

S.K. Zipatolla^{1*} , Zh.Zh. Orazayeva² , M.A. Rakhmetullina¹ ,
T.S. Smakova¹ , N.B. Akzhunusova¹ 

¹ Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan;

² Aktobe Regional University named after K. Zhubanov, Akotobe, Kazakhstan

(E-mail: zipatollashyngys@gmail.com; zh.orazaeva@mail.ru; rakhmetullina.m@gmail.com; naziko_02.86@mail.ru;
toqzhan_krq@mail.ru)

Artificial intelligence and the “Coloniality of Knowledge”: Examining Western-Centric Narratives in Historical Outputs

This study examines how contemporary artificial intelligence (AI) systems reproduce Western-centric historical narratives through the concept of “the coloniality of knowledge.” Utilizing Aníbal Quijano’s theoretical framework, the research analyzes how AI-generated interpretations reflect enduring epistemic hierarchies rooted in imperial knowledge production. Specifically, the article investigates whether AI systems privilege Western historical experiences and interpretations over non-Western perspectives. The novelty of this study lies in extending the concept of the coloniality of knowledge—originally developed in the context of Latin America—to the analysis of AI-generated historical narratives, with a specific focus on Siberia and Central Asia. This research broadens the geographical and analytical scope of the concept and contributes to emerging discussions on AI bias in historical knowledge production. A qualitative comparative methodology was employed, focusing on the outputs of three AI systems—ChatGPT, Gemini, and DeepSeek—using identical prompts related to four historical figures: Yermak Timofeevich, Mikhail Skobelev, Mikhail Chernyaev, and Kenesary Kasymuly. The findings reveal consistent patterns across all examined systems, where AI-generated narratives tend to prioritize imperial actors, particularly those associated with the Russian Empire, while portraying Indigenous societies in Siberia and Central Asian political entities as secondary or reactive. Terms such as “expansion,” “conquest,” and “capture” normalize imperial violence and frame historical processes as inevitable. Moreover, AI systems frequently rely on analytical frameworks derived from Western military historiography, oversimplifying complex local socio-political systems and largely omitting Indigenous epistemologies and oral traditions. This study demonstrates that AI systems not only reproduce dominant historical narratives but also reinforce the coloniality of knowledge through discursive normalization, the privileging of imperial sources, and the marginalization of local perspectives. These patterns contribute to the persistence of epistemic hierarchies and the reproduction of asymmetrical power relations in digital knowledge production. Overall, the findings highlight the need for more inclusive, context-sensitive, and epistemologically diverse approaches to AI training in order to mitigate representational bias and promote more balanced historical narratives in the age of artificial intelligence.

Keywords: Kenesary Kasymuly, Ermak Timofeevich, Russian Empire, ChatGPT, Gemini, DeepSeek, Eurocentric, postcolonial theory, Mikhail Skobelev, Mikhail Chernyaev.

Introduction

The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has transformed how knowledge is produced, accessed, and interpreted across various disciplines, including the humanities and historical studies. Many AI systems today are developed in the Global North or trained on datasets that are predominantly Western-centric. This can lead to structural biases that reproduce stereotypes and systemic inequalities in knowledge. Historically, the production of knowledge has often served colonial purposes, resulting in the exploitation of populations and natural resources. This created biased and selective knowledge systems that reflected the interests of dominant powers rather than the perspectives of colonized societies. Such processes contributed to intellectual dependency, where imperial narratives marginalized or replaced Indigenous epistemologies.

Peruvian sociologist Aníbal Quijano conceptualized this phenomenon as the “coloniality of knowledge” [1; 215-232]. He argued that colonialism reshaped not only political and economic structures but also epistemic systems, influencing ways of knowing, symbolic orders, and forms of knowledge production. These patterns, often structured through racial and hierarchical classifications, persisted even after the formal end of colonial rule.

In the contemporary context, AI systems trained on Western-dominated datasets may unintentionally reproduce these patterns. This issue is particularly relevant in historical research, where AI-generated

* Corresponding author’s e-mail: zipatollashyngys@gmail.com

narratives increasingly shape public understanding of the past. If AI models primarily rely on Western-centered datasets, they risk reinforcing dominant interpretations while marginalizing alternative perspectives from non-Western regions.

The importance of this study lies in the growing influence of AI in knowledge production and education, as well as the necessity to critically assess its role in shaping historical narratives. As AI tools become widely used in academic and public contexts, understanding their embedded biases is essential for ensuring more balanced and inclusive knowledge systems.

We use the concept of the “coloniality of knowledge” to analyze AI-generated historical narratives, particularly in the contexts of Siberia and Central Asia. While this concept has been widely applied to Latin America, extending its application to AI systems and regional histories offers a new analytical perspective and broadens its theoretical scope.

Hence, the aim of the study is to examine the extent to which AI-generated historical narratives reproduce Western-centric biases and reflect the coloniality of knowledge. For this purpose, the following objectives are defined: to identify whether AI-generated outputs privilege Western historical experiences and interpretations; to examine the representation of non-Western actors and narratives, particularly Indigenous societies of Siberia and Central Asia; to assess the use of language and terminology that may normalize imperial or colonial perspectives; to evaluate the extent to which alternative epistemologies, including Indigenous knowledge systems, are included or excluded in AI-generated narratives.

