

<http://www.fao.org/3/i1757r/i1757r.pdf>

Madan G., 2016. Liberia's land Law could Protect Forest, People and the Climate. Rights Resources. URL: <https://rightsandresources.org/en/blog/liberias-land-law-protect-forests-people-climate/#.X1OLf6NeOuV> Accessed: 31.08.2016

Forest industries. 2012. Liberia: Sustainable Forest Management. – Available at: <http://forestindustries.eu> Accessed: 05.04.2012

Manvell A., 2019. How Liberia's forest communities can benefit more from their timber resources in small forest reserves — community forestry in Liberia. – UK: Fern/DFID, 2019. – 34 p.

World Bank, 2018. Liberia: Country Forest Note. Environment and Natural Resources Global Practice. – 2018. – 40 p. Available at: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/233271527176589175/pdf/Liberia-Country-Forest-Note.pdf>

Сведение об авторе:

Камалджанова Тахира Анваржановна — кандидат исторических наук, ассоциированный профессор Евразийского национального университета им. Л.Н. Гумилёва, Астана, Казахстан.

Автор туралы мәлімет:

Камалджанова Тахира Анваржановна — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, Л.Н. Гумилёв атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің қауымдастырылған профессоры, Астана, Қазақстан.

Information about author:

Takhira Anvarzhanovna Kamaljanova — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.

IRSTI 03.20.00

LAND REFORMS OF THE SOVIET PERIOD AND THE POSITION OF THE KAZAKH INTELLIGENTSIA

Aisara A. Oralbekova

Shakarim University, Semey, Kazakhstan

Email: aysara.oralbekova@bk.ru
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9727-8388>

Annotation. This article analyzes the essence of land reforms during the Soviet era and their impact on Kazakh society. The land policies implemented by Soviet authorities, particularly collectivization and forced sedentarization, brought fundamental changes to the traditional economic system of the Kazakh people. As a result, the nomadic and semi-nomadic population was forced to settle, leading to severe consequences such as economic crisis and famine.

Additionally, the article examines the positions of Kazakh intellectuals regarding these reforms.

Although the views of Alash figures and Soviet-era national intellectuals on land issues varied, their primary goal was to preserve the land, culture, and livelihood of the Kazakh people. Some cooperated with Soviet authorities and supported certain aspects of the reforms, while others opposed the injustices of land policies and criticized them. The article aims to assess the long-term consequences of Soviet agrarian policies and to historically evaluate the role and struggle of Kazakh intellectuals in this issue. The article also examines the contradictions and contentious issues of the national-territorial delimitation of the Soviet republics, which, in turn, was one of the factors influencing the ethnic and state unity of the Kazakh people.

Keywords: Soviet authorities, land reforms, collectivization, sedentarization, Kazakh intelligentsia, Alash figures, land issue, agrarian policy, famine, historical analysis.

Introduction

Land is one of the essential factors for the existence and development of any nation. In Kazakh society, land had long been the foundation of nomadic and semi-nomadic livelihoods. However, at the beginning of the 20th century, Soviet agrarian reforms brought fundamental changes to this traditional system. In particular, the land policies of the 1920s and 1930s became a severe trial for the Kazakh people. Collectivization, forced sedentarization, and the nationalization of land significantly affected people's way of life, leading to economic crises and famine.

During this period, Kazakh intellectuals held different positions on land issues. Some supported Soviet reforms and attempted to adapt to the new system, while others recognized the dangers of these policies for the Kazakh people and opposed them. The leaders of the Alash movement and other national intellectuals fought to preserve Kazakh lands and protect the interests of rural communities.

This study analyzes the impact of Soviet land reforms on Kazakh society and examines the positions of Kazakh intellectuals on this issue. Based on historical data and research, it aims to provide a comprehensive assessment of the consequences of Soviet agrarian policies.

The 1920s marked a significant period in the process of shaping Kazakhstan's territorial boundaries. Following the October Revolution, the Soviet authorities were compelled to reconsider the administrative-territorial structure in response to the country's political and economic conditions. Amid these historical transformations, Kazakh intellectuals—particularly Ä. Bökeyhan, A. Baitursynuly, and M. Dulatuly—worked tirelessly to defend national interests and preserve territorial integrity.

During this time, Kazakh intellectuals waged a determined struggle for national independence and land rights. One of their primary objectives was to safeguard the unity of Kazakh lands and achieve a fair territorial demarcation. Prioritizing national interests over personal safety, these leaders devoted themselves selflessly to securing the future of their people.

At the beginning of the 20th century, Kazakh intellectuals were divided in their views on land issues. Analyzing this debate, historian M. Koigeldiev assessed the proposal to allocate 15 desyatinas of land per person and transition to a fully sedentary lifestyle as a dangerous step, arguing that it would lead to the economic collapse of the Kazakh people under conditions of rapid colonization (Koigeldiev, 1995).

Even after the February Revolution of 1917, the Provisional Government continued

the colonial policies of the Tsarist regime and failed to take concrete measures regarding land issues in the Kazakh steppe. The proposals of the local population to limit the influx of settlers from inner Russia and regulate land relations were ignored. Leaders of the Alash movement advocated for a peaceful resolution to this issue, emphasizing the need to halt migration and allow the local population temporary use of unoccupied lands.

Materials and methods

Currently, domestic historiography contains a limited number of scholarly works and historical studies dedicated to land issues in Kazakhstan. While some research examines the topic from economic, agricultural, and agrarian perspectives, most studies reflect the ideological biases of the Soviet period.

Kazakhstan's land issue is closely linked to the broader history of agrarian policies within the Russian Empire. Key historical sources include imperial legislative acts, official reports, correspondence, protocols, statistical records, telegrams, government orders, petitions from indigenous Kazakh communities and peasant settlers, speeches delivered in the State Duma, and newspaper articles.

