



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 tarikhy
Has been issued as a journal
since 1998
ISSN: 1814-6961 (Print)
ISSN: 2788-9718 (Online)
2025. Vol. 29. Is. 1. Pp. 276–
287
Journal homepage: <https://otan.history.iie.kz>



FTAXP/MPHTI/IRSTI 03.20

https://doi.org/10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_276-287

THE KAZAKHSTANI VARIANT OF THE SOVIET NATION-BUILDING PROJECT IN THE CONTEXT OF IMPERIAL LEGACY AND SOCIALIST MODERNIZATION (1920-1940)

Zhanat K. Akhmetova¹, Almagul U. Abdrazakova²

¹Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University
(114 Gogol Street, Almaty 050040, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Candidate of Historical Sciences, Acting Associate Professor (corresponding author)
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6671-1954>. E-mail: akhmetova.zhanat73@gmail.com

²Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University
(29A Aiteke Bi Street, Kyzylorda, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1793-7011>. E-mail: abdrazakova.alma.71@mail.ru

© Ch.Ch. Valichanov, 2026

© Akhmetova Zh.K., Abdrazakova A.U., 2026

Abstract. *Introduction.* This article examines the specific features of implementing the Soviet nation-building project in Kazakhstan during a period of profound political, social, and cultural transformations from 1920 to 1940. This historical phase was characterized by the collapse of the imperial system, the establishment of Soviet power, and the implementation of a large-scale modernization program that fundamentally reshaped institutional structures, social hierarchies, and cultural identities. *The relevance* of this study lies in the need for a comprehensive reassessment of Soviet national policy as a multidimensional process combining ideological directives, administrative engineering, and social experimentation. Analyzing the Kazakhstani experience provides a deeper understanding of how universal modernization frameworks were adapted to local historical, cultural, and demographic conditions, creating a distinct variant of socialist nation-building. *Aim and Objectives.* The aim of the study is to identify the mechanisms, strategies, and consequences of Soviet nation-building in Kazakhstan. The objectives include analyzing institutional reforms, examining changes in ethnocultural policy, assessing social transformations, and evaluating their long-term impact on the formation of national identity. *Materials and Methods.* The research is based on archival documents, legislative acts, statistical data, and current academic scholarship. The methodological framework integrates historical institutionalism, comparative analysis, discourse analysis, and elements of modernization theory. *Results.* The findings indicate that the Soviet modernization project in Kazakhstan was a complex and contradictory process, combining progressive social reforms with coercive political practices. It facilitated rapid structural transformation, the creation of new administrative and cultural institutions, and the formation of a Soviet Kazakh identity, while simultaneously generating significant social and cultural disruptions. *Conclusion.* The Kazakhstani variant of Soviet nation-building represented a unique synthesis of

ideological design and pragmatic adaptation, the legacy of which continues to influence contemporary debates on national development, identity, and statehood.

Keywords: Soviet project, nation-building, modernization, Kazakhstan, national policy, 1920–1940, social transformations, identity, institutional reforms

For citation: 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) // Otan tarihy. 2026. Vol. 29. No. 1. Pp. 276–287. [in Eng.]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_276-287

ИМПЕРИЯЛЫҚ МҰРА МЕН СОЦИАЛИСТІК МОДЕРНИЗАЦИЯ КОНТЕКСІНДЕ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ КЕҢЕСТІК ҰЛТ ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУ ЖОБАСЫНЫҢ НҮСҚАСЫ (1920-1940 жж.)

Жанат Куандықовна Ахметова¹, Алмагуль Умурзаковна Абдразакова²

¹Қазақ ұлттық қыздар педагогикалық университеті
(050040, Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Гоголь көшесі 114)
тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор м.а. (корреспондент-автор)
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6671-1954>. E-mail: akhmetova.zhanat73@gmail.com

²Қорқыт Ата атындағы Қызылорда университеті
(Қазақстан Республикасы, Қызылорда қ., Әйтеке би көшесі 29А)
педагогика ғылымдарының магистрі, аға оқытушы
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1793-7011>. E-mail: abdrazakova.alma.71@mail.ru

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы ТЭИ, 2026
© Ахметова Ж.К., Абдразакова А.У., 2026

Аңдатпа. *Kіріспе.* Мақалада 1920-1940 жылдар аралығындағы Қазақстандағы кеңестік ұлт қалыптастыру жобасын жүзеге асыру ерекшеліктері зерттеледі. Бұл кезең империялық жүйенің күйреуімен, совет билігінің орнауымен және кең ауқымды модернизация бағдарламасының енгізілуімен сипатталды, ол институционалдық құрылымдарды, әлеуметтік иерархияларды және мәдени бірегейлікті түбегейлі өзгертті. *Зерттеу өзектілігі* кеңестік ұлттық саясатын идеологиялық негіздер, әкімшілік құрылымдау және әлеуметтік тәжірибелерді біріктіретін көпөлшемді процесс ретінде кешенді қайта қарау қажеттілігінен туындайды. Қазақстан тәжірибесін талдау модернизацияның әмбебап үлгілері жергілікті тарихи, мәдени және демографиялық жағдайларға қалай бейімделгенін тереңірек түсінуге мүмкіндік береді және социалистік ұлт қалыптастырудың ерекше үлгісін айқындайды. *Мақсаты мен міндеттері.* Зерттеудің мақсаты, Қазақстандағы кеңестік ұлт қалыптастырудың механизмдері, стратегиялары және салдарын анықтау. Міндеттері: институционалдық реформаларды талдау, этномәдени саясаттағы өзгерістерді зерттеу, әлеуметтік трансформацияларды бағалау және олардың ұлттық бірегейлігінің қалыптасуына ұзақ мерзімді әсерін қарастыру. *Материалдар мен әдістер.* Зерттеуде мұрағат құжаттары, заңнамалық актілер, статистикалық материалдар және қазіргі ғылыми әдебиет қолданылды. *Методологиялық негізі* тарихи институционализм, салыстырмалы талдау, дискурс талдау және модернизация теориясының элементтерін біріктіреді. *Нәтижелер.* Алынған нәтижелер көрсеткендей, Қазақстандағы кеңестік модернизация жобасы күрделі және қарама-қайшы үдеріс болып, прогрессивті әлеуметтік реформаларды мәжбүрлеуші саяси тәжірибелермен үйлестірді. Бұл жедел құрылымдық өзгерістерді, жаңа әкімшілік және мәдени институттардың құрылуын қамтамасыз етті және кеңестік қазақ бірегейлігінің қалыптасуына ықпал етті, сонымен қатар әлеуметтік және мәдени бөлушілікті тудырды. *Қорытынды.* Қазақстандағы кеңестік ұлт қалыптастыру нұсқасы идеологиялық жобалау мен прагматикалық бейімдеудің бірегей синтезі ретінде көрініс тауып, оның мұрасы қазіргі ұлттық даму, бірегейлік және мемлекеттілік мәселелері жөніндегі талқылауларға әсерін жалғастыруда.

