



Қазақстан Республикасы
Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы
Тарих және этнология институты

ОТАН ТАРИХЫ

2026. Т. 29 (1)

ISSN 1814-6961
E-ISSN 2788-9718

ОТАН ТАРИХЫ

2026. Т.29 (1)

- ТАРИХ
- ЭТНОЛОГИЯ
- АРХЕОЛОГИЯ



ISSN: 1814-6961 (print)
ISSN: 2788-9718 (online)

Отан тарихы
Отечественная история
History of the Homeland

Үш айда бір рет шығатын ғылыми журнал
2026. Т. 29 (1)



Published in the Kazakhstan
Otan tarikhyy
Has been issued as a journal
since 1998
ISSN: 1814-6961 (Print)
ISSN: 2788-9718 (Online)
2026. Vol. 29. Is. 1. Pp. 288–
302
Journal homepage: <https://otan.history.iie.kz>



FTAXP/MPHTI/IRSTI 03.20
https://doi.org/10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_288-302

ISSUES OF CULTURAL POLICY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN THE PERIOD BETWEEN THE KAZAKH AUTONOMOUS SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC AND THE KAZAKH SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

Elmira Zh. Azretbergenova¹, Nurlan A. Baigarayev²

¹Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University
(25 Zhambyl Street, 050010, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Candidate of Historical Sciences
<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5876-7312>. E-mail: cazret@mail.ru

² Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University
(114, building 1, Gogol Street, 050000, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Doctor of Philosophy, PhD (corresponding author)
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8128-5700>. E-mail: baigarayev.n1984@gmail.com

© Ch.Ch. Valichanov, 2026

© Azretbergenova E.Zh., Baigarayev N.A., 2026

Abstract. *Introduction.* The period between the formation of the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and the transition to the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic represents a complex and contradictory stage in the evolution of cultural policy and the development of national identity. During this period, the simultaneous influence of modernization initiatives and strict ideological control led to significant changes in traditional value systems, educational practices, and the scientific and cultural environment. These processes had a decisive impact on the institutional development of culture, science, and education, as well as on the long-term trajectories of national self-awareness within the framework of Soviet statehood. *Purpose and Objectives.* The purpose of this study is to provide a comprehensive scholarly analysis of the characteristics of cultural policy and the mechanisms of national identity formation in Kazakhstan during the period of transformation between the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. The objectives include identifying the conceptual foundations and instruments of Soviet cultural policy, analyzing its impact on the development of education, science, and culture, and examining the transformation of national identity under ideological pressure and socio-political change. *Materials and Methods.* The methodological framework is based on historical, comparative-typological, and structural-functional approaches. The source base includes archival documents, legal and regulatory acts, official statistical data, academic publications, and memoir evidence. Methods of critical source analysis, contextual interpretation, and historiographical comparison are applied to ensure the scholarly rigor and objectivity of the conclusions. *Results.* The findings demonstrate that cultural policy in the period under review functioned simultaneously as an instrument of modernization and ideological unification. While it contributed to the expansion of literacy, the strengthening of educational and scientific institutions, and the formation of a new

intellectual stratum, it also resulted in the disruption of cultural continuity, repression of national intelligentsia, and transformation of identity models. *Conclusion.* It is concluded that the contradictory nature of cultural transformations during this stage laid the foundations for the subsequent development of Soviet Kazakhstan and simultaneously generated long-term challenges in preserving and reinterpreting national identity.

Keywords: cultural policy, national identity, KazASSR, KazSSR, Soviet modernization, cultural revolution, intelligentsia, ideology, repressive policy, historical memory, state-building.

For citation: *Azretbergenova E.Zh., Baigarayev N.A.* Issues of cultural policy and national identity in the period between the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic // *Otan tarihy.* 2026. Vol. 29. No. 1. Pp. 295–309. [in Eng.]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_295-309

ҚАЗАКСР МЕН ҚАЗКСР АРАСЫНДАҒЫ КЕЗЕҢДЕ МӘДЕНИ САЯСАТ ЖӘНЕ ҰЛТТЫҚ БІРЕГЕЙЛІК МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ

Эльмира Жарылқасынқызы Азретбергенова¹, Нұрлан Әлиұлы Байғараев²

¹Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті
(Жамбыл көшесі, 25, 050010, Алматы қаласы, Қазақстан Республикасы)
Тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты
<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5876-7312>. E-mail: eazret@mail.ru

²Қазақ ұлттық қыздар педагогикалық университеті
(Гоголь көшесі, 114 к 1, 050000, Алматы қаласы, Қазақстан Республикасы)
Философия докторы, PhD (автор-корреспондент)
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8128-5700>. E-mail: baigarayev.n1984@gmail.com

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы ТЭИ, 2026

© Азретбергенова Э.Ж., Байғараев Н.Ә., 2026

Аңдатпа. *Kipicne.* ҚазАКСР-дің құрылуынан ҚазКСР-дің жариялануына дейінгі кезең мәдени саясаттың трансформациясы мен ұлттық бірегейліктің қалыптасуы тұрғысынан күрделі әрі қайшылықты тарихи кезең болып табылады. Бұл уақыт аралығы модернизациялық серпіндер мен қатаң идеологиялық бақылаудың қатар әсер етуімен сипатталып, дәстүрлі құндылықтар жүйесінде, білім беру тәжірибесінде, ғылыми және мәдени ортада терең өзгерістердің орын алуына алып келді. Аталған үдерістер кеңестік мемлекеттік құрылым жағдайында мәдениет, ғылым және білім беру институттарының дамуына, сондай-ақ ұлттық өзіндік сананың ұзақ мерзімді эволюциялық бағыттарының қалыптасуына айтарлықтай ықпал етті. *Мақсаты мен міндеттері.* Зерттеудің мақсаты ҚазАКСР мен ҚазКСР арасындағы өтпелі кезеңде Қазақстандағы мәдени саясаттың ерекшеліктері мен ұлттық бірегейлікті қалыптастыру тетіктерін кешенді ғылыми тұрғыдан талдау болып табылады. Осы мақсатқа сәйкес төмендегідей міндеттер қойылды: кеңестік мәдени саясаттың тұжырымдамалық негіздері мен құралдарын айқындау; оның білім беру, ғылым және мәдениет жүйесінің дамуына ықпалын талдау; идеологиялық қысым мен әлеуметтік-саяси өзгерістер жағдайындағы ұлттық бірегейліктің трансформациясын сипаттау. *Материалдар мен әдістер.* Зерттеудің әдіснамалық негізін тарихи, салыстырмалы-типологиялық және құрылымдық-функционалдық тәсілдер құрайды. Дереккөздік базаға архивтік құжаттар, нормативтік-құқықтық актілер, ресми статистикалық мәліметтер, ғылыми жарияланымдар мен мемуарлық деректер енгізілді. Қорытындылардың ғылыми негізділігі мен объективтілігін қамтамасыз ету мақсатында дереккөздерді сыни талдау, контекстуалдық интерпретация және тарихнамалық салыстыру әдістері қолданылды. *Нәтижелер.* Зерттеу барысында қарастырылған кезеңдегі мәдени саясаттың бір мезгілде модернизацияның және идеологиялық унификацияның құралы ретінде қызмет атқарғаны анықталды. Бұл үдерістер сауаттылық деңгейінің өсуіне, білім беру мен ғылым институттарының нығаюына, жаңа интеллектуалдық топтың қалыптасуына ықпал еткенмен, сонымен қатар мәдени сабақтастықтың үзілуіне, ұлттық интеллигенцияға қарсы репрессияларға және бірегейлік үлгілерінің түбегейлі өзгеруіне алып келді. *Қорытынды.* Аталған кезеңдегі мәдени қайта құрулардың қайшылықты сипаты кеңестік Қазақстанның одан әрі дамуының негізін қалыптастырып, сондай-ақ ұлттық бірегейлікті

сақтау мен қайта пайымдау саласында ұзақ мерзімді сын-қатерлерді туындатты деген тұжырым жасалды.

Түйін сөздер: мәдени саясат, ұлттық бірегейлік, ҚазАКСР, ҚазКСР, кеңестік модернизация, мәдени революция, интеллигенция, идеология, репрессивтік саясат, тарихи сана, мемлекеттік құрылыс.