In the course of research, extensive use has been made of archival documents housed in the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan. This article primarily draws on the works of both domestic and international scholars, enabling a comprehensive examination of zemstvo activities. Furthermore, various historical documents, particularly articles authored by prominent national intellectuals and compiled in documentary collections, provide valuable insights into the complexities of the land issue.

This study is grounded in established scientific methods, their classification, and theoretical frameworks within academic research. The research adheres to fundamental principles, including historicism, objectivity, the system-structural approach, and social analysis.

The principle of historicism emphasizes the examination of events and facts within their historical context, considering their interconnected development over time. This approach makes it possible to understand societal evolution, the nature of interethnic relations, and the interplay of social and historical processes. The principle of objectivity ensures a balanced evaluation of phenomena by acknowledging both their strengths and contradictions. The system-structural approach allows for the identification of cause-and-effect relationships between historical events, particularly the Russian Empire's expansion and the transformation of Kazakhstan's traditional land relations.

By incorporating perspectives from social history, economic history, intellectual history, imperial studies, biographical research, and oral history, this study adopts an interdisciplinary approach. The integration of these methodologies enhances the depth and scope of the research. Additionally, an analysis of historical sources and historiographical works has been conducted, contributing to the formation of an independent scholarly perspective.

Discussion

The land issue remains one of the most complex subjects in Kazakh historical research. To gain a deeper understanding of this topic, it is essential to examine key works that provide significant insights. Among the notable Soviet-era scholars who contributed to this field are A. Donich (Donich, 1928), M.G. Sirius (Sirius, 1928), A.I. Chelintsev (Chelintsev, 1928), and S.P. Shvetsov (Shvetsov, 1926), among others. These researchers generally maintained the view that, due to natural and climatic conditions, the majority of Kazakhstan's territory was only suitable for nomadic livestock farming.

S.P. Shvetsov, in particular, argued that the nomadic lifestyle and extensive pastoral economy of the Kazakh people were essential and should be preserved because of environmental factors. Additionally, under the direction of A. Alibekov, he conducted an extensive study that examined not only the Kazakh way of life but also the living conditions and land relations of Cossacks and Russian settlers. By compiling and organizing available materials, he produced a comprehensive work titled "Kazakh Economy in Its Natural-Historical and Everyday Contexts."

In 1926, the People's Commissariat of Agriculture of the Kazakh ASSR published materials on land allocation norms in the republic (Shvetsov, 1926). While contemporary researchers often cite this publication as an individual work by Shvetsov, it was, in fact, a collaborative effort carried out under his editorial supervision.

The issue of land in Soviet-era Kazakhstan has been thoroughly examined in both Russian and Kazakh academic literature. Historians often cite S.D. Asfendiyarov, a key figure in Kazakh historiography, who played a crucial role in shaping Kazakhstan's scientific historical narrative. He was one of the first scholars to explore discussions on the civilizational unity of nomadic culture, critically reevaluating early interpretations that linked ethnicity to ancestral knowledge shaped by environmental and cultural factors (Asfendiyarov, 1998).

To gain a deeper understanding of the complex transformations within Kazakh society, the comprehensive works of M.K. Kozybayev (Kozybayev, 1991), N.E. Masanov (Masanov, 1995), and Zh.B. Abylkhozhin (Abylkhozhin, 1991) are particularly valuable.

Some of the most significant research on the social dimensions of agrarian history, conducted under the Kazakhstan Academy of Sciences, includes the studies of G.F. Dakhshleyger and K.N. Nurpeisov (Dakhshleyger, Nurpeisov, 1985). These scholars provided an objective perspective on land redistribution, emphasizing that one of the Kazakh people's greatest achievements in land use policies was securing genuine equality.

In contemporary historiography, the in-depth and comprehensive studies of A.P. Kozlov (Kozlov, 2015), N.A. Abdurakhmanov (Abdurakhmanov, 2014), and S.Sh. Kaziyev (Kaziyev, 2014) deserve special attention. These authors analyze the Soviet leadership's land policies, highlighting contradictions and inconsistencies in the early government decrees. They particularly focus on the central issue of

resettlement, shedding light on the disparities between federal and regional authorities in addressing this challenge. According to researchers, despite the urgent need to resolve the agrarian issue in Kazakhstan, it required a thorough and well-considered analysis rather than hasty decisions driven by fleeting political sentiments.

J.U. Kydyralina, in her works, examines Soviet national policy in the 1920s, revealing the conflict between Kazakh political parties and the national intelligentsia, who supported the idea of "national communism," and those who advocated for strict centralization. This clash also extended to land issues (Kydyralina, 2009).

E.B. Sydykov argues that the policy of returning Kazakh lands and prohibiting peasant resettlement had significant socio-psychological consequences (Sydykov, 1998).

Contemporary Kazakh researchers such as A.M. Auanasova and A.M. Suleimenov have also addressed this multifaceted issue, particularly focusing on the evolution of the delimitation of Kazakhstan's state borders and the formalization of its borders under Soviet rule (Auanasova, Suleimenov, 2010). N.B. Seidin has studied the relationship between geopolitical changes and border policies across different historical periods (Seidin, 2006).

In recent studies, Z.A. Amanzholova has emphasized the role of the "Alash" party, noting that the territorial-national autonomy established at the Second All-Kazakh Congress in Orenburg—comprising regions with a predominantly Kazakh population—marked the beginning of Kazakh statehood (Amanzholova, 2014).

Numerous local scholars have documented valuable insights regarding land settlement in the Irtysh region during this period. In her work "Famine in Semey District and Its Consequences (1931-1933)", K.K. Baisarina highlights that the ineffective agrarian reforms implemented by the Soviet government were a key factor contributing to the famine, detailing its impact specifically in the Semey district (Baisarina, 2021).