Түйін сөздер: кеңестік жобасы, ұлт қалыптастыру, модернизация, Қазақстан, ұлттық саясат, 1920-1940 жылдар, әлеуметтік трансформациялар, бірегейлік, институционалдық реформалар

Дәйексөз үшін: Ахметова Ж.К., Абдразакова А.У. Империялық мұра мен социалистік модернизация контексінде Қазақстандағы кеңестік ұлт қалыптастыру жобасының нұсқасы (1920–1940 жж.) // Отан тарихы. 2026. Т. 29. № 1. 276–287-бб. [ағылш. тілінде]. DOI:10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_276-287

КАЗАХСТАНСКИЙ ВАРИАНТ СОВЕТСКОГО НАЦИЕСТРОИТЕЛЬСТВА В КОНТЕКСТЕ ИМПЕРСКОГО НАСЛЕДИЯ И СОЦИАЛИСТИЧЕСКОЙ МОДЕРНИЗАЦИИ (1920-1940 гг.)

Жанат Куандықовна Ахметова¹, Алмагуль Умурзақовна Абдразақова²

¹Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет
(д. 114, ул. Гоголя, 050040 Алматы, Республики Казахстан)
кандидат исторических наук, и.о.ассоциированного профессора (автор корреспондент)
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6671-1954>. E-mail: akhmetova.zhanat73@gmail.com

²Кызылординский университет имени КORKYT АТА
(ул. Айтеке би 29А, г.Кызылорда, Республика Казахстан)
магистр педагогических наук, старший преподаватель
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1793-7011>. E-mail: abdrazakova.alma.71@mail.ru

© ИИЭ имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2026

© Ахметова Ж.К., Абдразакова А.У., 2026

Аннотация. *Введение.* В статье исследуются особенности реализации советского проекта нациестроительства в Казахстане в период глубоких политических, социальных и культурных трансформаций 1920–1940 годов. Этот исторический этап был ознаменован распадом имперской системы, установлением советской власти и реализацией масштабной программы модернизации, которая коренным образом преобразовала институциональные структуры, социальные иерархии и культурные идентичности. *Актуальность исследования* определяется необходимостью комплексного переосмысления советской национальной политики как многомерного процесса, сочетающего идеологические установки, административное конструирование и социальные эксперименты. Анализ казахстанского опыта позволяет глубже понять, как универсальные схемы модернизации адаптировались к локальным историческим, культурным и демографическим условиям, формируя особый вариант социалистического нациестроительства. *Цель и задачи,* выявить механизмы, стратегии и последствия советского нациестроительства в Казахстане. Задачи включают анализ институциональных реформ, изучение изменений в этнокультурной политике, оценку социальных трансформаций и их долгосрочного влияния на формирование национальной идентичности. *Материалы и методы.* В работе использованы архивные документы, законодательные акты, статистические материалы и современная научная литература. Методологическая основа объединяет исторический институционализм, сравнительный анализ, дискурс-анализ и элементы теории модернизации. *Результаты.* Полученные результаты показывают, что проект советской модернизации в Казахстане представлял собой сложный и противоречивый процесс, сочетавший прогрессивные социальные реформы с принудительными политическими практиками. Он обеспечил быстрое структурное преобразование, создание новых административных и культурных институтов и формирование советской казахской идентичности, одновременно вызывая глубокие социальные и культурные разломы. *Заключение.* Казахстанский вариант советского нациестроительства выступал как уникальный синтез идеологического проектирования и прагматической адаптации, наследие которого продолжает влиять на современные дискуссии о национальном развитии, идентичности и государственности.

Ключевые слова: советский проект, нациестроительства, модернизация, Казахстан, национальная политика, 1920–1940 годы, социальные трансформации, идентичность, институциональные реформы.

Для цитирования: Ахметова Ж.К., Абдразакова А.У. Казахстанский вариант советского нациестроительства в контексте имперского наследия и социалистической модернизации (1920–1940 гг.) // Отан тарихы. 2026. Том 29. № 1. С. 276–287. [на англ. яз.]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_276-287

Introduction. The national question occupied a central place in the strategy of Bolshevik leadership within the context of designing a new socialist society. While Soviet leaders proclaimed internationalist principles, they simultaneously faced the necessity of practically adapting these ideas to the realities of the multiethnic space of the former Russian Empire. Between 1917 and 1923, national policy was conceived as a strategic instrument for legitimizing the new authority, a means of pacifying national minorities, and a mechanism for integrating the peripheries into the framework of Soviet statehood. The implementation of these objectives was accompanied by the formulation of a comprehensive “national compromise” program, which combined declarative equality of peoples with active management of ethno-cultural processes.

By the late 1920s, the national policy of the Soviet center had undergone a profound transformation, losing its initial ethno-cultural emphasis and becoming functionally subordinated to the broader strategy of industrialization, collectivization, and societal modernization. The priority of industrial and socio-cultural development determined the content of local national initiatives, forming a paradigm of ethnic neutrality and centralized governance. V.I. Lenin and I.V. Stalin proceeded from a Marxist economic determinism, considering that a communist society could only emerge on the basis of a highly developed industrial economy [Eskaliev, Aitenov, 2025: 1245-1259]. However, the realities of the Soviet periphery, including Kazakhstan, necessitated the construction of industrial infrastructure “from above” through a powerful autocratic state, which distinguished Soviet modernization from the Western European model, where industrial capitalism developed gradually, relying on religious ethics, discipline, and civil norms.

The relevance of this study is conditioned by the insufficient scholarly attention given to regional features in the implementation of the Soviet nation-building project. Despite a wide range of research on USSR national policy, the adaptation of all-Union directives to the local ethno-cultural, demographic, and historical conditions of Kazakhstan has been studied only fragmentarily. Particular interest lies in the interaction of traditional ethno-cultural institutions with instruments of coercive modernization, as well as the role of Soviet authority in shaping a specific Kazakh model of national identity. An analysis of the Kazakh experience allows for identifying distinctive frameworks that integrate ideological planning with pragmatic adaptation to regional conditions, which is significant for understanding the long-term impact of Soviet national policy on the contemporary ethno-cultural landscape..

The choice of the research topic is dictated by Kazakhstan’s strategic role as a region integrated into the Soviet modernization system and by the importance of understanding the local variant of nation-building for interpreting all-Union practices. Studying the specifics of the Kazakh nation-building project enables the identification of the particularities of regional adaptation of all-Union modernization programs, the interaction of ethnic and administrative factors, and the consequences for the formation of the institutional and cultural foundation of the region. The topic’s distinctiveness lies in its interdisciplinary nature, combining political, historical, and socio-cultural analysis, which ensures a comprehensive understanding of socialist modernization processes and ethno-political transformation.

