

IRSTI 03.20.00

THE LAND ISSUE IN THE NATIONAL POLICY OF THE SOVIET STATE IN KAZAKHSTAN (1920-1928)

Arafat M. Mamyrbekov^{1*}, Aisara A. Oralbekova²

¹*University of Calgary (Calgary, Canada)*

²*Semey University named after Shakarim (Semey, Kazakhstan)*

E-mail:^{1*} arafat.mamyrbekov@ucalgary.ca, ²aysara.oralbekova@bk.ru

 ¹<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3454-8563>;

 ²<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9727-8388>

Annotation. The agrarian policy of the Soviet state has consistently garnered attention from historians, particularly during the first decade of Soviet rule. This period marked a time of significant change as traditional economic systems and rural lifestyles were transformed. The history of pre-collective farm peasantry in the Soviet era is well documented, both in terms of the sheer volume of literature produced and its scientific merit. However, many aspects of the Bolshevik's agrarian policy in the 1920s remain controversial. One of the most debated issues is the unique nature of the Soviet state's agrarian policy in remote areas, including Kazakhstan, whose socio-economic situation during the specified period was quite distinctive. This article explores the agrarian reforms implemented by the Soviet government in the 1920s in Kazakhstan, a multi-ethnic region shaped by unique colonization patterns. The Soviet government's agrarian policy in Kazakhstan was marked by several distinct features. The article highlights the challenges in shifting policy approaches in the latter half of the 1920s, including the conflict between those advocating for strict centralization and Kazakh party members advocating for "national communism". This conflict was most prominently displayed in regards to preserving ethnic privileges in land management, and efforts to maintain a ban on the resettlement of non-Kazakh peasants. Using archival materials, the author demonstrates that the attempt to reconcile the national aspirations of Kazakh communists with socialist ideals resulted in failure, leading to accusations of "national deviationism" and purges within the party and state institutions. The article also examines the factors that worsened inter-ethnic relations during the implementation of agrarian reforms, focusing on the characteristics of land management practices and their impact on the formation of an ethnocentric model of governance in Kazakhstan.

Key words: agrarian policy, land and water reform, national-territorial autonomies, modernization, Kazakh ASSR, resettlement policy, Bolsheviks, Soviet government, land management.

Introduction

Today, the general public's interest in uncovering Kazakhstan's historical past provides opportunities to address numerous complex historical questions, such as the land issue. Hence, it is essential to meticulously study the difficulties surrounding the examination of agrarian relations that evolved based on land ownership and use in early 20th century Kazakhstan. Additionally, it is important to investigate the land-related issues passed down from the tsarist government to Soviet power, to analyze the Bolsheviks' efforts to resolve this problem, and to understand its impact on land relations in Kazakhstan.

The article aims to examine land relationships in post-revolutionary Kazakhstan and scrutinize the complexities of the Soviet government's agrarian policy.

The study's subject matter is to clarify the essence of land relations and the Soviet government's agrarian policy in Kazakhstan during the period from 1920 to 1928.

To achieve the study's objectives and main goal, the following tasks have been set in the article:

- Examining the historical research and source material available for the study;
- Depicting the state of agrarian relations between the indigenous Kazakh population and their traditional economy in the early 1900s;
- Examining the post-revolutionary land issue in Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 20th century and the Soviet Union's agrarian policy, its forms and methods.

Historians have continually shown interest in the Soviet state's agricultural policy. This is especially evident in the early years of Soviet rule when existing economic systems crumbled and the long-standing way of life for peasant families changed. There is a substantial body of literature and research on the history of Soviet pre-collective farm peasantry. However, many aspects of the Bolshevik's agrarian policy in the 1920s remain open to debate. One such disputed topic is the unique characteristics of the Soviet state's agricultural policy in rural areas, including Kazakhstan, which had a distinctive socio-economic situation during the relevant time period.

Nowadays, it is clear that the Soviet government's agricultural policy in the 1920s was not in line with Bolshevik ideologies, but was instead a short-term solution for addressing tactical issues. Building socialism in a multi-ethnic country with small-scale agriculture proved to be a challenge, requiring the search for temporary allies. While the Bolsheviks successfully gained the support of peasants in central European Russia by giving them the landlords' land, resolving this issue in rural areas was much harder to achieve. In the Kazakh steppe, land ownership was not a major issue as there were few landowners. Most of the cultivated land was either owned by settlers or held in "permanent use" by the Cossack troops. The Soviet government had a hostile attitude towards the Cossacks, who supported the "whites" during the Civil War. The settlers also sympathized with the Cossacks, with whom they had developed friendly relationships prior to the revolution. These circumstances likely prompted the Bolsheviks to use a nationalistic approach in Kazakhstan.

Materials and methods

There are only a limited number of scholarly works and historical studies on the issue of land ownership in Kazakhstan in national history. Although some works related to this subject include differentiation and analysis in economic and agricultural terms, a bias reflecting the Soviet period can still be found in the majority of them.

The issue of land ownership in Kazakhstan must be viewed in the broader context of the overall Russian agrarian history. In this context, a wide range of sources must be consulted, including imperial legislative acts (laws, decrees, resolutions), various clerical documents (reports, official letters, protocols, journals, presentations, messages, telegrams, orders, and circulars), orders and appeals of indigenous people and peasant settlers in the Kazakh steppe, speeches by State Duma members, and newspapers and magazines. All of these sources provide a comprehensive overview of the agrarian history of Kazakhstan at the turn of the 20th century. (Maltusynov, 2006).

As a result of research work, documents stored in the Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan and "Center for documentation of modern history" of Abay region were widely used. Being guided by the works of not only domestic, but also foreign scientists, as the main sources when writing an article, makes it possible to comprehensively analyze zemstvo activities.

The study is based on the different levels and types of scientific knowledge methods that have evolved in science and ways to categorize them. The basic scientific principles, such as the historical principle, the principle of objectivity, the principle of a systematic and structural approach, and the principle of social analysis, were upheld during the research. The historicity principle considers facts and events based on a particular historical context and examines their interconnection in development. This allowed for the exploration of the relationship and impact of the socio-historical process on the nature, types, and forms of relationships between people, taking into account the evolution of society and relationships within it. The principle of objectivity demands an assessment of both its universality and contradictions, including the positive and negative aspects of each phenomenon. The principle of a systematic and structural approach facilitated the determination of causal relationships between historical events, particularly the establishment of the Soviet government and changes in land

relations in Kazakhstan.

The research on the agrarian question has taken on an interdisciplinary character by studying it through various areas such as social history, economic history, intellectual history, imperiology, biographical research, and oral history. This combination of methods complementing each other has contributed to the scientific comprehensiveness and depth of the article. Additionally, the analysis of a range of historical data and reflections in historiographic research helped to form a personal opinion based on these sources.

