

Yerlanbek ZHALMAGAMBETOV ✉* (Abai KazNPU, Almaty, Kazakhstan)

Shamek TLEUBAYEV** (IHE, Almaty, Kazakhstan)

Dariya ASSYMOVA*** (Abai KazNPU, Almaty, Kazakhstan)

Saiyn BORBASSOV**** (IHE, Almaty, Kazakhstan)

Yenglik NURMUKHAN***** (Abai KazNPU, Almaty, Kazakhstan)

State Construction and the Impact of the Relocation of the Capital City in Soviet Kazakhstan at the Beginning of the 20th Century

<https://doi.org/10.34739/his.2024.13.24>

Abstract: *The purpose of the work is to reveal the topic of state and state-building in Kazakhstan, aspects of its management system, description of the features of the phenomenon of the “migrating capital”, as well as the relationships between them. The paper presents a study of the phenomenon of capital relocation and its impact on society; reveals the features of the national and state construction of Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 20th century. The materials of the paper are of the practical and theoretical value for sociologists, political scientists, historians, and researchers of the influence of the capital city relocation on the development of the system of governance and power in the state, and people who are interested in the features and aspects of the development of Kazakhstan in the early 20th century, its political structure, which is an integral part of state-building.*

Key words: Ethnic Group, State-building, Migrating Capital, Shifting of the Capital, post-Soviet Area, Civil Nation, Localisation Policy

* Corresponding Author. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0246-0572>.
yzhalmagambetov@gmail.com; Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University.

** ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9659-1006>. shamek.tleubayev@outlook.com;
Institute of History and Ethnology named after Sh. Sh. Ualikhanov of Science Committee of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

*** ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4322-4584>. dariya_assymova@proton.me;
Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University.

**** ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3105-3696>. saiyn.borbassov@hotmail.com;
Institute of History and Ethnology named after Sh. Sh. Ualikhanov of Science Committee of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

***** ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2368-0884>. nurmukhan15@proton.me;
Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University.

Introduction

The Republic of Kazakhstan's statehood and sovereignty are undeniable in the modern era. However, a protracted and labour-intensive process of nation-building was necessary to get this outcome. This is because, not so long ago, the Republic of Kazakhstan was a part of the Soviet Union, meaning that all of its political, economic, and other processes were under the control of the Moscow government.¹ E.I. Pivovarov and E.A. Kosovan argued that the fact of the relocation of the capital status from one city to another is not something unusual for Kazakhstan.² On the contrary, such a phenomenon has been observed at least 4 times. In each of the cases, this action was aimed at strengthening the statehood of Kazakhstan and consolidating its society.

In the modern world, the need for a strong and stable state is a key factor in its development. At the dawn of the Kazakh state, its society consisted mostly of a nomadic population, which prevented the establishment of administrative borders.³ The zhuz organisation of the nomadic society was closely connected with geographical features and actively influenced ethnic identification.

Separately, it is worth noting the importance of language in the process of state-building. S.S. Kaziev and E.N. Burdina claim that during the period of Soviet "localisation policy" in Kazakhstan, it was possible to create a convenient administrative apparatus for the local population⁴. It is important that not only Kazakhs, as representatives of the titular ethnic group, could become part of it, but also representatives of any other peoples, subject to the main condition – proficiency in the Kazakh language. This condition directly strengthened both the identity of the Kazakh nation and the Kazakh state itself.⁵

Significant gaps persist in the current body of knowledge concerning state-building in early 20th-century Kazakhstan, specifically about the strategic tool of capital relocation for consolidation purposes. Although capital relocation has been studied

¹ E.A. Kosovan (2019: 998-9) concluded that the Alash Autonomy, which emerged at the beginning of the 20th century, and later the Kazakh ASSR, were characterised by the following problems: fragmentation of society, lack of unity in society, the "top-down" establishment of state structures. One of the ways to solve these problems was the relocation of the capital.

² Pivovarov & Kosovan, 2019a.

³ Following the conclusions of D.A. Amanzholova (2020), the traditional way of life, economic and artistic culture, the hierarchy of society in Kazakhstan were determined by complex tribal relationships that for many centuries developed around objective natural and climatic conditions with extremely poor development of transport infrastructure and cities.

⁴ Kaziev & Burdina, 2019.