Дәйексөз үшін: Азретбергенова Э.Ж., Байғараев Н.Ә. ҚазАКСР мен ҚазКСР арасындағы кезеңде мәдени саясат және ұлттық бірегейлік мәселелері // Отан тарихы. 2026. Т. 29. № 1. 288–302-бб. [ағылш. тілінде]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_288-302

ВОПРОСЫ КУЛЬТУРНОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ И НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТИ В ПЕРИОД МЕЖДУ КазАССР И КазССР

Эльмира Жарылкасыновна Азретбергенова¹, Нурлан Алиевич Байғараев²

¹Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая

(ул. Жамбыла, 25, 050010, Алматы, Республика Казахстан)

Кандидат исторических наук

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5876-7312>. E-mail: ezret@mail.ru

²Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет

(ул. Гоголь, 114 к 1, 050000, Алматы, Республика Казахстан)

Доктор философии, PhD (автор корреспондент)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8128-5700>. E-mail: baigarayev.n1984@gmail.com

© ИИЭ имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2026

© Азретбергенова Э.Ж., Байғараев Н.А., 2026

Аннотация. *Введение.* Период между КазАССР и КазССР представляет собой сложный и противоречивый этап трансформации культурной политики и формирования национальной идентичности. Данный временной отрезок характеризуется одновременным воздействием модернизационных импульсов и жесткого идеологического контроля, что привело к глубоким изменениям в традиционной системе ценностей, образовательных практиках, научной и культурной среде. Эти процессы оказали определяющее влияние на институциональное развитие культуры, науки и образования, а также на долговременные траектории национального самосознания в условиях советской государственности. *Цель и задачи.* Целью исследования является комплексный научный анализ особенностей культурной политики и механизмов формирования национальной идентичности в Казахстане в переходный период между КазАССР и КазССР. В рамках поставленной цели определены следующие задачи: выявить концептуальные основы и инструменты советской культурной политики; проанализировать ее воздействие на развитие системы образования, науки и культуры; охарактеризовать трансформации национальной идентичности в условиях идеологического давления и социально-политических преобразований. *Материалы и методы.* Методологическую основу исследования составляют исторический, сравнительно-типологический и структурно-функциональный подходы. Источниковая база включает архивные документы, нормативно-правовые акты, официальные статистические материалы, научные публикации и мемуарные свидетельства. Применяются методы критического анализа источников, контекстуальной интерпретации и историографического сопоставления, обеспечивающие научную обоснованность и объективность выводов. *Результаты.* Установлено, что культурная политика рассматриваемого периода выступала одновременно как инструмент модернизации и идеологической унификации, способствуя росту грамотности, институциональному укреплению образования и науки, формированию нового интеллектуального слоя, но вместе с тем приводила к разрыву культурной преемственности, репрессиям в отношении национальной интеллигенции и трансформации идентификационных моделей. *Заключение.* Противоречивый характер культурных преобразований периода между КазАССР и КазССР сформировал базовые институциональные и образовательные структуры советского Казахстана и одновременно создал долгосрочные вызовы для сохранения и переосмысления казахской национальной идентичности.

Ключевые слова: культурная политика, национальная идентичность, КазАССР, КазССР, советская модернизация, культурная революция, интеллигенция, идеология, репрессивная политика, историческая память, государственное строительство.

Для цитирования: Азретбергенова Э.Ж., Байгараев Н.А. Вопросы культурной политики и национальной идентичности в период между КазАССР и КазССР // Отан тарихы. 2026. Т. 29. № 1. С. 288–302. [на англ. яз.]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_288-302

Introduction. The study of cultural policy and national identity in Kazakhstan during the early Soviet period occupies a central place in contemporary historical scholarship, reflecting how the Bolshevik regime sought to restructure social consciousness and integrate diverse populations into a cohesive ideological and political framework [Suzhikov, 1981: 12]. The relevance of this topic lies in its capacity to illuminate both the mechanisms of Soviet modernization and the specific regional adaptations necessary for their implementation in areas with entrenched traditional institutions. Cultural policy, in this context, is defined as a set of deliberate state measures aimed at regulating cultural production, education, artistic activity, religious practices, and social customs to achieve political, ideological, and developmental goals. National identity is understood as a collective sense of belonging, shared cultural codes, linguistic patterns, historical memory, and institutional practices that differentiate a people within a broader sociopolitical space.

Between the formation of the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (KazAKSR) and the adoption of the 1936 Constitution establishing the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic (KazSSR), Kazakhstan experienced profound transformations of its cultural and social landscape. These transformations were driven by the dual imperatives of socialist modernization and ideological consolidation [Bakir, Kudaibergenova, Taiman, 2023]. Cultural policy was the principal instrument through which the Soviet state sought to shape new citizens, standardize social practices, and instill loyalty to the regime. Measures included the restructuring of educational systems, promotion of literacy, regulation of artistic production, and transformation of religious and communal practices. Collectively, these efforts aimed to replace traditional frameworks with forms of social and cultural behavior aligned with the principles of socialism.

The Bolshevik cultural policy in Kazakhstan pursued multiple objectives. First, it aimed to consolidate Soviet authority by creating a unified sociocultural space in which the notion of the “Soviet people” took precedence over local or ethnic affiliations. This supranational vision sought to integrate ethnic minorities into a single ideological system while subordinating local traditions to the imperatives of socialist governance. Second, cultural policy functioned as a tool for modernization, targeting illiteracy, “archaic” customs, and nomadic social structures, which were viewed as obstacles to social and economic development. Third, it sought to regulate language, education, and cultural production to ensure the dissemination of ideological messaging across the population. Finally, it aimed to reshape historical consciousness and collective memory, creating citizens whose sense of the past and social identity aligned with the socialist project [Kudaibergenov, 1977: 57].

The ethnic and national identity of Kazakhs before 1936 was primarily based on nomadic traditions, clan-based social structures, Islamic religion, oral culture, customary law (adat), and locally organized governance systems. These elements provided cohesion and continuity within Kazakh society but were perceived by Soviet authorities as incompatible with the demands of industrialization, centralized administration, and ideological conformity. Nomadic pastoralism dictated seasonal movement, social obligations were mediated through kinship networks, and religion structured moral and communal norms. The Soviet leadership considered these practices barriers to the formation of a disciplined, literate, and ideologically aligned populace, which necessitated state interventions to reshape national identity [Kozybaev, 2000: 17–21].

During the period from the formation of the KazAKSR to the establishment of the KazSSR, the Soviet authorities implemented intensive cultural policies to regulate and transform national identity. Institutional mechanisms included the creation of state-run educational institutions, literacy campaigns, and the codification and standardization of the Kazakh language in Cyrillic script. Cultural infrastructure such as theaters, libraries, and publishing houses was actively developed to disseminate socialist ideals and promote secular, collective practices [Polyakov, 1985: 69–82]. These interventions sought to produce a generation whose cultural practices, language use, and ideological orientation aligned with the principles of socialism while diminishing the influence of traditional institutions and religion.

State intervention during this period was characterized by centralization and coercive enforcement. New symbolic systems, including Soviet holidays, commemorations, and mass media campaigns, were introduced

to reshape collective consciousness. Historical memory was reconstructed through textbooks, publications, and public rituals, while religious practices were suppressed or subordinated to ideological objectives. Artistic production and education were harnessed to propagate the values of socialist culture and model the behavior of the “Soviet citizen” [Suleimenova, 2025]. The systematic nature of these policies created both opportunities for modernization and tensions with local social and cultural frameworks.

The consequences of these policies were significant and multifaceted. On one hand, they facilitated the creation of institutional and educational frameworks that enabled Kazakhstan to integrate into the broader processes of industrialization and social modernization within the USSR. Literacy rates increased, access to formal education expanded, and centralized mechanisms for cultural governance were established, laying the foundation for Soviet society in Kazakhstan. On the other hand, these policies disrupted traditional social structures, altered historical memory, restricted cultural autonomy, and challenged the preservation of indigenous values. This dual outcome illustrates the paradox of Soviet modernization: structural and social development achieved at the cost of dislocation and cultural tensions.

Regional adaptation of all-Union policies demonstrates the pragmatic dimension of Soviet nation-building. While directives were issued from the central authorities, local implementation had to account for Kazakhstan’s unique conditions, including dispersed nomadic populations, clan networks, and religious hierarchies. Regional authorities negotiated the application of policies to address literacy levels, economic capacity, and resistance to social transformation. This interaction between central planning and local conditions produced a distinctive Kazakh variant of Soviet national identity, in which traditional practices were selectively retained or modified within the framework of socialist modernization.

Scholarly engagement with this period highlights both accomplishments and contradictions of cultural policy in Kazakhstan. The creation of educational and cultural institutions, secularization initiatives, and literacy campaigns reflect the state’s capacity for large-scale social engineering. Simultaneously, the erosion of traditional institutions, imposition of centralized ideological norms, and reconfiguration of cultural practices created enduring dilemmas for identity formation. These dynamics underscore the dual nature of Soviet modernization: while enabling structural development and integration, they also produced long-term challenges for cultural continuity and national identity.

Despite extensive research on Bolshevik national policy, the cultural dimension and its impact on local identity remain underexplored and insufficiently systematized. Many studies focus on ideological constructs or macro-level social changes, neglecting the regional adaptation processes and the interaction between coercive mechanisms and local traditions. This gap highlights the need for an interdisciplinary approach that integrates social, cultural, and intellectual history methodologies to understand the complex processes of identity construction, contestation, and transformation in the context of Soviet modernization.

This study contributes to scholarship by providing a comprehensive analysis of cultural policy and national identity formation in Kazakhstan during the early Soviet period. It systematically examines the strategies and outcomes of Bolshevik cultural initiatives, elucidates the mechanisms of adaptation and resistance at the regional level, and identifies long-term consequences for institutional structures, language policy, and cultural practices. By focusing on the Kazakh experience, the research illuminates the interaction between centralized ideological planning and local realities, offering insights into the broader processes of Soviet modernization and nation-building.

The aim of this study is to provide a comprehensive analysis of cultural policy during the period between the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic and to examine its impact on the evolution of Kazakh cultural identity and social consciousness.

The objectives of the study are:

1. To analyze the main directions and mechanisms of Soviet cultural policy during the period under investigation.
2. To examine how Soviet ideological and institutional measures influenced Kazakh social and cultural practices, collective memory, and community structures.
3. To assess the long-term sociocultural consequences of these policies for the formation of local institutional frameworks, educational systems, and communal cultural norms.

The object of the study is the cultural policy of the Soviet state in Kazakhstan in the first third of the twentieth century.