Discussion

The authors S.Z. Zimanov, G.F. Dakhshleiger, K. Nurpeisov, and A.P. Kuchkin in their work (Dakhshleiger, 1985) addressed specific aspects related to resolving the national issue and managing land issues in the field of historical science. Zh.U. Kydyralina studied the Soviet state's national policy in the 1920s and identified a conflict between those who supported strict centralization and Kazakh party members who believed in "national communism" and the national intelligentsia. This conflict also surfaced regarding land management (Kydyralina, 2009). The fundamental research by Harvard University professor Terry Martin (Martin, 2011) is of great significance. The author offers a unique perspective on the Bolshevik principles of internationalism and the right of nations to self-determination, which were well known during the Soviet era. According to Martin, nation-building in the first Soviet republics was achieved at the expense of the Russian population. Specifically, he presents evidence of discrimination against Russian peasants during the early 1920s land reform in Kazakhstan.

In contemporary historiography, the well-researched and thoroughly documented articles by A.P. Kozlov, N.A. Abdurakhmanov, and S.Sh. Kaziev (Kaziev, 2014) deserve mention. The authors examine the Soviet leadership's land practices, the inconsistencies and contradictions in the first government decrees, and focus on the central issue of resettlement. They highlight the differences in the approach to resolving this issue between federal and regional authorities. The researchers stress that, despite the urgency of addressing the agrarian issue in Kazakhstan, it required careful and well-thought-out analysis that was not influenced by temporary political considerations.

Valuable information related to the issue of land settlement in Irtysh region in this period is reflected in the works of many local scholars. K.K. In Baisarina's work "Famine in Semey district and its consequences (1931-1933)" it is mentioned that ineffective agrarian reforms carried out by the Soviet government are one of the main causes of famine, and its consequences are described in Semey district (Baisarina, 2021).).

Atantayeva B.Zh. and other authors in the work "Confiscation of rich farms as an integral part of collectivization policy in the 20-30s of the 20th century (on the example of East Kazakhstan)" describe the structure of confiscation of the property of the rich in the East Kazakhstan region and the situation of wealthy peasants who lost their lands at that time (Atantayeva, Akhmetova, 2021).

In the article "Social aspect in land relations of Kazakhs of Turgai region at the beginning of the twentieth century" the authors who are N.E. Yesetov, A. Gundogdu, consider the issues of influence of land policy on changes in social life of Kazakhs at the beginning of the twentieth century (Yesetov, Gundogdu, 2020).

The article by Zhanbosinova A.S. and other authors, "Historical Memory of the Modernization of the Kazakh Court in Soviet Narratives," talks about the impact of land reforms on the social life of the nomadic Kazakh people, carried out under the slogan of modernizing the Kazakh village (Zhanbosinova, 2020).

In articles Ismagulov N.Sh. and Ismagulova D.M. the question of the formation of land norms in the Soviet land policy is comprehensively analyzed. The article talks about the importance of establishing land norms on the basis of new archival materials, the peculiarities of their formation and ways of determining the land fund (Ismagulov, Ismagulova, 2022).

Despite this, the scientific approach to the problem of socio-economic modernization of the Kazakh economy during the first decade of Soviet power has yet to be studied in its entirety. Only a limited number of works have touched on this topic, with most of them focusing on the periods of

industrialization and collectivization in the latter half of the 1920s. The available sources discuss agrarian policy in Kazakhstan within the context of the economic and political debates of the second half of the 1920s.

Results

Like the rest of the country, the February Revolution did not resolve the agrarian issue in Kazakhstan. The provisional government and its commissars in the region maintained the colonial policy of tsarism in their agrarian policy. They left unchanged the land relations in Kazakhstan that had been established by the tsarist colonial policy and did not modify the patriarchal-feudal land use system.

The situation in Kazakhstan in the early 1920s was extremely difficult. The consequences of the Civil War and famine affected. In the conditions of a drought in the summer of 1921, the introduction of a tax in kind turned out to be an unbearable burden for the starving population. In the annual report of the People's Commissariat for Agriculture (1923-1924) and the Statistical Bulletin (1923), exorbitantly high taxes, including the heaviest one, food taxes, were directly pointed out. It also spoke about the unequal exchange between the city and the countryside, which hindered the development of agriculture. In the first half of 1923 alone, prices for industrial goods rose by 311%, and the purchase of inventory was expensive (Annual report., 1925: 11). Despite the difficulties, the Soviet government set the task of socio-economic modernization of the former Asian national outskirts of the empire, which became part of the RSFSR, and agrarian reforms occupied a leading place in this process.

The victory in October 1917 was a reflection of the collective awareness of peasants, who had long dreamed of eliminating landownership and dividing all land equally among farming communities based on the amount of work put in. As a result, the initial agricultural policies introduced by the Bolshevik government, such as the "Decree on Land" (1917) and the "Basic Law on the Socialization of Land" (1918), were necessities driven by the need to reach a compromise with the peasantry during the impending civil war. The October Revolution in 1917 and the subsequent shift in politics in Kazakhstan did not resolve the issue of land ownership. It required a comprehensive examination that was independent of current political sentiments and needed to be addressed immediately.

Last year's decisions regarding international law in the Republic of Kazakhstan from the mid-last century indicate that the main challenges facing the regional district after the restructuring of the inter-territorial structure of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic (KASSR) were related to regulation of land ownership and ongoing peasant resettlement. The core principles of the national policy were outlined at the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (b), where it was stressed that the main objective of the national policy in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR) was to overcome the backwardness of the nation-states inherited from the past, allowing the peoples to match Central Russia in terms of state, culture, and economics (The CPSU in resolution., 1983: 366).

Modern land relations in the KSSR were formed on the basis of its agricultural colonization in the past (under the tsarist regime) and the unfinished process of settling of the indigenous Cossack population. Moreover, the settling is spontaneous, being the result of the decline of the pasture-nomadic scat farming, as a result of its land oppression.

These land relations are characterized by the confusion of interethnic relations of land use, firstly, the clash on land soil of the interests of different economic forms in terms of system and type (pasture cattle breeding and expansive grain farming), secondly, the presence of remnants of the original free seizure of land of land use methods among the Cossack population (leaving a lot of room for huge inequality of land use and for land troubles), thirdly. The state of decline in pasture-nomadic cattle breeding and the crisis of extensive grain farming (with the fallow-turning system of field cultivation) complicates the already unstable land structure of various groups of the population. As a result of these reasons, mass unauthorized internal resettlement has occurred and is occurring on the territory of the KSSR, accompanied by the wasteful predatory use of land areas. In addition, new

personnel of unauthorized settlers from central Russia and Siberia continue to arrive in Kazakhstan. Finally, the aggravation of land relations has recently increased both as a result of the rise of agriculture and in connection with the economic stratification of the aul and village on the basis of this rise (Archives of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan (AP RK), f. 141, i. 1, file 753, 8 p.).

