



МӘДЕНИ МҰРА
ғылыми журнал

КУЛЬТУРНОЕ НАСЛЕДИЕ
научный журнал

CULTURAL HERITAGE
science journal

ISSN: 3006-1377 (online)

№1 (112)

Астана
2026

РЕДАКЦИЯЛЫҚ АЛҚА:

ӘБДІҒАЛИҰЛЫ
Берік

– саяси ғылымдар кандидаты, алқа төрағасы (Қазақстан)

ИБРАЕВА
Ақмарал Ғосманқызы

– алқа төрағасының орынбасары, Қазақстан ұлттық жаратылыстану ғылымдары академиясының академигі, тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан)

ТАЙМАҒАМБЕТОВ
Жәкен Қожахметұлы

– ҚР ҰҒА академигі, тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан)

САМАШЕВ
Зайнолла Самашұлы

– тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан)

АЯҒАН
Бүркітбай Гелманұлы

– ҚР ҰҒА құрметті академигі, тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР Еңбек сіңірген қайраткері (Қазақстан)

ОҢҒАРҰЛЫ Ақан

– тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты (Қазақстан)

ҮМІТҚАЛИЕВ
Ұлан Үмітқалиұлы

– тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор (Қазақстан)

ИСМАИЛОВА
Жанат Хамидовна

– тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Өзбекстан)

ЦЗИ Сяофен

– PhD докторы (Қытай)

ВОЛЬФРАМ Сабине

– PhD докторы (Германия)

ШТЕЙН Гил

– PhD докторы (АҚШ)

ОУТРАМ Алан

– PhD докторы (Ұлыбритания)

ШОМФАЙ Иштван

– PhD докторы (Венгрия)

ӘБДУАҚАП Қара

– PhD докторы (Түркия)

ДАВЫДОВ
Владимир Николаевич

– әлеуметтану ғылымдарының кандидаты, PhD докторы (Ресей Федерациясы)

АҒАТАЙ
Өткірбай Мылтықбайұлы

– PhD докторы (Қазақстан)

ДУВАНБЕКОВ
Руслан Сабырұлы

– PhD докторы (Қазақстан)

ИСКАКОВ
Қуаныш Алдабергенұлы

– PhD докторы (Қазақстан)

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Berik Abdygaliuly	– candidate of Political Science (Chairman of the editorial board) (Kazakhstan)
Akmaral Ibrayeva	– deputy chairman of the editorial board, Academician of the National Academy of Natural Sciences of Kazakhstan, Doctor of historical sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)
Zhaken Taimagambetov	– academician of NAS RK, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)
Zainolla Samashev	– doctor of Historical Sciences, (Kazakhstan)
Ayagan Burkitbay	– Honorary Academician of the NAS RK, doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Honored Worker of RK (Kazakhstan)
Ongaruly Akan	– candidate of Historical Sciences (Kazakhstan)
Umitkaliev Ulan	– candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)
Ismailova Zhanat	– doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Uzbekistan)
Ji Xiaofen	– PhD (China)
Wolfram Sabine	– PhD (Germany)
Gil Stein	– PhD (USA)
Alan Outram	– PhD (UK)
Somfai Istvan	– PhD (Hungary)
Abdulvahap Kara	– PhD (Turkey)
Davydov Vladimir	– candidate of Sociological Sciences, PhD (Russian Federation)
Agatay Otkirbay	– PhD (Kazakhstan)
Duvanbekov Ruslan	– PhD (Kazakhstan)
Iskakov Kuanysh	– PhD (Kazakhstan)

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ:

ӘБДІҒАЛИҰЛЫ
Берік

– кандидат политических наук (председатель коллегии) (Казахстан)

ИБРАЕВА
Акмарал Госмановна

– заместитель председателя коллегии, Академик Казахстанской национальной академии естественных наук, доктор исторических наук, профессор (Казахстан)

ТАЙМАГАМБЕТОВ
Жакен Кожаметович

– академик НАН РК, доктор исторических наук, профессор (Казахстан)

САМАШЕВ
Зайнолла Самашевич

– доктор исторических наук, профессор (Казахстан)

АЯҒАН
Буркитбай Гелманулы

– Почетный академик НАН РК, доктор исторических наук, профессор, Заслуженный деятель РК (Казахстан)

ОНГАРУЛЫ Акан

– кандидат исторических наук (Казахстан)

УМИТКАЛИЕВ
Улан Умиткалиевич

– кандидат исторических наук, профессор (Казахстан)

ИСМАИЛОВА
Жанат Хамидовна

– доктор исторических наук, профессор (Узбекистан)

ЦЗИ Сяофен

– PhD доктор (Китай)

ВОЛЬФРАМ Сабине

– PhD доктор (Германия)

ШТЕЙН Гил

– PhD доктор (США)

ОУТРАМ Алан

– PhD доктор (Великобритания)

ШОМФАЙ Иштван

– PhD доктор (Венгрия)

КАРА Абдукап

– PhD доктор (Турция)

ДАВЫДОВ
Владимир Николаевич

– кандидат социологических наук, PhD доктор (Российская Федерация)

АГАТАЙ
Уткирбай Мылтыкбайулы

– PhD доктор (Казахстан)

ДУВАНБЕКОВ
Руслан Сабырулы

– PhD доктор (Казахстан)

ИСКАКОВ
Куаныш Алдабергенович

– PhD доктор (Казахстан)

