup>14</sup> *Russian State Archive of Contemporary History (RGANI)*, fond 5, opis’ 68, delo 420, list 11.

<sup>15</sup> RGANI, fond 5, opis’ 68, delo 420, list 11; Zueva R., and S. Shteingrud. 1975. “Kipchak Words Have Grown into the Slavic Verse.” On the New Book by Olzhas Suleimenov “*AZ i IA*.” *Leninskaya smena*, vol. 133, July 9.

<sup>16</sup> RGANI, fond 5, opis’ 68, delo 420, list 11.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Suleimenov, O.O. *Tak bylo...* 2023. Almaty: Service press. P. 56.

<sup>19</sup> Likhachev, D.S. 1976. “Hypotheses or Fantasies in the Interpretation of Obscure Passages of “The Tale of Igor’s Campaign”.” *Zvezda*, no. 6, pp. 203–210.

upbringing and education. I regret that you did not see this in the book, dear Boris Aleksandrovich. Some people are accustomed to thinking that declarations of love must be made on one's knees".<sup>20</sup>

Of particular interest is Lev Gumilev's review of "*AZ i IA*" (unknown to most researchers who have written about the book, including the author himself). In it, Gumilev writes not so much about the book itself as he does in an ironic vein about the scandal that erupted within the academic community, while briefly turning to his theory of ethnogenesis and criticizing the critical reviews of "*AZ i IA*".<sup>21</sup>

Probably among the most odious reviews of the book is an article by Yu. Seleznev, one of the "spiritual leaders" of the soil-bound writers, who concluded his piece with a weighty "revelation": "It is difficult to say whether O. Suleimenov will find within himself sufficient strength and talent, sufficient spiritual maturity, to understand the causes and consequences of his "myth-making", to recognize where it leads and to whom it is of benefits."<sup>22</sup>

The writer, translator, and chairman of the Union of Russian-language Writers of Israel, David Markish, wrote about the ideological condemnation of "*AZ i IA*" and its author as follows: "Had Olzhas been a Russian, an 'insider', such a scandal would not have erupted: he would merely have been scolded as a 'brash fellow' and his mistakes pointed out... But here it was a Polovtsian, the ancient steppe adversary, who dared to lay hands on the sacred."<sup>23</sup>

In the memorandum summarizing the discussion of "*AZ i IA*" at the joint meeting of the Bureau of the Department of Literature and Language and the Bureau of the Department of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, particular attention was devoted to the criticism of "a phraseology and symbolism alien to us, as internationalists, in relation to the 'historical mission' of the Jewish people". This critique was based on several of Olzhas Suleimenov's historical-linguistic comments concerning certain late Semitic signs of Ancient Near East and the history of the Khazar Khaganate, and led to accusations of the author's "Zionism."<sup>24</sup>

In the document dated 22 July 1976, submitted to the CPSU Central Committee and signed by Deputy Head of the Propaganda Department G. Smirnov, Head of

<sup>20</sup> Suleimenov, O.O. *Tak bylo...* 2023. Almaty: Service press. 16 p.

<sup>21</sup> Gumilev, L.N. 1975. "Debate with a Poet on the Article by A. Kuzmin 'The Point in a Circle from Which a Burdock Grows'" [*Journal "Molodaya gvardiya"*, no. 12. Available at: <http://www.kulichki.net/~gumilev/articles/Article02.htm>

<sup>22</sup> Seleznev, Yu. 1976. *Myths and Truths*. Moscow, pp. 201–208; Ogryzko, V. 2013. "And the Eternal Struggle: Yuri Seleznev." *Literaturnaya Rossiya*, no. 23. June 7, 2013. Available at: <http://www.litrossia.ru/archive/item/6495-oldarchive>

<sup>23</sup> Markish, D. 2016. "The Steppe Wind of Legend." In *Olzhas i Ya*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literature publ., pp. 199–203.