The emergence of the national question in modern Kazakhstan at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries was closely linked to the social, economic, and cultural changes that occurred in Kazakh society due to the significant migration of peasants from Europe, leading to the crisis of the nomadic economy, the breaking of tribal connections, and increased social differentiation. The land policy of the Tsarist government in the early 20th century was perceived by the Kazakhs as a gross injustice and resulted in confrontation between a significant portion of the Kazakh population and both the state and settlers. The nomads of Northern Eurasia were part of the Russian Empire with the understanding that their traditional way of life and the boundaries of their land usage would be protected. The changes in the social, economic, and cultural order during the pre-revolutionary period led to many intense conflicts between settlers and the Kazakh population, particularly regarding land ownership. This issue caused tension between the peoples and contributed to the development of the "foreign issue" in Siberia. The resettlement policy of the Tsarist government was carried out for over three decades and, during its active phase, it led to the loss of Kazakh aul. The purpose of the Tsarist resettlement policy was to address the issue of overpopulation in the European part of the country by demographically Russianifying the outskirts. The imperial authorities disregarded the needs and grievances of the Kazakh population regarding harassment from both local administration and settlers. The Soviet government's land management campaign, which favored the poor Kazakh population, lasted from 1921 to 1926 for a total of five years. Unlike the agrarian reforms of the nationalist democrats in the latter half of the 20th century in the newly liberated Eastern countries, the Soviet government's land and water reform was not aimed at destroying the resettlement economy, expelling the "colonial" population, or promoting ethnic segregation. Instead, it aimed to eliminate actual and legal inequalities and create conditions for integration based on class solidarity and inter-ethnic trust. Without swift action in the land issue and concessions towards the peoples previously oppressed by Tsarism, the successes of the new government would have been short-lived.

The Soviet authorities carried out an agrarian policy in Kazakhstan in the 1920s aimed at redistributing the land in favor of the native population with a strong national emphasis. From the inception of autonomy, the Communist Party and Soviet state declared that the primary goal of addressing the land issue in Kazakhstan was to eliminate the impacts of Tsarism's "colonial policy". A letter from Lenin addressed to A.A. Ioffe, written shortly after the formation of the KASSR, highlights the importance of gaining the trust of the local population. Lenin demanded that any means necessary be used to prove that the new government was not imperialistic and that chauvinistic behavior would not be tolerated (Dachschleiger, Nurpeisov, 1985: 106).

One of the major events was the return of lands previously taken from the Kazakh people. Based on the decrees issued on February 2 and April 19, 1921, Kazakh peasants were given back their free lands that had not been developed by settlers until February 1921 in the provinces of Akmola, Kustanai, Turgai, Semipalatinsk, and Ural. The Kazakh population was returned lands that had been leased to noblemen, capitalists, and monasteries, as well as lands that had been transferred by the imperial government for the use of the Siberian and Ural Cossack troops. The settlers were given plots of land equal to their labor allotments, and new farmer settlers were given the same allotments of land as Russian peasants. An objective assessment of the redistribution of the land fund was given by G.F. Dachschleiger and K.I. Nurpeisov, who believe that the main achievement of these years was the achievement of actual equality of the Kazakh population in matters of land use: "Land reforms of 1921–1922. did not resolve and did not set a goal to fully resolve the agrarian issue in Kazakhstan... . But the very fact of the return of land to Kazakh workers and the de facto equalization of the land and water use of the workers of the aul and village was of great economic and political importance" (Dachschleiger, Nurpeisov, 1985: 118). According to E.B. Sydykov, there was a powerful socio-psychological implication in the policy of returning Kazakh lands and in the ban on peasant

resettlement: “the act of restoring violated justice, territorial restitution, would largely neutralize the consequences of the colonial policy of tsarism ... and could turn Kazakh nomads from reliable subjects into sincere neophytes of the regime” (Sydykov, 1998: 208). The goal of equalizing land and water usage among different populations during the land reform led to reverse inequality for non-indigenous populations, which was similar to the inequality experienced by “foreigners” during the Tsarist era.

Initially, the agrarian changes had a major impact on southern regions. In the southern part of Kazakhstan, in the Semirechensk and Syrdarya regions, the implementation of the land and water reform began in the latter half of February 1921. The objective of the reform was to redistribute land and water resources in favor of the Kazakh workers by eliminating *zaimok* (large landholdings), farms, and other property belonging to Cossacks and peasant migrants. The poorest sections of the Kazakh rural community became the driving force behind the agrarian reforms. To secure their support, the *kombeds* and unions of the poor that existed independently were combined into a single entity, the “Koshchi” union, in December 1921. The authorities explained the need for land redistribution by the fact that the allegedly existing “land surpluses in resettlement villages and Cossack villages have an extremely negative impact on the state of the Kazakh cattle-breeding economy” (Soviet construction., 1957: 216), as they block the nomadic paths of pastoralists. In this regard, land “surpluses” were subject to urgent expropriation in favor of the indigenous population.

In just two years of the “emergency land management work” (1920-1921), over 1 million acres of land that were previously owned by peasant settlers or Cossacks were redistributed to the Kazakh population (Kaziev, 1999:11-12). In the summer of 1922, the process of “delimitation” began for the lands on the left bank of the Ural River, which were previously transferred to the Cossacks for “perpetual use.” In 1922, over 208,000 *dessiatins* were taken away from the Ural Cossacks and given to the native population. In the Kustanai province, resettlement farms lost more than 44,000 *dessiatins*. In the Akmola province, 350 Kazakh farms were given additional land. The entire free land fund in the Kokchetav district was transferred to the indigenous population of the district by the decision of the Kokchetav district council. In 1922, in the Petropavlovsk district, “50 resettlement plots, 35 plots along a 10-verst Cossack strip, and about 10 former privately owned plots of dues articles” were transferred to the Kyrgyz population for general use (Socialist construction., 1962: 287-289). Furthermore, all the former plots owned by officers were transferred to the land management fund for the benefit of the indigenous population. Along with the land, members of the indigenous community also received livestock, farming equipment, outbuildings, and other items that were confiscated from the Russian population (Dakhshleiger, 1965: 152).

The adoption of the national principle for the order of land management by the republic's political party and government led to significant conflicts based on ethnic differences. In certain regions such as the Pavlodar district and the Kustanai district, there were overt confrontations between Kazakhs and non-native farmers. The inhabitants of rural areas are called for an end to ethnic discrimination and the elimination of priority in land management practices. In rural and village areas, demands for the separation of counties with a predominantly Russian-Ukrainian population from Kazakhstan and their attachment to Siberia became widespread (Kaziev, 1999: 7-12).