⁵ According to the conclusions of S.A. Tarkhov (2008), it is entrusted with certain image functions, since the capital embodies and presents the whole state. After all, this city is not just the location of the head of state, not just the city where the highest state institutions are located. It is the main symbol of both the state and the nation, embodying many significant social, cultural, and political archetypes, reflecting the state of society. According to the researcher, from the end of the 18th to the beginning of the 21st century, the relocation of the capital took place in 69 countries, and some states performed this action repeatedly.

in the past, there hasn't been a thorough examination of how it affects society structures, governance, and the development of regional identity. A significant shortcoming is the absence of particulars concerning the management system in place at this pivotal time. The system's structure and important players are mentioned in the authors' texts, but they fall short of giving a thorough grasp of the complex governance mechanisms, difficulties faced, or adjustments made in reaction to the capital's relocation.⁶

Furthermore, the articles raise the possibility of a relationship between climate and environmental factors and the current management system, but it doesn't provide specific examples or delve deeply into the ways that geographic and environmental factors impact governance practices. To truly understand the subtleties of this relationship, a more thorough study is necessary. Moreover, the historical account of Kyzylorda and the everyday lives of its people, given its status as a capital city, is still not sufficiently clear. To obtain a comprehensive understanding of the impact of capital relocation on both urban and rural sectors in Kazakhstan, a more thorough investigation is necessary to examine the implications of this transition on the city's social fabric, infrastructure development, and economic dynamics. These research gaps must be filled to further the understanding of this critical period of Kazakhstan's history and make it more inclusive and thorough in its academic analysis.⁷

The purpose of the work is to reveal the topic of state and state-building in Kazakhstan, aspects of its management system, description of the features of the phenomenon of the "migrating capital", as well as the relationships between them. Therefore, the article's objectives are: The "migrating capital" phenomenon in Kazakhstan, with a focus on examining its causes, effects, historical background, and driving forces; The characteristics of the state and state-building in Kazakhstan during the early 1900s, with an emphasis on the effects of the capital shift on social cohesion, identity formation, and governance frameworks; The connection between Kazakhstan's natural and climatic environment and its management system, looking at how location and surroundings influenced administrative procedures and decision-making; An examination of Kyzylorda's development as a capital city, taking into account social shifts, economic expansion, urban planning, and resident experiences.

⁶ N.A. Koldobskaya (2022) noted that the assignment of the capital status to the city directly affects many indicators: an increase in population, acceleration of changes in the quality of the urban environment, an increase in living standards. This is conditioned by the fact that the relocation of the capital city gives a significant impetus to the comprehensive development of the region in which it is located (see also Cherkes & Idak, 2022). New transport and infrastructure facilities are also being created, and industry is developing. Consequently, it was revealed that the problem of state-building in Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 20th century (in particular, using the example of the relocation of the capital to the city of Kyzylorda) is insufficiently disclosed, therefore, the purpose of this study is a comprehensive investigation of the stated topic; see also Zhalmagambetov *et al.*, 2013.

⁷ Kerimkhulle *et al.*, 2022; Aleksieienko, Leliuk & Poltinina, 2021.

Discussion

Factors in decisions to relocate capitals

The nomadic lifestyle of the majority of the population of Kazakhstan is considered equally important, which led to the complication of the establishment of administrative borders, and the foundation of state institutions. The first attempt at the self-determination of the Kazakhs can be considered Alash Autonomy (Alash Orda) created in 1917 as part of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR) with its capital in Alash-Kala. Although being part of another state, autonomy is the first step in the process of state-building.⁸

After the liquidation of the Alash Autonomy in 1920, the Kyrgyz Autonomous Socialist Soviet Republic (KASSR) was approved with the centre in Orenburg. However, the local authorities considered it unacceptable to find the capital of the republic on the territory of Russia, since Orenburg was neither an economic nor a cultural centre of the region. Nevertheless, the main reason for the need to move the capital was the remoteness of Orenburg from the main territory of Kazakhstan, the small number of the Kazakh population, and the fact that over time Orenburg became part of the RSFSR. Party leaders even proposed to annex the Turgai region, populated mainly by Kazakhs, as a way to solve this problem. However, in connection with the then delimitation of administrative borders in Central Asia and new territorial acquisitions (the Zhetysu and Syrdarya provinces in the south and the Karakalpak Autonomous Region), party leaders agreed on the relocation of the capital as the optimal solution to the task.⁹ It was decided to move the capital to one of the newly acquired regions, populated mainly by Kazakhs and having transport links with the whole country. In April 1925, Orenburg province was withdrawn from the KASSR, after which the republic was renamed the Kazakh ASSR. Thus, the choice fell on Ak Mosque. The city was formerly known as Perovsk, but Sultanbek Kozhanov changed its name back to Ak Mosque before Kyzylorda was eventually adopted in the same month.¹⁰

The city was suitable for this role due to its territorial location, mono-ethnic Kazakh population, transport links with various regions of autonomy, good opportunities for the development of agriculture, mining, and fishing industry. Thus, the city embodied the idea that the Kazakh people do not need a “beautiful city with tall houses”, they need at least a small, but their own capital.¹¹ However, the city was small: there were 941 households in it, the population was about 10 thousand people, there was no electricity in it – the streets were lit with kerosene lamps, and the ditches simulta-

⁸ Doszhan, 2023.

⁹ Baranov & Sevgi, 2021.

¹⁰ Ilyassova & Bagdatova, 2018.