The aim of the study is to systematically examine the processes, strategies, and outcomes associated with the implementation of the Soviet nation-building project in Kazakhstan between 1920 and 1940. To achieve this aim, the following research objectives were formulated: analysis of institutional reforms and legislative initiatives in the context of national policy; examination of transformations in ethno-cultural and educational policies; assessment of social, economic, and cultural changes; identification of the influence of local modernization practices on the formation of Kazakh national identity; comparison of regional practices with all-Union nation-building policies and identification of the specifics of the Kazakh model.

The novelty of this study lies in the systematic analysis of the implementation of the Soviet nation-building project at the regional level in Kazakhstan during 1920-1940, with particular attention to the adaptation of all-Union directives to local ethno-cultural, demographic, and historical conditions. For the first time, the interaction between traditional Kazakh institutions and instruments of coercive modernization is examined, highlighting their role in shaping a distinctive Kazakh model of national identity and revealing the specific features of regional nation-building and the long-term effects of Soviet national policy.

The research hypothesis posits that the Kazakh variant of Soviet nation-building represented a unique synthesis of centralized ideological planning, coercive modernization measures, and adaptation to local ethno-cultural conditions. It is assumed that this model not only ensured accelerated structural and social transformation of the region but also laid long-term foundations for the development of national identity, institutional structures, and the cultural code of Soviet Kazakhstan.

Materials and Methods. The study of the implementation processes of the Soviet nation-building project in Kazakhstan during the 1920s-1940s relies on a comprehensive analysis of diverse sources,

including archival documents, official statistical data, legislative acts, census materials, regional reports, and contemporary scholarly publications [Kumyspayev, Izbasarova, 2025: 417-418]. The empirical base of the study includes the 1926 census materials, which provide information on types of households, the structure of nomadic and sedentary populations, the radius of migration, and the distribution of households across the regions of Northern, Central, and Southern Kazakhstan. Analysis of these data allows for the identification of the dynamics of secondary nomadization, processes of sedentarization among nomadic and semi-nomadic communities, as well as changes in the socio-economic organization of Kazakh society associated with collectivization and agrarian reform.

Archival materials include protocols of meetings and decrees of Soviet authorities regulating agrarian policy, collectivization, and cultural and educational transformation of the Kazakh population. These documents record specific measures concerning the sedentarization of nomads, land distribution, eradication of illiteracy, and the establishment of new administrative and cultural institutions. Particular attention is given to directives from I.V. Stalin, which underscore the connection between the national question and the agrarian structure of society and highlight the limitations of addressing national issues in a predominantly agrarian population. The use of such sources enables the reconstruction of the decision-making logic at the central authority level and its comparison with local social and cultural practices [Marchukov, 2025].

The study of the Soviet nation-building project in Kazakhstan necessitates careful historiographic analysis, as the existing literature reflects a variety of approaches and emphases on political, economic, and cultural aspects. One key issue identified in the literature is the tension between centralized state policy and local social structures of nomadic and semi-nomadic communities. Analysis of sources reveals how the October Revolution created conditions for the implementation of radical social transformations, including the reorganization of peasant households and revision of land use systems, directly influencing the formation of Soviet Kazakh identity and national-state institutions [Dakhshleyger, 1967a: 24]. These studies emphasize that the modernization project in an agrarian society faced resistance from traditional communities and required adaptation of universal frameworks to local conditions.

Another aspect of historiographic discussion concerns demographic changes and migration processes accompanying agrarian reforms. Research indicates that collectivization, industrialization, and resettlement policies triggered secondary nomadization and social tension among the poorest layers of the Kazakh population, necessitating social engineering and state intervention in local relations. Data on household distribution by type of activity and level of sedentarization allow a quantitative assessment of the effects of reforms and their consequences for social structures [Asylbekov, 1995: 71-74]. These findings demonstrate that centralized planning of modernization could not succeed without considering local social and cultural specificity.

Special attention in the historiography is given to state policy toward Kazakh peasants and the sedentarization process of nomadic communities. Several studies analyze the measures of encouragement and coercion aimed at transition to sedentary life, eradication of illiteracy, and the formation of new cultural practices. These measures illustrate the attempt to reconcile ideological goals of socialist modernization with the pragmatic need to stabilize the region and create a homogeneous socialist society [Khalidullin, 2001: 19]. Sources emphasize that forced sedentarization and collectivization of nomadic households directly affected interethnic and inter-kin relations, intensifying social conflicts that the state attempted to regulate through administrative mechanisms.

The issue of cultural transformation and the formation of Soviet Kazakh identity is considered a distinct direction in historical discourse. Studies identify the tension between state strategies of industrialization and collectivization, aimed at creating a uniform cultural space, and the resilience of traditional forms of social self-organization, including kinship structures and systems of mutual aid in the aul. These works show that cultural adaptation to new economic and social orders occurred in parallel with the preservation of local norms, which provided a measure of stability and allowed the state to gradually implement new institutions [Kozybaev, 2000].

From the perspective of demographic and statistical analysis, scholars emphasize the necessity of comparing official census data with local observations and regional reports. This approach reveals discrepancies between central government declarations and the actual situation on the ground, including levels of sedentarization, household structures, and the character of migration processes. Analysis of 1926 data shows that a significant portion of the Kazakh population continued to engage in nomadic and semi-nomadic pastoralism, confirming the persistence of traditional economic forms and the need to account for these factors when evaluating the effectiveness of national policy [Dakhshleyger, 1967b].

The issue of interethnic and inter-kin conflicts is one of the key aspects of the historiography of the Soviet national project. Historical studies demonstrate that concessions in land policy and initial measures for the socialization of nomadic communities contributed to intensified competition among different ethnic and social groups. These findings highlight that the socialist nation-building project in Kazakhstan was not homogeneous, representing a complex interaction of centralized initiatives and local realities [Abylkhozhin, 1989].

Historiographic analysis also reveals the diversity of approaches to evaluating the role of the state and local institutions. Some scholars emphasize the necessity of coercive measures aimed at industrialization and collectivization, while others highlight local self-regulatory mechanisms, including kinship councils and social support for the poorest layers. A comprehensive approach integrates these perspectives, identifying both successes and limitations in implementing the Soviet nation-building project within an agrarian society with limited resources.

The methodological framework of the study combines historical-social analysis, an institutional approach, discourse and statistical methods, as well as elements of comparative and modernization methodology. Historical-social analysis enables the identification of dynamics in economic and social structures, understanding the interaction of traditional nomadic institutions with new state structures, and assessing the impact of reforms on social stability and cultural practices. The institutional approach is applied to study the functioning mechanisms of aul communities, kinship councils, inter-kin and interethnic relations, and ways to prevent social deprivation while maintaining cultural order.