The redistribution of land and the policy of transferring land to the resettlement fund, previously implemented by the tsarist government, worsened relations between the Kazakh and Russian Cossack populations in the area. Bolshevik leaders of “European” descent hindered the decisions of the central government. In June 1921, the Ural Provincial Committee refused to adhere to the decree that required the return of a 10-verst strip along the left bank of the Urals to the Kazakh population and, citing violations of the rights of the Cossacks, petitioned for the separation of the Ural region from the Kazakh ASSR. As a response, the entire provincial leadership was removed from their positions. In the Semipalatinsk region, prominent party members who refused to carry out land management for the Kazakh population were arrested and subjected to trial. S. Sadvokasov dissolved local authorities and established new Kazakh revolutionary committees. In June 1922, some members of the Kustanai provincial committee accused their Kazakh colleagues of nationalism and requested the transfer of the province to the Chelyabinsk province. In Petropavlovsk, A. Kenzhin attempted to eliminate the

"chauvinists" within the Akmola provincial committee and the provincial executive committee (Grigoriev, 1989: 93–98).

In Semirechye, rumors circulated among the Russian population about an impending mass eviction. G. F. Dachsleiger acknowledged that there were unavoidable excesses in the policy and practice of land management, which were fueled by ethnocentric interpretations of the adopted regulations and were not in line with the overall policy of the Soviet government to integrate peoples based on social solidarity. There were even suggestions for the complete removal of the Russian-Ukrainian peasantry from the territory of the Kazakh ASSR and the closure of the territory of the autonomy for resettlement (Dakhshleiger, 1977: 55).

Activities for all branches of agriculture in the five-year plan for branches of agriculture on land management states that land relations between the indigenous population and national minorities are regulated by normal and extraordinary methods.

The normal method is to carry out continuous land management in a planned manner, calculated in Kazakhstan for 1925-1935. The bulk of land relations will be regulated during this period by inter-settlement land management.

An extraordinary method - carrying out extraordinary land management (in the Semipalatinsk and Dzhetysay provinces) in those individual areas where land and other interethnic relations were extremely strained (as a result of colonization, due to the resettlement of the area, land reform, etc. - 10 verstnaya Priirtyshskoy strip, Chubar-Bogoslovskoye, etc.) The government of Kazakhstan notes that in eastern Kazakhstan not a single worker of Russian or other national minorities was separated from the area of actual land use during the entire time of the revolution. In southern Kazakhstan such eviction took place (land reform of 1921) during the time when the southern Kazakh regions were part of the former Turkestan ASSR; for the regulation of land relations in these areas by the government of Kazakhstan in necessary cases in relation to educational, health and medical and other cultural services, both by the number of cultural institutions and by the quality of their work, the national minorities of Kazakhstan can be divided into two main groups:

- 1) Russians, Russian Cossacks, Ukrainians, Germans, etc. and Tatars.
- 2) Uzbeks, Dungans, Taranchins, Kashkarkyks, Uighurs, etc.

The first group - European national minorities and Tatars - are settled throughout Kazakhstan, their cultural services are at a much higher level than other national minorities.

The second group - eastern national minorities (with the exception of Tatars) - are settled only in southern Kazakhstan (in the Kara-Kalpak Autonomous Region, in the Syr Darya and Jetysay provinces, mainly in the latter), in cultural terms they are the most backward population of Kazakhstan (AP RK, f. 141, i. 1, file 757, 137 p.).

The theories of S. Sh. Kaziev and T. Martin reject the concept of "equation in practice." During the first half of the 1920s, maximum concessions were made to the indigenous population and immigration to Kazakhstan was restricted. This resulted in inter-ethnic tension and eroded trust in the Soviet state among settlers (Kaziev, 2014). T. Martin provides the following information: the land reform occurred from January 1921 to December 1922 and resulted in the mass expulsion of Slavic settlers and Cossacks. From 1920 to 1922, the Russian population in Kazakhstan declined from 2.7 million to 2.2 million people (approximately a 20% decrease), and the area under cultivation declined from 3.3 million acres to 1.6 million acres. This was despite the fact that the Russian population at the start of the reforms had 5 times more land than the Kazakh population (Abdurakhmanov, 2014: 28). The same issue with sources was recognized by the Orenburg researcher V.A. Labuzov, who pointed out not only the diverse origin of statistical data, but also its incompatibility (Labuzov, 2003).

Referring to the data of statisticians of the 1920s, Kaziev points out that by 1926, as a result of the "anti-European" land policy of the local leadership, the Russian and Ukrainian population of the region decreased by 700 thousand people (Kaziev, 2014: 120). T. Martin "specifies": of this number, only for the period 1920-1922. - per 500 thousand people (Martin, 2011: 88-89).

In 1923, the Land Code of the RSFSR was introduced in Kazakhstan, influenced by the core principles of the New Economic Policy (NEP). It reflected the connection between the land management of the population and the type of economic activity in a particular region, taking into

account the natural and climatic conditions. The State Commission for the Electrification of Russia's plan included the task of dividing the country into several major economic regions based on the division of labor and production, taking into account the characteristics of natural resources, raw materials, economic resources, and energy resources. The Land Code had a specific section dedicated to resettlement, which categorized settlers into two groups: planned and unplanned. Resettlement that was carried out within the framework of the plan and following established procedures was encouraged through various benefits established by relevant decrees (Moiseenko, 2020: 90). As a result, the state only supported "planned" migrants.

Therefore, the issue of resettlement played a crucial role in the land management policy. It was evident, as explained by N.A. Abdurakhmanov (Abdurakhmanov, 2014: 29), that the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the People's Commissariat of Agriculture of the RSFSR were inconsistent in their approach to resettlement. On one hand, they allowed partial resettlement of peasants from central provinces, and on the other hand, they were pressured by the Kazakh People's Commissariat of Land to ban resettlement from outside. In the historical evaluations of the Soviet resettlement policy in the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic (KASSR), several often conflicting perspectives can be identified. G. F. Dakhshleiger and K. N. Nurpeisov stated that the agrarian reforms of 1921-1922 did not alter the land system in either the resettlement village or the Kazakh aul, and did not aim to completely solve the agrarian issue in Kazakhstan. Nonetheless, the authors acknowledged the significant economic and political impact of the act of giving land back to Kazakh workers, as well as the equal distribution of land and water usage among the workers of the aul and village (Dachschleiger, Nurpeisov, 1985: 118).

On April 17, 1924, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR adopted the "Decree on the land management of the nomadic, semi-nomadic and transitioning to a settled economy population of the Autonomous Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic." The "Regulations" to it said that land management was "solid and mandatory and applies to all areas ... of the Republic" with the exception of some settled agricultural areas (Soviet Kirghizia, 1924: 167). As per Soviet historical records, this was the first extensive, complicated, and ambitious state land management project. It required consistent and compulsory land management over an area of 230 million acres, which had never been attempted before in the world (Shaumyan, 1965: 176). On October 17, 1924, a resolution from the Council of Labor and Defense was released titled "On the Immediate Tasks of Colonization and Resettlement." The goal of colonization was defined as bringing unused lands into the economic system in order to increase agricultural and industrial production through rational resettlement and utilization of natural resources, taking into account both national and local interests. The foundation for the colonization and resettlement efforts was to be a comprehensive plan established by the Central Colonization Committee under the Central Election Commission of the USSR (Moiseenko, 2015: 132).