Similarly, B.Zh. Atantayeva and her co-authors, in their study "Confiscation of Rich Farms as an Integral Part of the Collectivization Policy in the 1920s-30s (Based on the Example of East Kazakhstan)", examine the process of property confiscation from wealthy landowners in East Kazakhstan and the hardships faced by peasants who lost their lands during this time (Atantayeva, Akhmetova, 2021).

The study by Zhanbosinova A.S. and colleagues, "Historical Memory of the Modernization of the Kazakh Court in Soviet Narratives", explores the effects of land reforms on the social structure of the nomadic Kazakh people. These reforms were implemented under the pretext of modernizing the Kazakh village (Zhanbosinova, 2020).

Similarly, N.Sh. Ismagulov and D.M. Ismagulova provide a comprehensive analysis of the development of land norms within Soviet land policy. Their article emphasizes the significance of defining land norms based on newly uncovered archival materials, examining the unique aspects of their formation and the methods used to determine the land fund (Ismagulov, Ismagulova, 2022).

Additionally, significant interest is sparked by the foundational research of

Harvard University professor Terry Martin (Martin, 2011). He offers a different perspective on the well-known Bolshevik principles of internationalism and the right of nations to self-determination, arguing that early Soviet national policies were detrimental to the Russian population. Specifically regarding Kazakhstan, he introduces historical evidence into academic discourse suggesting that Russian peasants faced discrimination during the Land Reform of the early 1920s.

When studying the territorial division related to the land issue, another important aspect should be highlighted. Western scholars note that until 1924, the new Soviet government retained all administrative divisions of the former Tsarist Empire, merely renaming them without considering their geographical or historical relevance. The language and ethnic characteristics of the population were disregarded.

For instance, "The former Steppe Governor-Generalship, located within the territory of Soviet Kazakhstan, was transformed into the Autonomous Kyrgyz Republic, while the Turkestan province remained unchanged and was renamed the Turkestan Autonomous Republic."

A. Bennigsen writes that Muslim communist leaders advocated for the unity of the Muslim nation and sought to establish Muslim states such as a Unified Turkestan, the Tatar-Bashkir Republic, and a United North Caucasus. However, a unified Muslim state posed a significant threat as a centralized competitor to Soviet power (Bennigsen, 1983).

Results

The colonization of the Kazakh steppe has a long history. The pre-revolutionary colonization of Kazakhstan can be divided into two stages: the military-Cossack colonization, which lasted until the 1870s, and the subsequent mass migration of Slavic and other European populations from the western provinces of the Russian Empire. As a result, between 1870 and 1914, approximately 1,434,400 people settled in what is now Kazakhstan (Alekseenko, Alekseenko, 1999). This large-scale colonization significantly influenced the region's ethnic composition and left a lasting impact on its economic, social, and cultural development.

One of the dominant demographic trends in pre-revolutionary Kazakhstan was the gradual increase in the proportion of settlers and the decline of the indigenous population. This trend was particularly noticeable in Northern and Eastern Kazakhstan. By October 1917, on the eve of the Bolsheviks' rise to power, the total population of Kazakhstan reached 5,753,500 people (Alekseenko, 1993).

The starting point of Soviet Kazakhstan's national-political history was the signing of the decree by V.I. Lenin on August 26, 1920, establishing the "Kyrgyz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic" under the authority of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR). The newly formed state's borders were primarily drawn based on economic and political considerations rather than a thorough acknowledgment of the historical and ethnic characteristics of the

included territories. Consequently, it is unsurprising that Kazakhstan's national borders were revised multiple times over the years.

Soviet agrarian policy in Kazakhstan had unique aspects. Unlike in Russia's central European regions, where the Bolsheviks secured peasant support by redistributing land from landlords, the land issue in Kazakhstan was less critical. This was due to the absence of large landowners, with most cultivable land being held by settlers and Cossacks. Following their rise to power, the Bolsheviks struggled to fully execute their agrarian agenda. The October Revolution of 1917 symbolized the dominance of the communal peasant mindset, fulfilling a long-standing aspiration to eliminate private landownership and redistribute land among peasants according to labor-based norms. As the country edged closer to civil war, the Bolshevik government sought to appease the peasantry by introducing its initial agrarian policies—the Decree on Land (1917) and the Fundamental Law on the Socialization of Land (1918).

At the beginning of the 20th century, in the socio-political life, the role of the leader of Alash, Alihan Bokeyhan, was of great importance among the intelligentsia. Ä. Bökeyhan considered his primary duty to be the restoration of the rights of Kazakhs to their lands and territories, while avoiding bloody resistance from Russian settlers, Cossacks, and others. The establishment of the Main Land Committee by the Provisional Government in April 1917 to address land issues provided him with many opportunities in this matter. As the commissioner of the Turgay region, he was able to find an effective solution to the complex land issue in favor of the Kazakhs under his jurisdiction, without causing significant complaints from settlers and their representatives. This can be seen in subsequent events.

At the initiative of A. Bokeyhan, in April 1917, provincial Kazakh congresses were held in several regions. In addition to discussing pressing issues of the time, they raised demands for Russia to be declared a democratic federal republic, the election of deputies from among the Kazakh people, and the establishment of civil administration committees from the village level to the provincial level. Between April 2 and 8, in Orenburg, under the chairmanship of A. Baitursynuly, the Turgay Regional Congress adopted the following decisions under the sixth clause:

1. Kazakhs consider it fair that land be expropriated for state needs only after the settlement process is completed, based on the principles established by the Constituent Assembly.

2. Vacant plots, as well as unlawfully seized lands, must be immediately returned to their former owners. Additionally, plots abandoned by old settlers must be transferred back to their original owners.