Statistical analysis is used for a quantitative assessment of the extent of sedentarization and nomadization, household distribution by type of activity, migration radius, and regional differences. Comparing data from Northern, Central, and Southern Kazakhstan allows for the evaluation of the impact of centralized reforms on local communities, the identification of adaptation mechanisms to new conditions, and the consequences of secondary nomadization and the persistence of traditional economic forms. The discourse method interprets official documents and speeches of Soviet leaders, revealing the ideological basis of policy, its connection to class structure, and modernization priorities. Texts by I.V. Stalin and decrees of the Council of People's Commissars are analyzed, highlighting the role of the national question in the context of agrarian reform and collectivization.

The comparative method is applied to juxtapose the Kazakh experience with all-Union modernization and national policy practices, allowing the identification of the region's unique characteristics and the adaptation of universal programs to local historical, cultural, and demographic conditions. The modernization approach enables the assessment of social and cultural consequences of industrialization, collectivization, transition to sedentary life, and educational reform, as well as their influence on the formation of Soviet Kazakh identity and institutional structures of society.

The application of this methodological framework enables the identification of complex interrelations between national policy, agrarian reform, industrialization, and cultural transformation, allowing the Kazakh experience to be viewed as a unique synthesis of ideological planning and local adaptation, which retained a significant influence on the socio-cultural and economic structure of the region over the long term.

Discussion. The research problem addressed in this study involves examining the processes of Sovietization of the Kazakh aul during the 1920s and the mechanisms through which Soviet authorities exerted influence over traditional nomadic society, as well as analyzing resistance emerging from kin elders and affluent strata. The period under study is characterized by extensive socio-economic and political transformations driven by the Soviet leadership's pursuit of industrialization and collectivization, which necessitated the dismantling of traditional institutions and the restructuring of the economic base of nomadic society [Taimanov, 1956: 49]. This problem is significant in historical scholarship, as it provides insight into the dynamics of interaction between state reforms and local socio-cultural practices, while also allowing for an assessment of the effectiveness of socialist modernization methods in agrarian regions with entrenched traditional structures.

The Soviet authorities faced unique characteristics of the Kazakh aul, where economic and social power was concentrated in the hands of *baıs* and *aksakals*, and kinship solidarity ensured the stability of the traditional order. Until the mid-1920s, attempts at formal Sovietization, including the establishment of aul Soviets and *volispolkoms*, had little real impact on governance, as control was exercised through local "big men" [Utegenov, 1958: 16–19]. These facts support the conclusion that Soviet authorities did not fully account for the social structure of the aul or the dependency of the poorer layers on the traditional elite, which constrained the implementation of centralized reforms.

Analysis of the activities of *baıs* and *aksakals* reveals mechanisms for maintaining their power and the resilience of social structures. The “big men” leveraged economic influence, social authority, and the practice of soft pressure on poorer households to secure support for their representatives in elected bodies. The case of elections to the aul Soviets in 1925-1926 demonstrates that official measures to disenfranchise *baıs* proved ineffective, as key decisions remained dependent on their influence [Aliev, 1973: 75-79]. These observations confirm that the traditional institutions of nomadic society could not be dismantled solely through administrative measures. Effective Sovietization required a comprehensive approach incorporating economic, social, and cultural measures.

The economic structure of the aul, based on nomadic pastoralism, played a decisive role in maintaining the social hierarchy. Affluent households controlled the largest herds and possessed knowledge of pastures and water sources inaccessible to poorer households. These resources created dependency of the impoverished on *baıs*, reinforcing the stability of the traditional social system. Within the framework of Marxist doctrine, the destruction of this economic base was deemed necessary for socialist transformation. Soviet authorities concentrated on sedentarization of nomads, confiscation of property, and the dismantling of the economic power of “big men” to undermine their social and political influence [Suzhikov, 1968: 98-101].

Particular attention should be given to the responses of national communists and representatives of the Alash movement, who understood the significance of *baıs* for social stability in the aul. Attempts to idealize the poor and intervene in economic relations without considering the social status and experience of local residents risked destabilization. For example, at the Second Plenum of the Kazkrai Committee in December 1926, measures were discussed aimed at developing the households of the poorest layers, while noting that effective resource utilization required preservation of social control mechanisms [TsGA RK, F. P-1179, Op. 2, D. 17, Pp. 41]. These sources underscore the necessity of a comprehensive approach combining economic incentives with respect for social and cultural norms.

The 1928 Soviet campaign for confiscation of *baıs*' households and the displacement of the wealthiest members of the kin elite represents the culmination of efforts to undermine traditional authority in the aul. Over 600 households were confiscated, affecting approximately 145,000 heads of livestock. Simultaneously, the Chingizid stratum was deported, depriving potential opposition movements of traditional leaders [TsGA RK, F. P-1179, Op. 2, D. 21, Pp. 3-7]. These measures allowed the Soviet authorities to dismantle the economic foundation and political influence of *baıs*, creating conditions for the implementation of Soviet structures and preparation for collectivization and sedentarization of nomads.

Historical sources and archival materials, including documents from the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan (CSA RK) and protocols of party conferences, enable reconstruction of actual actions of the Soviet leadership and assessment of the degree of resistance from traditional elites [TsGA RK, F. P-1179, Op. 2, D. 23, Pp. 15-24].

Analysis leads to the conclusion that Sovietization of the Kazakh aul was a multifaceted and contradictory process encompassing economic, social, cultural, and political measures. Economic interventions, property confiscation, and sedentarization of nomads were accompanied by administrative reforms, legal regulation, and active involvement of the party apparatus. Resistance from *baıs*, *aksakals*, and kin elders demonstrates that traditional mechanisms of self-regulation and social control were strong and required comprehensive consideration in the implementation of centralized programs.

The distinctive feature of Sovietization was that it was not limited to administrative measures alone. The influence of cultural norms, kinship solidarity, and economic dependency of poorer households on affluent ones created unique conditions in which state policy had to balance coercion and incentives, dismantling old authority while establishing new structures. This approach gradually integrated the Kazakh aul into the system of socialist modernization while reducing the risk of anti-Soviet resistance.

Social practices, including collective responsibility, traditions of hospitality, and mutual aid, functioned simultaneously as mechanisms of resilience and as targets of Soviet intervention. Economic measures aimed at dismantling the economic power of “big men” were combined with livestock confiscation and resource redistribution, creating a new social and economic structure within the aul. At the same time, the dependency of poorer households on the senior elite remained a critical factor, necessitating further adaptation of Sovietization measures [Zimanov, 1998: 57-61].