In the brief report on land management activities in the KSSR conducted in the 1925-1926 operational year, it is noted: Conducting continuous land management of the nomadic, semi-nomadic and sedentary population is one of the most important, urgent and responsible tasks of the Land Bodies of the KSSR, since this population was not land managed in pre-revolutionary times and its land use was extremely constrained by colonization seizures. In 1925/26, land management was carried out in the northern provinces of the KSSR and the Kara-Kalpak Autonomous Region. Land management of the Jetysu and Syr-Darya provinces was carried out by the Special Commission under the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, independently of the KNKZ, which is why in this case only the results of work in Northern Kazakhstan and the Karakalpak Autonomous Region will be covered. In the latter, land management work was carried out for the first time in 1926, while in the Northern provinces (Semipalatinsk, Akmola, Kustanai Okrug, Aktyubinsk and Urals) they have been carried out since the field period of 1924. The lack of funds allocated from the state budget for this land management in previous years (in 1923/24 - 127,672 rubles, 1924/25 - 189,081 rubles) did not allow the work to be expanded to the required extent. As a result, in the first two years (1923/24 and 1924/25) only preparatory work was carried out (stage 1 of work), which consisted of surveying and assessing land holdings, recording the population and actual land use, and identifying the wishes of

the population undergoing land management. The preparation and transfer of land management projects to nature (stage 2 of the work) began only in the spring of last year. (AP RK, f. 141, i. 1, file 753, 1 p.).

In the meetings of the Semipalatinsk City Committee, it is noted that after hearing the report of Comrade Masanov on the 6th All-Kazakh Congress of Soviets, the general assembly of the VKP(b) cell No. 25 welcomes the policy of the KSSR government aimed at the overall economic strengthening of Kazakhstan. The correct resolution of land policy, which has been the key to national tensions between Europeans and the indigenous population in the past, and the transition to comprehensive land management, provides the indigenous population of Kazakhstan with the opportunity for settled, constructive work, which will contribute to the overall strengthening of Kazakhstan. The construction of factories and railways provides Kazakhstan with the necessary cadre of industrial workers and will contribute to an increase in the number of Kazakh workers.

As employees of the land management authority, we will do everything in our power to support our Kazakhstani government in its activities.

In the upcoming land management work, the parties should be familiar with the general policy of land management so that everyone working in this area can conduct propaganda among both the European and Kazakh populations (State Archive of the Abai region (SAAR) fund 152, inventory 5, file 4, 49 p.).

In the report on land management on 07.12.1925, the General Meeting notes the following achievements for the year:

1. Improvement of the qualitative aspect of land management. (participation of agronomists and hydraulic engineers in land management)
2. Allocation of land at the expense of equal obruchiy, voskhodkovy and other lands of the main population of the Kazakh provinces.
3. Regulation of land use between settlers and the indigenous population, thereby putting an end to the constant disputes between them on this basis (SAAR. fund 152, inventory 5, file 5, 117p.).

Although in fact, land disputes between settlers and the indigenous population continued. This is evidenced by materials from the archive.

The central government's attack on regional autonomy did not begin until the mid-1920s, when the regional authorities were stripped of their relatively free control over the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic (KASR). In historical literature, the implementation of Stalinist centralism is linked to the appointment of F.I. Goloshchekin (1924) as secretary of the Kazakh Regional Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). He launched a "new red October" not only in the Kazakh villages but also against the national intelligentsia who were in positions of authority. During the period being discussed, the regional leadership was mostly comprised of representatives of the Kazakh nation, mainly the intelligentsia, who in a short period of the early 1920s made significant contributions to the cultural growth of their people and the enhancement of autonomous rights (Moiseenko, 2015: 135). As the head of the regional party organization starting in September 1925, F.I. Goloshchekin at the VI Regional Conference of the All-Union Communist Parties (Bolsheviks) held in November 1927 successfully condemned the "national opposition" in order to maintain class stability in the Kazakh village. This was done despite opposition to equal land usage for both the indigenous and non-indigenous populations. The leaders of the opposition (M. Munbaev, S. Sadvokasov, S. Khodzhanov) were removed from the Bureau of the Kazakh Regional Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks. After extensive discussions about the method of land management based on nationality at the conference, participants were compelled to acknowledge this approach as mistaken and replaced it with a "class" approach. The conference resolution stated that "land management, resettlement, and colonization, both in settled agricultural areas and in areas of continuous land management, should proceed on a strictly class principle, the same for all nationalities inhabiting Kazakhstan" (Soviet Kirghizia, 1924: 11).

Interestingly, when it came to the "gathering" of the Kazakh nation, preserving national identity, and land management, the positions of both parties were aligned. For example, Alimkhan Ermekov, a prominent resident of Alash Orda, was a scientist and the first Kazakh professor of mathematics.

He was also a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Kazakh ASSR and in 1920, he gave a report on the situation in Kazakhstan at a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars in Moscow, which was presided over by Vladimir Lenin. During a passionate discussion about the borders of the republic, Ermekov was able to secure the return of several important territories that had previously belonged to Russia back to Kazakhstan. These territories included the Korostylev steppe, the Semipalatinsk, Akmola regions, and the northern coast of the Caspian Sea (Shaumyan, 1965, 175). A notable figure in the Alash intelligentsia, Smagul Sadvokasov, wrote an article that went over all the border disputes of the autonomy and demonstrated through in-depth knowledge of the ethnic composition and economic characteristics of each area, which territories should stay within the borders of the KASSR. The most contentious area he discussed was the Adaevsky district, which was being claimed by the Turkestan region (Kydyralina, 2009, 293).

In turn, Seytgali Mendeshev was a prominent figure in the Kazakh intelligentsia who fought for the rights of the Kazakh people. The fact that he was able to bring up the issue of the Tashkent district and argue for its inclusion within the borders of the Kazakh ASSR shows the importance placed on preserving the national identity and interests of the Kazakh people during that time. The actions of individuals like Alimkhan Ermekov, Smagul Sadvokasov, and Seytgali Mendeshev demonstrate the agency and determination of the Kazakh intelligentsia in safeguarding the rights and autonomy of their people (Maltusynov., 2006, 38).

Conclusion

The central government neglected the traditional lifestyle of the local population, resulting in the second major famine in 1932-1933 which, according to different estimates, claimed the lives of anywhere from 1 million to 1.75 million people. This tragedy also hindered the growth of local self-government institutions. The Kazakh leaders, who had become resigned to Goloshchekin's dictatorship, actively participated in the following collectivization campaign and approved lifting the ban on resettling peasants from the European part of the country to Kazakhstan in February 1929. This shift in national policy in Kazakhstan paved the way for a new wave of land resettlement and the implementation of collectivization plans, which turned into a disaster for millions of its residents. The complete detachment of Kazakh nomads, Cossacks, and Russian peasants from the land due to the nomad settlement and village collectivization campaign effectively addressed the issue of inter-ethnic conflicts over land management.