¹¹ Kumyrzak, 2017.

neously served as gutters and a watering hole for livestock. The townspeople suffered from dust, as there were no pavements, the only water pump in the city could not cope with meeting the needs of the entire population.¹² Put simply, these words highlight the shortcomings and limits of the infrastructure of capital cities while simultaneously conveying the idea that having a capital city of your own, no matter how tiny and imperfect, is important.¹³

In May 1925, the architect I.V. Ryangin presented a draft version of the plan for the development of the city.¹⁴ The architect developed the changes of the main administrative centre of Kazakhstan in accordance with the basic principles of urban planning of the capital cities: the main administrative buildings were concentrated around the central square, the connection of the central square with the railway station through a wide street with a boulevard in the centre – the main city street. The space from the station was planned to be built up with outbuildings. On the central square, there was an administrative centre of a theatrical type, it could serve as a venue for the congresses of Soviets. It was supposed to be a monumental building decorated with artistic bas-reliefs, it should have a view from all converging streets. All the buildings on the central square were planned to be implemented in a single architectural style to create a harmonious artistic impression. A special commission recognised the proposed plan as suitable for execution. A master plan of the city was created: the future growth of the city was planned in the north-east direction, and the development of empty plots within the city was also being prepared. A more detailed study of the plan of the future city, with the construction of parks, boulevards, squares, and market squares was not carried out due to time constraints.¹⁵ According to the documents of the construction committee, it was planned to erect about 150 buildings in Kyzylorda within two years.

Among the measures taken by the government to improve the city's amenities were: cleaning streets and squares; expansion of the telephone network; additional planting of trees; construction of bridges and crossings over ditches; attempts to expand the housing stock of the city. However, these measures were not enough to give the city a proper look. In addition to all the infrastructural difficulties, Kyzylorda could not cope with the main task of the capital – image. In this connection, in the spring of 1927, it was decided to move the capital of Kazakh Autonomous Socialist Soviet Republic (KASSR) to another city, which became Alma-Ata.¹⁶ Shifting the capital from Kyzylorda to Alma-Ata significantly reshaped Kazakhstan's governance, policy, and power structures. Centralized control became more pronounced as government institutions consolidated in Alma-Ata, leading to streamlined decision-making but

¹² Kerimkhulle *et al.*, 2023a.

¹³ Amanzholova, 2020.

¹⁴ Donchenko & Samoilov, 2019.

¹⁵ Kerimkhulle *et al.*, 2023b.

¹⁶ Bekus & Medeouva, 2011.

potentially marginalizing outlying regions. Policy focus shifted towards developing the new capital and surrounding areas, potentially neglecting Kyzylorda's needs. Power structures realigned around Alma-Ata, with local elites gaining prominence, while Kyzylorda's influence waned.

The relocation of the capital had a profound and wide-ranging effect on Kazakh identity over time. Unintended consequences resulted from the initial goal of strengthening Kazakh identity by centralising it in a city with a majority Kazakh population. Non-Kazakh immigrants brought greater cultural diversity to Alma-Ata and possibly lessened Kazakh influence. Nonetheless, regardless of geography, the adoption of Kazakh as the official language and the development of Kazakh culture via the arts and education were crucial in strengthening a sense of national identity among the larger Kazakh population. In the end, the relocation did not have a negative or positive effect on identity; rather, it encouraged a more complex and hybrid sense of Kazakhness that was shaped by the country's growing urbanisation and nomadic past.

The capital is the main component of the geopolitical environment, a necessary attribute of statehood, and the basis of its functioning. The capital city, as an institution, is a combination of several processes: expansion and superiority in the territorial aspect; the establishment of the state as a management system. The capital city, as the centre of the state's functioning, housed all the highest authorities, including the president, and was a hub for logistics, infrastructure, economic, and industrial facilities.¹⁷

Soviet city plans during the Stalinist era followed a strict, centralised vision that prioritised industrial efficiency, monumentality, and ideological messaging. From central squares dominated by imposing neoclassical buildings adorned with socialist symbols, grand avenues extended outward. Elevating the working class was the goal of the parks and cultural institutions dotting the landscape.¹⁸ This uniformity did not, however, necessarily apply to Kazakhstan. Large cities like Alma-Ata absorbed elements of the “Stalinist style”, but they also frequently used traditional materials and motifs, creating a distinctive visual fusion. Furthermore, deviations from the standard plan were occasionally necessary due to Kazakhstan's vast steppe and resource-dependent economy, resulting in planned communities and industrial suburbs that were different from the idealised Soviet city centre.

In addition, the capital's status, together with all the processes accompanying it, allows the city to embody all the features of the way of life in the country – cultural, social, ideological, administrative, political, and economic. It can also be noted that the symbolic function of the capital is to reflect the current mood in society, its attitude to its past, and the vision of the future. This city embodies the political and cultural

¹⁷ Smyrnov, Liubitseva, & Zapototskyi, 2023.