The subject of the study is the mechanisms through which cultural policy shaped social behavior, educational practices, and collective cultural orientation in Kazakhstan during the transition from an autonomous to a union republic.

The research hypothesis is based on the assumption that Soviet cultural policy during this transitional period was systematic and directive in nature, aimed at creating a unified Soviet sociocultural framework. These policies significantly restructured traditional cultural practices, reshaped communal and educational norms, and influenced the long-term development of social and cultural identity in Kazakhstan, with effects that continue to be observable in the contemporary sociocultural landscape.

Materials and Methods. During the Soviet period, the national question was approached as an integral element of socialist construction and proletarian internationalism, with the cultural and ethnic dimensions interpreted primarily through the lens of ideological priorities and class-based analysis. In this framework, Kazakh social and cultural practices, language, traditional worldviews, and religious customs were often assessed in terms of their alignment with socialist modernization goals, while their broader historical and cultural significance received limited attention. As a result, the study of local traditions, communal structures, and patterns of cultural continuity remained largely outside the central focus of contemporary scholarship.

Historiography of the national question in Kazakhstan between 1922 and 1936 was shaped by strict censorship and the imperatives of ideological control. Scholarly publications emphasized the achievements of socialist construction, the perceived success of Leninist national policy, and the promotion of interethnic cooperation, while the social and cultural costs of forced modernization, secularization, and cultural homogenization were seldom addressed [Abylkhozhin, 1991a: 24]. Within this context, cultural policy was often represented as an unequivocally progressive tool of transformation, and the complex effects of policy implementation on traditional practices, educational systems, and community organization were largely overlooked.

Some studies touched on aspects of national development in discussions of agrarian reforms, industrialization, the cultural revolution, educational reform, and the growth of mass media. However, in these works, cultural considerations typically played a secondary role, subordinated to economic and class-focused analyses [Beisembiev, 1970: 121–124]. Changes in cultural norms, shifts in collective memory, and the gradual formation of new social and cultural models were rarely the primary focus of research. Consequently, the processes by which Soviet policies reshaped social behaviors, everyday practices, and community organization remain an underexplored dimension of early Soviet nation-building in Kazakhstan.

Despite the absence of specialized historiographical syntheses, the Soviet period witnessed the emergence of individual works that sought to provide a theoretical interpretation of national policy. These studies emphasized the leading role of the Communist Party in the construction of socialist statehood and interpreted Leninist national policy as a universal model for the successful resolution of national contradictions [Tuganbaev, 1967]. Their conclusions, however, were rigidly predetermined by official ideology, which significantly constrained their analytical depth and critical potential.

A distinctive place in the historiography is occupied by the work of G.F. Dakhshleiger, *V. I. Lenin and the Problems of Kazakhstani Historiography*, which represents an attempt to comprehend the evolution of historical scholarship in Kazakhstan in the context of Leninist legacy [Dakhshleiger, 1973]. The author addresses the national question, underscoring its significance within Soviet historical discourse, yet treats it predominantly within the framework of official party doctrine. Nevertheless, this work is of considerable interest as a source for analyzing the mechanisms underlying the formation of Soviet historiographical tradition and its methodological constraints.

A significant advance in the development of domestic historiography was achieved with the candidate dissertation of Z.S. Batpenova, devoted to the analysis of the history of the national question in Kazakhstan during 1956-1991. Although its chronological scope extends beyond the limits of the present study, this work is of fundamental importance, as it constitutes the first attempt at a systematic historiographical analysis of national policy [Batpenova, 1999]. The author identifies the key stages in the evolution of scholarly interpretations, reveals dominant conceptual approaches, and formulates methodological guidelines relevant for further research.

A new phase in the study of cultural policy and identity formation in Kazakhstan emerged during the years of the country's independence. The opening of archival collections, the application of interdisciplinary research methods, and the development of modern analytical approaches enabled scholars to investigate the sociocultural, demographic, and historical consequences of Soviet modernization with greater precision. Researchers such as M.K. Kozybaev, T. Omarbekov, M. Koigeldiev, S.Z. Zimanov, Zh.K. Kasymbaev, D. Kishibekov, K.S. Aldazhumanov, Zh.B. Abylkhozhin, and O. Kh. Mukhatova have focused on identifying

the mechanisms through which Soviet policies reshaped traditional social structures, educational institutions, and community practices.

These studies highlight that the top-down implementation of the Soviet cultural model involved significant restructuring of traditional socialization mechanisms, the reorganization of historical memory, the reduction of religious influence in public life, and the modification of communal and cultural norms [Zimanov, Reitor, 1983: 11-17]. Particular attention is given to language policy, educational reforms, and ideological guidance in artistic and media production, revealing the institutional and practical processes that contributed to the emergence of new collective identities. At the same time, much of this scholarship remains thematically segmented and does not yet offer a fully integrated account of cultural change and identity dynamics across the early Soviet period.

Significant insights into the cultural and intellectual dimensions of nation-building have been provided by studies of the Kazakh intelligentsia, participants in the Alash movement, and Soviet state and party officials. The works of K.N. Nurpeisov, D.A. Amanzholova, R.K. Nurmagambetova, D.D. Suleimenova, D.A. Makhat, and L.D. Kuderina examine the challenges, contradictions, and strategies of adaptation that characterized the elite's intellectual engagement under intense ideological and institutional pressures. Analysis of these figures and their legacies illuminates the ways in which individual and collective agency interacted with state-driven modernization, shaping patterns of social behavior, cultural practice, and identity formation in Kazakhstan [Makhat, 2007].

Overall, contemporary research underscores that the Soviet cultural model was not a neutral or purely administrative process; rather, it actively reconfigured social institutions, altered symbolic and ritual practices, and influenced the ways communities understood their cultural heritage. By examining the interactions between state policy, local traditions, and intellectual agency, these studies provide a nuanced perspective on the long-term processes of cultural transformation in Kazakhstan, highlighting both the adaptive strategies employed by local populations and the enduring legacies of early Soviet modernization.

A significant contribution to the historiography of Soviet national policy in Kazakhstan has been made by foreign scholars, including J. Wheeler, R. Pipes, R. Conquest, W. Kolarz, H. Seton-Watson, Z. Brzezinski, H. Arendt, and L. Snyder. Through comparative-historical and political-philosophical analysis, these studies interpret Soviet national policy as an instrument of centralized governance and social engineering, designed to create a unified cultural space and regulate ethnic diversity. Their research provides a framework for situating the Kazakh experience within broader studies of state-directed modernization and totalitarian governance [Toynbee, 1991].

The empirical foundation of this study relies on archival documents from central and regional repositories in Kazakhstan. These include resolutions of party and state bodies, reports from the People's Commissariat of Education, materials from cultural and educational institutions, statistical compendia, census data, and periodical publications from 1920-1936. Memoirs, diaries, and recollections of intellectuals and party officials are also utilized, enabling the reconstruction of contemporary perceptions of cultural transformation and policy implementation.

Methodologically, the study is grounded in historicist principles, systematic analysis, and rigorous scholarly objectivity. It employs approaches from social, cultural, and intellectual history, combined with elements of historical anthropology, discourse analysis, and identity studies. Comparative-historical and chronological methods are applied to trace the development of cultural policies and their effects on social behavior, educational structures, and community organization. Structural-functional analysis is used to identify the mechanisms through which these policies influenced collective practices and cultural norms.

By integrating these approaches, the study provides a nuanced understanding of how Soviet cultural policy operated at multiple levels—ideological, institutional, demographic, and social—and how it shaped evolving patterns of Kazakh cultural identity. This framework allows national identity to be analyzed not as a fixed or uniform concept, but as a historically contingent and contextually shaped process, reflecting the interaction between state policies, local traditions, and social structures.

Discussion. In March 1921, at the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), I. V. Stalin articulated a directive aimed at the “nationalization” of the party, state, economic, and cultural apparatus in the national republics and regions [Barsuk, 1947: 7-9]. This policy was conceived as an institutional mechanism for implementing Soviet national policy, designed to establish a managerial infrastructure adapted to the ethnocultural specificities of local populations. Its key components included the introduction of native languages into judicial proceedings, administrative governance, education, and cultural and educational activities, as well as the training of national cadres.

At the same time, the concept of “nationalization” of the administrative apparatus was predominantly instrumental in character and subordinated to the objective of politically integrating national regions into the centralized system of Soviet power. The formation of national cadres was viewed not as a means of expanding cultural autonomy, but rather as a mechanism for incorporating local elites into an ideologically controlled space of proletarian dictatorship [Isaev, 1930: 17-21]. In relation to Kazakh society, this course was accompanied by a critical reassessment of the traditional nomadic way of life, which in official discourse was portrayed as socially and culturally archaic, thereby serving as a theoretical justification for policies of forced modernization and the profound transformation of traditional forms of social organization and identity.