Economically reasonable land use norms that applied to both the indigenous and migrant populations of Kazakhstan were developed in 1929. These norms varied across different districts. However, the measures taken did not have a significant impact and were likely just another tactical maneuver by the authorities, who aimed for a complete overhaul of agriculture through mass collectivization. To achieve this goal, the Bolsheviks, both nationally and specifically in Kazakhstan, had to find new allies and social support. As a result, not only Russian peasants became victims of the communist experiment in agriculture, but also members of the indigenous community, whose nomadic economy proved to be most vulnerable during the agrarian transformation.

The implementation of collectivization plans, which was the result of a new turn in national policy in Kazakhstan, resulted in tragedy for millions of its inhabitants. Despite this, it cannot be denied that significant progress was made in resolving the national question in the USSR during the 1920s. By 1936, the Kazakh SSR was becoming an industrialized country and was making progress in areas such as agriculture, culture, education, and industry. National minority groups are no longer seen as outsiders. The largest ethnic groups, who reside in their historical territories, have become fully involved in the building of a socialist society. During the process of nation-building, the culture of the peoples of the USSR has flourished and their educational and cultural level has improved. The defeat of the "bourgeois nationalists" and "national communists" was largely due to the prompt and responsive actions of the Soviet government. They sought to promote genuine integration among the Soviet peoples and consistently followed a policy of internationalism. This was the only feasible approach in the face of persistent inter-ethnic conflicts that arose in the newly established socialist state.

References

- Abdurakhmanov N.A. From the history of the land management policy of the Kazakh population in 1917-1927. The role of the national intelligentsia in resolving the land issue [Electronic resource] / N. A. Abdurakhmanov // Bulletin of the Karaganda University. - 2014. - No. 4 (76). - S. 26-33. Access mode: URL: https://historyphilosophyvestnik.ksu.kz/apart/srch/2014_history_4_76_2014.pdf
- Annual report of the People's Commissariat of Agriculture for the operational year 1923-24 /KSSR, Nar. com. agriculture; under total ed. Deputy People's Commissar S.K. Karpenko. - Orenburg, 1925. - 164 p.
- Archives of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan (AP RK), fund 141, inventory 1, file 753, 8 p.
- AP RK, fund 141, inventory 1, file 753, 1 p.
- AP RK, fund 141, inventory 1, file 757, 137 p.
- Atantaeva B.Zh., Akhmetova R.D., Abenova G.A., Tokhmetova G.M. Confiscation of rich farms as an integral part of collectivization policy in the 20-30s of the 20th century (on the example of East Kazakhstan) // Collection of reports of the republican scientific and practical conference on the topic "Political repressions in the 20s-30s of the 20th century: causes and consequences" - Semey, 2021. - P. 36-39.
- Baysarina K.K. Famine in the Semey region and its consequences (1931-1933) // Collection of reports of the republican scientific-practical conference on the topic "Political repression in the 20-30s of the XX century: causes and consequences" - Semey city, 2021. - p. 31-35 .
- State Archive of the Abai region-(SAAR) fund 152, inventory 5, file 4, 49 p.
- SAAR. fund 152, inventory 5, file 5, 117 p.
- Dakhshleiger G.F. History of the peasantry of Soviet Kazakhstan./ G.F. Dakhshleiger, K.N. Nurpeisov. - Alma-Ata: Science, 1985. - 247 p.
- Dakhshleiger G.F. Socio-economic transformations in the countryside and aul of Kazakhstan: 1921-1929 / G. F. Dakhshleiger. - Alma-Ata: Science, 1965. - 536 p.
- Dakhshleiger G.F. October and some problems of the history of solving the national question in Kazakhstan (proletarian internationalism in action) / G.F. Dakhshleiger // Great October in Kazakhstan: collection of articles. Art. - Alma-Ata: Science. - 1977. - p. 36-58.
- Grigoriev V.K. Ideological and political work of the party organizations of Kazakhstan (1917-1925) /V. K. Grigoriev, N. R. Dzhaifarov, V. P. Osipov. - Alma-Ata: Kazakhstan, 1989. - 176 p.
- Ismagulov U.Sh., Ismagulova D.M. Kazakstanda zher normasy n zhasakta zhane zher koryn anyktau maseleleri (1917-1930 zhzh.). [Problems of creating land norms and determining land stock in Kazakhstan (1917-1930)] № 4 (100). 122-131(2022)
- Kaziev S.Sh. National-political processes and interethnic relations in Kazakhstan: 1920-1995: author. diss. ... cand. history Sciences. /S. Sh. Kaziev. - M., 1999. - 255 p.
- Kaziev S.Sh. Resettlement issue in the national policy of the Soviet state in Kazakhstan in the 1920s / S. Sh. Kaziev // Bulletin of the Perm University. History. - 2014. - Issue. 3 (26). pp. 116-124.
- Kydyralina Zh. U. Nation and history. /Zh. U. Kydyralina. - Astana: Elorda, 2009. - 304 p.
- Labuzov V.A. , Interrupted Choice. Orenburg village in the 20s - early 30s of the twentieth century. /Labuzov V. A. - M.: Education, 2003. - 400 p.
- Maltusynov S.N. Agrarian history of Kazakhstan (late XIX - early XX centuries): a collection of documents and materials. /S.N. Maltusynov. - Almaty: Dike-Press, 2006. -1240 p.
- Martin T. The positive action empire. Nations and nationalism in the USSR, 1923-1939 / T. Martin; per. from English. O. R. Shchelokova; Commissioner for Human Rights in the Russian Federation [and others]. M. : ROSSPEN : B. N. Yeltsin Presidential Center Foundation, - 2011. - 662 p.
- Moiseenko V.M. Peasant resettlements in the 1920s (From the history of migration in Russia) [Electronic resource] / V. M Moiseenko // Demographic Review. Electronic scientific journal. - 2015.

V. 2, No. 3. - S. 87 - p. 141. Access mode: URL: https://demreview.hse.ru/data/2016/02/12/1140704068/1DemRev_2_3_2015_87-141.pdf

Resolutions of the VI All-Kazakhstan Regional Party Conference of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks. - Kyzyl-Orda: Edition of the Kazkraykom of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, 1928. - 43 p.

Shaumyan M.Kh. From nomads to socialism. /M. Kh. Shaumyan. - Alma-Ata: Kazakhstan, 1965. - 200 p.

Socialist construction in Kazakhstan during the recovery period: 1921-1925: a collection of documents and materials. - Alma-Ata: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR, 1962. - 594 p.

Soviet construction in the auls and villages of Semirechye: 1921-1925: a collection of documents and materials. - Alma-Ata: Kazgosizdat, 1957. Part 1. - 283 p.