МАЗМҰНЫ / CONTENT / СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

Археология / Archaeology / Археология

<i>Молдахмет А.А., Елеуов М., Талеев Д., Есен С.</i> Қазақ хандығы дәуіріндегі Созақ: археологиялық зерттеу тарихынан	
<i>Молдахмет А., Елеуов М., Талеев Д., Есен С.</i> Созақ в период Казахского ханства: из истории археологических исследований	
<i>Moldakhmet A., Eleuov M., Taleev D., Esen S.</i> Sozak in the Kazakh khanate period: from the history of archaeological research.....	8
<i>Аккошкарлова Ж.Т., Рахимжанова С.Ж., Тушева Е.К.</i> Орталық Қазақстандағы Қу 1-4, 6-7 тас дәуірі тұрақтарының материалдарын зерттеу	
<i>Аккошкарлова Ж.Т., Рахимжанова С.Ж., Тушева Е.К.</i> Изучение материалов стоянок каменного века Куу 1-4, 6-7 в Центральном Казахстане	
<i>Akkoshkarova Zh.T., Rakhimzhanova S.Zh., Tusheva E.K.</i> Study of materials from the stone age sites of Kuu 1-4, 6-7 in Central Kazakhstan.....	22
<i>Абильмаликов К.К., Байдалы Р.Ж., Шакшаков К.Г.</i> Археологические исследования на стоянке Талдысай-II в 2025 году	
<i>Әбілмәліков Қ.Қ., Байдалы Р.Ж., Шакшаков Қ.Г.</i> 2025 жылғы Талдысай-II тұрағындағы археологиялық зерттеулер	
<i>Abilmalikov K.K., Baidaly R.Zh., Shakshakov K.G.</i> Archaeological research at Taldysay-II site in 2025.....	34
<i>Қожа М.Б., Сиздинов Б.С., Әлімбекұлы Ә.</i> Особенности мечети Отрара конца XIV – начала XV в.	
<i>Қожа М.Б., Сиздинов Б.С., Әлімбекұлы Ә.</i> XIV ғасырдың аяғы – XV ғасырдың басындағы Отырар мешітінің ерекшеліктері	
<i>Khozha M.B., Sizdikov B.S., Alimbekuly A.</i> Features of the Otrar mosque of the late 14th – early 15th cc.....	45
<i>Усачук А.Н., Шишлина Н.И., Степанов И.А., Леонова Н.В.</i> Булавка из Краматорского могильника (Подонцовье). Результаты трасологического анализа	
<i>Усачук А.Н., Шишлина Н.И., Степанов И.А., Леонова Н.В.</i> Краматорск қорымынан табылған түйреуіш (Донец маңы). Трасологиялық талдау нәтижелері	
<i>Usachuk A.N., Shishlina N.I., Stepanov I. A., Leonova N.V.</i> A hammer-headed pin from the Kramatorsk burial ground (Podontsovye). The results of the trace-wear analysis.....	58
<i>Karazhigitova A.Ye., Janeyeva A.K.</i> History of studies and main results of research on medieval burial sites in Northeast Saryarka	
<i>Қаражігітова Ә.Е., Джанеева А.Қ.</i> Солтүстік-Шығыс Сарыарқадағы ортағасырлық жерлеу ескерткіштерін зерттеу тарихы мен негізгі нәтижелері	
<i>Қаражігітова А.Е., Джанеева А.Қ.</i> История изучения и основные результаты исследований погребальных памятников средневековья Северо-Восточной Сарыарки.....	69
<i>Sultanova A.K.</i> Stone sculptures in the Museum collection: issues of museification and exhibition	
<i>Сұлтанова А.К.</i> Музей коллекциясындағы тас мүсіндер: музейлендіру және экспозициялау мәселелері	
<i>Сұлтанова А.К.</i> Каменные изваяния в музейной коллекции: вопросы музеефикации и экспонирования.....	82
<i>Брынза Т.В.</i> В.Ф. Зайберт и его роль в изучении истории и археологии Северного Казахстана (по материалам газеты «Акмолинская правда»)	
<i>Брынза Т.В.</i> В. Ф. Зайберт және оның Солтүстік Қазақстан тарихы мен археологиясын зерттеудегі рөлі («Акмолинская правда» газеті материалдары бойынша)	
<i>Brynza T.V.</i> V.F. Zaibert and his role in the study of the history and archaeology of Northern Kazakhstan (based on materials from the newspaper “Akmolinskaya Pravda”).....	92

Этнология / Ethnology / Этнология

- Балтабай Д.Ө.** Әбілғазы Баһадүр хан шежіресінде кездесетін бірқатар этнонимдердің шығу тегі
Балтабай Д.А. Происхождение ряда этнонимов в шежере Абулгази Бахадур хана
Baltabay D.A. The origin of selected ethnonyms in the genealogy of Abulgazi Bahadur Khan..... 101
- Тастанбеков М.М., Байболов Б.Қ., Жүнісбаев Ұ.Д., Тұрсынов А.Х.** Қожа Ахмет Ясауи қабірінің жапқышы туралы зерттеулер
Тастанбеков М.М., Байболов Б.Қ., Жунисбаев Е.Д., Турсинов А.Х. Исследования покрывала гробницы Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави
Tastanbekov M.M., Baibolov B.K., Junisbaev E.D., Tursinov A.H. Research on the Pall of the Tomb of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi..... 113
- Байгаж А., Нурбаева А.М., Рустемова А. Е.** Традиционные игры с астрагалами тюрко-монгольского ареала: язык, норма и культурная память
Байгаж А., Нурбаева А.М., Рустемова А. Е. Түркі-моңғол ареалындағы асыққа байланысты дәстүрлі ойындар: тіл, норма және мәдени жады
Baigazh A., Nurbayeva A.M., Rustemova A. Ye. Traditional games with astragal in the turkic-mongolian region: language, norms and cultural memory..... 125