Overall, the discussion demonstrates that the Sovietization of the Kazakh aul was a complex and contradictory process involving multi-level interactions among economic, political, and cultural factors. Systemic resistance from kin elders and *baıs*, the resilience of social norms, and the dependency of the poor

on affluent households created conditions under which the effectiveness of Soviet policy depended on a comprehensive approach incorporating economic, administrative, and cultural measures.

Results. The results of the conducted research allow for a comprehensive assessment of the consequences of F.I. Goloshchekin's policies and those of his successors in the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (KazASSR) within the context of collectivization, sedentarization of the nomadic population, indigenization of personnel, and industrialization. A central aspect of the analysis is Goloshchekin's stance, as he consistently denied personal responsibility for the outcomes of collectivization and sedentarization, despite the official charges brought against him by the investigation in the autumn of 1939, which claimed that his actions had exacerbated the political situation, prompted mass migrations of the Kazakh population to Western China, disrupted collective farms, and discredited the idea of collectivization. Goloshchekin rejected these accusations, asserting in his testimony that the crises in the region resulted from class-based resistance by baïs, clan leaders, bourgeois nationalists, and Right-Trotskyist elements who responded to measures of socialist transformation in Kazakhstan with sharp oppositional activities, including predatory slaughter of livestock, migrations, and plundering [Smagulov, 2011: 54-57]. This approach illustrates the ideological justification of repressive and stringent administrative policies through the lens of party interpretation, characteristic of regional leadership in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

Documentary analysis indicates that Goloshchekin's actions significantly intensified social tensions in the republic. Mass migrations, accompanied by the destruction of household structures, reflected the contradictions between the party's agrarian policy and the traditional nomadic system of the Kazakh population. Concurrently, Goloshchekin's attempts to shift responsibility onto national communists and baïs highlight both a personal strategy for reputation preservation and an ideological framing of social conflict as class struggle. These circumstances suggest that social dynamics in the region were largely shaped at the intersection of economic transformation and resistance from traditional structures [Sbornik, 1927].

Particular attention is given to personnel policies and the implementation of national indigenization, which became key mechanisms for stabilizing the republic following Goloshchekin's recall. The appointment of L. Mirzoyan as head of the regional party organization in 1933 was accompanied by a reassessment of previous policies and a renewed emphasis on aspects of Kazakh national identity. Mirzoyan linked manifestations of Kazakh nationalism to reactions against Great-Russian chauvinism, indicating the necessity of considering the ethno-cultural factor in the implementation of Soviet policy. The introduction of the Kazakh language into official administration, decreed by the Bureau of the Kazkrai Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on April 16, 1933, mandated the translation of all documents in the KazASSR Central Executive Committee (KazCIK), People's Commissariat of Education (Narkompros), People's Commissariat of Health (Narkomzdrav), People's Commissariat of Land (Narkomzem), Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate, and the Council of People's Commissars apparatus into Kazakh, as well as the conduction of correspondence in both Kazakh and Russian. Subsequent recommendations to transition the education system to Kazakh established conditions for forming a national cadre reserve capable of integration into party and administrative structures [Sapargaliev, 1947: 18-24].

Statistical data confirm the effectiveness of the indigenization policy: by early 1936, Kazakh personnel accounted for 57.7% of the KazCIK, 39% of the Council of People's Commissars, 61.3% of Narkompros, 47.3% of Narkomjust, while in the apparatus of Soviets, the proportion of Kazakhs in oblast executive committees reached 52%, and in district executive committees – 87%. In the leadership of republican commissariats, Kazakhs constituted 64%, in district executive committees – 69%, and within the party organization of the republic as of January 1, 1937 – 46.8%. Concurrently, the number of Kazakh workers in industry and trade unions increased: non-ferrous metallurgy – 56.9%, oil – 50%, coal – 60.6%, railway transport – 50.5%, which partially mitigated the shortage of skilled labor and strengthened the socialist infrastructure along national lines [Ryskulov, 1925: 52–57].

Analysis of industrialization indicates that Kazakh workers were primarily engaged in physically demanding tasks, while the preparation of personnel from among former nomads allowed for the formation of labor contingents for large infrastructure projects, including the construction of the Turkestan–Siberia Railway (Turksib). By 1932, more than half of the workforce on the Turksib project were Kazakhs, demonstrating the effectiveness of measures to integrate the national contingent into the industrial sector. However, the study also identifies negative consequences of industrialization for interethnic relations. In Karaganda, at Mine No. 3, between August and October 1933, the number of Kazakh miners fell from 500 to 80 due to dismissals and ethnic segregation. At the construction site of the Chimkent lead plant in 1932, 485 Kazakh workers left due to workplace discrimination. Interethnic conflicts and administrative arbitrariness,

including beatings and restrictions on cohabitation in dormitories, created social tension and impeded the effective implementation of industrial projects [Nusupbekov, 1953: 32-35].

The findings demonstrate that social and ethnic tensions in the industrial sector required a comprehensive approach to regulating interethnic relations, developing mechanisms to protect the rights of Kazakh workers, and creating an integrative labor policy. An important adaptation mechanism for the industrial environment was the organization of short-term vocational training courses for former nomads. In the Aktobe region in July 1933, plans were made to train 1,500 individuals in masonry, plastering, painting, and carpentry, which facilitated the effective formation of skilled labor for major construction projects and ensured their participation in the republic's industrialization [Nurtazina, 2008: 24].

A comprehensive assessment of the KazASSR leadership's activities during the 1920s–1930s indicates that Sovietization involved several interconnected directions: collectivization and sedentarization of the nomadic population, national indigenization of personnel, industrialization, introduction of the Kazakh language into official administration and education, and integration of Kazakhs into party and administrative structures. The policies of F.I. Goloshchekin and his successors combined economic pressure, administrative regulation, and cultural-educational measures, which gradually reduced resistance from traditional structures and facilitated the formation of new socialist institutions in Kazakh territories [Naumova, 1992: 41].

Nevertheless, the study identifies significant contradictions between ideological rhetoric and the actual social situation. Mass migrations, resistance from baïs and aksakals, ethnic segregation and discrimination against Kazakh workers in industry, as well as conflicts over resource access, underscore the complexity and contradictions of the Sovietization process. These conditions necessitated continual adjustment of party policy and consideration of local socio-cultural features, highlighting the limitations of unilateral administrative solutions in the context of a nomadic economy and multiethnic social structure.