3. Settlement activities in the Steppe regions and Turkestan must be halted. The relocation of Kazakhs currently residing on unsettled lands should be suspended. There should be a new land demarcation process, returning illegally taken homes, hayfields, arable lands, and pastures to Kazakhs. In these areas, free haymaking and livestock grazing should be permitted during the winter. Forest plantations cultivated by Kazakhs should be returned to their former owners. Poor Kazakhs living near forested areas should be provided with housing conditions (Alash-Orda, 1992).

This congress played a significant role in addressing crucial issues such as the

unification of the Kazakh people and the resolution of land-related matters.

In this regard, it is particularly noteworthy that the Cossacks' congress "fully supported the resolution of the regional Kazakh congress on the land issue and decided to join it." Additionally, "The Kazakhs and peasants at the congress shook hands, embraced as brothers... They declared, 'Let us now be friends, let us resolve minor border disputes through mutual agreement and unite through our committee.'" (Kyr balasy, 1917).

In July 1917, A. Bokeyhan decided in advance to leave the Cadet Party. He explained his departure by stating that during the summer of 1917, he encountered strong disagreements with other members of the Central Committee (CC) on three key issues. The Cadet Party's CC supported the introduction of private land ownership, whereas Bokeyhan was convinced that if Kazakhs acquired land as private property, they would soon sell it to Russian peasants—just as the Bashkirs had tragically done—and would ultimately be left with nothing. Additionally, at a critical moment, the Cadet Party's Central Committee suddenly began opposing Kazakh autonomy and the separation of religion from the state. In response to this, Bökeyhan expressed his dissatisfaction, resigned from the Central Committee, and announced his departure from the party at the First All-Kazakh Congress, held in Orenburg from July 21 to 28, 1917.

He wrote about his decision in an article titled "Why I Left the Cadet Party." In particular, he stated: "The Cadet Party supports private land ownership. In our case, transferring land into private hands will lead to a situation similar to that of the Bashkirs, where, after some time, land plots will be sold to neighboring peasants, and Kazakhs will end up impoverished. The Cadet Party opposes national autonomy. We, under the banner of Alash, strive to establish national autonomy... The Cadet Party is against the separation of church and state, whereas I support this separation. These three differences are clearly defined. Therefore, I decided to leave the Cadet Party and organize the Alash Party." (Gali han, 1917).

Due to the frequent change of the All-Russian government every two to three months, the leader of Alash-Orda, Alihan Bokeyhan, persistently and convincingly defended the necessity of including the Siberian and Turkestan regions within the Alash autonomy before each newly established Russian authority.

He also emphasized that Alash autonomy covered a circular-shaped territory and formed a large political entity with a population of ten million (Alash-Orda, 1992). It is important to note that Bokeyhan and his Alash-Orda associates did not aim to expel Russian peasants who had settled on Kazakh lands, nor the so-called "German colonists" and Hokhols (a term used by settlers themselves and Tsarist officials— Author's note), as well as Cossacks and many other migrants. They did not seek to deport them back to Russia. In all his works, research, articles, and writings, Älihan viewed all categories of settlers as victims of the Tsarist government's "ill-conceived colonial expansionist policy." After the fall of autocracy, despite being a commissioner of the Provisional Government, he did not allow Kazakhs to mistreat settlers or forcibly expel them from occupied territories. Evidence of this can be found in his telegram sent from Orenburg on May 19, 1917, while serving as the Turgay regional commissioner: "If the Kazakhs of Village No.

2 in the Elek volost, resettled under Section No. 434, do not agree with the conditions outlined in the protocol drawn up by the regional government chairman Tkachenko and deputy chairman Kadırbayev on May 13, 1917, they will be forcibly expelled."

Alihan Bokeyhan urged Kazakhs to live as peacefully as possible with settlers. He accepted the settlement of Russian migrants in the Kazakh steppe as an already established fact. On the eve of the declaration of Alash autonomy, he wrote: "A boundary will be plowed between Russian and Kazakh lands, and beyond that, Kazakhs shall no longer graze their livestock, mow hay, or cultivate crops. I ask you to live in harmony with the Russians, without conflict. Otherwise, Kazakhs will be punished." (CGA RK. – F. 17. – Op. 1. – D. 23. – L. 11.)

Regarding the land issue, the renowned poet and Alash activist M. Dulatov also addressed this pressing matter in his poem "Kazakh Lands," stating: "If you lose the land you have left today, You will only graze livestock on bare soil, Kazakh." With these lines, he called for finding a solution to the escalating land dispute. During a heated debate at the Kremlin on August 20, 1920, Ä. Yermekov gave a precise answer to Lenin's question, "Which territories will be included in the Kazakh autonomy?" As a result, he successfully secured a 13,400-kilometer border in favor of Kazakh autonomy. In this context, Ahmet Baitursynuly also emphasized the importance of the land issue in his article "On an Unresolved Matter," published in the "Kazakh" newspaper. He argued that the land issue was the most critical problem, determining whether the Kazakh people would survive or perish.

To illustrate the difficult period of negotiations in the Kremlin for defining the border between Kazakh autonomy and the RSFSR, here are a few little-known facts from Kazakhstan's history in 1919–1920. One notable fact is how 29-year-old Alimhan Yermekuly (Yermekov) defended the oil and gas fields of what was then Guriyev (now Atyrau region) from Soviet leader V. Lenin. A short excerpt from his memoirs was published by Zhayık Bekturov in 1989 in the "Ortalyq Qazaqstan" regional newspaper under the article "Ush Aleken" ("Three Ali's") (Bekturov, 1989).