Materials and Methods

The primary sources for this study consisted of responses generated by ChatGPT, Gemini, and DeepSeek regarding Yermak Timofeevich, Mikhail Skobelev, Mikhail Chernyaev, and Kenesary Kasymuly. These were analyzed using Anibal Quijano’s concept of the “coloniality of knowledge” [1] to identify patterns of Western-centric bias. In addition, the study engaged with existing scholarship on AI bias and Western-centric narratives, including works by Mak and Luo [2] and Zia [3].

To provide a historical counterbalance to AI-generated narratives, the research also drew on secondary historical sources. These included The Collection of State Treaties and Documents Preserved in the State College of Foreign Affairs [4], as well as works by Sobolev [5], Miller [6], and Kotkin [7] on the history of Siberia and its khanates. Further, the study consulted works by Mackay [8], Hopkirk [9], and Lansdell [10], which address the history of Central Asia during the period of the Russian Empire. Additional sources included studies by Kamalova [11] on the history of Tashkent, Sigalov [12] on the Cossacks, and works by Karasayev et al. [13] and Olcott [14] on the Kazakh Khanate. The analysis also incorporated General Skobelev’s correspondence [15] and materials from conferences held in Tashkent related to the Russian Empire’s conquest of the city in 1865 [16].

The methodological basis of this research combines general scientific approaches and methods commonly used in the humanities with methods specific to historical studies. One of the key methods employed was comparative analysis. The historical figures analyzed in this study were selected through an exploratory search process. The research team formulated and tested multiple prompts related to various historical personalities and identified cases where Western-centric narratives were most apparent. As a result, four figures were selected for detailed analysis, as they most clearly reflected recurring patterns of Western-centric representation in AI-generated responses.

We selected the AI systems ChatGPT, Gemini, and DeepSeek to analyze the possible presence of Western-centric historical narratives in their responses. After obtaining answers from these AI systems, our team conducted a qualitative analysis to determine whether the responses contained Western-centric narratives or recurring patterns. ChatGPT and Gemini were selected because both AI systems were developed in the Global North. DeepSeek was included because we assumed that it relies heavily on widely circulated narratives about historical issues, which may also reflect existing biases in dominant historical interpretations.

The study employed a qualitative comparative research design. Identical prompts about Yermak Timofeevich, Mikhail Skobelev, Mikhail Chernyaev and Kenesary Kasymuly were submitted to each AI system in order to ensure comparability of responses. The prompts were formulated around four debated historical figures. This approach allowed the researchers to examine how AI systems construct historical narratives when responding to the same historical queries.

The analytical framework of the study was informed by the “coloniality of knowledge” concept. Western-centric narratives were identified when responses prioritized Western historical experiences, framed

Western actors as the primary agents of historical change, or marginalized perspectives from non-Western societies. Particular attention was paid to patterns such as the prioritization of European actors, the presentation of historical development as diffusion from Western civilization, and the omission or marginalization of local historical perspectives.

The findings were interpreted through the lens of interpretive philosophy, allowing for a deeper understanding of meaning-making processes in AI-generated historical narratives.

Results

The first question was regarding Ermak Timofeevich, who was the leader of the Cossacks that participated in the Russian invasion of Siberia. The prompt was: “Who was Ermak Timofeevich?”

In describing Ermak, Gemini used the phrase “opening the vast Siberian frontier.” DeepSeek similarly framed Ermak’s campaign as the “conquest of Siberia.” ChatGPT, when covering this topic, used phrases like “Russian expansion into Siberia”, “expedition into Western Siberia.” However, Siberia was not a “wilderness” that needed a European power to “open” or “conquer” it. In reality, Siberia was inhabited by numerous Indigenous peoples with complex social structures, religious systems, and economic networks, with whom Moscow itself maintained various forms of diplomatic contact. This challenges the notion of Siberia as a “wilderness” and instead highlights it as a politically and socially organized region.

This is further evidenced by historical sources. For example, the Collection of State Charters and Treaties Preserved in the State College of Foreign Affairs located in Moscow has diplomatic correspondence between Khan Kuchum and Moscow. Surviving fragments of an agreement concluded between the two sides suggest that the Siberian khan entered into relations with Ivan IV in a subordinate position [4]. Then, Gemini referred to Ermak’s opponents as “Siberian tribes” and described the Cossacks as possessing a “technological advantage.” DeepSeek similarly highlighted the importance of their “superior firearms.” Such representations create a binary distinction between the “primitive” and the “civilized,” suggesting that European technological superiority made the outcome inevitable. The use of the term “tribes” reinforces a simplified and hierarchical view of Siberian societies.