Within the Soviet historiographical tradition, interpretations of the national question were consistently constructed within the framework of Leninist proletarian internationalism, according to which national self-determination was understood as derivative of class struggle and socialist revolution [Instruktsiya, 1928: 118-125]. Drawing upon Leninist tenets, scholars emphasized the necessity of forming a voluntary union of peoples based on the principles of equality, trust, and free consent, which was interpreted as the fundamental rationale underlying the Soviet model of national-state construction. In this context, the establishment of Kazakh statehood, the development of national culture, and the institutionalization of autonomy were construed as direct outcomes of the implementation of the party’s national program. At the same time, the conceptual foundation of this interpretation rested upon the subordination of the national factor to the imperatives of class struggle [Aldazhumanov, 1996: 27-34]. The national question was thus treated not as an autonomous sociocultural problem, but as a manifestation of social-class contradictions, the resolution of which was linked exclusively to the victory of the proletariat. Within this logic, it was asserted that only the proletariat could ensure genuine freedom of peoples and real equality among nations, whereas the bourgeoisie sought to obscure the social essence of national conflicts by substituting them with ethnic rhetoric. Such an approach consolidated the reduction of national identity to a derivative of socioeconomic relations, thereby precluding the possibility of autonomous development of ethnocultural forms.

The Soviet scholarly paradigm was likewise grounded in the premise that the nation was a product of the bourgeois epoch and a historically transient form of social development, destined ultimately to give way to a unified international socialist culture. Accordingly, national culture was regarded as a transitional stage, intended to facilitate the passage toward a supranational form of cultural integration based on the synthesis of the “best achievements” of various peoples. The victory of the October Revolution and the implementation of the party’s national policy were interpreted as accelerating factors in the formation of a “socialist nation” within which national specificity would gradually dissolve into universalist models of Soviet identity [Prokopenko, 1999: 14].

In Soviet historical scholarship, issues of cultural policy and national identity were examined exclusively within the framework of proletarian internationalism and rigid ideological dogmas. Researchers such as S.I. Umakhanov, A.K. Aliev, N. Dzhandil’din, M. Suzhikov, A.E. Erzhanov, and others systematically exposed the so-called “bourgeois falsifiers” who critically assessed the consequences of socialist modernization for national culture and traditions [Maidanali, 2003: 45-49]. Any attempts to question the thesis of the progressive role of Soviet power in the “liberation” and “cultural revival” of the Kazakh people were interpreted as ideologically hostile. The socialist revolution and subsequent cultural construction were presented as objectively necessary conditions for the formation of a “new,” socialist type of national identity, while traditional cultural forms were viewed either as archaic and destined to be overcome, or as requiring radical transformation in accordance with the objectives of communist construction [Tuganbaev, 1967: 98]. Within this paradigm, the national question was subordinated to the logic of class struggle, and cultural policy functioned as an instrument for shaping internationalist consciousness and integrating diverse ethnic groups into the framework of a unified “Soviet community”. The concept of the “Soviet people” actively elaborated in the works of N. Dzhandil’din and his associates, ultimately consolidated the primacy of supranational identity over ethnocultural specificity, thereby significantly constraining the possibilities for autonomous development of national cultures [Dzhandil’din, 1989: 64-67].

The institutional foundation for implementing this model of cultural policy was laid with the establishment in 1919 of the Kirghiz Revolutionary Committee, which was entrusted with political, economic, and cultural governance of the region [Kshibekov, 1972: 54-58]. While declaring sensitivity to local conditions, traditions, and ways of life, this body in practice ensured the enforcement of centralized decisions and strict control over cultural development processes. The location of its headquarters in Orenburg and the appointment of party functionaries to leadership positions testified to the dominance of



external governance and the secondary status of national interests. In Soviet historiography, the formation of Kazakh autonomy was portrayed as the highest achievement of national-state construction; in reality, however, this process was accompanied by systematic ideologicalization of culture, unification of educational and linguistic space, and the displacement of traditional forms of spiritual life. Cultural policy during this period was oriented not so much toward preserving and developing national distinctiveness as toward shaping a new type of identity grounded in socialist values and internationalist rhetoric [Eleuov, 1961: 243]. As a result, a profound contradiction emerged between the proclaimed principles of national self-determination and the actual practices of cultural construction, exerting a lasting impact on the transformation of national consciousness and the cultural dynamics of Kazakh society.

In Soviet historiography, the proclamation of autonomy of the Turkestan region on 30 April 1918 and the establishment of the Turkestan Soviet Federative Republic within the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic were interpreted as pivotal stages in the implementation of Leninist national policy, possessing not only domestic but also international significance. According to S. Beisembaev [Beisembaev, 1987: 21-23], this act demonstrated in practice to the oppressed peoples of the East the possibility of liberation and the attainment of self-governance, whereas the creation of the Kirghiz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic on 26 August 1920 was assessed by S. Dosymbekov and S. Kul'baev as the result of the "fraternal assistance of the Russian people" and the guiding role of the Communist Party, without which, in their view, overcoming economic, cultural, and political backwardness would have been impossible [Dosymbekov, Kul'baev, 1960: 24]. Contemporary historical scholarship, however, subjects these interpretations to substantial revision. As T. Omarbekov emphasizes, already in the early years of Soviet power Kazakh society confronted large-scale demographic and socioeconomic catastrophes, culminating in the famine of 1921-1922, caused by the combined impact of the Civil War, the policies of War Communism, and the forced consolidation of Soviet statehood. This resulted in a sharp decline in population, particularly in Western Kazakhstan, where demographic losses between 1917 and 1923 amounted to 981,314 individuals, thereby revealing a profound contradiction between the proclaimed principles of national liberation and the actual consequences of early Soviet modernization [Omarbekov, 1994: 57-59].

In Soviet historiography, the establishment of the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was traditionally presented as a result of the revolutionary transformation of society and the leadership of the Communist Party, with primary reference to the decisions of the Constituent Congress of Soviets of the Kazakh ASSR held on 4 October 1920 in Orenburg and the adoption of the "Declaration of the Rights of the Working People of the Kazakh ASSR," which was treated as a foundational document of Soviet statehood [Kozybaev, 1990: 32-33]. A closer examination, however, indicates that for the populations of the former colonial territories, including Kazakh society, the principal political aspiration remained genuine self-governance and sovereignty, reflected in initiatives developed by the local intelligentsia.

Leninist principles formally acknowledged the right to self-determination, including secession, while simultaneously limiting its practical implementation within the framework of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic. This tension resulted in the symbolic rather than substantive character of the proclaimed autonomy. In practice, the formation of Kazakh statehood occurred under conditions of strong centralization, with the union center exerting substantial influence over administrative structures, personnel policies, and local governance. The newly established institutions were designed primarily to integrate the region into the broader Soviet administrative system, rather than to provide mechanisms for the exercise of independent political authority [Abishev, 1950: 34-37]. Consequently, the autonomous republic functioned as a controlled regional unit within a centralized state structure, and the development of a genuinely independent national political elite was constrained by the priorities of the central authorities.

The economic and cultural transformations accompanying Soviet construction in Kazakhstan were officially interpreted as evidence of the "triumph" of Leninist-Stalinist national policy, reinforced by statistical data indicating industrial growth and large-scale state investment. Yet behind these indicators lay profound structural deformations engendered by forced modernization, collectivization, accelerated industrialization, and political terror [Kudaibergenov, 1977: 52-64]. During the 1920s and 1930s, Kazakh society was drawn into a radical social experiment marked by massive demographic losses, the destruction of traditional lifeways, the undermining of cultural institutions, and the annihilation of the national intellectual elite. The political repressions of the 1930s, which engulfed representatives of science, culture, and the military and technical intelligentsia, constituted the culmination of a process of total subjugation of society to ideological control, radically narrowing the space for the development of national identity. Thus, the Soviet model of Kazakh statehood, despite its proclaimed goals of cultural revival and social progress, in practice

led to a profound deformation of national self-consciousness, the substitution of historical forms of identity with a socialist construct, and the formation of long-term contradictions whose consequences continued to exert influence throughout the subsequent development of Kazakhstan.

Results. In Soviet ideological doctrine, the elevation of the cultural level of the population was regarded as a key prerequisite for increasing labor productivity and for the restoration and development of the productive forces. This position found its most concentrated expression in the works of V. I. Lenin, who emphasized the impossibility of building socialism without reliance on the advanced achievements of science and large-scale industrial technology, and who advanced the task of universal literacy and the systematic appropriation of the finest examples of European and American culture as a primary priority of socialist construction [Dzhunusov, 1958: 21]. Within this framework, I. V. Stalin, while proclaiming support for the development of national cultures, simultaneously viewed them as a transitional stage on the path toward the formation of a unified socialist culture, thereby reflecting the internal contradiction of Marxist-Leninist national policy, which combined the formal recognition of ethnocultural diversity with an orientation toward its subsequent unification. These principles were institutionalized in party programs that proclaimed civil equality irrespective of nationality, religion, and social origin, guarantees of education in one's native language, the right to use national languages in public and administrative spheres, and the recognition of the political equality of peoples as the foundation for resolving the national question [Dzhandil'din, 1956: 47]. At the same time, the practical implementation of these principles unfolded under conditions of rigid centralization and ideological control, transforming cultural policy into an instrument of socialist modernization and political integration, aimed less at the autonomous development of national cultures than at the construction of a unified sociocultural space and the formation of a supranational, "Soviet" identity.

Within the Soviet model of national policy, the overcoming of the socioeconomic and cultural backwardness of the "formerly oppressed peoples" was regarded as a necessary condition for achieving genuine equality. This presupposed the accelerated development of industry in national regions, the formation of a working class and a national intelligentsia, the expansion of networks of educational and cultural institutions, and the institutional implementation of the principles of indigenization (*korenizatsiia*). The resolutions of the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in 1923 conceptualized these objectives in accordance with Stalin's interpretation of the national question, according to which its final resolution was possible exclusively under socialist conditions through the affirmation of sovereignty and the formal equality of nations, the struggle against all forms of nationalism, and the development of local cadres, party structures, and national languages in administration, education, and ideological work [Erzhanov, 1961: 7-9]. Thus, national policy was organically linked with processes of economic modernization, industrialization, and cultural revolution, enabling it to be understood as an integral component of the broader strategy of socialist transformation of society.