Тарих / History / История

- Бисенова Г.А., Отепова Г.Е., Болдыков Ж.Б.** Гималай асқан көш тарихы: Үндістан ұлттық архив құжаттары негізінде
Бисенова Г.А., Отепова Г.Е., Болдыков Ж.Б. История миграции казахов через Гималаи: на основе документов Национального архива Индии
Bissenova G.A., Oteпова G.E., Boldykov Zh.B. Migration history of Kazakhs through the Himalayas: based on documents from the National Archives of India..... 140
- Мырзаханов Ә.Е., Мұсағалиева А.С.** Шәкәрім Құдайбердіұлының ақталуы: жаңа деректерді талдау
Мырзаханов А.Е., Мусағалиева А.С. Реабилитация Шакарима Құдайбердиева: анализ новых данных
Myrzakhanov A.E., Musagalieva A.S. Shakarim Kudaiberdiyev's rehabilitation: analysis of new data..... 155
- Атдаев С.Дж., Атдаева О.Г.** Стражи туркменского общества XIX в. (до 1881 г.): ясавулы, ферраджи и караульные дозорные
Атдаев С.Дж., Атдаева О.Г. XIX ғ. (1881 жылға дейін) түрікмен қоғамының сақшылары: жасауылдар, феррадждар және қарауыл күзетшілері
Atdaev S.J., Atdaeva O.G. Guards of the Turkmen society of the 19th century (before 1881): yasavuls, ferrajs, and sentry guards..... 168
- Абсаликов А.А.** Генеалогия казахских ханов в «Ахсан ат -Таварих» Хасанбека Румлу (сравнительный анализ пяти рукописных списков и одного печатного издания)
Абсаликов А.А. Хасанбек Румлудың «Ахсан ат-Тауарих» еңбегіндегі қазақ хандарының генеалогиясы (бес қолжазба көшірмесі мен бір баспа басылымының салыстырмалы талдауы)
Absalikov A.A. The genealogy of Kazakh khans in Hasanbeg Rumlu's "Ahsan at-Tawarikh" (a comparative analysis of five manuscript copies and one printed edition)..... 180
- Мамытова С.Н.** The historical evolution of philanthropy in Kazakh society in the 19th – early 20th centuries
Мамытова С.Н. XIX–XX ғасырдың басындағы қазақ қоғамындағы меценаттықтың тарихи эволюциясы
Мамытова С.Н. Историческая эволюция меценатства в казахском обществе XIX – начала XX вв..... 191



<i>Akshanova A.M., Oteпова G.E., Shabambayeva A.G.</i> Historiographical discourse on the study of the korenizatsiia (indigenization) policy	
<i>Ақшанова А.М., Өтепова Г.Е., Шабамбаева А.Г.</i> Қазақстандағы жергіліктендіру саясатының тарихнамалық дискурсы	
<i>Ақшанова А.М., Отепова Г.Е., Шабамбаева А.Г.</i> Историографический дискурс политики коренизации в Казахстане.....	199

Музей ісі / Museology / Музейное дело

<i>Ибраева А.Ф., Пазылова Г.А.</i> Ұлттық тарихи-мәдени мұраны жаһандық дискурста ұсыну: халықаралық және әлемдік көрмелер тәжірибесі	
<i>Ибраева А.Г., Пазылова Г.А.</i> Представление национального историко-культурного наследия в глобальном дискурсе: опыт международных и всемирных выставок	
<i>Ibraeva A.G., Pazylova G.A.</i> Presenting national historical and cultural heritage in global discourse: the experience of international and world expositions.....	212
<i>Orazkulova K., Karibayeva G.</i> Museums, painting, and ideology in Soviet Kazakhstan	
<i>Оразкулова К. С., Карибаева Г.А.</i> Кеңестік Қазақстандағы музейлер, кескіндеме және идеология	
<i>Оразкулова К.С., Карибаева Г.А.</i> Музеи, живопись и идеология в советском Казахстане.....	233

*Orazkulova K.¹, Karibayeva G.²

¹Temirbek Zhurgenov Kazakh National Academy of Arts
Almaty, Kazakhstan

²Independent researcher
Dubai, UAE

*e-mail:orazkulova.ks@gmail.com

MUSEUMS, PAINTING, AND IDEOLOGY IN SOVIET KAZAKHSTAN

Abstract. In the Soviet Union, museums functioned not merely as repositories of objects but as powerful ideological institutions that shaped historical narratives and structured the interpretation of the visual world. Within this framework, painting served as a key medium for representing socialist labor, progress, and collective identity.

This article examines how paintings produced during the Soviet period were exhibited in museums of Kazakhstan and analyzes the curatorial strategies employed to stabilize and regulate their meanings. Grounded in critical museology and visual culture studies, the research further develops Adam Jolles's (2005) concept of the Stalinist "speaking museum."

Adopting a qualitative historical-interpretative methodology, the study combines close visual analysis of selected Soviet-era paintings with discursive and spatial analysis of exhibition texts, labels, catalogues, and display practices. Works by A. Kasteev, M. Kisamedinov, and artists of the Sixties generation serve as key case studies.

The findings suggest that paintings were treated as ideologically sensitive objects unless contained within tightly controlled interpretive frameworks.

The article argues that Soviet-period painting in Kazakhstan functioned less as an autonomous aesthetic practice and more as a regulated visual language embedded within the broader system of socialist museum enlightenment, rendering socialism visible, intelligible, and ideologically secure.

Keywords: art history, Soviet museology, Soviet painting, the «talking» museum, ideological exhibitions, museum pedagogy.

For citation: Orazkulova K., Karibayeva G. Museums, painting, and ideology in Soviet Kazakhstan // Madeni mura. 2026. №1 (112). pp. 233-243 (in Eng.)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47500/2026.v25.i1.19>

Introduction

In the Soviet Union, museums served more than just as repositories of objects. They played a central role in shaping historical consciousness and socialist identity, with painting occupying a special place within this system (Bezzubova, 2016). Its visual immediacy and emotional impact made it an effective means of conveying ideological messages, social hierarchies, and models of labour, progress, and collective identity. At the same time, painting's aesthetic independence was seen as potentially risky, as images could provoke emotions or interpretations beyond ideological control. This tension between visual power and ideological regulation significantly influenced Soviet museum practice. As a constituent republic of the Soviet

Union, Kazakhstan was fully integrated into this cultural system. Soviet-era paintings produced and exhibited in Kazakhstan belonged to the same ideological framework as those shown in Moscow or Leningrad, yet they expressed Soviet modernity through distinctly regional, colonial, and local visual vocabularies (Bown, 1991). Paintings depicting industrialisation, collectivisation, socialist labour, and the transformation of everyday life were not neutral reflections of reality; they aimed to serve pedagogical purposes, teaching viewers how to interpret history, work, and society through a socialist lens. Museums provided the institutional framework within which these images were mobilised, contextualised, and interpreted.

This article examines Soviet-era paintings in Kazakhstan not merely as artworks, but as museum objects embedded within a broader system of ideological interpretation. Instead of seeing paintings as standalone aesthetic forms, the study regards them as part of a didactic exhibition environment where meaning was deliberately fixed through narration, chronological order, and interpretive framing. Drawing on Adam Jolles' (2005) concept of the Stalinist "talking museum", the article indicates that Soviet museums were highly wary of images that spoke for themselves. Visual ambiguity and aesthetic enjoyment were considered politically unsafe, prompting museums to depend heavily on labels, banners, timelines, and explanatory panels. Therefore, paintings were exhibited less as objects for contemplation and more as elements to be explained.