However, this framing overlooks the historical complexity of the region. Khan Kuchum himself was part of the Shibaniid branch from Bukhara, descended from the Chinggisid rulers of the Golden Horde, whose lineage traced back to Shibani, a descendant of Jochi, the eldest son of Chinggis Khan, representing a long-established ruling dynasty. Additionally, during the medieval period, the Siberian yurt was a crucial hub within transregional caravan networks. Its geographical location facilitated sustained connections with major Central Asian cities such as Bukhara, Merv, Urgench, Serakhs and Nisa, which continued even after Siberia became part of the Russian state [5; 50].

At the same time, as noted by Miller, the outcome of the conflict cannot be attributed solely to military or technological superiority. A key factor in Khan Kuchum’s defeat was the defection of segments of the Tatar and Ugric clan nobility to the Russian side, along with the participation of service Tatars and Ugrians in military operations alongside Russian forces [6; 680]. These dynamics suggest that the Siberian Chinggisid polity should not be viewed as a “primitive” tribal formation; rather, Siberia functioned, in certain respects, as a developed trade hub with complex political and social structures. Furthermore, the case demonstrates that Kuchum’s defeat was shaped not only by external pressure, but also by the internal diversity and fragmentation of the Siberian Khanate, which ultimately facilitated the Cossack advance.

It also should be mentioned that Gemini’s narrative centered entirely on Ermak’s motivations, such as “redemption,” “heroism,” and “gifts from the Tsar.” It treats Indigenous peoples as passive obstacles rather than protagonists in their own right. Further, DeepSeek described Khan Kuchum as the “main opponent.” In this narrative, he was framed as an obstacle to Russian expansion. Nevertheless, Khan Kuchum was the legitimate ruler of a sovereign state [7], while Ermak was an “invader.”

Overall, only ChatGPT’s answer regarding Ermak tried to avoid strong Eurocentrism because it explicitly states that Russian narratives portray Ermak as a hero, while postcolonial and regional perspectives emphasize the impact on Indigenous peoples. But, the problem is that all mentioned AI systems do not provide sufficient information on Indigenous peoples of Siberia, such as the Khanty, Mansi, and Siberian Tatars. In addition, all of them implicitly positioned the Russian Empire as the primary historical actor, while Siberian Khanate was a secondary actor.

The next question was about Mikhail Skobelev, Russian general of the 19th century. Hence, the prompt was “Who was Mikhail Skobelev?”

Gemini, answering this question, described him as a “hero” and “charismatic” figure. Similarly, DeepSeek portrayed him as a hero in Bulgaria, highlighting this point so prominently in a summary of his life. In reality, Russian expansion in Central Asia frequently relied on coercion and violence [8; 561]. A particularly illustrative example is Skobelev’s 1881 campaign against the Turkmens at Geok Tepe, which has been described as indiscriminately violent toward both combatants and civilians [9; 233]. In his official report, Skobelev himself acknowledged that approximately 14,500 people were killed during the siege and subsequent pursuit [8; 562]. Framing such a figure as a “hero” thus reflects a Western-centric perspective that tends to romanticize the violent practices of the Russian Empire rather than critically interrogate them [15].

Moreover, Gemini’s narrative includes such words as a “capture” and “siege.” While DeepSeek, describing him, used the phrases like a “Russia’s expansion into Central Asia.” In describing the conquest of Kokand, DeepSeek also mentioned the word “capture.” However, the words “capture” and “siege” are a classic military terms used in Western history, which in this case seems irrelevant. Moreover, the word “expansion” is a classic Western-centric framing as well that mirrors phrases like “American westward expansion.” ChatGPT similarly describing him used the phrase like “conquest of Central Asia” which also normalizes imperial invasion as a strategic military achievement [10; 10].

Nevertheless, the worst part is that DeepSeek quoted his horrific statement, “In Asia, the duration of peace is in direct proportion to the slaughter you inflict upon the enemy. The harder you hit them, the longer they stay quiet.” This controversial quote used to justify genocide and mass murder practiced by Skobelev. Summing up, only ChatGPT and DeepSeek mentioned that in Central Asia he was considered as a colonial conqueror, while Gemini focused entirely on Western-centric rhetoric and covered in a few sentences his Geok Tope massacre. But, all of the three systems’ narratives centered Russian empire as a main subject of history, while Central Asian actors appeared secondary.

The next question focused on Mikhail Chernyaev, a Russian general who played a key role in the colonial invasion of Central Asia. The prompt was: “Who was Mikhail Chernyaev?”

In describing his campaign in Tashkent, Gemini characterized the city as being merely “defended by a garrison,” while DeepSeek used phrases like “expanding the Russian Empire into Central Asia” and “played a key role in expanding the empire’s influence.” ChatGPT similarly employed expressions such as “Russia’s advance into Central Asia” and “capture the city of Tashkent.” These representations are not neutral. Gemini’s description reduces Tashkent to a purely military object, stripping away its political, social, and historical complexity. In reality, Tashkent has a history spanning over a thousand years and is an important trade and cultural center. Yet, it is simplified to a mere “garrison” [11; 1753].

DeepSeek’s rhetoric positions the Russian Empire as the central historical actor and normalizes “expansion” as a neutral or even inevitable process. Similarly, ChatGPT’s use of directional language, such as “advance” and “capture,” implicitly suggests a sense of inevitability and legitimacy in the context of imperial conquest. Furthermore, the portrayal of Chernyaev is often romanticized. Gemini refers to him as the “Lion of Tashkent,” while DeepSeek highlights his “bold and often risky operations,” framing colonial violence in heroic terms.