V.I. Lenin attached exceptional significance to cooperation and the cultural revolution, stressing that the complete cooperativization of the peasantry was inconceivable without a radical elevation of literacy, education, and the cultural development of the broad masses, and that the effectiveness of transformations had to be measured by tangible economic outcomes [Tursunbaev, 1967: 121-127]. In the official discourse of the first and second Five-Year Plans, collectivization, the eradication of illiteracy, the expansion of universal and secondary education, the growth of cultural needs, and the formation of a "socialist way of life" were interpreted as compelling evidence of the successful overcoming of social and national inequality. Simultaneously, the ideological dimension of the cultural revolution acquired paramount importance: the refinement of the system of party propaganda, the training of cadres of agitators and instructors, the creation of specialized educational institutions, and the expansion of mass political literature were viewed as key mechanisms for shaping a new, socialist type of consciousness and loyalty to Soviet power.

Within this paradigm, the cultural revolution was conceptualized both as a process of enlightenment and modernization and as an instrument of profound transformation of social consciousness, directed toward the construction of the "Soviet people" and the establishment of communist ideology as the dominant value system. Scholars emphasized that it was implemented "from above," under the leadership of the socialist state and through the mass mobilization of working people, which ensured its scale and systemic character. At the same time, the proclaimed support for the development of national cultures was combined with their ideological selection and subordination to all-Union objectives, as a result of which cultural policy became a central instrument for integrating the national republics into a unified political and cultural space, where priority was given not to the autonomous development of ethnic traditions, but to the formation of a standardized socialist identity.

Culture and education as means of shaping a socialist Russian-speaking individual in the course of the cultural revolution were examined in detail by K. Nurpeisov and Kh. Abzhanov, who noted that the “cultural revolution is aimed at transforming all working people into socially and politically active participants in the cultural-historical process and at educating a new person,” viewing it not as an isolated task, but as a fundamental condition for the construction of socialist society, cooperation, and the incorporation of the peasantry into the new economic system [Nurpeisov, Abzhanov, 1990: 24-28]. At the same time, they emphasized that any excesses and extremes in the course of the cultural revolution should not be conflated with the revolution itself: “this is not the cultural revolution; revolution is a profound phenomenon of a high order, bearing social responsibility and creating a civilization significantly superior to previous forms,” thereby demonstrating that its true objective was to employ the achievements of past culture as the raw material for constructing a new socialist cultural order.

During the period between the establishment of the Kazakh ASSR and the Kazakh SSR, Zh.O. Artykbaev offered a distinctive interpretation of the cultural revolution and the development of education and science in Kazakhstan. He argued that the primary objective of the cultural revolution extended beyond increasing literacy, focusing instead on the formation of individuals according to the ideological and sociopolitical goals of the Soviet state. At the same time, he noted that the contemporary educational system remained underdeveloped, as evidenced by the fact that in 1936 only eleven Kazakh children graduated from secondary school. Zh.O. Artykbaev’s analysis emphasizes both the limitations of early Soviet educational initiatives in terms of access and quality for the indigenous population and the formal achievements of the period, such as the establishment of the Academy of Sciences of Kazakhstan in 1946, which by the 1990s included thirty-two research institutions, approximately 250 doctors of science, and 2,000 candidates of science, even though the participation of Kazakh scholars within these institutions remained limited [Artykbaev, 1997: 34-37]. His work highlights the complex interplay between ideological objectives, institutional development, and the sociocultural realities of Kazakh society during this transformative period.

The actual state of the “cultural revolution” in the Soviet period is vividly illustrated by L.D. Kuderina’s study *Genocide in Kazakhstan*, which demonstrates that, under the contrived accusation of “Kazakh nationalism,” Zhumakhan Mauysymbai and forty-two other Kazakh intellectuals were prosecuted, including teachers, educators, writers, poets, jurists, physicians, and political figures who had made a substantial contribution to Kazakh culture [Kuderina, 1994: 11-14]. These repressed representatives of the “national elite” in fact constituted the cultural core of the nation, and their persecution was accompanied by systematic Russification and the displacement of previously used Arabic-language textbooks, which ultimately led to their oblivion. Traces of cultural policy directed against the Kazakh people are also evident in A. Kaken’s article on S. Seifullin, which reflects the practice of discrediting figures associated with the Alash movement and the effort to undermine the authority and public recognition of national leaders [Kaken, 2004: 34-39]. Nevertheless, as P. Zh. Altynbekova observes, even under conditions of forced collectivization and repression, cultural and social life in Kazakhstan received a new impetus, demonstrating the limited but tangible outcomes of Leninist cultural policy and socialist construction, despite the fact that neither repression nor pressure on the intelligentsia and religious institutions permitted a substantial alteration in the overall course of the “cultural revolution” [Altynbekova, 2000: 9-11].

Conclusion. The analysis of the processes involved in the formation of Kazakh Soviet statehood and the implementation of the cultural revolution in Kazakhstan demonstrates a complex interaction of ideological, social, and economic factors that shaped the region’s development during the Soviet period. The establishment of the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and its subsequent transformation into the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic cannot be viewed merely as an administrative and territorial act. Rather, this process was closely linked to the implementation of the Leninist and Stalinist models of national policy, which combined limited autonomy, social transformation, and integration into all-Union institutional structures. A key outcome of these transformations was the emergence of a new social structure in which the working class and the local intelligentsia became central agents of modernization, simultaneously subjected to ideological control and actively involved in the realization of economic and cultural programs. Within this framework, the mechanism of the cultural revolution functioned both as a means of raising educational standards and as an instrument of political socialization, shaping the “new Soviet Russian-speaking individual” capable of sustaining the socialist system and disseminating Soviet values across all levels of public life. This approach ensured the systemic integration of economic, educational, and cultural reforms, while at the same time creating conditions for the restriction of national initiative and the strict control of

intellectual and cultural elites, most visibly manifested in the repression of Kazakh intellectuals and figures associated with the Alash movement.

A critical dimension of this period lies in the inherent contradictions of the cultural revolution. On the one hand, it facilitated rising literacy rates, the development of education and science, and the formation of professional and administrative cadres essential for the functioning of the new state. On the other hand, these processes were accompanied by intense ideological pressure, deliberate Russification, and political repression against the active segment of the national intelligentsia, which constrained the participation of the indigenous population in the governance of cultural and scientific institutions. This duality reveals the specific nature of Soviet modernization, in which cultural and educational transformation simultaneously served as a tool of development and a mechanism of political control. Achievements in education and science, including the establishment of academic institutions, research centers, and the growth of scientific personnel, coexisted with the initially low representation of Kazakh specialists, reflecting the structural limitations and socio-political tensions of the era.

Thus, the period between the formation of the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic can be regarded as a stage of institutional and cultural consolidation characterized by a dual effect: while significant quantitative progress was achieved in education, science, and industrial development, substantial constraints on social and cultural autonomy persisted. This historical experience allows for a critical reassessment of the mechanisms underlying the cultural revolution, revealing the limitations of ideologically driven reforms and demonstrating that modernization in Soviet Kazakhstan resulted less from organic societal development than from a combination of political control, social coercion, and economic incentives. At the same time, the creation of educational and scientific infrastructures laid the groundwork for the subsequent growth of the national intelligentsia and scientific capacity, enabling long-term transformations of the social environment and opening possibilities for cultural revival in the post-repression period. This comprehensive analysis underscores that the cultural revolution in Soviet Kazakhstan functioned simultaneously as an instrument of ideological mobilization, a means of socialization, and a driver of economic modernization, making this historical experience a valuable case for understanding the dynamics of Soviet nation-building and cultural policy.