The second fact concerns Ahmet Baitursynuly's letter to the All-Russian Council of People's Commissars and the Central Executive Committee, which resulted in the return of Kostanay Uyezd from Russia's Chelyabinsk region to the jurisdiction of the Autonomous Republic. Today, you know that Kostanay region has become the "breadbasket" of an independent Kazakhstan, where at least a quarter of the country's annual grain harvest is produced. Would Alimhan Yermekuly and Ahmet Baitursynuly have been able to defend and return these lands to the Kazakhs without the irrefutable scientific and historical evidence presented by national leader Alihan Bokeyhan? His archival proofs confirmed that Tsarist colonial authorities had illegally seized these territories. Bokeyhan personally participated in negotiations, particularly in discussions on defining the border between Kazakhstan and Russia. Leading the Kazakh delegation, he attended meetings of the RSFSR Council of People's Commissars and negotiations in the Kremlin. However, he preferred to remain in the background, supporting his younger colleagues—such as Yermekov—by providing them with indisputable facts and arguments.

Or take another example: In his letter demanding the return of Kostanay Uyezd,

A. Baitursynuly not only emphasized that he was born and raised in the region and had worked there as a teacher but also provided concrete evidence that Kazakh lands in the area had been illegally seized by Cossacks and settlers. To strengthen his argument, he cited A. Bokeyhan's 1908 article "The Future Desert," which detailed these unlawful land acquisitions (Staryi Stepnyak, 1908). Bokeyhan's leading role in the border negotiations is further confirmed by Ä. Yermekov's memoirs, as well as an archival document provided by the Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History (RGASPI) (RGASPI. – F. 17. – Op. 3. – D. 65. – L. 17.).

In 1928, Bokeyhan wrote and published a brief but highly valuable scientific essay titled "Agriculture of the Karakalpak Region" in the journal "Kazakhstan's National Economy." At that time, the Karakalpak Autonomous Region was still part of the Kazakh ASSR until July 1930. It remains unclear whether the Alash leader published this essay out of concern over the RSFSR's planned annexation of the region or purely for academic purposes. However, on July 20, 1930, the Karakalpak Autonomous Region was officially removed from the Kazakh ASSR and placed directly under the RSFSR's jurisdiction. Later, on December 5, 1936, it was transferred to the Uzbek SSR. In the same year (1930), Uzbekistan also claimed Tashkent as its new capital. Notably, between 1918 and 1924, under the leadership of T. Ryskulov and S. Khodjanov, Tashkent served as the capital of the Turkestan ASSR and effectively remained within the Kazakh ASSR until 1930. However, these territorial redistributions took place when A. Bokeyhan was not only absent from the leadership of the republic but also from his homeland altogether. Since 1922, the "Alaş-Orda" leader had been trapped in the "Moscow cage," from which he could only escape to his homeland occasionally.

In 1923, an administrative-territorial reform was initiated in the USSR, leading to the process of national-territorial division in Central Asia. One of the main objectives of this large-scale initiative, which continued for many years, was to ensure the efficient use of the country's natural resources. S. Saduaqasov explained that the reform concerning the Kyrgyz Republic aimed to consolidate regions with similar climatic and ethnic characteristics into a unified economic-administrative entity. While acknowledging the overall rationale behind the project, Sādūaqasov also highlighted several issues that arose during the districting process, particularly in defining the republic's external borders. In his article, he thoroughly analyzed all disputed territories of the autonomy, demonstrating which regions should remain within the Kazakh ASSR. His conclusions were based on an in-depth understanding of the ethnic composition of the uyezds and the types of economic activities practiced in those areas.

In his previously published article, S. Saduaqasov highlighted the national issue in connection with economic districting, emphasizing this matter more thoroughly in his role as chairman of the Kazakh ASSR Planning Commission. He stressed the need to consider the historical characteristics of the planned district-based volosts. Sādūaqasov argued that, due to the Tsarist government's policy of selective rather than mass colonization of Kazakh lands, the current approach to districting did not align with the framework of the modern economy (Sadvokasov, 1924). In this context, it is worth recalling that in 1923, during the adoption of the RSFSR Land

Code, the local government introduced an additional regulation. This regulation established land-use relations in the Kazakh ASSR's nomadic and semi-nomadic regions in accordance with the local characteristics of existing economies. However, while expressing his views on settlement policies, Säдуақасов disagreed with the content of this regulation.

In turn, Seyitqali Mendeshev, the first chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Kazakh ASSR and a member of the Presidium of the USSR CEC in 1924-1925, insisted that the Tashkent Uyezd should be incorporated into Kazakhstan during territorial disputes between the Kazakh ASSR and the Uzbek SSR over the former Syr Darya region. Mendeshev based his argument on the fact that the majority of the population in the Tashkent Uyezd were Kazakhs. He noted a fundamentally incorrect tendency to count only the nomadic Kyrgyz (Kazakhs) while disregarding the settled, agricultural Kyrgyz (Kazakhs), even though they constituted the majority in several districts of the uyezd. Saken Seifullin, a prominent representative of the revolutionary wing and Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the Kazakh ASSR (1922-1924), frequently opposed what Zh. U. Kydyralin described as the "colonial excesses of the central authorities." At Kazakhstan's Third Party Conference in March 1923, a representative of the central apparatus, E. M. Yaroslavsky, harshly criticized Seifullin, accusing him of deviating from the main line of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and replacing class struggle with national struggle.

Conclusion

By 1925, the process of unifying all Kazakh lands under the Kazakh ASSR was finalized. This followed a decree by the USSR Central Executive Committee on October 7, 1924, which established the Uzbek and Turkmen ASSRs, along with the Tajik ASSR within Uzbekistan and the Kara-Kyrgyz Autonomous Region under the RSFSR. As part of this decision, Kazakh lands that had been part of the Turkestan Republic were transferred to the Kazakh ASSR, along with the Karakalpak Autonomous Region, which remained part of it until 1930.

The Alash leaders took the land issue seriously, recognizing its significance for the people's well-being. Publications like "Aikap" magazine and "Kazakh" newspaper consistently highlighted land concerns, emphasizing the need to preserve national unity and sovereignty. Many historical materials from these periodicals, which contributed to intellectual, literary, and cultural discussions, were later misrepresented or excluded from Soviet historiography. These newspapers and magazines pursued ambitious goals, but many had short lifespans, with some ceasing publication after just one issue. Nevertheless, they played a crucial role in political debates, striving to fulfill their mission despite the challenges.