<sup>24</sup> Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences (ARAN) fond 457. opis' 1. delo 674. list 133; Dmitriev, L., and O. Tvorogov. 1976. "The Tale of Igor's Campaign" in the Interpretation of O. Suleimenov." *Russkaya literature*, pp. 251–258; Kuzmin, A. 1975. *The Point in a Circle from Which a Burdock Grows*. *Molodaya gvardiya*, no. 12, pp. 270–280.

the Department of Science and Educational Institutions S. Trapeznikov, and Head of the Department of Culture V. Shauro, Suleimenov was accused, among other things, of treating “the history of relations between Turkic tribes and other peoples in a one-sided manner, from extremely objectivist positions”.<sup>25</sup> It is possible that what was intended here were the poet’s “subjectivist” positions, yet even in this wording — an accidental slip of the socialist realist clerk’s pen — the accusation appears highly characteristic.

The condemnation of the book continued not only in scholarly and ideological writings, but also in works of fiction — for instance, in the novel “*Everything Lies Ahead*”<sup>26</sup> by the soil-bound writer Vasily Belov.

At the same time, despite such a powerful ideological campaign, some critics nonetheless acknowledged the author’s right to be correct. Even in the memorandum submitted to the State Committee for Publishing, it was noted that certain of the author’s arguments appeared justified — specifically, his observations concerning “the insufficient scholarly study of the cultural history of Turkic-speaking peoples, the Turkic-Tengrians, the Kipchaks, and the Khazars”, as well as their role “in resisting the aggression of the Arabs, and later the Tatar-Mongols, in the regions of Eastern Europe”.<sup>27</sup> The author’s assessment of the nature of “the feudal strife in Rus’ during the 11<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> centuries — when the position of a particular prince, as well as that of the Polovtsy who participated in these conflicts, was determined not by the opposition of Rus’ to the “steppe”, but by the criteria of internecine struggle”<sup>28</sup> — was likewise recognized as valid.

In the course of the discussion (held behind closed doors), leaders of the KGB also took part. According to the recollections of Olzhas Omarovich, after the conclusion of a writers’ plenum in 1976, a man in civilian clothing approached him and asked him come “to see Filipp Denisovich”. This was how Olzhas Suleimenov first met the head of the Fifth “Ideological” Directorate and later Deputy Chairman of the KGB, Filipp Bobkov, who remarked in conversation that he and his colleagues had “carefully studied the book and found nothing objectionable in it. Perhaps it contains certain debatable or mistaken judgments, but those fall outside our jurisdiction. This is a matter for scholarship.”<sup>29</sup>

The book was not republished until 1990. With the royalties received from the second edition of “*AZ i IA*”, which had a print run of 200,000 copies, Olzhas Suleimenov purchased and donated eight one-room apartments to students who had participated in the December 1986 events and were returning from prison [4. P. 118].<sup>30</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Russian State Archive of Contemporary History (RGANI), fond 5. opis’ 68. delo 420. list 27.

<sup>26</sup> Belov, V. 1993. *Vsyo vpered. Roman [Everything Lies Ahead. A Novel]*. Moscow: Sovremennyi pisatel’ publ. 222 p.

<sup>27</sup> RGANI fond 5. opis’ 48. delo 420. list 2.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, list 3.

<sup>29</sup> Snegirev, V.N. 2020. *Olzhas Suleimenov*. Moscow: Molodaya gvardiya, issue 42, p. 179.

<sup>30</sup> Suleimenov, O.O. 2023. *Tak bylo...* Almaty: Service press, p. 118.

Over time, certain propositions of the book gradually entered the academic narrative, enriching not only “*Slavic studies*” but also other disciplines in the humanities, while “prudently forgetting their origins”. The author’s ideas likewise began to be engaged with by the most forward-thinking scholars [13].

### Conclusion

Thus, the debate and condemnation surrounding the book “*AZ i IA*” gave rise to one of the most vivid and significant ideological discussions on historical knowledge. In the course of this debate, not only scholarly issues were at stake, but also human destinies and the potential trajectory of the ideological climate in the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic.

The book itself became a multilayered deciphering: first of the “obscure passages” in *The Tale of Igor’s Campaign*, then of the origins of the word and sign as a multicultural logos, and finally — at the stage of public controversy — of the ideological contradictions of the era.

Despite the apparent absurdity of the accusations leveled against the author in 1975–1976, as analyzed in the article, such a reaction of the ideological system was highly characteristic and served as a mirror reflection of the radical epistemological rupture effected in the book. The author’s strategy — an exit from binary oppositions and predetermined ideological trajectories in favor of producing new, alternative forms of knowledge — may be regarded as one of the few successful attempts to reclaim historical subjectivity and to transcend cultural hierarchies, without collapsing into the extremes of glorification or victimization.