Literature

- Абишев, 1950 – *Абишев Г.* Работа партии большевиков по воспитанию чувства советского патриотизма у воинов-казахов в годы Великой Отечественной войны (1941–1945). Алматы, 1950. 185 с.
- Абылхожин, 1991а – *Абылхожин Ж.Б.* Традиционная структура Казахстана. Социально-экономические аспекты функционирования и трансформации (1920–1930 гг.). Алматы: Ғылым, 1991.
- Абылхожин, 1991б – *Абылхожин Ж.Б.* (сост.). История Казахстана: белые пятна. Сб. ст. Алматы: Казахстан, 1991. 345 с.
- Алдажуманов, 1996 – *Алдажуманов К.С.* Крестьянское движение сопротивления коллективизации и политические репрессии в Казахстане // Народ не безмолвствует. Алматы: Обелиск, Простор, 1996. 305 с.
- Алтынбекова, 2000 – *Алтынбекова П.Ж.* Л.И. Мирзоянның Қазақстандағы қоғамдық-саяси және мемлекеттік қызметі (1933–1938 жж.). Автореф. дисс. ... канд. ист. наук. Астана, 2000. 25 б.
- Артыкбаев, 1997 – *Артыкбаев Ж.О.* История Казахстана (двенадцать лекций). Караганда, 1997. 144 с.
- Барсук, 1947 – *Барсук Ф.Я.* Казахская советская социалистическая республика. Алматы: Каз. объедин. гос. изд., 1947. 48 с.
- Батпенова, 1999 – *Батпенова З.С.* Историография национального вопроса в Казахстане (1956–1991 гг.). Дисс. ... канд. ист. наук. Алматы, 1999. 150 с.
- Бәкір, Құдайбергенова, Тайман, 2023 – *Бәкір Ә., Құдайбергенова А.И., Тайман С.Т.* Мұстафа Шоқайдың тәуелсіз мемлекет жолындағы күресіндегі негізгі тұжырымдар // Отан тарихы. 2023. Т. 26. No 4. 846–859-бб. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2023_26_4_846-859
- Бейсембаев, 1987 – *Бейсембаев С.* Ленин и Казахстан. 2-е изд. Алматы: Казахстан, 1987. 392 с.
- Бейсембиев, 1970 – *Бейсембиев К.* Победа марксистско-ленинской идеологии в Казахстане. Алматы: Казахстан, 1970. 384 с.
- Дахшлейгер, 1973 – *Дахшлейгер Г.Ф.* В.И. Ленин и проблемы казахстанской историографии. Алматы: Наука, 1973. 216 с.
- Джандильдин, 1956 – *Джандильдин Н.* Расцвет культуры и науки в советском Казахстане. Алматы: Казгосиздат, 1956. 76 с.
- Джандильдин, 1989 – *Джандильдин Н.* Единство интернационального и национального в психологии советского народа. Алматы: Казахстан, 1989. 199 с.
- Джунусов, 1958 – *Джунусов М.С.* Об историческом опыте строительства социализма в ранее отсталых странах. Москва, 1958. 264 с.

- Досымбеков, Кульбаев, 1960 – *Досымбеков С., Кульбаев С.* Сороколетие образования казахской советской государственности. Алматы, 1960. 52 с.
- Елеуов, 1961 – *Елеуов Т.* Установление и упрочение советской власти в Казахстане (март 1917 – июнь 1918 года). Алматы: Изд. АН КазССР, 1961. 528 с.
- Ержанов, 1961 – *Ержанов А.Е.* Осуществление ленинской национальной политики в Казахстане в 1935–1958 годах. Автореф. дисс. ... канд. ист. наук. Алматы, 1961.
- Зиманов, Рейтор, 1983 – *Зиманов С.З., Рейтор И.К.* Советская национальная государственность и сближение наций. Алматы: Наука, 1983. 223 с.
- Исаев, 1930 – *Исаев У.* Ленинское разрешение национального вопроса. Алматы: Госиздат РСФСР, Казахское краевое отделение, 1930. 30 с.
- Инструкция, 1928 – *Инструкция по применению постановления ЦИК и СНК КССР о конфискации байских хозяйств // НХК. 1928. № 6–8. С. 118–125.*
- Кәкен, 2004 – *Кәкен А.* Алаш арыстары және сұңқар Сәкен // Ақиқат. 2004. № 4. 34–39–66.
- Козыбаев, 1990 – *Козыбаев М.К.* Новое мышление и некоторые проблемы истории коллективизации // Коллективизация сельского хозяйства в республиках Средней Азии и Казахстане: опыт и проблемы. Алматы: Ғылым, 1990. 200 с.
- Козыбаев, 2000 – *Козыбаев М.К.* Казахстан на рубеже веков: размышления и поиски. Социализм: несбывшиеся надежды. Кн. 2. Алматы, 2000. 388 с.
- Кудайбергенов, 1977 – *Кудайбергенов У.Д.* К теории национально-государственного строительства в СССР // Вопросы национально-государственного строительства в Средней Азии и Казахстане. Алматы: Наука, 1977. С. 50–66.
- Кудерина, 1994 – *Кудерина Л.Д.* Геноцид в Казахстане. Москва: Скорпион, 1994. 58 с.
- Кшибеков, 1972 – *Кшибеков Д.* Критика буржуазной фальсификации опыта строительства социализма в Казахстане. Алматы: Казахстан, 1972. 112 с.
- Майданали, 2003 – *Майданали З.* Земледельческие районы Казахстана в годы насильственной коллективизации. Учеб. пособие. Алматы, 2003. 202 с.
- Махат, 2007 – *Махат Д.А.* Қазақстанда әміршіл-әкімшіл социализм жүйесін қалыптастырудың сталиндік концепциясының мерзімді басылымдарда насихатталуы (1925–1956 жж.). Автореф. дисс. ... канд. ист. наук. Алматы, 2007. 45 б.
- Нұрпейісов, Әбжанов, 1990 – *Нұрпейісов К., Әбжанов Х.* Мәдени революция: тапқанымыз бен жоғалтқанымыз // Қазақстан коммунисті. 1990. № 10. 24–28–66.
- Омарбеков, 1994 – *Омарбеков Т.* Зобалаң (Күштеп ұжымдастыруға қарсылық). Оқу құралы. Алматы: Санат, 1994. 272 б.
- Поляков, 1985 – *Поляков А.* Страна Советов во время образования СССР: национальный состав населения // История СССР. 1985. № 1. С. 69–82.
- Прокопенко, 1999 – *Прокопенко Л.А.* Влияние тоталитаризма на традиционную деревню Казахстана (начало XX в. – 1936 г.). Автореф. дисс. ... канд. ист. наук. Караганда, 1999. 25 с.
- Сужиков, 1981 – *Сужиков М.М.* Гармоническое сочетание интернациональных и национальных интересов. Алматы, 1981. 47 с.
- Сулейменова, 2025 – *Сулейменова А.Т.* Республикалық бақылау комиссияларының құжаттары Қазақстанда 1925–1933-жылдары жүргізілген науқандарды зерттеудің тарихи дереккөзі ретінде // Отан тарихы. 2025. Т. 28. № 4. 1117–1135–66. [қазақша]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_4_1117-1135
- Тойнби, 1991 – *Тойнби А.Дж.* Постигание истории / пер. с англ.; сост. А.П. Огурцов. Москва: Прогресс, 1991. 736 с.
- Туганбаев, 1967 – *Туганбаев А.* Октябрьская революция и развитие Казахской Советской национальной государственности. Алматы: Казахстан, 1967. 136 с.
- Турсунбаев, 1967 – *Турсунбаев А.* Казахский аул в трех революциях. Алматы: Казахстан, 1967. 483 с.

References

- Abishev, 1950 – *Abishev G.* Rabota partii bol'shevikov po vospitaniyu chuvstva sovetskogo patriotizma u voynov-kazakhov v gody Velikoi Otechestvennoi voyny (1941–1945) [The work of the Bolshevik Party on fostering Soviet patriotism among Kazakh soldiers during the Great Patriotic War]. Almaty, 1950. 185 p. [in Russian]
- Abylkhozhin, 1991a – *Abylkhozhin Zh.B.* Traditsionnaya struktura Kazakhstana. Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie aspekty funktsionirovaniya i transformatsii (1920–1930 gg.) [Traditional structure of Kazakhstan: socio-economic aspects of functioning and transformation]. Almaty: Gylym, 1991. [in Russian]
- Abylkhozhin, 1991b – *Abylkhozhin Zh.B.* (comp.). Istoriya Kazakhstana: belye pyatna. Sbornik statei [History of Kazakhstan: blank spots. Collection of articles]. Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1991. 345 p. [in Russian]
- Aldazhumanov, 1996 – *Aldazhumanov K.S.* Krest'yanskoe dvizhenie soprotivleniya kollektivizatsii i politicheskie repressii v Kazakhstane [Peasant resistance movement to collectivization and political repression in Kazakhstan]. Almaty: Obelisk, Prostor, 1996. 305 p. [in Russian]