The results allow for several key conclusions. First, accelerated collectivization and sedentarization of the nomadic population had substantial social and economic consequences, including mass migrations, household destruction, and heightened social tension. Second, Goloshchekin's attempts to shift responsibility for negative outcomes onto nationalists and baïs reflect an ideological framing of events and a lack of systematic analysis of social realities. Third, the policy of national indigenization and the introduction of the Kazakh language into official administration contributed to stabilizing the administrative system and increasing the representation of Kazakhs within the party and workforce. Fourth, industrialization, training of labor from former nomads, and integration of Kazakhs into the economic sector facilitated the creation of a cadre reserve, though interethnic conflicts and discrimination limited the effectiveness of social and economic programs. Fifth, successful Sovietization depended on a comprehensive approach that accounted for economic, social, and cultural factors, including kinship structures, national characteristics, and traditional social norms.

Conclusion. The conclusion of this study allows for a series of scientifically grounded insights into the complex dynamics of political, socio-economic, and cultural-ethnic processes in the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic during the 1920s and 1930s. Based on the analysis of the activities of F.I. Goloshchekin, his successors, and the regional party leadership, the research reveals the multidimensional nature of transformations associated with collectivization, sedentarization of the nomadic population, personnel indigenization, and industrialization. A central element of the study is the identification of contradictions between the official ideological line, the political ambitions of the regional leadership, and the real social conditions in which these transformations were implemented.

One of the key aspects concerns the role of F.I. Goloshchekin in the formulation and execution of collectivization policies. His refusal to acknowledge personal responsibility for the consequences of these measures illustrates the character of party interpretations of crises as manifestations of class struggle. From Goloshchekin's perspective, social upheavals, migrations, and household disorganization were the result of resistance by baïs, nationalists, and Right-Trotskyist elements, rather than flawed administrative decisions. This approach reflects both a personal effort to preserve political reputation and the ideological justification for strict policies in conditions where the economic transformation of a traditional nomadic economy encountered population resistance. Simultaneously, it underscores the limitations of unilateral administrative measures in a region characterized by social and cultural diversity.

Another significant conclusion relates to the role of personnel policy and indigenization in stabilizing republican governance. Following Goloshchekin's recall, L. Mirzoyan was appointed head of the regional party organization, criticizing the previous policy line and restoring principles of respect for Kazakh national identity. The introduction of national indigenization allowed for an increase in the proportion of Kazakh

personnel within senior management bodies and local executive structures, thereby facilitating more effective implementation of political, economic, and cultural measures. The introduction of the Kazakh language into official administration, along with the transition of the education system to Kazakh, became important tools for developing a national cadre reserve and strengthening the social legitimacy of Soviet authority among the indigenous population. Statistical data from the late 1930s demonstrate a sustained increase in the Kazakh contingent within party and administrative structures, creating the prerequisites for a more integrated and resilient state system within the republic.

Particular attention is given to industrialization and the socio-economic integration of the Kazakh population. Programs aimed at training labor from among former nomads for large infrastructure projects, such as the construction of the Turkestan-Siberia Railway and industrial enterprises, facilitated the development of skilled workforces and ensured the participation of indigenous populations in the industrial sector. However, socio-ethnic tensions manifested in discrimination against Kazakh workers, segregation in dormitories, and workplace conflicts, highlighting significant challenges to integration and the need for systematic regulation of interethnic relations. These circumstances emphasize that economic modernization, industrialization, and socialist transformation could not succeed without consideration of local ethno-cultural realities, the social consciousness of the population, and the historically established structures of economic and social organization.

The study also reveals the complex interplay between national policy and economic transformation. On the one hand, industrialization measures and the expansion of productive capacities contributed to establishing a stable economic base for the republic and increasing the participation of the Kazakh population in the workforce. On the other hand, such changes intensified social tensions and ethnic competition for employment, necessitating administrative flexibility and mechanisms for protecting the rights of national workers. The cases of Karaganda and the Chimkent lead plant demonstrate that industrial expansion without regard for social specificity could result in workforce demoralization, escalating interethnic confrontation, and reduced project efficiency.

It should be noted that national indigenization and linguistic integration functioned not only as instruments of cultural adaptation but also as mechanisms for strengthening the legitimacy of Soviet authority among the indigenous population. The introduction of the Kazakh language into administration, education, and vocational training created conditions for building a national cadre potential and ensuring Kazakh participation in republican governance. This process, in turn, reduced local resistance to socialist transformations, reinforced social stability, and established institutional prerequisites for further economic and cultural integration.

A comprehensive analysis demonstrates that the processes of collectivization, industrialization, and indigenization implemented in the Kazakh ASSR were closely interrelated and mutually dependent. Mass migrations and resistance from traditional structures could only be mitigated through a combination of administrative measures, cultural policies, and economic incentives. At the same time, the ideological rhetoric of regional leadership and attempts to shift responsibility for social consequences onto external factors illustrate the complexity of interpreting historical events and the necessity of a critical approach to sources.

Sources

TsGA RK – Tsentral'nyy gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Respubliki Kazakhstan [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]

Literature

Абылхожин, 1989 – *Абылхожин Ж.Б., Козыбаев М.К., Татимов М.Б.* Казахстанская трагедия // Вопросы истории. 1989. №7. С. 53–66.

Алиев, 1973 – *Алиев А.К.* Формирование и развитие традиций советского народа – новой исторической общности людей // Актуальные проблемы развития национальных отношений в СССР. Махачкала, 1973. 266 с.

Асылбеков, 1995 – *Асылбеков М.Х., Козина В.В.* Демографические процессы современного Казахстана. Алматы: Атамура, 1995. 128 с.

Базарова, 2008 – *Базарова В.В.* Коренизация государственного аппарата в Бурят-Монголии как опыт национальной политики в 1920–1930-х гг. // Власть. 2008. № 3. С. 53–55.

Дахшлейгер, 1967а – *Дахшлейгер Г.Ф.* Октябрь и угнетенные народы царской России. М.: Знание, 1967. 48 с.

Дахшлейгер, 19676 – *Дахшлейгер Г.Ф.* Проблемы национально-государственного строительства Советского Казахстана в современной исторической литературе // Известия АН КазССР, сер. общ. 1967. № 4. С. 5–15.

Ескалиев, Айтенов, 2025 – *Ескалиев С.А., Айтенов Ж.К.* Коммунистік партия мен кеңестік мемлекеттілік: тоталитарлық жүйенің институционалдық эволюциясы (тарихи аспект) // Отан тарихы. 2025. Т. 28. № 4. 1245–1259-бб. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_4_1245-1259

Зиманов, 1998 – *Зиманов С.З.* Теория и практика автономизма в СССР. Алматы: Жеті жарғы, 1998. 144 с.

Козыбаев, 2000 – *Козыбаев М.К.* Казахстан на рубеже веков: размышления и поиски. Социализм: несбывшиеся надежды. Кн.2-я. Алматы, 2000. 388 с.