The importance of engaging with the intellectual legacy of that tradition — embodied in the works of several prominent figures, the most significant of whom was and remains Olzhas Suleimenov — lies in the fact that contemporary attempts to appropriate and develop decolonial and postcolonial agendas within Kazakhstani humanities, which have intensified over the past decade, appear largely unproductive. This is because they are adopted through external reception, as a form of intellectual fashion, superimposed upon cultural traumas and inherited archetypes of mass consciousness, rather than grounded in the study and assimilation of the intellectual experience of past decades and the ideological debates whose arguments, logic, and paradoxes continue to recur among new post-Soviet generations of a future that has yet to arrive.

### References

1. Abylkhozhin, Zh.B., and I.V. Krupko, 2024. “Ideological debates and the search for historical subjectivity in Kazakhstani society in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.” *New Research of Tuva*, no. 3, pp. 265–278. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2024.3.15> EDN: IUVNNU Print.
2. Krupko, I.V. 2023. “Reinventing the historical subjectivity of the Kazakhs in the works of Olzhas Suleimenov of the 1960s.” *Ural Historical Journal*, vol. 78, no. 1, pp. 123–132. (In Russ.) [https://doi.org/10.30759/1728-9718-2023-1\(78\)-123-132](https://doi.org/10.30759/1728-9718-2023-1(78)-123-132) EDN: KYFNAO Print.

3. Tlostanova, M. 2018. "His main target was Eurocentrism." *Olzhas i Ya. Book Two*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, pp. 415–436. Print. (In Russ.)
4. Dolzhikov, V.A. 2019. "Eurasian Integral Turkic-Slavism of O. Suleimenov." *Proceedings of the First International Altaic Forum "Turkic-Mongolian World of Greater Altai: Historical and Cultural Heritage and Modernity."* Barnaul-Gorno-Altaysk, September 12–14, 2019. Barnaul: Altai University Press. 396 p. P. 70. EABRFU Print. (In Russ.) EDN: EABRFU
5. Likhomanov, I.V., and V.A. Boiko. 2019. "AZ i IA" by Olzhas Suleimenov in the Context of Eurasian Discourse." *Tomsk State University Journal*, no. 454, pp. 137–144. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.17223/15617793/454/16> EDN: GADFTD Print.
6. Ram H. 2001. "Imagining Eurasia: The Poetics and Ideology of Olzhas Suleimenov's *AZ i IA*." *Slavic Review*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 289–311. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.2307/2697272> EDN: HACQYP Print.
7. Dzhusupov, M. 2020. "Olzhas Suleimenov's *AZ i IA* (the gene of disobedience and the gene of justice)." *Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 219–236. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.36078/1586145534> EDN: ZLDBWH Print.
8. Melnikov, D. 2023. "Towards post- / decolonial imagination: Artistic reflection of space and language in post-Soviet Russian-language literature of Kazakhstan." Bissenova A.Zh., et al. *Qazaqstan. Kazakhstan, قازاقستان: Labyrinths of Contemporary Postcolonial Discourse*. Center for Contemporary Culture "Tselinny", Almaty. pp.120–122.
9. Caffee, N. 2020. "Between the First, Second, and Third Worlds: Olzhas Suleimenov and Soviet Postcolonialism, 1961–1973." *Russian Literature*, vol. 111, pp. 91–118. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ruslit.2020.03.004> EDN: FQMIHG Print.
10. Abylkhozhin, Zh.B. 2020. *The post-Stalinist period in the history of Soviet Kazakhstan: A series of doomed reforms and failed declarations (1953–1991)*. Almaty: KBTU. 468 p.
11. Manichkin, N.A. 2025. "Interdependent formation: Poetic reinterpretation of symbols and images of historical memory in Kazakhstan." *Asian Journal "Steppe Panorama,"* vol. 2, no. 10, pp. 334–346. (In Russ.) [https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994\\_2023\\_34\\_2\\_334-346](https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994_2023_34_2_334-346) Print.
12. Preobrazhensky, S.Yu. 2018. "On the imaginary philosophy of O.O. Suleimenov." *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 406–409. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-897X-2018-15-3-406-409> EDN: YLXEZV Print.