A detailed study of the 1930 pre-Soviet map of Kazakhstan, published in 1985 by researchers from Oxford University's Central Asian Studies Society, shows that the country's territorial boundaries once had a nearly circular shape (Kazakhs on Russians Before 1917, 1985). This reflects the borders defined during "Alash-Orda"

leader Alikhan Bokeikhan's steadfast efforts to assert Kazakh rights over these lands before the All-Russian authorities in 1918–1919. The map also illustrates how Kazakhstan's present borders were formed following the separation of the Orenburg region and the Karakalpak Autonomous Region. Bokeikhan's remark on the eve of "Alash-Orda's" autonomy declaration—"These lands are sufficient for us, as long as we protect and cultivate them"—highlights the critical importance of preserving Kazakhstan's vast territory.

References:

Abdurahmanov N. A. Iz istorii politiki zemleustroistva kazahskogo naseleniya v 1917—1927 gg. Rol' nacional'noi intelligencii v razreshenii zemel'nogo voprosa [Elektronnyi resurs]/ N. A. Abdurahmanov// Vestnik Karagandinskogo universiteta. – 2014. - № 4(76). – S. 26-33. Rejim dostupa: URL:https://history-philosophy.vestnik.ksu.kz/apart/srch/2014_history_4_76_2014.pdf

Abylhojin J. B. Tradicionnaya struktura Kazahstana: social'no-ekonomicheskie aspekty funkcionirovaniya i transformacii (1920—1930-e gg.). / J. B. Abylhojin.- Alma-Ata : Gylym, 1991. – 240 s.

Alash-Orda: Sbornik dokumentov./ Sost. N. Martynenko. – Almaty: «Айқар», 1992, 189 s.

Alekseenko A.N. Naselenie Kazahstana v 1920-1990 gg./ A.N. Alekseenko. – Almaty: Gylym, 1993. – 7 p.

Alekseenko N.V., Alekseenko A.N. Naselenie Kazahstana za 100 let (1897 – 1997 gg.)/ N.V. Alekseenko, A.N. Alekseenko. – Ust'-Kamenogorsk: Poligrafia, 1999. – 27 p.

Amanjolova Z.A., Atanov M.M., Turarbekov B.SH. Pravda o gosudarstvennoi granice Respubliki Kazahstan. 3-e izd. / Z.A. Amanjolova, M.M. Atanov, B.SH. Turarbekov. – Almaty: Jibek joly, 2014. – 167 p.

Asfendiarov S. D. Istoriya Kazahstana s drevneishih vremen. 3-e izd.: uchebnik / S. D. Asfendiarov.- Almaty : Sanat, 1998. - 304 s.

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.

Auanasova A.M., Suleimenov A.M. Iz istorii delimitacii gosudarstvennyh granic Respubliki Kazahstan / A.M. Auanasova, A.M. Suleimenov// Evraziiskii yuridicheskii jurnal. – 2010. - №4 (23). – S. 10-15.

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 .

Bekturov J. Ush Aleken./ Bekturov J. // «Ortalyk Kazakstan» gaz., - Қарagandy, 1989.

Bennigsen A. Musul'mane v SSSR. / A. Bennigsen. – Parij: Ymca Press. 1983. –

90 с.

CGA RK. – F. 17. – Op. 1. – D. 23. – L. 11.

Chelincev A.N. Perspektivy razvitiya sel'skogo hozyaistva Kazahstana/ A.N. Chelincev// Narodnoe hozyaistvo Kazahstana, 1928. – №4–5. – S.1–39.

Dahshleiger G. F., Nurpeisov K. N. Istoriya krest'yanstva sovetskogo Kazahstana. / G. F. Dahshleiger, K. N. Nurpeisov. Alma-Ata : Nauka, 1985. T. 1. - 247 s.

Donich A.N. Problemy novogo kazahskogo aula./ A.N. Donich. – Kzyl-Orda: izd. Gosplana KazSSR, 1928. – 28 s.

Gali han. Men kadet partiyasynan nege shyktym?// «Kazak» gaz., - Semei, 1917, 23 jelt., - № 256.

Ismagulov U. Sh., Ismagulova D. M. Kazakstanda zher normasyn zhasaktau 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) Kazakhs on Russians Before 1917. A. Bukeykhanov, M. Dulatov, A. Baytursynov,

T. Ryskulov.// Society for Central Asian Studies. Reprint series. – 1985, Oxford.

-

№ 5.

Kaziev S. SH. Pereselencheskii vopros v nacional'noi politike sovetskogo gosudarstva v Kazahstane v 1920-e gody / S. SH Kaziev.// Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Istoriya. - 2014. - № 3 (26). S. 116—124.

Koigeldiev M. Alash kozgalysy. Juz jyldan son: oku kuraly./ M.Koigeldiev. – Almaty, 1995. – 7 p.

Kozlov A. P. Istoki agrarnoi politiki sovetskoi vlasti v Kazahstane v 1920-e gg./ A.

P. Kozlov // V mire nauchnyh otkrytii. Social'no-gumanitarnye nauki. - 2015. - № 9.3 (69). P. 823—829

Kozybaev M. K. Istoriya i sovremennost'./ M. K. Kozybaev.- Alma-Ata, 1991. - 256 s.

Kydyralina J. U. Naciya i istoriya. / J. U. Kydyralina. – Astana : Elorda, 2009. – 304 s.

Kyr balasy. «Torgai oblysynyn mujyk-kazagynyn siezi». //«Kazak», gaz., - Orynbor, 1917. - № 229.