Soviet Kirghizia: a monthly Soviet economic journal: organ of the KTsIK and KSNK, KirSTO and Gosplan. Orenburg: Kirgosizdat, 1924. No. 5—6 - 178 p.

Sydykov E.B. Russian-Kazakh relations at the stage of formation of the totalitarian system / E.B. Sydykov. - Alma-Ata: Gylym, 1998. - 272 p.

The CPSU in resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee. In 15 vols. T. 2. - 9th ed. - M.: Politizdat, 1983. - 446 p.

Yesetov N.E., Gundogdu A. Social aspect in land relations of the Kazakhs of the Turgai region at the beginning of the twentieth century // Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Series history, philosophy. - 2020 (97)1. P. 88-95.

Zhanbosinova A.S., Zhandybayeva S.S., Atantayeva B.Z., Zhirindinova, K.R., Kazbekova A.T. The historical memory on modernization of the Kazakh aul in Soviet narratives // Opción, Año 36, Regular №91.- 2020. - 426-441.

ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ КЕҢЕС МЕМЛЕКЕТІНІҢ ҰЛТТЫҚ САЯСАТЫНДАҒЫ ЖЕР МӘСЕЛЕСІ (1920-1928)

Арафат М. Мамырбеков, Айсара А. Оралбекова*

Калгари университеті, Калгари, Канада

Семей қаласының Шәкәрім атындағы университеті Семей, Қазақстан

Аннотация. Кеңес мемлекетінің аграрлық саясаты, әсіресе Кеңес өкіметінің алғашқы онжылдығында тарихшылардың назарын үнемі аударып отырды. Дәстүрлі экономикалық жүйелер мен ауылдық өмір салтын өзгертуге байланысты бұл кезең елеулі өзгерістерге толы болды. Кеңес өкіметі кезіндегі колхоздық шаруалардың тарихы, шығарылған әдебиеттің көптігі жағынан да, ғылыми еңбегі жағынан да жақсы сақталған. Алайда 20-шы жылдардағы большевиктердің аграрлық саясатының көптеген аспектілері әлі де даулы күйінде қалып отыр. Ең көп талқыланды мәселелердің бірі – Кеңес мемлекетінің шалғай аудандардағы, оның ішінде Қазақстандағы аграрлық саясатының ерекше сипаты мен осы кезеңдегі әлеуметтік-экономикалық жағдайы. Бұл мақалада 1920 жылдардағы Кеңес үкіметінің, отарлаудың ерекше үлгілерімен қалыптасқан көпұлтты аймақ Қазақстанға жүргізген аграрлық реформалары қарастырылады. Кеңес үкіметінің Қазақстандағы аграрлық саясаты бірнеше ерекше белгілермен ерекшеленді. Мақалада 1920 жылдардың екінші жартысындағы саяси көзқарастардың алуандығына байланысты мәселелер, оның ішінде қатаң орталықтандыруды жақтаушылар мен «ұлттық коммунизмді» жақтаған қазақ партиясының мүшелері арасындағы қайшылықтар көрсетілген. Бұл қақтығыстардың басым көпшілігі жерді басқарудағы этникалық артықшылықтардың сақталуына және қазақ емес шаруаларды қоныстандыруға тыйым салуды сақтау жөніндегі күрестерге байланысты болды. Автор мұрағат материалдарын пайдалана отырып, қазақ коммунистерінің өздерінің ұлттық ұмтылыстарын социалистік

идеалдармен үйлестіру әрекеттерінің сәтсіздікпен аяқталғанын, нәтижесінде «ұлттық жалтару» деген айыптауларға, сондай-ақ партиялық және мемлекеттік институттардағы тазартуларға әкелгенін көрсетеді. Сондай-ақ мақалада аграрлық реформаларды жүзеге асыру кезінде ұлтаралық қатынастарды нашарлатқан факторлар қарастырылып, жерге орналастыру тәжірибесінің ерекшеліктеріне және оның Қазақстандағы басқарудың этноцентристік моделінің қалыптасуына қалай әсер еткеніне назар аударылады.

Кілт сөздер: аграрлық саясат, жер-су реформасы, ұлттық-территориялық автономиялар, жаңғырту, Қазақ АССР-і, қоныс аудару саясаты, большевиктер, Кеңес өкіметі, жерге орналастыру.

ЗЕМЕЛЬНЫЙ ВОПРОС В НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ПОЛИТИКЕ СОВЕТСКОГО ГОСУДАРСТВА В КАЗАХСТАНЕ (1920-1928 гг.)

Арафат М. Мамырбеков*, Айсара А. Оралбекова

Университет Калгари, Калгари, Канада

Университет имени Шакарима города Семей, Семей, Казахстан

Аннотация. Аграрная политика советского государства неизменно привлекала внимание историков, особенно в течение первого десятилетия советской власти. Этот период ознаменовался значительными переменами, поскольку традиционные экономические системы и сельский образ жизни были преобразованы. История доколхозного крестьянства в советскую эпоху хорошо задокументирована, как с точки зрения огромного объема выпущенной литературы, так и с точки зрения ее научных достоинств. Однако многие аспекты аграрной политики большевиков в 1920-е годы остаются спорными. Одним из наиболее обсуждаемых вопросов является уникальный характер аграрной политики советского государства в отдаленных районах, включая Казахстан, социально-экономическая ситуация в котором в указанный период была весьма своеобразной. В этой статье исследуются аграрные реформы, проведенные советским правительством в 1920-х годах в Казахстане, многонациональном регионе, сформированном уникальными моделями колонизации. Аграрная политика советского правительства в Казахстане была отмечена несколькими отличительными чертами. В статье освещаются проблемы, связанные с изменением политических подходов во второй половине 1920-х годов, включая конфликт между теми, кто выступал за строгую централизацию, и членами казахской партии, выступавшими за "национальный коммунизм". Этот конфликт наиболее ярко проявился в отношении сохранения этнических привилегий в управлении земельными ресурсами и усилий по сохранению запрета на переселение неказахских крестьян. Используя архивные материалы, автор демонстрирует, что попытка примирить национальные устремления казахских коммунистов с социалистическими идеалами закончилась неудачей, что привело к обвинениям в "национальном уклонизме" и чисткам внутри партийных и государственных институтов. В статье также рассматриваются факторы, ухудшившие межэтнические отношения в ходе реализации аграрных реформ, с акцентом на характеристиках практики управления земельными ресурсами и их влиянии на формирование этноцентрической модели управления в Казахстане.

Ключевые слова: аграрная политика, земельно-водная реформа, национально-территориальные автономии, модернизация, Казахская АССР, переселенческая политика, большевики, советская власть, землеустройство.

Список литературы

Абдурахманов Н.А. Из истории политики землеустройства казахского населения в 1917—1927 гг. Роль национальной интеллигенции в разрешении земельного вопроса [Электронный ресурс]/ Н. А. Абдурахманов// Вестник Карагандинского университета. – 2014.