This research, focusing on paintings exhibited in Soviet Kazakhstan, examines how this logic shaped perceptions and understandings of the artworks. It explores the interplay between image and text, the place of paintings in historical narratives, and the subordination of aesthetic form to ideological instruction. By situating Soviet Kazakhstani painting within the broader context of Soviet museology, the study contributes to discussions of socialist visual culture, museum education, and the regulation of meaning under state socialism. Ultimately, it demonstrates that Soviet-era painting in Kazakhstan served not only as art but also as a disciplined visual language designed to educate, normalise, and make socialism visible. Research aim and questions:

Guided by an understanding of the Soviet Museum as a didactic and explanatory institution, this article addresses the following research question: how were Soviet-era paintings displayed in Kazakhstani museums during the Soviet period, and what curatorial strategies were used to stabilise their ideological meanings? The study pursues three interrelated aims. First, it examines how paintings depicting industrialisation, collectivisation, and socialist labour were incorporated into museum narratives in Soviet Kazakhstan. Second, it analyses the role of explanatory texts, labels, and exhibition sequencing in shaping the interpretation of these works. Third, it explores how visual ambiguity and aesthetic independence were managed through museological practices that prioritised ideological education over open-ended reflection. By exploring the interaction between images and

curatorial narrative, this article seeks to deepen our understanding of Soviet-era painting as a controlled visual form operating within the broader system of socialist museum education.

Materials and Research Methods

This study employs a qualitative historical-interpretive approach rooted in critical museology and visual culture analysis. Focusing solely on the Soviet period, it examines how paintings created and displayed in Kazakhstan functioned within the Soviet museum and ideological framework. Rather than concentrating only on artistic style or authorial intent, the methodology highlights the exhibition conditions under which paintings were mediated, interpreted, and stabilised as ideological images.

The study employs a museum-based visual-discursive analysis, combining detailed visual examination with an analysis of curatorial structure. The study draws on conceptual insights from Adam Jolles's (2005) analysis of Stalinist "talking museums," which emphasises the central role of explanatory narrative in shaping visual meaning. This framework guides both the selection of analytical categories and the interpretation of museum practices, whilst the analysis is situated within the Soviet historical context.

The analysis draws on three main types of sources. First, it considers paintings created in Soviet-era Kazakhstan, particularly those depicting industrialisation, collectivisation, socialist labour, and changes in daily life. These paintings are viewed not only as individual artworks but also as museum objects within exhibition systems. Second, the study investigates archival and documentary materials related to Soviet museums in Kazakhstan, such as exhibition catalogues, museum guides, wall texts, and, where available, period photographs of exhibition arrangements. These sources provide insights into how paintings were presented, explained, and incorporated into museum displays. Third, the research utilises Soviet museological and cultural policy texts, including official directives, congress reports, and theoretical writings on museum work and socialist art. Collectively, these materials help establish the broader ideological and institutional framework that shaped exhibition practices across the Soviet Union.

The analysis unfolds across three interconnected stages. First, a visual examination



of the selected paintings concentrates on the subject matter, composition, figuration, and representational strategies associated with socialist realism and Soviet visual pedagogy. This stage establishes the ideological and emotional potential of the paintings as visual forms. Second, a discourse analysis investigates the explanatory materials accompanying these works in museum exhibitions. Labels, captions, banners, and chronological narratives are analysed to determine how meaning was fixed, framed, or constrained. Particular attention is given to how explanatory texts sometimes preceded or overshadowed visual interpretation, positioning the paintings as illustrations of predetermined historical and ideological narratives. Third, a spatial and narrative analysis explores how paintings were placed within exhibition sequences, including their position within chronological timelines, thematic sections, and broader narratives of socialist progress. This stage assesses how artworks were integrated into pedagogical structures designed to influence visitor understanding. Collectively, these stages allow for a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between image, text, and exhibition layout as a cohesive system of meaning-making.

The methodological focus intentionally concentrates on museum exhibition practices during the Soviet period. The study does not consider post-Soviet reinterpretations, contemporary museum politics, or current audience reception. Instead, it emphasises how paintings functioned within Soviet institutional and ideological frameworks at the time of their exhibition. By highlighting curatorial narration and exhibition design, the methodology views the museum as an active agent in shaping visual meaning. This approach facilitates a nuanced understanding of Soviet-era painting in Kazakhstan as a controlled visual form operating within a broader system of socialist pedagogy, rather than as an autonomous aesthetic practice.

Analysis

This study investigates Soviet-era painting in Kazakhstan from a critical museological perspective, recognising the museum not as a neutral space for aesthetic display but as an ideological and educational institution. It primarily draws on Adam Jolles's (2005) analysis of Stalinist "talking museums," which provides a theoretical framework for understanding how painting functioned within Soviet exhibition systems. This

approach enables us to analyse how visual art was managed, interpreted, and stabilised through curatorial practice during the Soviet period.

Jolles argues that Soviet museums, particularly during the Stalinist period, were shaped by a profound mistrust of autonomous images. Paintings were viewed as ideologically unreliable due to their ability to evoke emotions, visual pleasure, or ambiguous meanings, which were considered politically dangerous. Consequently, Soviet museology focused more on explanation than reflection. Exhibitions relied heavily on textual narratives, labels, banners, slogans, chronological tables, and display sequences to ensure that artworks conveyed ideologically correct messages consistent with Marxist-Leninist principles (Kudaibergenova, 2017). Within this framework, the museum functioned less as a space for aesthetic experience than as an educational environment. Visitors were positioned as learners, and exhibitions were designed as educational texts, divided into clearly defined sections and arguments. Paintings were not expected to speak for themselves; instead, their meaning was predetermined by curatorial narratives explaining their social context, ideological significance, and historical importance. Thus, meaning was created institutionally rather than revealed through individual interpretation. Within Soviet cultural policy, painting was at the centre of ongoing tension. It was praised as a powerful way to visualise socialist ideals, labour, and collective life, yet its aesthetic openness also made it hard to control (Bown, 1991). Jolles' (2005) framework clarifies how this tension was managed by treating painting as a controlled visual form whose ideological authority relied on its placement within explanatory exhibition systems. Images of factories, collective farms, workers, and socialist transformation were therefore presented as visual proof of historical progress and class struggle (Malinovskaya, 2017). Labels and contextual panels guided interpretation, ensuring that aesthetic form remained secondary to ideological meaning. Painting was not meant to invite ambiguity or personal reflection, but to depict a designated narrative of socialist development.