In truth, Chernyaev captured Tashkent in 1865 with a relatively small force of around 2,000 soldiers facing a city of approximately 200,000 inhabitants, which was nevertheless well defended [12; 587-591]. Despite the eventual victory of the Russian Empire, the conquest was met with fierce resistance from the city’s diverse population, including men, women, and youth, and resulted in significant civilian losses.

This perspective is increasingly reflected in contemporary scholarship. At a conference in June 2025 marking the 160th anniversary of the fall of Tashkent, organized by the Institute of History of Uzbekistan, scholars characterized the Russian campaign culminating on June 17, 1865, as “brutal” and “vile,” challenging earlier narratives that framed it as a straightforward military success [16]. Gemini also mentioned “Great Game”, which frames Central Asia as a chessboard where only two major players exist like Russian Empire and Great Britain. However, people and Khanates of Central Asia were not just a “territory.” Chernyaev’s actions were not just a struggle against Great Britain, but was the invasion and conquest of sovereign states.

In general, all of the three AI systems framed the rhetoric around the history of Russian empire, while Central Asian khanates were shown as a secondary agents. Despite the fact that all of them mentioned that Chernyaev in Central Asia is associated with imperial and colonial invasion, the information regarding Bukhara, Khiva and other Khanates were very limited, which creates a dominant western-centric narrative over the regional one.

The next question was about Kenesary Kasymuly, the last Kazakh Khan of 19th century. Consequently, the prompt was “Who was Kenesary Kasymuly?”

In this case, both Gemini and DeepSeek used such phrases as “national liberation movement” or “rebellion”, which assume that the Russian Empire was the “default” state and Kenesary reacted against it. However, the Kazakh Khanate was violently incorporated into the Russian Empire, and Kenesary’s movement can be understood as an effort to reassert Kazakh sovereignty and preserve the territorial integrity of his polity. At the same time, these uprisings were shaped by a complex interplay of socioeconomic factors, including land disputes, tax burdens, and resistance to Russian economic exploitation [13; 147]. In its response regarding Kenesary, Gemini uses terms like “modernization” and “administrative reforms.” Within a Western-centric interpretive framework, such language is often associated with a movement toward a European-style bureaucratic state. This framing risks suggesting that the traditional nomadic political order — characterized by oral legal traditions (*adat*), flexible kinship networks, and mobile governance — was inherently “primitive” or “pre-modern.”

However, Kenesary Khan did not aim to modernize Kazakh governance along European institutional lines. Instead, his efforts were focused on the standardization and consolidation of existing norms, particularly those grounded in *adat* and Islamic principles, which already structured social and political life in the steppe. This is particularly evident in relation to taxation. Pre-colonial Kazakh society already had established forms of fiscal extraction, most notably “*zakat*” and various customary obligations collected by khans and local elites. These practices were embedded in the socio-political fabric of nomadic life and operated through personal authority, reciprocity, and mobility, rather than through fixed bureaucratic mechanisms [14; 155].

Kenesary’s reforms should be understood not as the introduction of a fundamentally new fiscal system, but as an attempt to systematize and centralize existing practices in response to increasing external pressures, particularly from the Russian Empire. ChatGPT’s use of the term “expansion” places the Russian Empire at the forefront as the main historical actor, much like the narratives generated by Gemini and DeepSeek. However, unlike those platforms, ChatGPT also depicts Kenesary as a builder of a state.

Discussion

Recent scholarship has increasingly highlighted that Large Language Models (LLMs) used by ChatGPT and Gemini often reproduce cultural biases and historical misconceptions found in their training data. For instance, Mak and Luo demonstrate that content generated by LLMs frequently reflects Western-centric perspectives, which marginalize alternative historical narratives and underrepresented viewpoints. Their framework focuses on quantifying these biases through indicators such as the Cultural Bias Score and the Historical Misconception Score, providing a systematic method for identifying distortions in AI-generated narratives [2; 4].

At the same time, emerging research in postcolonial AI studies conceptualizes these issues in broader structural terms. Zia, for example, interprets artificial intelligence as a form of digital colonialism, where technologies developed in the Global North perpetuate historical power imbalances through data extraction, epistemic dominance, and algorithmic bias. From this perspective, AI systems are not merely technical tools but also mechanisms that reinforce global inequalities and marginalize non-Western knowledge systems [3].

While both approaches offer valuable insights, this study does not adopt either the quantitative evaluation framework proposed by Mak and Luo or the broader concept of digital colonialism as its primary analytical lens. Instead, it draws on the concept of the colonality of knowledge, developed by Anibal Quijano, which provides a more precise framework for analyzing how knowledge is structured, categorized, and hierarchized.