- Altynbekova, 2000 – *Altynbekova P.Zh. L.I. Mirzoyannyn Kazakhstandagy kogamdyk-sayasi zhane memlekettik kyzmeti (1933–1938 zhzh.)* [Socio-political and state activity of L.I. Mirzoyan in Kazakhstan]. Avtoref. diss. kand. ist. nauk. Astana, 2000. 25 p. [in Kazakh]
- Artykbaev, 1997 – *Artykbaev Zh.O. Istoriya Kazakhstana (dvenadtsat' lektsii)* [History of Kazakhstan: twelve lectures]. Karaganda, 1997. 144 p. [in Russian]
- Bakir, Kudaibergenova, Taiman, 2023 – *Bakir A., Kudaibergenova A.I., Taiman C.T. Mustafa Shoqaydyñ täuelsiz memleket jolyndağı küresindegi negizgi tujirimdar* [Basic concepts of Mustafa Shokay's fight for an independent state]. *Otan tarikhy*. 2023. Vol. 26. No. 4. Pp. 846–859. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2023_26_4_846-859
- Barsuk, 1947 – *Barsuk F.Ya. Kazakhskaya Sovetskaya Sotsialisticheskaya Respublika* [Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic]. Almaty: Kazakh State Publishing House, 1947. 48 p. [in Russian]
- Batpenova, 1999 – *Batpenova Z.S. Istoriografiya natsional'nogo voprosa v Kazakhstane (1956–1991 gg.)* [Historiography of the national question in Kazakhstan]. Diss. kand. ist. nauk. Almaty, 1999. 150 p. [in Russian]
- Beisembaev, 1987 – *Beisembaev S. Lenin i Kazakhstan* [Lenin and Kazakhstan]. 2nd ed. Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1987. 392 p. [in Russian]
- Beisembiev, 1970 – *Beisembiev K. Pobeda marksistsko-leninskoi ideologii v Kazakhstane* [Victory of Marxist-Leninist ideology in Kazakhstan]. Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1970. 384 p. [in Russian]
- Dakhshleiger, 1973 – *Dakhshleiger G.F. VI. Lenin i problemy kazakhstanskoi istoriografii* [V.I. Lenin and problems of Kazakh historiography]. Almaty: Nauka, 1973. 216 p. [in Russian]
- Dzhandil'din, 1956 – *Dzhandil'din N. Rastsvet kul'tury i nauki v sovetskom Kazakhstane* [Flourishing of culture and science in Soviet Kazakhstan]. Almaty: Kazgosizdat, 1956. 76 p. [in Russian]
- Dzhandil'din, 1989 – *Dzhandil'din N. Edinstvo internatsional'nogo i natsional'nogo v psikhologii sovetskogo naroda* [Unity of international and national in the psychology of the Soviet people]. Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1989. 199 p. [in Russian]
- Dzhunusov, 1958 – *Dzhunusov M.S. Ob istoricheskom opyte stroitel'stva sotsializma v ranee otstalykh stranakh* [On the historical experience of socialist construction in formerly backward countries]. Moscow, 1958. 264 p. [in Russian]
- Dosymbekov, Kul'baev, 1960 – *Dosymbekov S., Kul'baev S. Sorokoletie obrazovaniya kazakhskoi sovetskoi gosudarstvennosti* [Fortieth anniversary of the formation of Kazakh Soviet statehood]. Almaty, 1960. 52 p. [in Russian]
- Eleuov, 1961 – *Eleuov T. Ustanovlenie i uprochenie sovetskoi vlasti v Kazakhstane (mart 1917 – iyun' 1918 goda)* [Establishment and consolidation of Soviet power in Kazakhstan]. Almaty: Academy of Sciences KazSSR, 1961. 528 p. [in Russian]
- Erzhanov, 1961 – *Erzhanov A.E. Osushchestvlenie leninskoi natsional'noi politiki v Kazakhstane v 1935–1958 godakh* [Implementation of Leninist national policy in Kazakhstan]. Avtoref. diss. kand. ist. nauk. Almaty, 1961. [in Russian]
- Zimanov, Reitor, 1983 – *Zimanov S.Z., Reitor I.K. Sovetskaya natsional'naya gosudarstvennost' i sblizhenie natsii* [Soviet national statehood and convergence of nations]. Almaty: Nauka, 1983. 223 p. [in Russian]
- Isaev, 1930 – *Isaev U. Leninskoe razreshenie natsional'nogo voprosa* [Leninist solution of the national question]. Almaty: Gosizdat RSFSR, Kazakh branch, 1930. 30 p. [in Russian]
- Instruktsiya, 1928 – *Instruktsiya po primeneniyu postanovleniya TsIK i SNK KSSR o konfiskatsii baiskikh khozyaistv* [Instruction on the implementation of confiscation of bai households]. *NHK*. 1928. No. 6–8. Pp. 118–125. [in Russian]
- Kaken, 2004 – *Kaken A. Alash arystary zhane sunkar Saken* [Leaders of Alash and Falcon Saken]. *Aqikat*. 2004. No. 4. Pp. 34–39. [in Kazakh]
- Kozybaev, 1990 – *Kozybaev M.K. Novoe myshlenie i nekotorye problemy istorii kollektivizatsii* [New thinking and some problems of collectivization history]. *Kollektivizatsiya sel'skogo khozyaistva v respublikakh Srednei Azii i Kazakhstane*. Almaty: Gylym, 1990. 200 p. [in Russian]
- Kozybaev, 2000 – *Kozybaev M.K. Kazakhstan na rubezhe vekov: razmyshleniya i poiski. Sotsializm: nesbyvshiesya nadezhdy* [Kazakhstan at the turn of the centuries: reflections and searches]. Book 2. Almaty, 2000. 388 p. [in Russian]
- Kudaibergenov, 1977 – *Kudaibergenov U.D. K teorii natsional'no-gosudarstvennogo stroitel'stva v SSSR* [On the theory of national-state construction in the USSR]. *Voprosy natsional'no-gosudarstvennogo stroitel'stva v Srednei Azii i Kazakhstane*. Almaty: Nauka, 1977. Pp. 50–66. [in Russian]
- Kuderina, 1994 – *Kuderina L.D. Genotsid v Kazakhstane* [Genocide in Kazakhstan]. Moscow: Skorpion, 1994. 58 p. [in Russian]
- Kshibekov, 1972 – *Kshibekov D. Kritika burzhuznoi fal'sifikatsii opyta stroitel'stva sotsializma v Kazakhstane* [Critique of bourgeois falsification of socialist construction experience in Kazakhstan]. Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1972. 112 p. [in Russian]
- Maidanali, 2003 – *Maidanali Z. Zemledel'cheskie raiony Kazakhstana v gody nasil'stvennoi kollektivizatsii* [Agricultural regions of Kazakhstan during forced collectivization]. Almaty, 2003. 202 p. [in Russian]

- Makhat, 2007 – *Makhat D.A. Kazakhstanda amirshil-akimshil sotsializm zhuyesin kalypstaryudyn stalindik kontseptsiasynyn merzimdi basylymdarda nasikhattaluy (1925–1956)* [Promotion of Stalinist administrative-command socialism in periodicals]. Avtoref. diss. kand. ist. nauk. Almaty, 2007. 45 p. [in Kazakh]
- Nurpeisov, Abzhanov, 1990 – *Nurpeisov K., Abzhanov Kh. Madeni revolyutsiya: tapkanymız ben zhogaltkanymız* [Cultural revolution: achievements and losses]. *Kazakhstan kommunisti*. 1990. No. 10. Pp. 24–28. [in Kazakh]
- Omarbekov, 1994 – *Omarbekov T. Zobalan (Kushtem uyymdastyruqa karsylyk)* [Tragedy: resistance to forced collectivization]. Almaty: Sanat, 1994. 272 p. [in Kazakh]
- Polyakov, 1985 – *Polyakov A. Strana Sovetov vo vremya obrazovaniya SSSR: natsional'nyi sostav naseleniya* [Land of Soviets during the formation of the USSR: ethnic composition]. *Istoriya SSSR*. 1985. No. 1. Pp. 69–82. [in Russian]
- Prokopenko, 1999 – *Prokopenko L.A. Vliyaniye totalitarizma na traditsionnyuyu derevnyu Kazakhstana (nachalo XX v. – 1936 g.)* [Impact of totalitarianism on traditional village of Kazakhstan]. Avtoref. diss. kand. ist. nauk. Karaganda, 1999. 25 p. [in Russian]
- Suzhikov, 1981 – *Suzhikov M.M. Garmonicheskoe sochetanie internatsional'nykh i natsional'nykh interesov* [Harmonious combination of international and national interests]. Almaty, 1981. 47 p. [in Russian]
- Suleimenova, 2025 – *Suleimenova A.T. Respublikalyq baqylau komissialarynyñ qujattary Qazaqstanda 1925-1933 jildary жүргizilgen naýqandardy zertteýdiñ taryhy derekközi retinde* [Documents of Republican control commissions in Kazakhstan As historical sources of the campaigns carried out in 1925–1933] // *Otan tarihy*. 2025. T. 28. No 4. Pp. 1117–1135. [in Kazakh]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_4_1117-1135
- Toynbee, 1991 – *Toynbee A.J. Postizhenie istorii* [A Study of History]. Transl. from English. Moscow: Progress, 1991. 736 p. [in Russian]
- Tuganbaev, 1967 – *Tuganbaev A. Oktyabr'skaya revolyutsiya i razvitie kazakhskoi sovetskoi natsional'noi gosudarstvennosti* [October Revolution and development of Kazakh Soviet statehood]. Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1967. 136 p. [in Russian]
- Tursunbaev, 1967 – *Tursunbaev A. Kazakhskii aul v trekh revolyutsiyakh* [Kazakh aul in three revolutions]. Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1967. 483 p. [in Russian]