Kazakhstan, as a constituent republic of the Soviet Union, was fully integrated into this system. Museums adhered to the same exhibition directives as elsewhere in the USSR, using painting as a key pedagogical tool (Robert, 1990). Simultaneously, Soviet painting in Kazakhstan expressed socialist

modernity through regional and colonial visual languages, incorporating local environments and social realities into a unified ideological narrative. Instead of viewing this art as peripheral, the study positions Kazakhstani Soviet painting as central to Soviet visual culture. Framed through Jolles' (2005) concept of the talking museum, the analysis demonstrates how ideological coherence was upheld across different republics through a common museological logic.

Rooted in this theoretical framework, the analysis investigates how paintings were framed and interpreted within Soviet-era exhibitions. It emphasises explanatory texts, exhibition sequencing, and the positioning of paintings within narratives of progress and labour. By tracing how paintings were made to "speak" through institutional storytelling, the study uncovers the mechanisms through which Soviet museums shaped aesthetic experience and controlled visual meaning. In doing so, it redefines painting not merely as an artistic object, but as a deliberate visual language used within the ideological education of Soviet socialism.

Results

This section presents and interprets the findings of a qualitative visual-discursive analysis of Soviet-era painting and museum practices in Kazakhstan. Drawing on detailed case studies of artists associated with the Sixties generation, alongside documented exhibition practices in Soviet Kazakhstan, the analysis shows how paintings that conveyed aesthetic ambiguity, historical violence, or emotional intensity were systematically managed through museum narration and exhibition design. These empirical findings are interpreted through three complementary theoretical perspectives: Adam Jolles' (2005) analysis of the Stalinist "talking museum", Kate Cowcher's (2020) conceptualisation of the museum as a protective or carceral institution, and de Tiesenhausen's (2024) distinction between art as a social actor and art as an institutional representative.

Across the material examined, one central pattern emerges: paintings were consistently considered ideologically unsafe unless subjected to explanatory and institutional control. This finding supports Jolles' (2005) argument that Soviet museums were shaped by a deep mistrust of autonomous images. As Jolles (2005) suggests, visual form was seen as politically risky because

it could evoke emotion, pleasure, or interpretive openness beyond the limits of ideological regulation. In response, museums evolved into "talking" institutions that did more than just display images; they actively shaped their meanings in advance. The case of Soviet Kazakhstan shows that this logic was not limited to metropolitan centres of power but was also fully present within republican contexts (Zueva, 2016). Paintings by Kazakh artists, even those endorsed by official cultural policy, were never allowed to function independently as aesthetic or interpretive forces (Tlostanova, 2018). Their presence in exhibitions depended on being carefully contained within curatorial narratives. This institutional suspicion of images is evident not only in exhibition practices but also in the artworks themselves, many of which internalised pedagogical and ideological expectations. The result is a visual culture in which art anticipates its own regulation.

Abylkhan Kasteev's *A Gift for Comrade Stalin* (1950) provides a clear example of how Soviet painting in Kazakhstan already reflected the museum's explanatory logic at the time of its creation (Figure 1). The painting portrays a ceremonial scene in which Kazakh women present a woven portrait of Stalin to a Soviet official (Atanova, 2021). Importantly, the ideological emphasis is not on Stalin as an individual but on his image, which is visually isolated and emphasised within the composition (Bown, 1991). In this way, the painting actively guides the viewer towards a specific way of viewing. The figures are arranged hierarchically, the portrait is framed as untouchable and sacred, and the visible presence of *Pravda* reinforces the authority of text over visual interpretation (Abykayeva-Tiesenhausen, 2016). The image allows little room for reflection or ambiguity. Instead, it functions as a didactic tableau, demonstrating how images are intended to be viewed, revered, and understood. This is significant because it shows that the museum's role as an explanatory authority was not solely imposed through exhibitions but was already anticipated and reinforced within the artistic process itself. In de Tiesenhausen's (2024) terms, Kasteev's painting does not operate as an independent social actor. Rather, it acts as an institutional representative, reflecting and reinforcing ideological norms rather than challenging or reshaping them.

Makum Kisamedinov's *Walking Makhambet* (1973) presents a different kind of ideological



Fig. 1. Abylkhan Kasteev's *A Gift for Comrade Stalin* (1950)

risk, one rooted in historical violence and insurgent memory. Makhambet Otemisuly, the nineteenth-century rebel-poet, embodies a form of anti-imperial resistance that could easily destabilise Soviet historical narratives if left open to interpretation (Kopbosinova, 1972). As Bonin's (2021) analysis shows, Kisamedinov's portrayal emphasises physical strength, embodied presence, and symbolic attributes such as the book and the sword, all of which generate strong affective intensity. However, this affective charge was not allowed to remain politically open. Within Soviet exhibition discourse, Makhambet was recast as a proto-revolutionary figure compatible with Marxist-Leninist anti-colonial narratives. Through curatorial narration, his nationalist and insurgent specificity was stripped away, and his image was redirected towards a universalised revolutionary teleology. This process closely reflects Cowcher's

(2020) conceptualisation of the museum as a protective or carceral institution. Rather than erasing Makhambet from cultural memory, the museum placed him under interpretive custody. His image was preserved, but its political volatility was neutralised. In this way, potential ideological danger was managed through reclassification rather than outright suppression.