Quijano argues that modern knowledge systems create frameworks that define the relationships between Western Europe and the rest of the world through binary categories such as “primitive–civilized,” “irrational–rational,” and “traditional–modern.” These classifications establish hierarchical distinctions that position the “non-European” as aligned with the past and, consequently, constructed as inferior. Additionally, they frame the relationship between Western Europe and the rest of the world as one between a subject and an object, reinforcing the notion that Europe is the sole legitimate source of knowledge.

Although Central Asia and Siberia were not colonized by Western European empires, they were subject to Russian imperial and later Soviet domination. This domination, which differed from overseas colonialism, involved the incorporation of territory, systematic resource extraction, and cultural assimilation. These processes significantly influenced local systems of knowledge production. In this context, the term

“Western-centric,” as used in this study, primarily refers to the epistemological frameworks of Russian imperialism and the Soviet era, which operated in ways similar to Western colonial knowledge systems. Although Quijano originally developed the concept of the “coloniality of knowledge” in the context of Latin America and the global expansion of Western European modernity, this study argues that it can also be productively applied to Russian imperial and Soviet epistemologies. The production of knowledge about Central Asia and Siberia reveals comparable patterns of hierarchical classification, epistemic exclusion, and the privileging of imperial perspectives.

Within this framework, the analysis of AI-generated responses demonstrates a consistent focus on the Russian Empire as the primary reference point in narratives about Ermak, Skobelev, Chernyaev, and Kenesary. Historical processes are depicted through a recurring vocabulary of imperial movement and control, which implicitly positions imperial actions as the main drivers of historical change. Consequently, Indigenous societies and Central Asian polities are primarily represented in relational terms — defined in opposition to or in reaction to imperial expansion, rather than as autonomous actors with their own political trajectories.

For example, in narratives about Ermak, Khan Kuchum is frequently portrayed as the “main opponent,” reducing his role to that of an obstacle to Russian expansion and obscuring his status as the legitimate ruler of the Siberian Khanate. More broadly, accounts of Ermak, Skobelev, and Chernyaev consistently rely on language that situates Central Asian actors as secondary or reactive within a narrative structured around imperial movement and achievement. A similar pattern is evident in representations of Kenesary, who is often labeled a “rebel,” thereby diminishing the sovereign and state-building dimensions of his movement.

The coloniality of knowledge also operates through discursive normalization. The language used to describe imperial encounters presents them as technical, neutral, or inevitable processes, obscuring the coercive and often violent nature of imperial rule while reinforcing imperial perspectives as common sense. Another dimension is the hierarchization of knowledge systems. AI-generated narratives tend to privilege knowledge derived from written archives, military campaigns, and state-building processes — sources historically associated with imperial authority. In contrast, local epistemologies, including oral traditions, Indigenous political concepts, and socio-ecological practices, remain largely absent. This imbalance reinforces the dominance of imperial narratives while marginalizing alternative ways of knowing.

This asymmetry is further reflected in the selective omission of perspectives. In discussions of Ermak, AI systems rarely engage with the experiences of Indigenous peoples of Siberia, such as the Khanty, Mansi, and Siberian Tatars. Similarly, narratives concerning Skobelev and Chernyaev lack substantial engagement with Central Asian perspectives. Significant events, such as the Geok Tepe massacre, are often underrepresented or only superficially addressed. Moreover, contemporary reinterpretations — like recent debates in Uzbekistan regarding the 1865 capture of Tashkent — are largely omitted, despite their importance for understanding the ongoing re-evaluation of imperial histories.

In addition, these narratives reproduce core binary oppositions identified by Quijano. A “primitive–civilized” dichotomy is implicitly reinforced, for example, through references to the technological superiority of Cossack firearms over Siberian forces. Likewise, a “traditional–modern” dichotomy emerges in portrayals of Kenesary’s policies, where his efforts to standardize existing Islamic and adat-based norms are framed as attempts at “modernization”, thereby measuring local political developments against European institutional models. These representations further illustrate how AI-generated narratives reproduce hierarchical classifications embedded in the coloniality of knowledge.

Conclusions

This study demonstrates that AI-generated historical narratives are not neutral representations of the past; instead, they are shaped by deeply embedded epistemological structures that reflect the coloniality of knowledge. Through a comparative analysis of responses generated by ChatGPT, Gemini, and DeepSeek, the research identified consistent patterns of Western-centric framing in the portrayal of historical figures such as Ermak Timofeevich, Mikhail Skobelev, Mikhail Chernyaev, and Kenesary Kasymuly.

The findings indicate that AI systems tend to position imperial actors — particularly those associated with the Russian Empire — as the primary agents of historical change. In contrast, non-Western societies are often represented as secondary, reactive, or peripheral. This narrative structure reinforces a hierarchical understanding of history, wherein local actors are deprived of agency and reduced to obstacles, subjects, or contextual backgrounds within imperial expansion. Furthermore, the study reveals that the coloniality of knowledge operates in AI outputs through several mechanisms: the normalization of imperial discourse, the

privileging of imperial sources and written archives, and the systematic omission or marginalization of Indigenous and local perspectives. These patterns not only reproduce historical asymmetries but also obscure the coercive and violent dimensions of imperial encounters, presenting them as technical, inevitable, or progressive processes.