¹⁸ Petryshyn *et al.*, 2022.

archetypes inherent in society.¹⁹ Thus, the capital is a multifunctional city, and must have sufficient resources to implement: the personification of justice, power, state and national identity. Their non-fulfilment, as a rule, leads to the transfer of the status of the capital to another city more suitable for this role.²⁰ The relocation of the capital, although rare, is still a natural event in world history. It is obvious that the processes of choosing the capital city, its nomination, liquidation, and transfer are not only closely related to important changes in the entire social, economic, political, and cultural life of society, but are also conditioned by them.²¹

The Phenomenon of a “Wandering Capital”

The determining condition for the migration of capitals is the periodicity of the transfer of capital status from city to city. In this case, they should be divided into 2 types: transitive or alternating and wandering capitals. The “transitive capital” implies the presence of certain cities, between which there is a periodic or nonperiodic migration of the capital status. The practice of “wandering capital” implies haphazard migration among cities within the state. In the post-Soviet space, only the Republic of Kazakhstan is a state with a “wandering capital”. This conclusion can be reached based on the frequent relocations of the capital city within this state. An equally important factor in the relocation of the capital to Kyzylorda is its geographical location within Kazakhstan. Researchers agree that the best position for the capital will be central. This is due to being at an equal distance from all regions of the country, therefore, which would effectively connect logistics and infrastructure interchanges. In addition, the location in the centre of the state allows strengthening the national unity in society, which is an equally important factor in multi-ethnic states.²² Accordingly, Kyzylorda, with its location, met all the above requirements well. Thus, the process of state-building in Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 20th century was considered; the development of the city of Kyzylorda in the 1920s and 1930s was described; the functions of the capital city and its significance for the state were revealed; the phenomenon of the “wandering capital” was considered.

The analysis of state-building in Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 20th century is an urgent task, as it allows drawing conclusions that reveal the scale of work done in this area. The study of this process is an important subject of research and is of interest to historians, sociologists, political scientists, and representatives of other fields of science. It was indicated that state construction in Kazakhstan effectively began with the foundation of the Alash Autonomy as part of the RSFSR, after which it success-

¹⁹ Bekus & Medeouva, 2011.

²⁰ Pivovar & Kosovan, 2019b.

²¹ Rossman, 2013a.

²² Potts, 1985.

fully developed in subsequent years. It was during this period of time that the national and cultural Kazakh identity began to form. This happened, among other things, due to the Soviet “localisation policy”. Due to this process, certain successes have been achieved in a number of areas: record keeping in the Kazakh language; establishment of national elites designed to develop and strengthen the republic; creation of managerial and bureaucratic personnel; establishment of a convenient and understandable management system for the local population; consolidation of society; strengthening both the Kazakh state and the national identity of the Kazakhs. The authors’ interpretation of the results can become the basis of a new hypothesis or theory within the framework of this discourse and other areas.²³

The study investigated that one of the manifestations of the development of statehood in Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 20th century was the relocation of the capital of the state to the city of Kyzylorda, which, due to its location in the Kazakh steppe and the ethnic composition of the population, was more suitable for this role than Orenburg. Based on this, it can be noted that the authors’ conclusions about the insolvency of Orenburg as the capital of Kazakhstan are confirmed by other researchers. The authors also described the importance of the capital city for the state and society, expressed the functions performed by it. The capital is the main city in the country, where the highest authorities and public administration are located. However, other researchers believe that not all capitals are the same. Some have this role solely due to the fact that public authorities are located in the city. Capitals in states with a federal structure have fewer governmental functions than in unitary ones. Thus, D. Gordon divides capitals into 7 types [Tab. 1].²⁴

According to S.I. Syutkin, the capital city is not only the political, but also the economic centre of the state, attracting business and investment.²⁵ The main function of the capital is to ensure the political and managerial activities of the state, both internal and external. For the sake of proper internal security, the capital city needs to be in good transport accessibility for all regions of the country, the presence of logistics centres and infrastructure hubs. The capital provides external activity by maintaining the status of a “business card of the state”, which even leads to the identification of the city and the country – “Berlin has declared”, “Paris is concerned”, etc. Thus, this approach to considering the significance of the capital for the state differs from the approach used by the author. However, V.I. Rossman²⁶ concludes that the idea of separating the political and economic centres of the country is more useful for the state. This is conditioned by the fact that the concentration of political power

²³ Butenko, Zaslavska & Sheianova, 2023.

²⁴ Gordon, 2009. Tab. 1.

²⁵ Syutkin, 2007.

²⁶ Rossman, 2013b.

and economic dominance over other cities in the capital can lead to excessive centralisation of the state.