The generation of Kazakh artists known as the Sixtiers offers a particularly rich empirical case for examining the limits of artistic agency under socialism. Artists such as Salikhitdin Aitbaev introduced flattened spatial structures, symbolic abstraction, and suspended temporality into Soviet painting, thereby unsettling the narrative clarity demanded by Socialist Realism (Kopbosinova, 1972). Works such as *Young Kazakhs* (1967) depict figures with closed eyes and immobilised bodies, evoking mythic or timeless states rather than linear



Fig. 2. Makum Kisamedinov's Walking Makhambet (1973)

historical progression (Abykayeva-Tiesenhausen, 2016). Happiness (1966) foregrounds affect without offering narrative resolution, while Zhibek (1972) combines epic subject matter with modernist abstraction, resisting immediate ideological legibility (Kopbosinova, 1972). What emerges from these cases is not the suppression of such works, but their discursive domestication. Museum texts and critical commentary reframed these paintings as expressions of national culture compatible with socialist modernity (Zueva, 2016). Formal ambiguity was acknowledged as aesthetic innovation, yet its political implications were neutralised through interpretation. In Jolles' (2005) terms, this confirms that visual openness was tolerated only when accompanied by narrative closure. The museum retained its role as the ultimate interpretive authority, ensuring that paintings functioned as symbolic representations rather than as active agents capable of generating meaning on their own.

Beyond individual artworks, Bonin (2021) highlights instances of direct institutional intervention that clearly demonstrate the

mechanisms of museological governance. The renaming and reframing of the exhibition *Campfire of the Great Nomads* illustrate how exhibition titles and narrative structures were altered to reinforce linear models of historical progress and ideological coherence (Abykayeva-Tiesenhausen, 2016). These interventions show that ideological regulation operated not only through individual labels or explanatory texts but also at the structural level of exhibition design. Chronological organisation, thematic grouping, and interpretive sequencing functioned as control mechanisms, guiding visitors towards predetermined conclusions. This finding directly supports Jolles' (2005) argument that Soviet museums operated as pedagogical machines, positioning visitors as learners receiving authorised interpretations rather than as interpreters actively producing meaning.

Another finding concerns the contrasting treatment of Kazakh painting in international and domestic settings. Bonin (2021) points out that works by Kazakh artists circulated internationally at venues such as Expo '67 and Afro-Asian cultural congresses, where they could showcase cultural differences, symbolic otherness, and a degree of interpretive freedom. Within the Soviet Union, however, these same works were reintegrated into tightly controlled educational narratives (Sunny and Martin, 2001). This contrast highlights the museum's role as a regulatory institution within the Soviet state. What served as a form of cultural ambassadorship abroad was domestically transformed into a controlled ideological image. In line with Cowcher's (2020) insights, this shows that museums govern not only objects but also the meanings associated with them: the same image may be temporarily free or strictly confined depending on its institutional context.

Viewed through de Tiesenhausen's (2024) framework, the empirical findings reveal a consistent pattern: Soviet museums in Kazakhstan systematically prevented paintings from functioning as social actors. Artistic agency was present in terms of form, symbolism, and historical reference, but it was limited during exhibition. Through curatorial framing, paintings were transformed into symbols of pre-arranged narratives. Cultural production did not cease; instead, it was redirected. The outcome was a visual culture rich in formal experimentation but restricted in its capacity to act. This synthesis clarifies that the museum's role is not as a neutral host of ideology but as an institution that completed



Fig. 3. Salikhitdin Aitbaev' Young Kazakhs (1967)

ideological work. Where a painting might otherwise act, the museum spoke.

Taken together, these findings demonstrate that Soviet-era museums in Kazakhstan acted as tools of visual control. They influenced emotional reactions, regulated ambiguity, and transformed potentially disruptive images into educational instruments. Jolles (2005) explains how this control was implemented through institutional storytelling; Cowcher (2020) clarifies why it depended on containment; and de Tiesenhausen (2024) highlights what was ultimately lost in the process, the ability of art to engage with social life rather than depict it.

This study shows that Soviet painting in Kazakhstan did not lose its cultural importance under socialism; it lost its independence. The museum took responsibility for maintaining ideological safety by assigning meaning, neutralising emotion, and transforming artistic expression into a representational function. Paintings were neither

silenced nor destroyed, nor were they marginalised. Instead, they were made to speak correctly. Based on detailed analyses of artworks, exhibition practices, and institutional interventions, this study reveals that Kazakhstani Soviet museums were not peripheral imitations of metropolitan models, but active participants in a shared socialist exhibitionary regime. The museum did not simply display ideology, it created it, through images that were never allowed to act on their own terms.

Conclusion

This article explores how Soviet-era paintings were displayed in Kazakhstani museums during the Soviet period and highlights the curatorial strategies used to maintain their ideological significance. By viewing paintings not as standalone aesthetic objects but as museum artefacts within a didactic exhibition system, the study shows that Soviet museums in Kazakhstan served as active agents of

visual governance. Using multiple case studies and institutional practices, the analysis demonstrates that paintings were consistently presented within explanatory frameworks that prioritised ideological clarity over openness to interpretation.

Drawing on Adam Jolles's (2005) concept of the "talking museum," the study demonstrates that Soviet museology was rooted in a fundamental mistrust of images left to their own devices. Paintings were viewed as potentially unstable visual forms, capable of evoking emotions, ambiguities, or historical resonances beyond established narratives. To mitigate this risk, museums relied on explanatory texts, exhibition sequencing, thematic organisation, and narrative design to predetermine meaning. Consequently, paintings depicting socialist labour, historical figures, or national culture were understood through institutional narrative rather than through visual contemplation. The case studies discussed in this article demonstrate how this logic operated in practice. Abylkhan Kasteev's *A Gift for Comrade Stalin* shows how paintings could internalise pedagogical and ideological expectations at the moment of their creation, anticipating their later function within museum storytelling. Makum Kisamedinov's representations of Makhambet Otemisuly illustrate how historically and emotionally charged figures were reinterpreted and confined within acceptable revolutionary narratives. The works of the Sixtiers, particularly those of Salikhitdin Aitbaev, further reveal that even when Soviet painting embraced formal experimentation and symbolic ambiguity, interpretive autonomy remained constrained by curatorial discourse. Across these cases, the museum emerges not as a neutral space of display but as an institution that completed the ideological work of painting.