By applying Quijano's concept of coloniality of knowledge to the case of Central Asia and Siberia, this research broadens the analytical scope of postcolonial AI studies beyond the traditional focus on Western European colonialism. It highlights that Russian imperial and Soviet epistemologies function in comparable ways, producing hierarchical classifications and epistemic exclusions that persist in contemporary AI systems.

However, this study has several limitations. First, the analysis is based on a relatively small sample of AI systems and focuses on only four historical figures, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, while the selection of prompts and figures is systematic, it remains interpretive and may reflect the researchers' analytical focus. Third, the study relies on qualitative analysis, which, although suitable for identifying patterns of meaning, does not provide a measurable assessment of the scale or frequency of bias. Finally, AI-generated responses are dynamic and may vary over time due to model updates, meaning the results represent a snapshot rather than a fixed condition.

Ultimately, the study underscores the need for a more critical engagement with AI-generated knowledge. Addressing these biases requires not only technical solutions but also epistemological interventions that incorporate diverse historical perspectives, including local, Indigenous, and non-imperial ways of knowing. Without such efforts, AI systems risk perpetuating existing inequalities in global knowledge production and reinforcing historically rooted power asymmetries in the digital age.

References

- 1 Quijano A. Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America / A. Quijano // *International Sociology*. — 2000. — No. 15. — P. 215–232.
- 2 Mak M. A framework for evaluating cultural bias and historical misconceptions in LLMs outputs / M. Mak, T. Luo // *BenchCouncil Transactions on Benchmarks, Standards and Evaluation*. — 2025. — No. 5. — P. 1–11.
- 3 Zia M. Digital Colonialism: Reimagining Power, Identity, and Resistance by Decolonizing AI [Electronic resource] / M. Zia // *Intelligent Transformation: AI's Role in Business, Governance, Learning, and Spiritual Growth*. — Access mode: <https://publisher.yavasandpi.or.id/index.php/dpipress/article/view/1722/640>
- 4 Собрание государственных грамот и договоров, хранящихся в государственной коллегии иностранных дел. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://www.prilib.ru/item/366276>
- 5 Соболев В.И. История сибирских ханств (по археологическим материалам) / В.И. Соболев. — Новосибирск: Наука, 2008. — 356 с.
- 6 Миллер Г.Ф. История Сибири / Г.Ф. Миллер. — Москва: Восточная литература, 1999. — 795 с.
- 7 Kotkin S. Defining Territories and Empires: from Mongol Ulus to Russian Siberia 1200–1800 [Electronic resource] / S. Kotkin // *Slavic research center*. — Access mode: <https://src-h.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/sympo/Proceed97/Kotkin3.html>
- 8 Mackay J. Historical sources of Russian imperial legitimization claims / J. Mackay // *International Affairs*. — 2026. — No. 2. — P. 561–578.
- 9 Hopkirk P. The Great Game: on secret service in high Asia / P. Hopkirk. — London: John Murray, 1990. — 562 p.
- 10 Landsdell H. Russian Central Asia: Including Kuldja, Bokhara, Khiva / H. Landsdell. — London: Merv S. Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, 1885. — 732 p.
- 11 Kamalova Z. The Strategic Importance of Tashkent in 19th Century / Z. Kamalova // *Journal of Social Studies*. — 2022. — No. 4. — P. 1752–1762.
- 12 Сигалов С.А. Черняевы-казачий род из Кособродки / С.А. Сигалов // *Гороховские чтения*. — 2016. — С. 587–591.
- 13 Карассаев Г. Борьба казахов в Центральной Азии против реформ российской имперской администрации в XIX веке / Г. Карассаев, Г. Кенжебаев, Д. Калиев, Б. Найманбаев, С. Бакторазов // *Historica: Revue pro historii a příbuzné vědy*. — 2025. — T. 16, № 2. — С. 147–166. DOI: 10.15452/Historica.2025.16.0007.
- 14 Olcott M.B. The Kazakhs / M.B. Olcott. — Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1995. — 388 p.
- 15 Осада и штурм Денгиль-Тепе. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://abashin.org/2025/11/09/osada-i-shturm-kreposti-dengil-tepe/>
- 16 Unmasking colonial myths: Uzbekistan's historians unveil Russian Empire's 1865 Tashkent atrocities. — [Electronic resource]. — Access mode: <https://kun.uz/en/news/2025/06/27/unmasking-colonial-myths-uzbekistans-historians-unveil-russian-empires-1865-tashkent-atrocities>

Ш.К. Зипатолла, Ж.Ж. Оразаева, М.А. Рахметуллина, Т.С. Смакова, Н.Б. Акжунусова

Жасанды интеллект және «білімнің отаршылдығы»: тарихи интерпретациялардағы батысцентрилік нарративтерді талдау