An important aspect of this system is the idea of balances and counterweights, the policy of balancing the political and economic centres, which often leads to the implementation of a special project of an administrative city. Striking examples are the United States of America (USA) (economically developed New York balances with the purely political centre of the country – Washington), Canada (Ottawa and Toronto), Australia (Canberra and Sydney), and South Africa (Pretoria and Johannesburg). Interestingly, this system is typical for the most economically developed countries (USA, France, Japan, Great Britain). Although it is worth noting that the division of the functions of the capital is hardly a key aspect of the prosperity of the state, but examples of states that are successful in economic and social terms can speak about the advantages of this system.²⁷ Therefore, the study, when considering this problem, came to different conclusions. It is important to pay attention to the fact that in some cases the state has two or more capitals, since the capital functions are divided between several cities. Examples of countries with dual capitals are: the Netherlands (Amsterdam is the national and constitutional capital, Hague is the location of parliament, the Supreme Court, and the government), Israel (Jerusalem is the location of parliament and government, Tel Aviv – the ministries and embassies), Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur – legislative capital, Putrajaya – administrative capital).²⁸ Interestingly, this feature of the state structure was not typical for Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 20th century.

Examples of capital relocations in history

There has been a good deal of information about the capital's relocation throughout world history. Numerous political, climatic, and economic factors contributed to the motivation behind these actions. The phenomenon of seasonal bifurcation of capital city functions can also be taken into consideration. During the colonial era, states with tropical climates were known for this particular feature. Consequently, during the summer months of 1912-1947 in British India, the capital was relocated from Delhi to Shimli, and during the summer months of 1910-1975 in the Philippines, the capital status was changed from Manila to Baguio. The purpose of these short-term capital relocations was to give government employees and officials better living arrangements during the warmest and most uncomfortable months of the year. It made it possible for the government to carry on operating while avoiding the discomfort and health hazards that come with extremely hot and humid weather. Seasonal capital relocation was

²⁷ Rossman, 2013b.

²⁸ Senyk, 2019.

a common practice during the colonial era, and it was a practical solution to the problems caused by the climate in tropical colonies.

It is possible to distinguish informal capitals that are economic or cultural centres in their states, for example: New York (USA), Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), Istanbul (Turkey).²⁹ The study suggests that the relocation of the capital of the Kazakh ASSR from Kyzylorda to Alma-Ata occurred, among other things, due to unfavourable climatic and geographical conditions. The study considered the phenomenon of the “migrating capital”, the reasons and prerequisites for its implementation, the impact of this action on the development of the state and society. It is worth paying attention to the fact that this process is not unusual in a historical perspective. On the contrary, since 1800, capitals have changed their place in more than 40 countries (e.g. Finland – 1812, Canada – 1865, Japan – 1868, Australia – 1911, Russia – 1918, Lithuania – 1939, Brazil – 1956, Chile – 1990, Germany – 1994, United Arab Emirates – 2009). In Kazakhstan alone, the process in question took place four times.

According to the conclusions of S.B. Tkachenko, since the 16th century, the relocation of capitals pursued territorial compromises: Warsaw, located between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Lithuania, in 1598 became the capital of the Union, Washington is located on the border of the Northern and Southern states of the United States, the capital of Nigeria, Abuja, is on the border of Muslim and Christian regions.³⁰ Since the 19th century, there has been a trend of historical integration, i.e., the capitals return to their historical place: Israel returned the capital to Jerusalem, while Germany moved it to Berlin. The strategy of economic integration prompted the governments of Japan, Kazakhstan, and South Korea to move their capitals to other cities or to build new ones, which contributed to the growth of economic indicators of these states. In Brazil, in 1956, the capital status left the metropolis of Rio de Janeiro to a city built according to O. Niemeyer's project in the centre of the country with limited growth of territory, development, and population. Thus, arose the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) monument – the city of Brasilia.

An important factor accelerating the implementation of this project is conditioned by the fact that the processes of national and state building continue to take place in many countries of the world. Many countries are in search of new ways of social and political integration. The new capitals serve as accelerators of the processes of nation-building, and forms of preserving the balance of interests of the identities that make up these states – linguistic, ethnic, and religious. The symbolic significance of the new capitals, often also associated with their geographical location, often serves to construct a new national identity and reflect the current mood in society. The important

²⁹ Gritsevich, 2014.

³⁰ Tkachenko, 2014.

factor for complementing research is the dependence between the political constitution of various states, in particular, their unitary or federal structure, and the nature of their capital cities. A federal state, as a rule, assumes a compact metropolitan city that is not overloaded with other functions. Such a city best corresponds to the way of their political and social life, the nature of relations between the constituent parts of the federation, none of which should have predominant importance in the capital city. The importance and number of functions of capitals has a direct impact on the level of centralisation in various types of federal states.³¹

It is also worth noting the importance of the role of capitals in the process of political reform. A. Hadinata and C. Bezoky argue that in many states, abrupt changes in politics and transformation of society were accompanied by the relocation of capitals.³² New capitals became the centres of the establishment of new elites, turned into cities where new symbolism was created, new meanings were born, aimed at legitimising the newly established political regime.³³ The Russian and Turkish revolutions, the overthrow of the monarchy in China, and the Meiji Revolution in Japan were inextricably linked with the change of the capital city. The Mahdi revolution in Sudan led to the relocation of the capital from Khartoum to Omdurman in 1895, and after its completion, the capital status returned to Khartoum. Thus, it is possible to draw a parallel with the events of the civil war in Russia, which led to the establishment of the Kazakh statehood, and as a result – the relocation of the capital to Kyzylorda in 1925.