By drawing on Kate Cowcher's (2020) concept of the museum as a protective or imprisoning institution, the study further clarifies how

Soviet museums managed potentially disruptive meanings. Instead of erasing problematic histories or suppressing artistic innovation, museums placed such materials under interpretative custody, preserving images while neutralising their political and emotional volatility. In this sense, Soviet museums in Kazakhstan functioned simultaneously as sites of preservation and containment, maintaining ideological coherence by regulating how the past could be viewed, interpreted, and experienced.

Through de Tiesenhausen's (2024) distinction between art as a social actor and art as a representative, the analysis reveals what was ultimately at stake in these museological practices. Soviet painting in Kazakhstan was neither erased nor marginalised, but its capacity to influence social life was carefully constrained. Artistic agency persisted in form and symbolism, yet it was redirected towards representational functions. The museum emerged as an authoritative voice, speaking on behalf of images and ensuring that they supported approved narratives rather than generating new meanings.

By addressing the research questions, this study significantly contributes to understanding Soviet visual culture, museum practices, and Central Asian art history. It demonstrates that Kazakhstani museums played a central role, rather than a peripheral one, within the Soviet exhibition system; that visual meaning was shaped as much through curatorial pedagogy as through censorship; and that the museum served as a key space where ideology, art, and historical memory came together. By conceptualising Soviet-era painting in Kazakhstan as a regulated visual language operating within an interpretative museum framework, the article illuminates how socialism was made visible, comprehensible, and stable through exhibition practices. Ultimately, it was not the silence of images that was most significant, but the manner in which they were taught to speak.

References

1. Abykayeva-Tiesenhausen, A. (2016). *Central Asia in art: From Soviet Orientalism to the new republics*. London: I.B. Tauris.
2. Atanova, S. A. (2021). "Borites za osvobozhdenie zhenshchiny Vostoka!" *Sovetskie kovry i plakaty za emansipatsiyu zhenshchin Tsentral'noy Azii v 1920–1930-e gg.* *Siberian Historical Research*, 3, 140–170. [E-source]. URL: <https://doi.org/10.17223/2312461X/33/7> [in Russian]
3. Bezzubova, O. V. (2016). *Muzej i politika pamyati* [Museum and the politics of memory]. *Mezhdunarodnyy zhurnal issledovaniy kul'tury*, (3), 24–35. [E-source]. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/muzej-i-politika-pamyati/viewer> [in Russian]



4. Bonin, C. (2021). The art of the Sixtiers in Soviet Kazakhstan, or how to make a portrait from a skull. *Central Asian Survey*, 40(1), 34–56. [E-source]. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634937.2020.1863912>
5. Bown, M. C. (1991). *Art under Stalin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
6. Cowcher, K. (2020). The museum as prison and other protective measures in socialist Ethiopia. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 26(12), 1166–1184. [E-source]. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2019.1661270>
7. de Tiesenhausen, A. (2024). *The social role of art and culture in Central Asia*. London: Routledge. [E-source]. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032195858>
8. Jolles, A. (2005). Stalin's talking museums. *Oxford Art Journal*, 28(3), 429–455. [E-source]. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxartj/kci036>
9. Kopbosinova, R. (1972). *Molodye khudozhniki Kazakhstana: Zhivopis', grafika, skul'ptura* [Young artists of Kazakhstan: Painting, graphics, sculpture.]. Alma-Ata: Zhazushy. [in Russian]
10. Kudaibergenova, D. (2017). *Rewriting the nation in modern Kazakh literature: Elites and narratives*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
11. Malinovskaya, E. G. (2017). Sociokulturnaya dinamika iskusstva Kazakhstana ot 1960-kh k 1990-m godam [Socio-cultural dynamics of Kazakhstan's art – from the 1960s to the 1990s]. *Dom Burganova. Prostranstvo kul'tury*, 1, 162–182. [in Russian]
12. Suny, R. G., & Martin, T. (Eds.). (2001). *A state of nations: Empire and nation-making in the age of Lenin and Stalin*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
13. Tlostanova, M. V. (2018). *What does it mean to be post-Soviet? Decolonial art from the ruins of the Soviet empire*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
14. Tucker, R. C. (1990). *Stalin in power: The revolution from above, 1928–1941*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
15. Zueva, A. S. (2016). Muzeifikatsiya sovetskogo na postsovetskom prostranstve: Kul'turnaya pamyat' ili ideologiya? [Museification of the Soviet Union in the post-Soviet space. Cultural memory or ideology?] // *Etnokulturnoe razvitie regionov: molodezhnyi vzglyad* (pp. 121–130). Moscow: Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Russian Academy of Sciences. [in Russian]

*Оразкулова К. С.¹, Карибаева Г.А.²

¹Темірбек Жүргенов атындағы Қазақ ұлттық өнер академиясы

Алматы, Қазақстан

²Тәуелсіз зерттеуші

Дубай, БАЭ

*e-mail:orazkulova.ks@gmail.com

КЕҢЕСТІК ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ МУЗЕЙЛЕР, КЕСКІНДЕМЕ ЖӘНЕ ИДЕОЛОГИЯ

Аңдатпа. Кеңес Одағында музейлер тек заттарды сақтау үшін ғана емес, сонымен қатар тарихты қалыптастыруда шешуші рөл атқарып, көрнекі әлемді идеологиялық тұрғыдан түсіндірді. Бұл жүйеде кескіндеме социалистік еңбекті, прогресті және ұжымдық тепе-теңдікті бейнелеу құралы ретінде қызмет етті.

Мақалада Кеңес Одағы кезінде салынған картиналардың Қазақстан музейлерінде қалай қойылғаны зерттеліп, олардың мағынасын бірізді түсіндіру үшін кураторлық стратегиялар талданады. Зерттеу сыни музееология және визуалды мәдениет талдауларына сүйеніп, сталиндік «сөйлейтін музей» тұжырымдамасын дамытады.

Сапалық тарихи-интерпретациялық тәсілді қолдана отырып, мақала сол кезеңдегі кескіндеме туындыларына визуалды талдау жүргізеді және көрме мәтіндеріне, экспозиция жазбаларына, этикеткаларға, каталогтерге, сондай-ақ көрме ұйымдастыру тәсілдеріне дискурсивті және кеңістіктік талдау жасайды. Мысал ретінде Ә. Қастеевтің, М. Қисамединовтің және алпысыншы жылдар буынына жататын суретшілердің

еңбектері қарастырылады.