### Список литературы

1. Абылхожин Ж.Б., Крупко И.В. Идеологические дискуссии и поиск исторической субъектности казахстанского общества в XX веке // Новые исследования Тувы. 2024. № 3. С. 265–278. <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2024.3.15> EDN: IUVNNU
2. Крупко И.В. Переизобретение исторической субъектности казахов в творчестве Олжаса Сулейменова 1960-х гг. // Уральский исторический вестник. 2023. № 1 (78). С. 123–132. [https://doi.org/10.30759/1728-9718-2023-1\(78\)-123-132](https://doi.org/10.30759/1728-9718-2023-1(78)-123-132) EDN: KYFNAO
3. Тлостанова М. Главной его мишенью был европоцентризм // Олжас и Я. Книга вторая. Москва : Художественная литература, 2018. С. 415–436.
4. Должиков В.А. Евразийский интегральный тюркославизм О. Сулейменова // Материалы Первого Международного алтаистического форума «Тюрко-монгольский мир большого Алтая: историко-культурное наследие и современность». 2019. С. 70. EDN: EABRFU
5. Лихоманов И.В., Бойко В.А. «Аз и Я» Олжаса Сулейменова в контексте евразийского дискурса // Вестник Томского государственного университета. 2020. № 454. С. 137–144. <https://doi.org/10.17223/15617793/454/16> EDN: GADFTD
6. Ram H. Imagining Eurasia: The Poetics and Ideology of Olzhas Suleimenov's *AZ i IA* // *Slavic Review*. 2001. Vol. 60. No. 2 (Summer). P. 289–311. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2697272> <https://doi.org/10.2307/2697272> EDN: HACQYP

7. Джусупов М. «Аз и Я» Олжаса Сулейменова (ген неповиновения и ген справедливости) // Ўзбекистонда хорижий тиллар. 2020. № 1 (30). С. 219–236. <https://doi.org/10.36078/1586145534> EDN: ZLDBWH
8. Мельников Д. К пост- / деколониальному воображению: Художественная рефлексия пространства и языка в постсоветской русскоязычной литературе Казахстана // Qazaqstan. Казахстан, قازاقستان: лабиринты современного постколониального дискурса / А.Ж. Бисенова и др. Центр современной культуры «Целинный». Алматы, 2023. С.120–122
9. Caffee N. Between First, Second, and Third Worlds: Olzhas Suleimenov and Soviet Postcolonialism, 1961–1973 // Russian Literature. 2020. Vol. 111. P. 91–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ruslit.2020.03.004> EDN: FQMING
10. Абылхожин Ж.Б. Постсталинский период в истории советского Казахстана: череда обреченных реформ и несостоявшихся деклараций (1953–1991 гг.). Алматы : КБТУ, 2020.
11. Маничкин Н. Взаимозависимое становление: поэтическая реинтерпретация символов и образов исторической памяти в Казахстане // Asian Journal “Steppe Panorama”. Вып. 10. № 2. С. 334–346. [https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994\\_2023\\_34\\_2\\_334-346](https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994_2023_34_2_334-346)
12. Преображенский С.Ю. О воображаемой филологии О.О. Сулейменова // Полилингвильность и транскультурные практики. 2018. Т. 15. № 3. С. 406–409. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-897X-2018-15-3-406-409> EDN: YLXEZV

#### Сведения об авторе:

**Крупко Игорь Владимирович** — доктор философии в области истории, заместитель директора Центра сближения культур под эгидой ЮНЕСКО, Республика Казахстан, 050010, г. Алматы, ул. Кунаева, д. 120. ORCID: 0000-0002-5349-0256. E-mail: [tengri95hismatulin@mail.ru](mailto:tengri95hismatulin@mail.ru)

#### Bio note:

**Igor V. Krupko** is a PhD in History, Deputy Director of the International Centre for the Rapprochement of Cultures, Republic of Kazakhstan, 050010, Almaty, 120 Kunaev St. ORCID: 0000-0002-5349-0256. E-mail: [tengri95hismatulin@mail.ru](mailto:tengri95hismatulin@mail.ru)