It would be appropriate to consider the example of the relocation of the capital in Malaysia. Based on the study by M.R. Mubaroq and A. Solikin, Putrajaya, which was built in 1995 and legally established in 1999, is part of an ambitious project aimed at placing the state on the list of developing countries by 2020.³⁴ According to the plan of the fourth Prime Minister of Malaysia, Mahathir Mohamad, the city was supposed to bring the country to the international arena and attract foreign investment to itself and the state, thus accelerating the development of the national economy.³⁵

The objective of this plan was to make Malaysia a completely developed country by 2020. The plan, which was formally introduced in 1991, described Malaysia's strategy for becoming a developed nation in several areas, including infrastructure, technology, education, economics, and more. The establishment of Putrajaya as Malaysia's new administrative capital was one of the main goals of Malaysian Vision 2020. The goal of Putrajaya was to become a sophisticated, well-planned metropolis that would house the government and assist Malaysia in rising to prominence in the world economy.

³¹ Achkasova & Platukhin, 2023.

³² Hadinata & Bezoky, 2021.

³³ Koznarska & Didyk, 2022.

³⁴ Bin Mohamad, 1991.

³⁵ Mubaroq & Solikin, 2018.

Its goals were to boost the nation's economy, encourage foreign investment, and make governance more effective.

The government has made tremendous efforts to ensure the transition of the country from an industrial economy to an economy based on information technology. Thus, it can be concluded that one of the main reasons for the transit of the status of the capital city from Kuala Lumpur was the desire of the then ruling elites to create a new image of the future for the state. However, an equally important reason for moving the capital inland is the climatic factor – typhoons and floods pose an immediate threat to the former capital of the country. Nevertheless, despite optimistic plans, the de facto political and economic centre of Malaysia is the former capital of Kuala Lumpur.

Based on this, the failure of this project of relocating the capital can be stated. As a result, the scientific aim of the study has been achieved and the actual problem, as such, has been considered. The results of the studies cited by other researchers largely coincide with the authors' findings. However, problems indirectly related to the scientific purpose of this study still require further consideration and diagnosis.

Conclusions

Thus, it can be concluded that state and national construction in Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 20th century were quite active because society was experiencing significant changes. A significant role in this process was played by the relocation of the capital to Kyzylorda in 1925, which had a great impact on strengthening the state and consolidating its divided society, achieving compromise solutions to the problems that had accumulated in society by that time. This paper outlined the main trends of state-building in Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 20th century, described the features of the daily life of citizens in the city of Kyzylorda, and the difficulties they faced. It was considered how the phenomenon of the “migrating capital” influenced the development of the Kazakh state, the reasons and prerequisites for this process were established. An important factor here was the fragmentation of society, which in Kazakhstan at that time, for the most part, was nomadic, which could not positively influence state-building. Consequently, in order to consolidate society and strengthen national identity, it was decided to move the capital. Based on this, the authors concluded that the main prerequisite for the relocation of the capital of Kazakhstan to the city of Kyzylorda was the multipolar integration of society.

The materials of the study can be useful and relevant for historians, political scientists, sociologists, and researchers dealing with the influence of the transit factor of the capital on the establishment of the system of governance and power in the state, the causes and prerequisites leading to this process. The findings will be of value to specialists in the field of historiography, students, and researchers who are interested in the features and aspects of the development of Kazakhstan in the early 20th century,

its political structure, which is an integral part of state-building. It is worth continuing research, extending the study of the connection between the capital and nation-building. The diagnostics carried out does not exhaust all the features of this historical and political problem and require further consideration of such issues as the impact of the relocation of the capital city on state-building, the prerequisites and factors influencing this phenomenon.



Fig. 1. A draft version of the plan for the development of the Kyzylorda by I.V. Ryangin (after Donchenko & Samoilo, 2019: Fig. 1)

Tab. 1. 7 types of capitals

Capital Type	Description	Examples
Multifunctional	Combine governmental, cultural, and social functions	London, Madrid, Paris
Global	Play a supranational role in politics and economics	London, Tokyo
Political	Exist exclusively as the location of government and authorities	Washington, Brasilia, Ottawa, Canberra
Former	Were once locations of governments but have lost that function	Philadelphia, Rio de Janeiro, St. Petersburg
Former Imperial	Retained status after fall of empire; retain influence on former territories	Vienna, London, Lisbon, Madrid
Provincial	Important cities in federal states, subordinate to federal government	Milan, Stuttgart, Toronto, Sydney
Super	Function as centers of international organizations	Geneva, Brussels, New York