- № 4(76). – С. 26-33. Режим доступа:

[URL:https://historyphilosophyvestnik.ksu.kz/apart/srch/2014_history_4_76_2014](https://historyphilosophyvestnik.ksu.kz/apart/srch/2014_history_4_76_2014).

Годовой отчет Народного комиссариата земледелия за операционный 1923—24 год / КССР, Нар. ком. земледелия; под общ. ред. замнаркомзема С. К. Карпенко. - Оренбург, 1925. - 164 с.

Атантаева Б.Ж., Ахметова Р.Д., Абенова Г.А., Тохметова Г.М. Конфискация байских хозяйств как составная часть политики коллективизации в 20-30-е годы XX века (на примере Восточного Казахстана) // Сборник докладов республиканской научно-практической конференции на тему «Политические репрессии в 20-е годы». -30-е годы XX века: причины и последствия» – г. Семей, 2021. – С. 36-39.

Байсарина К.К. Голод в Семейском районе и его последствия (1931-1933 гг.) // Сборник докладов республиканской научно-практической конференции на тему «Политические репрессии в 20-30-е годы XX века: причины и последствия» - г. Семей, 2021 г. . - С. 31-35.

Дахшлейгер Г.Ф. История крестьянства Советского Казахстана./ Г.Ф. Дахшлейгер, К.Н. Нурпеисов. - Алма-Ата: Наука, 1985. - 247 с.

Дахшлейгер Г.Ф. Социально-экономические преобразования в деревне и ауле Казахстана: 1921-1929 гг./ Г. Ф. Дахшлейгер. - Алма-Ата: Наука, 1965. - 536 с.

Дахшлейгер Г.Ф. Октябрь и некоторые проблемы истории решения национального вопроса в Казахстане (пролетарский интернационализм в действии) / Г. Ф. Дахшлейгер // Великий Октябрь в Казахстане : сб. ст. – Алма-Ата : Наука. - 1977. – р. 36–58.

Григорьев В.К. Идеино-политическая работа партийных организаций Казахстана (1917–1925 гг.) / В. К. Григорьев, Н. Р. Джагфаров, В. П. Осипов. – Алма-Ата: Казахстан, 1989. – 176с.

Исмагулов Ұ.Ш., Исмагулова Д.М. Қазақстанда жер нормасын жасақтау және жер қорын анықтау мәселелері (1917-1930 жж.). // Отан тарихы. - № 4 (100). – 2022. – 122-131 бб.

Казиев С.Ш. Национально-политические процессы и межнациональные отношения в Казахстане: 1920-1995 годы: автореф. дисс. ... канд. истор. наук. / С. Ш. Казиев. - М., 1999. - 255 с.

Казиев С.Ш. Переселенческий вопрос в национальной политике советского государства в Казахстане в 1920-е годы / С. Ш. Казиев // Вестник Пермского университета. История.- 2014. - Вып. 3 (26). С. 116—124.

Ким М. Октябьская революция и аграрный вопрос в Казахстане / М. Ким // Вопросы истории. - 1947. - № 10.- 20 с.

Кыдыралина Ж.У. Нация и история./ Ж. У. Кыдыралина. - Астана : Елорда, 2009. - 304 с.

Лабузов В.А. Прерванный выбор. Оренбургская деревня в 20-х — начале 30-х годов XX столетия./ В. А. Лабузов. - М. : Просвещение, 2003. - 400 с.

Малтусынов С.Н. Аграрная история Казахстана (конец XIX – начало XX вв.): сборник документов и материалов./ С.Н. Малтусынов. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2006. –1240 с.

Мартин Т. Империя «положительной деятельности». Нации и национализм в СССР, 1923— 1939 / Т. Мартин; пер. с англ. О. Р. Щёлоковой; Уполномоченный по правам человека в Российской Федерации [и др.]. М. : РОССПЭН : Фонд «Президентский центр Б. Н. Ельцина», - 2011. – 662 с.

Моисеенко В.М. Крестьянские переселения в 1920-е годы (Из истории миграции в России) [Электронный ресурс]/ В. М Моисеенко // Демографическое обозрение. Электронный научный журнал. - 2015. Т. 2, № 3. - С.87-141. Режим доступа: URL: https://demreview.hse.ru/data/2016/02/12/1140704068/1DemRev_2_3_2015_87-141.

Резолюции VI Всеказахстанской краевой партийной конференции ВКП(б). - Кзыл-Орда: Издание Казкрайкома ВКП(б), 1928. - 43 с.

Шаумян М.Х. От кочевья к социализму. / М. Х. Шаумян.- Алма-Ата : Казахстан, 1965. - 200 с.

Социалистическое строительство в Казахстане в восстановительный период: 1921-1925 гг.: сборник документов и материалов. - Алма-Ата: Изд-во АН Казахской ССР, 1962. -594 с.

Советское строительство в аулах и селах Семиречья: 1921-1925 гг.: сборник документов и материалов.- Алма-Ата: Казгосиздат, 1957. Ч. 1. - 283 с.

Советская Киргизия: ежемесячный советско-экономический журнал: орган КЦИК и КСНК, КирСТО и Госплана. Оренбург: Киргосиздат, 1924. № .5 - 178 с.

Сыдыков Е.Б. Российско-казахстанские отношения на этапе становления тоталитарной системы/ Е.Б. Сыдыков. – Алма-Ата : Гылым, 1998. – 272 с.

КПСС в резолюциях и решениях съездов, конференций и пленумов ЦК. В 15 т. Т. 2. – 9-е изд. – М. : Политиздат, 1983. – 446 с.

Есетов Н.Е., Гундогду А. Социальный аспект в земельных отношениях казахов Тургайской области в начале XX века // Вестник Карагандинского университета. Серия история, философия. - 2020 (97)1. С. 88-95.

Zhanbosinova, A.S., Zhandybayeva S.S., Atantayeva B.Z., Zhirindinova K.R., Kazbekova A.T. The historical memory on modernization of the Kazakh aul in Soviet narratives // Opción, Año 36, Regular №91.- 2020. – С.426-441.

Information about authors:

Mamyrbekov Arafat Mazhitovich – Ph.D candidate, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada.

Oralbekova Aysara Ayankyzy - PhD candidate, Shakarim University, Semey, Kazakhstan.

Сведения об авторах:

Мамырбеков Арафат Мажитович – докторант, Калгари университеті, Калгари, Канада.

Оралбекова Айсара Аянқызы – докторант, Семей қаласының Шәкәрім атындағы университеті, Семей, Қазақстан.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Мамырбеков Арафат Мажитович – докторант, Университет Калгари, Калгари, Канада.

Оралбекова Айсара Аянқызы – докторант, университет имени Шакарима г. Семей, Семей, Казахстан

Received: 05.07.2024

Revised: 20.09. 2024

Accepted: 27.09.2024