Martin T. Imperiya «polojitel'noi deyatel'nosti». Nacii i nacionalizm v SSSR, 1923— 1939 / T. Martin; per. s angl. O. R. SCHyolokovoi; Upolnomochennyi po pravam cheloveka v Rossiiskoi Federacii [i dr.]. M. : ROSSPEN : Fond

«Prezidentskii centr B. N. El'cina», - 2011. – 662 s.

Masanov N. E. Kochevaya civilizaciya kazahov: osnovy jiznedeyatel'nosti nomadnogo obschestva./ N. E. Masanov. - Almaty : Socinvest ; M. : Gorizont, 1995. – 320 s.

RGASPI. – F. 17. – Op. 3. – D. 65. – L. 17.

Sadvokasov S. Osnovnye problemy, vznikshie pri raionirovanii Kirgizii (Okonchanie)/ S. Sadvokasov.// Sovetskaya Kirgiziya. – 1924. - № 1-2. - S. 36— 42.

Seidin N.B. Kazakstan Respublikasynyn memlekettik shekarasy: kalyptasuy, maseleleri jane aikyndalu barysy./ N.B. Seidin. – Almaty. KSZI, 2006. – 172 p.

Shvecov S.P. Priroda i byt Kazahstan. Kazahskoe hozyaistvo v ego estestvenno-istoricheskikh usloviyah. Materialy k vyrabotke norm zemel'nogo ustroystva v Kazahskoi ASSR./ SHvecov S.P. – Leningrad: N.K.Z.KazSSR, 1926. – P.93–105.

Sirius M.G. K voprosu o bolee racional'nom napravlenii sel'skogo hozyaistva v Severnom Kazahstane/ M.G. Sirius// Narodnoe hozyaistvo Kazahstana. – 1928. – №6–7. – P.15–36.

Saryi Stepnyak`. Buduschaya pustynya.// «Sibirskie voprosy», jurn. – 1908. - №45-46. - P. 19-27.

Sydykov E. B. Rossiisko-kazahstanskie otnosheniya na etape stanovleniya totalitarnoi sistemy./ E. B. Sydykov. – Almaty: Gylym, 1998. – 208 p.

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.

Айсара А. Оралбекова

Шәкәрім университеті, Семей, Қазақстан

КЕҢЕС ДӘУІРІНДЕГІ ЖЕР РЕФОРМАЛАРЫ ЖӘНЕ ҚАЗАҚ ЗИЯЛЫЛАРЫНЫҢ ҰСТАНЫМЫ

Аннотация. Бұл мақалада Кеңес дәуіріндегі жер реформаларының мәні мен олардың қазақ қоғамына әсері талданады. Кеңес билігі жүргізген жер саясаты, әсіресе ұжымдастыру мен мәжбүрлі отырықшыландыру, қазақ халқының дәстүрлі экономикалық жүйесіне түбегейлі өзгерістер әкелді. Нәтижесінде, көшпелі және жартылай көшпелі халық қоныстануға мәжбүр болды, бұл экономикалық дағдарыс пен ашаршылық сияқты ауыр салдарларға алып келді.

Сонымен қатар, мақалада қазақ зиялыларының осы реформаларға қатысты ұстанымдары қарастырылады. Алаш қайраткерлері мен кеңестік кезеңдегі ұлттық интеллигенцияның жер мәселесіне қатысты көзқарастары әртүрлі болғанымен, олардың басты мақсаты – қазақ халқының жерін, мәдениетін және өмір сүру салтын сақтау болды. Кейбіреулері кеңес билігімен ынтымақтасып, реформалардың жекелеген тұстарын қолдаса, енді біреулері жер саясатының әділетсіздігін сынап, қарсылық білдірді. Мақаланың мақсаты – кеңестік аграрлық саясаттың ұзақ мерзімді салдарын бағалау және бұл мәселедегі қазақ зиялыларының рөлін, күресін тарихи тұрғыдан талдау. Сонымен қатар, мақалада кеңестік республикалардың ұлттық-аумақтық межелеуіндегі қайшылықтар мен даулы мәселелер қарастырылады, бұл өз кезегінде қазақ халқының этникалық және мемлекеттік бірлігіне ықпал еткен маңызды факторлардың бірі болды.

Кілт сөздер: Кеңес билігі, жер реформалары, ұжымдастыру, отырықшыландыру, қазақ зиялылары, Алаш қайраткерлері, жер мәселесі, аграрлық саясат, ашаршылық, тарихи талдау.

Айсара А. Оралбекова

Университет Шакарима, Семей, Қазақстан

ЗЕМЕЛЬНЫЕ РЕФОРМЫ СОВЕТСКОГО ПЕРИОДА И ПОЗИЦИЯ КАЗАХСКОЙ ИНТЕЛЛИГЕНЦИИ

Аннотация. Эта статья анализирует сущность земельных реформ советского периода и их влияние на казахское общество. Земельная политика, проводимая советскими властями, в частности коллективизация и насильственная оседлость, привела к коренным изменениям в традиционной экономической системе казахского народа. В результате кочевое и полукочевое население было вынуждено осесть, что повлекло за собой серьезные последствия, такие как экономический кризис и голод.

Кроме того, в статье рассматриваются позиции казахской интеллигенции по отношению к этим реформам. Хотя взгляды представителей движения «Алаш» и национальной интеллигенции советского периода на земельные вопросы различались, их главной целью было сохранение земель, культуры и образа жизни казахского народа. Одни сотрудничали с советскими властями и поддерживали отдельные аспекты реформ, тогда как другие выступали против несправедливости земельной политики и подвергали ее критике. Статья направлена на оценку долгосрочных последствий советской аграрной политики, а также на исторический анализ роли и борьбы казахской интеллигенции в данном вопросе. Кроме того, в ней рассматриваются противоречия и спорные вопросы национально-территориального размежевания советских республик, что, в свою очередь, являлось одним из факторов, повлиявших на этническое и государственное единство казахского народа.