Bibliography

- Achkasova, S., Platukhin, O. (2023). Identifying patterns of interest in the topic of managing equity capital of the enterprise. *Economics of Development*, 22(2), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.57111/econ/2.2023.41>
- Aleksieienko, I., Leliuk, S., Poltina, O. (2021). Intellectual and financial business processes optimizing the structure and cost of capital in value based management. *Development management*, 19(4), 27–35. [https://doi.org/10.57111/devt.19\(4\).2021.27-35](https://doi.org/10.57111/devt.19(4).2021.27-35)
- Amanzholova, D. A. (2020). K voprosu o prirodno klimaticheskikh faktorah natsionalno-gosudarstvennogo stroitelstva kazahskoy assr [On the issue of natural and climatic factors of the national-state building of the Kazakh ASSR]. *Russian Regions: A Look into the Future*, 1, 26–47. (in Russian)
- Baranov, N.A., Sevgi, K. (2021). Trudnyy put' k grazhdanskoy natsii: opyt natsiyestroitel'stva sovremennogo Kazakhstana [The difficult path to a civil nation: The experience of nation-building in modern Kazakhstan]. *Post-Soviet Issues*, 8(1), 136–151. <https://doi.org/10.24975/2313-8920-2021-8-1-136-151> (in Russian)
- Bekus, N., Medeouva, K. (2011). “Smena epoch kak smena stolicz: Astana kak globalnyj czentr” [Change of eras as a change of capitals: Astana as a global center]. *Neprikosnovennyi zapas*, 6(80) [<http://dspace.enu.kz/handle/data/10243>] (in Russian)
- Bin Mohamad, M. (1991). Malaysian: The Way Forward (Vision 2020). *Documents*. 14377. <https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/yjfs-documents/14377>
- Butenko, D., Zaslavska, K., Sheianova, Yu. (2023). Scientific and methodological principles of organizational capital management and its assessment. *Economics of Development*, 22(3), 52–61. <https://doi.org/10.57111/econ/3.2023.52>
- Cherkes, B., Idak, Yu. (2022). The phenomenon of the city in the contemporary discourse of urban history. *Architectural Studies*, 8(2), 7–23. <https://doi.org/10.56318/as2022.02.007>
- Donchenko, S. A., Samoilov, K. I. (2019). The architectural specific of Kyzylorda city in the capital of Kazakhstan status (1925-1929). *Science and Education Today*, 12(42), 107–109.
- Doszhan, R. (2023). The idea of work in the philosophy of Abai Qunanbaiuly. *Interdisciplinary Cultural and Humanities Review*, 2(2), 6–10. <https://doi.org/10.59214/2786-7110-2023-2-2-6-10>
- Gordon, D. (2009). *Planning 20th century capital cities*. New York: Routledge.
- Gritsevich, V. S., Maydanska, I. T. (2014). Heoprosstorovi poyednannya stolyts' derzhav svitu [Geospatial combinations of state capitals in the world]. *Geopolitics and Ecogeodynamics of Regions*, 10(2), 108–113. (in Ukrainian)
- Hadinata, A., Bezoky, C. (2021). The state capital relocation policy and pandemic COVID-19: A literature review. *Journal of Economics and Business Letters*, 1(1), 24–27. <https://doi.org/10.55942/jeb1.v1i1.88>
- Ilyassova, K. M., Bagdatova, S. A. (2018). Astana: Evolution of the capitals of Kazakhstan. *Bulletin of the L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University*, 123(2), 39–48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32523/2616-7255-2018-123-2-39-47>
- Kaziev, S.S., Burdina, E.N. (2019). Teoretiko-pravovyye aspekty natsional'no-gosudarstvennogo stroitel'stva v Kazakhstane v 1923-1926 gody: opyt korenizatsii i realizatsii yazykovogo zakonodatel'stva [Theoretical and legal aspects of nation-state building in Kazakhstan in 1923-1926: The experience of indigenization and implementation of language legislation]. *Bulletin of the Udmurt University*, 6, 836–844. <https://doi.org/10.35634/2412-9593-2019-29-6-836-844> (in Russian)
- Kerimkhulle, S., Baizakov, N., Slanbekova, A., Alimova, Z., Azieva, G., Koishybayeva, M. (2022). The Kazakhstan Republic Economy Three Sectoral Model Inter-sectoral Linkages Resource Assessment. *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, 502, 542–550.
- Kerimkhulle, S., Mukhanova, A., Kantureyeva, M., Koishybaeva, M., Azieva, G. (2023a). Applying a housing construction model to improve a small town demographic dynamics. *AIP Conference Proceedings* 2700: 040047. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0125066>