Зерттеу нәтижелері көрсеткендей, кескіндеме туындылары қатаң бақылауға алынған шеңберге енгізілмеген жағдайда, идеологиялық тұрғыдан қауіпті нысандар ретінде қабылданған.

Мақалада Қазақстандағы кеңестік кезеңдегі кескіндеме дербес эстетика тәжірибесі ретінде емес, социалистік музей ағарту жүйесінің шеңберінде реттелген визуалды тіл ретінде қызмет еткенін дәлелдейді. Музейдің визуалды мағынаны қалыптастырудағы рөлін айқындай отырып, мақала кеңестік музеология, социалистік визуал мәдениет және Орталық Азия өнері тарихы саласындағы зерттеулерге үлес қосады және экспозиция тәжірибесі социализмді көрнекі, түсінікті және идеологиялық тұрғыдан қауіпсіз етіп көрсеткенін дәлелдейді.

Кілт сөздер: өнертану, кеңестік музеология, кеңестік кескіндеме; «сөйлейтін» музей, идеологиялық көрмелер, музей педагогикасы.

Дәйексөз үшін: Оразкулова К. С., Карибаева Г.А. Кеңестік Қазақстандағы музейлер, кескіндеме және идеология // Мәдени мұра. 2026. №1 (112). бб. 233-243 (ағылш.)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47500/2026.v25.i1.19>

***Оразкулова К.С.¹, Карибаева Г.А.²**

¹Казахская национальная академия искусств имени Темирбека Жургенова
Алматы, Республика Казахстан

²Независимый исследователь
Дубай, ОАЭ

*orazkulova.ks@gmail.com

МУЗЕИ, ЖИВОПИСЬ И ИДЕОЛОГИЯ В СОВЕТСКОМ КАЗАХСТАНЕ

Аннотация. В Советском Союзе музеи не только хранили предметы, они играли ключевую роль в формировании истории и интерпретировали визуальный мир с идеологической позиции. В этой системе живопись была инструментом изображения социалистического труда, прогресса и коллективной идентичности.

В статье рассматривается, как произведения живописи, созданные в советский период, экспонировались в музеях Казахстана, а также анализируются кураторские стратегии, направленные на стабилизацию их смыслов. Исследование опирается на критическую музеологию и анализ визуальной культуры и развивает концепцию сталинского «говорящего музея».

Используя качественный историко-интерпретационный подход, статья сочетает визуальный анализ произведений живописи советского периода с дискурсивным и пространственным анализом выставочных текстов, этикеток, каталогов и методов экспонирования. В качестве примеров приводятся работы А.Кастеева, М.Кисамединова и художников-шестидесятников.

Результаты исследования показывают, что живописные произведения воспринимались как идеологически рискованные объекты, если они не были заключены в жёстко контролируемые рамки.

В статье утверждается, что живопись советского периода в Казахстане функционировала не как автономная эстетическая практика, а как регулируемый визуальный язык в рамках более широкой системы социалистического музейного просвещения. Подчёркивая роль музея в формировании визуального смысла, исследование вносит вклад в изучение советской музеологии, визуальной культуры и истории искусства Центральной Азии, демонстрируя, каким образом выставочные практики делали социализм наглядным, понятным и идеологически безопасным.



Ключевые слова: искусствоведение, советская музеология, советская живопись, «говорящий» музей, идеологические выставки, музейная педагогика.

Для цитирования: Оразкулова К.С., Карибаева Г.А. Музеи, живопись и идеология в советском Казахстане // Мәдени мұра. 2026. №1 (112). С.233-243 (каз.)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47500/2026.v25.i1.19>

Information about the authors:

Orazkulova Kaldykul, Temirbek Zhurgenov Kazakh National Academy of Arts, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan.

ORCID: 0009-0007-7215-0672

Scopus ID: 57216620447

Karibayeva Gulzhan, Independent researcher, Dubai, UAE.

ORCID: 0009-0001-8518-8414

Информация об авторах:

Оразкулова Калдыкуль Серикбаевна, кандидат философских наук, Казахская национальная академия искусств имени Теймурека Жургенова, Алматы, Республика Казахстан.

ORCID: 0009-0007-7215-0672

Scopus ID: 57216620447

Карибаева Гүлжан, Независимый исследователь, Дубай, ОАЭ.

ORCID: 0009-0001-8518-8414

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Оразкулова Калдыкуль Серикбаевна, Темірбек Жүргенов атындағы Қазақ ұлттық өнер академиясы, Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы.

ORCID: 0009-0007-7215-0672

Scopus ID: 57216620447

Карибаева Гүлжан, Тәуелсіз зерттеуші, Дубай, БАӘ.

ORCID: 0009-0001-8518-8414

КОРРИГЕНДУМ

Н.В. Летунованың «КСРО үшінші басшысының қуғынға ұшырауы және өмірінің жаңа кезеңі: Г.М. Маленков және Қазақ АКСР-і» атты мақаласына корригендум. Мәдени мұра. 2025. № 4 (111). 87–101-бб. Мақаланың аңдатпасы мен мәтінінде түзетуді қажет ететін қате басылулар анықталды. «Қазақ АКСР-і» деген сөз тіркесін «Қазақ КСР-і» деп оқу қажет.

КОРРИГЕНДУМ

Корригендум к статье Летуновой Н.В. «Опала и новая глава жизни третьего вождя СССР: Г.М. Маленков и Казахская АССР». Мәдени мұра. 2025. № 4 (111). С. 87–101. В аннотации и в тексте статьи были замечены опечатки, требующие коррекции. Словосочетание «Казахская АССР» следует читать «Казахская ССР».

CORRIGENDUM

Corrigendum to the article of Letunova N.V. "Disgrace and a new chapter in the life of the third leader of the USSR: G.M. Malenkov and the Kazakh ASSR". Madeni mura. 2025. № 4 (111). pp. 87–101. There were typos in the abstract and in the text of the article that require correction. The phrase "Kazakh ASSR" should be read "Kazakh SSR".