Кумыспаев, Избасарова, 2025 – *Кумыспаев С.С., Избасарова Г.Б.* Проблемы постколониализма и деколонизации в мировой и отечественной истории // Отан тарихы. 2025. Т. 28. № 2. С. 415–428. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_2_415-428

Марчуков, 2025 – *Марчуков А.* Национальный вопрос и Сталин в 1917–1922 годах. 2025. 19 апреля. URL: <https://iarex.ru/articles/147292.html>

Нусупбеков, 1953 – *Нусупбеков А.Н.* Объединение казахских земель в Казахской Советской Социалистической Республике. Алма-Ата: Изд-во Академии наук Казахской ССР, 1953. 94 с.

Наумова, 1992 – *Наумова О.Б.* Некоторые аспекты формирования современной бытовой культуры казахов в многонациональных районах Казахстана // Современное развитие этнических групп Средней Азии и Казахстана. М.: ИЭА РАН, 1992. Ч. I. С. 5–50.

Нуртазина, 2008 – *Нуртазина Н.Д.* Народы Туркестана: проблемы ислама, интеграции, модернизации и деколонизации (на рубеже XIX–XX веков). Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 2008. 166 с.+12 с.

Рыскулов, 1925 – *Рыскулов Т.* Революция и коренное население Туркестана. Сбор. главнейших статей, докладов, речей и тезисов с предисловием автора. 1917–1918 гг. Ташкент: Госиздат, 1925. Ч. 1. 218 с.

Сапаргалиев, 1947 – *Сапаргалиев М.С.* Сталинская Конституция и преобразование Казахской автономной ССР в союзную республику // Вестник АН КазССР. 1947. № 12(33). С. 18–24.

Сборник, 1927 – *Сборник важнейших решений Казкрайкома ВКП(б), принятых за период VVI Всеказахских конференций.* Кзыл-Орда: Казгосиздат, 1927.

Смагулов, 2011 – *Смагулов Н.К.* Кадровая политика большевиков в партийных и государственных органах Казахстана в 1917–1936 гг. Караганда: КарГТУ, 2011. 185 с.

Сужиков, 1968 – *Сужиков М.* Социально-экономические проблемы национальной консолидации. Из опыта перехода казахского народа к социализму, минуя капитализм. Под ред. и с предисл. проф. М.С. Джунусова. Алматы: Наука, 1968. 380 с.

Тайманов, 1956 – *Тайманов Г.Т.* Развитие советской государственности в Казахстане. Краткий историко-юридический очерк. М.: Госиздат. юридической литературы, 1956. 130 с.

Утегенов, 1958 – *Утегенов Л.О.* О классовой борьбе, как закономерности социалистического строительства на примере казахского аула // Вестник АН КазССР. 1958. № 4.

Халидуллин, 2001 – *Халидуллин Г.Х.* Политика советского государства в отношении казахского шаруа (1917–1940 гг.). Алматы: НИЦ Ғылым, 2001.

References

Abylkhozhin, 1989 – *Abylkhozhin Zh.B., Kozybaev M.K., Tatimov M.B.* *Kazakhstanskaya tragediya* [The Tragedy of Kazakhstan]. *Voprosy istorii*. 1989. No 7. Pp. 53–66. [in Russian]

Aliev, 1973 – *Aliev A.K.* Formirovanie i razvitie traditsii sovetskogo naroda – novoy istoricheskoy obshchnosti lyudey [Formation and Development of Traditions of the Soviet People as a New Historical Community]. *Aktualnye problemy razvitiya natsionalnykh otnosheniy v SSSR*. Makhachkala, 1973. 266 p. [in Russian]

Asylbekov, 1995 – *Asylbekov M.Kh., Kozina V.V.* *Demograficheskie protsessy sovremennogo Kazakhstana* [Demographic Processes of Contemporary Kazakhstan]. Алматы: Atamura, 1995. 128 p. [in Russian]

Bazarova, 2008 – *Bazarova V.V.* Korenizatsiya gosudarstvennogo apparata v Buryat-Mongolii kak opyt natsionalnoy politiki v 1920–1930-kh gg. [The Korenizatsiia of the State Apparatus in Buryat-Mongolia as an Experience of National Policy in the 1920s–1930s]. *Vlast*. 2008. No 3. Pp. 53–55. [in Russian]

Dakhshleyger, 1967a – *Dakhshleyger G.F.* *Oktyabr i ugnetennye narody tsarskoy Rossii* [October and the Oppressed Peoples of Tsarist Russia]. М.: Znanie, 1967. 48 p. [in Russian]

Dakhshleyger, 1967b – *Dakhshleyger G.F.* Problemy natsionalno-gosudarstvennogo stroitelstva Sovetskogo Kazakhstana v sovremennoy istoricheskoy literature [Problems of National-State Construction of Soviet Kazakhstan in Contemporary Historical Literature]. *Izvestiya AN KazSSR, ser. obshch.* 1967. No 4. Pp. 5–15. [in Russian]

Eskaliev, Aitenov, 2025 – *Eskaliev S.A., Aitenov Zh.K.* The Communist Party and Soviet Statehood: The Institutional Evolution of the Totalitarian System (Historical Aspect) // *Otan tarihy*. 2025. Vol.28. No 4. Pp. 1245–1259. [in Kazakh]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_4_1245-1259

Khalidullin, 2001 – *Khalidullin G.Kh.* *Politika sovetskogo gosudarstva v otnoshenii kazakhskogo sharu'a (1917–1940 gg.)* [Soviet State Policy towards the Kazakh Peasantry, 1917–1940]. Алматы: NITs Gylym, 2001. [in Russian]

Kozybaev, 2000 – *Kozybaev M.K. Kazakhstan na rubezhe vekov: razmyshleniya i poiski. Sotsializm: nesbyvshiesya nadezhdy. Kn. 2-ya* [Kazakhstan at the Turn of the Centuries: Reflections and Searches. Socialism: Unrealized Hopes. Vol. 2]. Almaty, 2000. 388 p. [in Russian]

Kumyspayev, Izbasarova, 2025 – *Kumyspayev S.S., Izbasarova G.B. Problems of postcolonialism and decolonization in the world and national history // Otan tarihy. 2024. Vol. 28. No 2. Pp. 415–428. [In Russ.]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_2_415-428*

Marchukov, 2025 – *Marchukov A. Natsional'nyi vopros i Stalin v 1917-1922 godakh* [The National Question and Stalin in 1917–1922]. 19 aprelya 2025. URL: <https://iarex.ru/articles/147292.html>.