МАЗМҰНЫ/ СОДЕРЖАНИЕ/CONTENT
ОТАН ТАРИХЫ. 2026. Т. 29. № 1

Касымова Д.Б., Капаева А.Т., Кудайбергеноулы Б. О «ФЕОДАЛЬНО-БАЙСКИХ ПЕРЕЖИТКАХ» В КАЗАХСКОЙ ССР: ДИСКУРС, ПРАВО И ПРАКТИКИ.....	5
Козина В.В., Уалтаева А.С., Баймагамбетова А.А. СОЦИАЛЬНО-ДЕМОГРАФИЧЕСКОЕ РАЗВИТИЕ МОНОГОРОДОВ КАРАГАНДИНСКОЙ ОБЛАСТИ.....	22
Мамраймов С. КЕҢЕСТІК АГРАРЛЫҚ САЯСАТ АЯСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ҰЖЫМДАСТЫРУ МЕН БАЙ-ШАРУАШЫЛЫҚТАРДЫ ТӨРКІЛЕУ (1928–1933 жж.).....	40
Turgunbayev I.Ye., Moryakova M.T., Zhanatayeva K.B. VILLAGE INSTITUTES IN TÜRKIYE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF CULTURAL POLICY.....	54
Sissenbayeva A.A., Kalybekova M.Ch. THEORETICAL AND SOURCE BASE FOR THE STUDY OF HISTORY OF KAZAKHSTANI PRISONERS OF WAR IN CONCENTRATION CAMPS ON THE TERRITORY POLAND DURING THE WORLD WAR II.....	66
Жолдасұлы Т., Досым А.Б. ҚЫЗЫЛОРДАДАҒЫ ИСЛАМНАН ӨЗГЕ ДІНИ ҰЙЫМДАР: СОВЕТТІК КЕЗЕҢ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ (1960–1980 ЖЖ.).....	77
Zhumatay G., Yskak A. TSARIST RUSSIA’S CIVILIZING MISSION AND POLICY OF CHRISTIANIZATION OF THE KAZAKHS IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19 th AND BEGINNING OF THE 20 th CENTURIES.....	91
Zholseitova M.A. SOCIO-POLITICAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE TURKIC-MUSLIM SOCIETY IN THE INTELLECTUAL HERITAGE OF THE ALASH MOVEMENT.....	107
Сабитов Ж.М., Каратаев А.А. О ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИИ И ИСТОРИИ ПЛЕМЕНИ АРГЫН.....	118
Бимақанова З.Ш., Мұқанова Г.Қ., Нұрғалиева Ф.М. ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ «КІШІ ҚАЗАН» ЗЕРТТЕУЛЕРІНДЕ ПӘНАРАЛЫҚ ТӘСІЛДІ ҚОЛДАНУДЫҢ ӘДІСНАМАЛЫҚ НЕГІЗДЕРІ МЕН ПРИНЦИПТЕРІ.....	132
Ахметова Г.М. ТОРГОВО-ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОЕ РАЗВИТИЕ КАЗАХСТАНА В XIX – НАЧАЛЕ XX ВЕКА: ОТЕЧЕСТВЕННАЯ И ЗАРУБЕЖНАЯ ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ.....	142

Ермаханова М.А., Абдразақова А.Ө., Айтуар Б.М. АҢЫЗ ЖӘНЕ ШЫНДЫҚ: ТЕМІРБЕК ЖҮРГЕНОВТИҢ ТҮЛҒАСЫНА ҚАТЫСТЫ ТАРИХНАМАЛЫҚ ТАЛДАУ.....	161
Махамбетова Л.А., Мейрманова Г.А. У.Х. ШӘЛЕКЕНОВТИҢ ЕҢБЕКТЕРІНДЕГІ ҚАЗАҚТАР МЕН ҚАРАҚАЛПАҚТАРДЫҢ ШАРУАШЫЛЫҚ ЖҮЙЕСІ.....	174
Байжанова А.Ә., Шашаев Ә.Қ., Әділбекова З.Ә. XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 20–30 ЖЫЛДАРЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ОҚУ-АҒАРТУ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ: ТАРИХИ ТАЛДАУ.....	185
Ошан Ж., Кенжеахмет Н., Қадылбек М. «ИМПЕРАТОР ГУАНСЮЙ БИЛГІ ТҰСЫНДАҒЫ СОЛТҮСТІК-БАТЫС ШЕКАРА ДЕЛИМИТАЦИЯЛЫҚ КАРТАСЫНЫҢ ҚЫТАЙША АУДАРМАСЫНДА» КӨРСЕТІЛГЕН ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ ШЫҒЫС ШЕКАРАСЫНА ҚАТЫСТЫ ТАРИХИ ТОПОНИМИКАЛАР.....	199
Zholdas A.K., Amirbek A.A., Kumganbayev Zh. K. THE ROLE OF HISTORY TEACHING IN FORMING THE KAZAKH INTELLIGENTSIA (1918–1927 YEARS).....	210
Саркенова К.А., Әбенова Б.С. БАТЫС СІБІР: ӘКІМШІЛІК-ТЕРРИТОРИЯЛЫҚ БӨЛІНСІ, ҚАЗАҚТАРДЫҢ ОРНАЛАСУЫ (XVIII Ғ. СОҢЫ – XIX Ғ. БІРІНШІ ЖАРТЫСЫ).....	219
Mirzakulova R.M., Alpysbayeva N.K. SCHOLARS’ PERSONAL FUNDS IN THE SCIENTIFIC ARCHIVE OF “GYLYM ORDASY” AS A PHENOMENON OF HISTORICAL MEMORY.....	234
Абдукадыров Н.М., Қалдыбаева С.С., Көбесова А.С. ОСМАН МЕМЛЕКЕТІ МЕН ОРТА АЗИЯ ХАЛЫҚТАРЫ АРАСЫНДА ОҚУ-АҒАРТУ САЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ЫНТЫМАҚТАСТЫҚ (XIX Ғ. СОҢЫ – XX Ғ. БАСЫ).....	249
Ауанасова К.М., Ауанасова А.М., Бадиев А.М. ВКЛАД СЕРАЛИ ЛАПИНА В ПРАВОВОЙ МОДЕРНИЗМ В ПЕРВЫЕ ГОДЫ СОВЕТСКОЙ ВЛАСТИ (НА ОСНОВЕ АНАЛИЗА ЗАПАДНОЙ И РОССИЙСКОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ).....	266
Akhmetova Zh.K., Abdrazakova A.U. THE KAZAKHSTANI VARIANT OF THE SOVIET NATION-BUILDING PROJECT IN THE CONTEXT OF IMPERIAL LEGACY AND SOCIALIST MODERNIZATION (1920–1940).....	276
Azretbergenova E.Zh., Baigarayev N.A. ISSUES OF CULTURAL POLICY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN THE PERIOD BETWEEN THE KAZAKH AUTONOMOUS SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC AND THE KAZAKH SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC.....	288

Дюсенова Н.К. ТҮРІК ЗЕРТТЕУШІЛЕРІНІҢ ЕҢБЕКТЕРІНДЕГІ АШАРШЫЛЫҚ МӘСЕЛЕСІ.....	303
Есенаманова А.С., Қалыш А.Б., Исаева А.И. ТҮРКІ ХАЛЫҚТАРЫНЫҢ КІЛЕМ ТОҚУ ДӘСТҮРІН ЗЕРТТЕУ ТАРИХНАМАСЫ: ЭТНОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ ЖӘНЕ МУЗЕЙЛІК ТҮРҒЫДАН ШОЛУ.....	312
Сарсенбаев А.Б., Оспанов Е.Б. ҚАЗАҚ ШЕЖІРЕСІ ЭТНОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ ДЕРЕККӨЗІ РЕТІНДЕ.....	325
Турекеев К.Ж. НАРЕЧЕНИЕ ИМЕНИ У КАРАКАЛПАКОВ НАВОЙСКОЙ И САМАРКАНДСКОЙ ОБЛАСТЕЙ: ТРАДИЦИИ И СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ТЕНДЕНЦИИ.....	333
Шамшетдинова Д.И. УСПЕХИ И НЕДОСТАТКИ РАЗВИТИЯ СФЕРЫ БЫТОВОГО ОБСЛУЖИВАНИЯ В СЕЛЬСКОЙ МЕСТНОСТИ КАРАКАЛПАКСТАНА В 1960–80-Е ГГ.....	343
Мұхатова О.Х., Қаипбаева А.Т., Саипова К.Д. ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ 1920–1930 ЖЫЛДАРДАҒЫ ПАНАСЫЗ БАЛАЛАР ТАРИХЫН ЗЕРТТЕУДІҢ ТЕОРИЯЛЫҚ ЖӘНЕ МЕТОДОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ.....	353
Қабдолдина К.Қ., Құндақбаева Ж.Б. ДІНИ ПАРЫЗ БЕН ЭПИДЕМИОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ ҚАУІПТЕР АРАСЫНДА: ХІХ ҒАСЫРДЫҢ СОҢЫ – ХХ ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗЫЛЫҚҚА САНИТАРЛЫҚ БАҚЫЛАУ ЖӘНЕ ОНЫҢ ҚИЫНДЫҚТАРЫ.....	367
Қалишабаев А.Ж., Елеуов М.Е. Т.Н. СЕНИГОВА: БАТЫС ЖӘНЕ ОҢТҮСТІК ҚАЗАҚСТАН ЭКСПЕДИЦИЯЛАРЫНЫҢ ҒЫЛЫМИ ЖАҒАЛЫҚТАРЫ (1950–1970 ЖЫЛДАР).....	378
Кенжебаев Ф.Қ. Сайфулмаликова С.С. БӨКЕЙ ОРДАСЫНДАҒЫ БАСТАУЫШ БІЛІМ БЕРУ: ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛДЫҚ, ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК ЖӘНЕ МӘДЕНИ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯЛАНУЫНА ПӘНАРАЛЫҚ ТАЛДАУ.....	387
Темирханова А.С., Альбина Абеновна Максүтова А.М., Исакаева А.М. ҚАСЫМ ЕРТІСБАЕВ ТҮЛҒАСЫ ХХ ҒАСЫР БАСЫНДАҒЫ ДІНИ-АҒАРТУШЫЛЫҚ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕР КОНТЕКСІНДЕ.....	400
Мухамадеева И.А., Кенжебек Д.К., Жаксыбаева А.А. ОБЩЕСТВЕННО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ ГАЗЕТА «КАЗАХ» (1913–1918 ГГ.) КАК ОДИН ИЗ ИСТОЧНИКОВ ОТЕЧЕСТВЕННОЙ ИСТОРИИ.....	410

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов ат. Тарих және этнология институты
Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28
Тел/факс: +7 727 261 67 19
e-mail: kazhistory@bk.ru