- Kerimkhulle, S., Saliyeva, A., Makhazhanova, U., Kerimkulov, Z., Adalbek, A., Taberkhan, R. (2023b). The estimate of innovative development of construction industry in the Kazakhstan. *E3S Web of Conferences* 389, 06004. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202338906004>
- Koldobskaya, N.A. (2022). Environmental consequences of the capital relocation in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Geography, Environment, Sustainability*, 15.1, 150–158. <https://doi.org/10.24057/2071-9388-2021-110>
- Kosovan, E.A. (2019). Fenomen migriruyushey stolitsy natsiestroitelstvo i gosudarstvennost Kazahstana [The phenomenon of the “Migrating Capital”, nation-building and statehood of Kazakhstan]. *Greater Eurasia: Development, Security, Cooperation*, 2(2), 995–999. (in Russian)
- Koznarska, H., Didyk, V. (2022). The impact of new buildings on the city’s image. *Architectural Studies*, 8(2), 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.56318/as2022.02.033>
- Kumyrzak, A. (2017). Ot Kamiskali do Kizilordi [From Kamyskala to Kyzylorda]. <http://www.e-history.kz/ru/publications/view/3347> (in Russian).
- Mubaroq, M.R., Solikin, A. (2018). Review on the financing scheme of Indonesia’s capital city relocation plan: Lessons learned from Brazil, Malaysia and Tanzania. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Finance Economics and Business, ICOFEB 2018, 12-13 November 2018, Lhokseumawe, Aceh, Indonesia*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4108/eai.12-11-2018.2288767>
- Petryshyn, H., Kryvorychko, O., Lukashchuk, H., Danylko, N., Klishch, O. (2022). Changing the qualities of urban space by means of landscape architecture. *Architectural Studies*, 8(1), 22–33. <https://doi.org/10.56318/as2022.01.022>
- Pivovar, E.I., Kosovan, E.A. (2019a). Fenomen «migriruyushchey stolitsy» na postsovetском prostranstve (na primere Respubliki Kazakhstan) [Phenomenon of “migrating capital” in the post-Soviet area (the case of the Republic of Kazakhstan)]. *Eurasian studies. History. Political science. International relations*, 1, 54–65. (in Russian)
- Pivovar, E. I., Kosovan, E.A. (2019b). «Nevedomyye stepnyye dali, otkrytyye vsem vetram»: k yubileyu Astany [“Unknown steppes: open to all winds”: for the anniversary of Astana]. In E.I. Pivovar (Ed.), *Trudy Instituta postsovetских i mezhhregional'nykh issledovaniy. Vypusk 2. Kazakhstanovedeniye* [Proceedings of the Institute of Post-Soviet and Interregional Studies. Issue 2. Kazakhstan studies] (pp. 9–51). Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities. (in Russian)
- Potts, D. (1985). Capital relocation in Africa: The case of Lilongwe in Malawi. *The Geographical Journal*, 151(2), 182–196. <https://doi.org/10.2307/633532>
- Rossmann, V.I. (2013a). *Kapitaly: ikh mnogoobraziye, zakonomernosti razvitiya i dvizheniya* [Capitals: their diversity, patterns of development and movement]. Moscow: Gaidar Institute Publishing House.
- Rossmann, V.I. (2013b). Sovremennaya kontseptsiya stolichnogo goroda i perenosy stolits v global'noy perspective [The modern concept of the capital city and the transfer of capitals in a global perspective]. *Izvestiya MSTU MAMI* 4(18), 99–105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17816/2074-0530-68022>
- Senyk, Y.I. (2019). Funktsiyi stolichnykh mist yak ob"yektiv turyst-s'ko-heohrafichnogo doslidzhennya [The capital city as an object of socio-geographical research]. *Master's Scientific Bulletin of Ternopil National Pedagogical University named after Volodymyr Hnatiuk*, 33, 3–5. (in Ukrainian)
- Smyrnov, I., Liubitseva, O., Zapototskyi, S. (2023). Kyievo-Podil, yak nekoronovana stolytsya het'mans'koyi Ukrayiny: nedootsinennyi turystychnyy potentsial destynatsiyi [Kyiv’s Podil as the hetman’s Ukraine uncrowned capital: underestimated tourist potential of the destination]. *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture and Sports*, 3, 190–199. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2786-6424-1/2023-190-199> (in Ukrainian)
- Syutkin, S.I. (2007). *Socio-economic geography: terms and concepts*. Sumy: Media Inform.
- Tarkhov, S.A. (2008). Perenosy stolits [Capital cities transfers]. <https://cutt.ly/jXHdut9>. (in Russian)

Tkachenko, S.B. (2014). Perenos stolitsy: gradostroitel'stvo i sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiye aspekty [Relocation of the capital: urban planning and socio-economic aspects]. *Bulletin of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences: Socio-Economic Problems of Economic Management*, 4, 46–52. (in Russian)

Zhalmagambetov, Y., Ilyassova, K., Espenbetova, A., Shamshiyeva, G. (2013). History of the Construction of the Capital of Kazakhstan First Experience: Service and its Outcome. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(3), 420–428. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.15.3.11086>

To cite this article: Zhalmagambetov, Y., Tleubayev, S., Assymova, D., Borbassov, S., Nurmukhan, Y. (2024). State Construction and the Impact of the Relocation of the Capital City in Soviet Kazakhstan at the Beginning of the 20th Century. *Historia i Świat*, 13, 397–412. <https://doi.org/10.34739/his.2024.13.24>



© 2024 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-ND) 4.0 license.