Naumova, 1992 – *Naumova O.B. Nekotorye aspekty formirovaniya sovremennoy bytovoy kultury kazakhov v mnogonatsional'nykh rayonakh Kazakhstana* [Some Aspects of the Formation of Contemporary Everyday Culture of Kazakhs in Multiethnic Regions of Kazakhstan]. *Sovremennoe razvitie etnicheskikh grupp Sredney Azii i Kazakhstana*. M.: IEA RAN, 1992. Ch. I. Pp. 5–50. [in Russian]

Nusupbekov, 1953 – *Nusupbekov A.N. Ob'yedinenie kazakhskikh zemel' v Kazakhskoy Sovetskoj Sotsialisticheskoy Respublike* [Unification of Kazakh Lands in the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic]. Alma-Ata: Izd-vo Akademii nauk Kazakhskoy SSR, 1953. 94 p. [in Russian]

Nurtazina, 2008 – *Nurtazina N.D. Narody Turkestana: problemy islama, integratsii, modernizatsii i dekolonizatsii (na rubezhe XIX–XX vekov)* [Peoples of Turkestan: Problems of Islam, Integration, Modernization, and Decolonization at the Turn of the 19th–20th Centuries]. Almaty: Qazaq Universiteti, 2008. 166 p. +12 p. [in Russian]

Ryskulov, 1925 – *Ryskulov T. Revolyutsiya i korennoye naselenie Turkestana. Sbor. glavneyshikh statej, dokladov, rechet i tezisev s predisloviyem avtora. 1917–1918 gg.* [Revolution and the Indigenous Population of Turkestan: Collection of Key Articles, Reports, Speeches, and Theses with Author's Foreword]. Tashkent: Gosizdat, 1925. Ch. 1. 218 p. [in Russian]

Sapargaliev, 1947 – *Sapargaliev M.S. Stalinskaya Konstitutsiya i preobrazovanie Kazakhskoy avtonomnoy SSR v soyuznuyu respubliku* [The Stalin Constitution and the Transformation of the Kazakh Autonomous SSR into a Union Republic]. *Vestnik AN KazSSR*. 1947. No 12(33). Pp. 18–24. [in Russian]

Sbornik, 1927 – *Sbornik vazhneishikh resheniy Kazkraikoma VKP(b), prinyatykh za period VVI Vsekazakhskikh konferentsiy* [Collection of the Most Important Decisions of the Kazakh Regional Committee of the VKP(b), Adopted During the VI All-Kazakh Conferences]. Kzyl-Orda: Kazgosizdat, 1927. [in Russian]

Smagulov, 2011 – *Smagulov N.K. Kadrovaya politika bol'shevikov v partijnykh i gosudarstvennykh organakh Kazakhstana v 1917–1936 gg.* [Personnel Policy of the Bolsheviks in the Party and State Bodies of Kazakhstan in 1917–1936]. Karaganda: KarGTU, 2011. 185 p. [in Russian]

Suzhikov, 1968 – *Suzhikov M. Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie problemy natsional'noy konsolidatsii. Iz opyta perekhoda kazakhskogo naroda k sotsializmu, minuya kapitalizm* [Socio-Economic Problems of National Consolidation: From Kazakh People's Transition to Socialism, Skipping Capitalism]. Ed. by M.S. Dzhunusov. Almaty: Nauka, 1968. 380 p. [in Russian]

Taimanov, 1956 – *Taimanov G.T. Razvitie sovetskoj gosudarstvennosti v Kazakhstane. Kratkiy istoriko-yuridicheskiy ocherk* [Development of Soviet Statehood in Kazakhstan: A Short Historical and Legal Essay]. M.: Gosizdat. yuridicheskoy literatury, 1956. 130 p. [in Russian]

Utegenov, 1958 – *Utegenov L.O. O klassovoy bor'be, kak zakonomernosti sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva na primere kazakhskogo aula* [On Class Struggle as a Law of Socialist Construction Using the Example of a Kazakh Village]. *Vestnik AN KazSSR*. 1958. No 4. [in Russian]

Zimanov, 1998 – *Zimanov S.Z. Teoriya i praktika avtonomizma v SSSR* [Theory and Practice of Autonomism in the USSR]. Almaty: Zheti Zhargy, 1998. 144 p. [in Russian]

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

<i>Касымова Д.Б., Капаева А.Т., Кудайбергеноулы Б.</i> О «ФЕОДАЛЬНО-БАЙСКИХ ПЕРЕЖИТКАХ» В КАЗАХСКОЙ ССР: ДИСКУРС, ПРАВО И ПРАКТИКИ.....	5
<i>Козина В.В., Уалтаева А.С., Баймагамбетова А.А.</i> СОЦИАЛЬНО-ДЕМОГРАФИЧЕСКОЕ РАЗВИТИЕ МОНОГОРОДОВ КАРАГАНДИНСКОЙ ОБЛАСТИ.....	22
<i>Мамраймов С.</i> КЕҢЕСТІК АГРАРЛЫҚ САЯСАТ АЯСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ҰЖЫМДАСТЫРУ МЕН БАЙ-ШАРУАШЫЛЫҚТАРДЫ ТӨРКІЛЕУ (1928–1933 жж.).....	40
<i>Turgunbayev I.Ye., Moryakova M.T., Zhanatayeva K.B.</i> VILLAGE INSTITUTES IN TÜRKIYE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF CULTURAL POLICY.....	54
<i>Sissenbayeva A.A., Kalybekova M.Ch.</i> 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
<i>Жолдасұлы Т., Досым А.Б.</i> ҚЫЗЫЛОРДАДАҒЫ ИСЛАМНАН ӨЗГЕ ДІНИ ҰЙЫМДАР: СОВЕТТІК КЕЗЕҢ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ (1960–1980 ЖЖ.).....	77
<i>Zhumatay G., Yskak A.</i> 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
<i>Zholseitova M.A.</i> SOCIO-POLITICAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE TURKIC-MUSLIM SOCIETY IN THE INTELLECTUAL HERITAGE OF THE ALASH MOVEMENT.....	107
<i>Сабитов Ж.М., Каратаев А.А.</i> О ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИИ И ИСТОРИИ ПЛЕМЕНИ АРГЫН.....	118
<i>Бимақанова З.Ш., Мұқанова Г.Қ., Нұрғалиева Ф.М.</i> ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ «КІШІ ҚАЗАН» ЗЕРТТЕУЛЕРІНДЕ ПӘНАРАЛЫҚ ТӘСІЛДІ ҚОЛДАНУДЫҢ ӘДІСНАМАЛЫҚ НЕГІЗДЕРІ МЕН ПРИНЦИПТЕРІ.....	132
<i>Ахметова Г.М.</i> 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. ШӨЛЕКЕНОВТИҢ ЕҢБЕКТЕРІНДЕГІ ҚАЗАҚТАР МЕН ҚАРАҚАЛПАҚТАРДЫҢ ШАРУАШЫЛЫҚ ЖҮЙЕСІ.....	174
Байжанова А.Ә., Шашаев Ә.К., 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 БӨЛІНІСІ, 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