Мақалада заманауи жасанды интеллект (ЖИ) жүйелерінің «білімнің отаршылдығы» тұжырымдамасы арқылы батысцентрилік тарихи нарративтерді қалай қайта өндіретіні қарастырылған. Анибал Киханоның теориялық негізіне сүйене отырып, зерттеу ЖИ арқылы жасалған интерпретациялар империялық білім өндірісінен бастау алатын тұрақты эпистемологиялық иерархияларды қалай бейнелейтінін талдайды. Атап айтқанда, мақала ЖИ жүйелері батыстық тарихи тәжірибелер мен интерпретацияларды батыстық емес көзқарастардан жоғары қоя ма деген мәселені зерттейді. Зерттеудің жаңалығы — бастапқыда Латын Америкасы контекстінде қалыптасқан «білімнің отаршылдығы» тұжырымдамасын ЖИ арқылы жасалған тарихи нарративтерді талдау, әсіресе Сібір мен Орталық Азияға қатысты қолдануын зерделеу. Бұл зерттеу аталған тұжырымдаманың географиялық және аналитикалық аясын кеңейтіп, тарихи білім өндірісіндегі ЖИ-дің біржақтылығы жөніндегі қазіргі ғылыми пікірталастарға үлес қосады. Зерттеуде сапалық салыстырмалы әдіс қолданылды. ChatGPT, Gemini және DeepSeek сияқты үш ЖИ жүйесінің жауаптары талданып, Ермак Тимофеевич, Михаил Скобелев, Михаил Черняев және Кенесары Қасымұлына қатысты бірдей сұрақтар қойылды. Нәтижелер барлық жүйелерде ұқсас заңдылықтардың бар екенін көрсетті: ЖИ-дің нарративтері көбінесе империялық акторларды, әсіресе Ресей империясымен байланысты тұлғаларды басты рөлде көрсетеді, ал Сібірдегі байырғы халықтар мен Орталық Азиядағы саяси құрылымдарды екінші дәрежелі немесе реактивті ретінде сипаттайды. «Экспансия», «жаулап алу», «басып алу» сияқты терминдер империялық зорлық-зомбылықты қалыпты құбылыс ретінде көрсетіп, тарихи процестерді заңды әрі сөзсіз ретінде бейнелейді. Сонымен қатар ЖИ жүйелері жиі батыстық әскери тарихнамаға негізделген аналитикалық тәсілдерді қолдана отырып, жергілікті әлеуметтік-саяси жүйелердің күрделілігін қарапайымдандырады және байырғы білім жүйелері мен ауызша дәстүрлерді елеусіз қалдырады. Зерттеу нәтижелері ЖИ жүйелері тек үстем тарихи нарративтерді қайталап қана қоймай, дискурстық нормаландыру, империялық дереккөздерді басым қолдану және жергілікті көзқарастарды маргинализациялау арқылы «білімнің отаршылдығын» нығайтатынын көрсетеді. Бұл үрдістер эпистемологиялық иерархиялардың сақталуына және цифрлық білім өндірісіндегі теңсіз билік қатынастарының қайта өндірілуіне ықпал етеді. Жалпы алғанда, зерттеу нәтижелері ЖИ жүйелерін оқытуда инклюзивті, контекстке сезімтал және эпистемологиялық тұрғыдан әртарапандырылған тәсілдердің қажеттілігін көрсетеді. Бұл тарихи нарративтердегі біржақтылықты азайтып, жасанды интеллект дәуірінде неғұрлым теңгерімді білім жүйесін қалыптастыруға мүмкіндік береді.

Кілт сөздер: Кенесары Қасымұлы, Ермак Тимофеевич, Ресей империясы, ChatGPT, Gemini, DeepSeek, еуроцентризм, постколониалдық теория, Михаил Скобелев, Михаил Черняев.

Ш.К. Зипатолла, Ж.Ж. Оразаева, М.А. Рахметуллина, Т.С. Смакова, Н.Б. Акжунусова

Искусственный интеллект и «колониальность знания»: анализ западно-центричных нарративов в исторических интерпретациях

Данное исследование рассматривает, как современные системы искусственного интеллекта (ИИ) воспроизводят западноцентричные исторические нарративы через призму концепции «колониальности знания». Опираясь на теоретическую рамку Анибала Кихано, автор анализирует, каким образом интерпретации, генерируемые ИИ, отражают устойчивые эпистемологические иерархии, сформированные в контексте имперского производства знания. В частности, статья исследует, в какой степени ИИ-системы отдают приоритет западным историческим интерпретациям и опыту по сравнению с незападными перспективами. Научная новизна исследования заключается в расширении применения концепции «колониальности знания», первоначально разработанной для анализа Латинской Америки, к изучению нарративов, генерируемых ИИ, с акцентом на Сибирь и Центральную Азию. Тем самым работа расширяет географический и аналитический охват данной концепции и вносит вклад в формирующуюся научную дискуссию о предвзятости ИИ в производстве исторического знания. Методологически исследование основано на качественном сравнительном подходе. Были проанализированы ответы трёх ИИ-систем — ChatGPT, Gemini и DeepSeek — на идентичные запросы, посвящённые четырём историческим фигурам: Ермаку Тимофеевичу, Михаилу Скобелеву, Михаилу Черняеву и Кенесары Касымұлы. Результаты выявили устойчивые закономерности во всех рассмотренных системах: ИИ-нарративы склонны придавать приоритет имперским акторам, прежде всего связанным с Российской империей, тогда как коренные народы Сибири и политические образования Центральной Азии представлены как второстепенные или реактивные. Использование таких терминов, как «экспансия», «завоевание» и «захват», нормализует имперское насилие и представляет исторические процессы как неизбежные и закономерные. Кроме того, ИИ-системы часто опираются на аналитические рамки западной военной историографии, упрощая сложные локальные социально-политические системы и игнорируя местные эпистемологии.