Ключевые слова: Советские власти, земельные реформы, коллективизация, оседлость, казахская интеллигенция, представители Алаш, земельный вопрос, аграрная политика, голод, исторический анализ.

Пайдаланылған әдебиеттер тізімі:

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.pdf

Абылхожин Ж. Б. Традиционная структура Казахстана: социально-экономические аспекты функционирования и трансформации (1920—1930-е гг.). / Ж. Б. Абылхожин.- Алма-Ата : Гылым, 1991. – 240 с.

Алаш-Орда: Сборник документов./ Сост. Н. Мартыненко. – Алматы: «Айқап», 1992, 189 с.

Алексеенко А.Н. Население Казахстана в 1920-1990 гг./ А.Н. Алексеенко. – Алматы: Гылым, 1993. – 125 с.

Алексеенко Н.В., Алексеенко А.Н. Население Казахстана за 100 лет (1897 – 1997 гг.)/ Н.В. Алексеенко, А.Н. Алексеенко. – Усть-Каменогорск: Полиграфия, 1999. – 147 с.

Аманжолова З.А., Атанов М.М., Турарбеков Б.Ш. Правда о государственной границе Республики Казахстан. 3-е изд. / З.А. Аманжолова, М.М. Атанов, Б.Ш. Турарбеков. – Алматы: Жибек жолы, 2014. – 228 с.

Асфендиаров С. Д. История Казахстана с древнейших времен. 3-е изд.: учебник / С. Д. Асфендиаров.- Алматы : Санат, 1998. - 304 с.

Атантаева Б.Ж., Ахметова Р.Д., Абеннова 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.

Ауанасова А.М., Сулейменов А.М. Из истории делимитации государственных границ Республики Казахстан / А.М. Ауанасова, А.М. Сулейменов// Евразийский юридический журнал. – 2010. - №4 (23). – С. 10-15.

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. . - стр. 31-35.

Бектуров Ж. Үш Әлекең./ Бектуров Ж. // «Орталық Қазақстан» газ., - Қарағанды, 1989.

Беннигсен А. Мусульмане в СССР. / А. Беннигсен. – Париж: Умса Press. 1983. – 90 с.

Гали хан. Мен кадет партиясынан неге шықтым?// «Қазақ» газ., - Семей, 1917, 23 желт., - № 256.

Дахшлейгер Г. Ф., Нурпеисов К. Н. История крестьянства советского Казахстана. / Г. Ф. Дахшлейгер, К. Н. Нурпеисов. Алма-Ата : Наука, 1985. Т. 1. - 247 с.

Донич А.Н. Проблемы нового казахского аула./ А.Н. Донич. – Кызыл-Орда: изд. Госплана КазССР, 1928. – 28 с.

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. Переселенческий вопрос в национальной политике советского государства в Казахстане в 1920-е годы / С. Ш. Казиев.// Вестник Пермского университета. История. - 2014. - № 3 (26). С. 116—124.

Козлов А. П. Истоки аграрной политики советской власти в Казахстане в 1920-е гг./ А. П. Козлов // В мире научных открытий. Социально- гуманитарные науки. - 2015. - № 9.3 (69). С. 823—829

Козыбаев М. К. История и современность./ М. К. Козыбаев.- Алма-Ата, 1991. - 256 с.

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

Қойгелдиев М. Алаш қозғалысы. Жүз жылдан соң: оқу құралы./ М.Қойгелдиев. – Алматы, 1995. – 369 б.

Қыр баласы. «Торғай облысының мұжық-қазағының сиезі». //«Қазақ», газ., - Орынбор, 1917. - № 229.

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.

Масанов Н. Э. Кочевая цивилизация казахов: основы жизнедеятельности кочевничества. / Н. Э. Масанов. - Алматы : Социнвест ; М. : Горизонт, 1995. – 320 с.

РГАСПИ. – Ф. 17. – Оп. 3. – Д. 65. – Л. 17.

Садвокасов С. Основные проблемы, возникшие при районировании Киргизии (Окончание) / С. Садвокасов. // Советская Киргизия. – 1924. - № 1-2. - С. 36—42.

Сейдин Н.Б. Қазақстан Республикасының мемлекеттік шекарасы: қалыптасуы, мәселелері және айқындалу барысы. / Н.Б. Сейдин. – Алматы. ҚСЗИ, 2006. – 172 б.

Сириус М.Г. К вопросу о более рациональном направлении сельского хозяйства в Северном Казахстане / М.Г. Сириус // Народное хозяйство Казахстана. – 1928. – №6–7. – С.15–36.

Старый Степняк. Будущая пустыня. // «Сибирские вопросы», журн. – 1908. -№45-46. - С. 19-27.

Сыдыков Е. Б. Российско-казахстанские отношения на этапе становления тоталитарной системы. / Е. Б. Сыдыков. – Алматы: Гылым, 1998. – 272 с. ЦГА РК. – Ф. 17. – Оп. 1. – Д. 23. – Л. 11.

Челинцев А.Н. Перспективы развития сельского хозяйства Казахстана / А.Н. Челинцев // Народное хозяйство Казахстана, 1928. – №4–5. – С.1–39.

Швецов С.П. Природа и быт Казахстана. Казахское хозяйство в его естественно-исторических условиях. Материалы к выработке норм земельного устройства в Казахской АССР. / Швецов С.П. – Ленинград: Н.К.З.КазССР, 1926. – С.93–105.

Kazakhs on Russians Before 1917. A. Bukeykhanov, M. Dulatov, A. Baytursynov, T. Ryskulov. // Society for Central Asian Studies. Reprint series. – 1985, Oxford. - № 5.

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.

Information about authors:

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

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

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

Сведения об авторах:

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