и устные традиции. Исследование показывает, что ИИ-системы не только воспроизводят доминирующие исторические нарративы, но и усиливают «колониальность знания» через дискурсивную нормализацию, приоритизацию имперских источников и маргинализацию локальных перспектив. Эти процессы способствуют сохранению эпистемологических иерархий и воспроизводству асимметричных властных отношений в цифровом производстве знания. В целом результаты подчёркивают необходимость разработки более инклюзивных, контекстно-чувствительных и эпистемологически разнообразных подходов к обучению ИИ, что позволит снизить уровень репрезентативной предвзятости и способствовать формированию более сбалансированных исторических нарративов в эпоху искусственного интеллекта.

Ключевые слова: Кенесары Касымұлы, Ермак Тимофеевич, Российская империя, ChatGPT, Gemini, DeepSeek, евроцентризм, постколониальная теория, Михаил Скобелев, Михаил Черняев.

References

- 1 Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15, 215–232.
- 2 Mak, M., & Luo, T. (2025). A framework for evaluating cultural bias and historical misconceptions in LLMs outputs. *BenchCouncil Transactions on Benchmarks, Standards and Evaluation*, 5, 1–11.
- 3 Zia, M. Digital Colonialism: Reimagining Power, Identity, and Resistance by Decolonizing AI. *Intelligent Transformation: AI's Role in Business, Governance, Learning, and Spiritual Growth*. Retrieved from <https://publisher.yayasandpi.or.id/index.php/dpi/press/article/view/1722/640>
- 4 Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov, khраниashchikh v gosudarstvennoi kollegii inostrannykh del [Collection of state charters and treaties kept in the State Collegium of Foreign Affairs]. *www.prilib.ru*. Retrieved from <https://www.prilib.ru/item/366276>
- 5 Sobolev, V.I. (2008). *Istoriia sibirskikh khanstv (po arkheologicheskim materialam)* [History of the Siberian Khanates (based on archaeological materials)]. Novosibirsk: Nauka [in Russian].
- 6 Miller, G.F. (1999). *Istoriia Sibiri* [History of Siberia]. Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura [in Russian].
- 7 Kotkin, S. Defining Territories and Empires: from Mongol Ulus to Russian Siberia 1200-1800. *Slavic research center*. Retrieved from <https://src-h.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/sympo/Proceed97/Kotkin3.html>
- 8 Mackay, J. (2026). Historical sources of Russian imperial legitimization claims. *International Affairs*, 2, 561–578.
- 9 Hopkirk, P. (1990). *The Great Game: on secret service in high Asia*. London: John Murray.
- 10 Landsdell, H. (1885). *Russian Central Asia: Including Kuldja, Bokhara, Khiva*. London: Merv S. Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington.
- 11 Kamalova, Z. (2022). The Strategic Importance of Tashkent in 19th Century. *Journal of Social Studies*, 4, 1752–1762.
- 12 Sigalov, S.A. (2016). Cherniaevy-kazachii rod iz Kosobrodki. *Gorokhovskie chteniia*, 587–591.
- 13 Karassae, G., Kenzhebaev, G., Kaliev, D., Naimanbaev, B., & Baktorzov, S. (2025). Borba kazakhov v Tsentralnoi Azii protiv reform rossiiskoi imperskoi administratsii v XIX veke [The struggle of Kazakhs in Central Asia against the reforms of the Russian imperial administration in the 19th century]. *Historica: Revue pro historii a pribuzné vědy — Historica: Journal for History and Related Sciences*, 16 (2), 147–166. DOI: 10.15452/Historica.2025.16.0007 [in Russian].
- 14 Olcott, M. B. (1995). *The Kazakhs*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.
- 15 Osada i shturm Dengil-Tepe. *abashin.org*. Retrieved from <https://abashin.org/2025/11/09/osada-i-shturm-kreposti-dengil-tepe/>
- 16 Unmasking colonial myths: Uzbekistan's historians unveil Russian Empire's 1865 Tashkent atrocities. *kun.uz*. Retrieved from <https://kun.uz/en/news/2025/06/27/unmasking-colonial-myths-uzbekistans-historians-unveil-russian-empires-1865-tashkent-atrocities>

Information about the authors

Shyngys Zipatolla — Master of Humanities, Senior Lecturer, Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8505-8599>

Zhazira Orazayeva — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Aktobe Regional University named after K. Zhubarov, Aktobe, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-8199-0803>

Maiken Rakhmetullina — Master of Psychological Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9229-2722>

Togzhan Smakova — Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6622-8499>

Nazerke Akzhunusova — Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Buketov Karaganda National Research University, <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4633-9882>