

ISSN 1814 - 6961

# **ОТАН ТАРИХЫ**

## **ҒЫЛЫМИ ЖУРНАЛ**

**Үш айда бір рет шығатын ғылыми журнал**  
**2019, № 3 (87)**

**3 /2019**

Журнал Қазақстан Республикасы Білім және ғылым министрлігі Білім және ғылым саласындағы бақылау комитетінің (ҚР БҒМ БҒБК) ғылыми қызметтің нәтижелерін жариялау үшін ұсынылатын баслымдар тізіміне кіреді.

**Бас редакторы:**  
Зиябек Қабылдинов

**Редакциялық алқа:**

Абдрахманов Толобек Абылович, т.ғ.д., профессор, И. Арабаев атындағы Қырғыз мемлекеттік университетінің ректоры (Қырғызстан)

Акинер Ширин, т.ғ.д., Лондон университетінің профессоры (Ұлыбритания)

Асылбекова Жамиля Мәлікқызы т.ғ.д., профессор, Халықаралық бизнес университеті (Қазақстан)

Әбусейітова Меруерт Хуатовна, т.ғ.д., профессор, Қазақстан Республикасы Білім және ғылым министрлігі Ғылым комитеті Р. Сулейменов атындағы Шығыстану институты «Тарихи материалдарды зерттеу орталығының» директоры, ҰҒА корр.-мүшесі (Қазақстан)

Әлімбаев Нұрсан, т.ғ.к., профессор, ҚР Мемлекеттік музейінің директоры (Қазақстан)

Әжіғали Серік Ескендірұлы, т.ғ.д., профессор, Қазақстан Республикасы Білім және ғылым министрлігі Ғылым комитеті Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты (Қазақстан)

Буканова Роза Гафаровна, т.ғ.д., профессор, Уфа қаласындағы Башқұр мемлекеттік университеті (Ресей)

Голден Питер, Принстон университетінің профессоры (АҚШ)

Жұмағұлов Қалқаман Тұрсынұлы, т.ғ.д., профессор, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің «Дүние жүзі тарихын зерттеу» орталығының директоры, Германиядағы Геттинген университетінің құрметті профессоры (Қазақстан)

Исмағұлов Оразақ, т.ғ.д., профессор, ҰҒА академигі (Қазақстан)

Көмеков Болат Ешмұхамедұлы, т.ғ.д., профессор, ҰҒА академигі (Қазақстан)

Ламин Владимир Александрович, т.ғ.д., профессор, РҒА корр.-мүшесі, РҒА Сібір бөлімінің Тарих институты (Ресей)

Мансура-Хайдар, профессор (Үндістан)

Масов Рахим Масович, т.ғ.д., профессор, А. Дониш атындағы Тарих, археология және этнография институты (Тәжікстан)

Мұқтар Әбілсейт Қапизұлы, т.ғ.д., профессор, Атырау қаласындағы «Сарайшық» мемлекеттік тарихи-мәдени музей-қорығының директоры (Қазақстан)

Навроцкий Карл, PhD докторы, Гданьск қаласындағы екінші дүниежүзілік соғыс музейінің директоры (Польша)

Осман Мерт, Ататүрк университетінің профессоры (Түркия Республикасы)

Сидхарт С. Саксена, Кембридж университетінің профессоры (Ұлыбритания)

Сон Ен Хун, Хангук шет тілдер университетінің профессоры (Оңтүстік Корея)

Сыдықов Ерлан Бәттишұлы, т.ғ.д., профессор, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ректоры (Қазақстан)

Якуб Алексей Валерьевич, т.ғ.д., профессор, Ф.М. Достоевский атындағы Омск мемлекеттік университет (Россия)

**Редакционная коллегия журнала**

Абдрахманов Толобек Абылович, д.и.н., профессор, ректор Кыргызского государственного университета имени И. Арабаева (Кыргызстан)

Абусейитова Меруерт Хуатовна, д.и.н., профессор, член корр. НАН РК, директор

центра «Исследование исторических материалов» института Востоковедения имени Р. Сулейменова Комитет науки Министерства образования и науки Республики Казахстан (Казахстан)

Акинер Ширин, д.и.н., профессор Лондонского университета (Великобритания)  
Алимбай Нурсан, к.и.н., профессор, директор Государственного музея Республики Казахстан (Казахстан)

Ажигали Серик Ескендерович, д.и.н., профессор, Институт истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова Комитета науки Министерства образования и науки Республики Казахстан (Казахстан)

Асылбекова Жамиля Маликовна, д.и.н., профессор, Университет международного бизнеса (Казахстан)

Буканова Роза Гафаровна, д.и.н., профессор Башкирского государственного университета г. Уфа (Россия)

Голден Питер, профессор Принстонского университета (США)

Жумагулов Калкаман Турсынович, д.и.н., профессор, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, директор «Центра по изучению Всемирной истории», Почетный профессор Геттингенского университета в Германии (Казахстан)

Исмагулов Оразак, д.и.н., профессор, академик НАН РК (Казахстан)

Кумеков Болат Ешмухамедович, д.и.н., профессор, академик НАН РК (Казахстан)

Ламин Владимир Александрович, д.и.н., профессор, член корр. РАН, директор Института истории Сибирского отделения Российской академии наук (Россия)

Мансура-Хайдар, профессор (Индия)

Масов Рахим Масович, д.и.н., профессор института истории, археологии и этнографии имени А. Дониша (Таджикистан)

Муктар Абилсейит Капизулы, д.и.н., профессор, директор государственного историко-культурного музея-заповедника «Сарайшық» в городе Атырау (Казахстан)

Навроцкий Карл, доктор PhD, директор музея Второй мировой войны в г. Гданьск (Польша)

Осман Мерт, профессор Атаюркского университета (Турция)

Сидхарт С. Саксена, профессор Кембриджского университета (Великобритания)

Сон Ен Хун, профессор университета иностранных языков Хангук (Южная Корея)

Сыдыков Ерлан Батташевич, д.и.н., профессор, ректор Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева. (Казахстан)

Якуб Алексей Валерьевич, д.и.н., профессор, ректор Омского государственного университета имени Ф.М. Достоевского (Россия)

### **Editorial Board of the Journal**

*Abdrahmanov Tolobek Abylovich, Doctor of Historical Sciences, professor, Rector at the I. Arabayev State university (Kyrgyzstan)*

*Abuseitova Meruert Huatovna, Doctor of History, professor, Corresponding Member NAS RK, director of the Center for the Study of Historical Materials at the Institute of Oriental Studies named after R. Suleimenov of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan Science Committee (Kyrgyzstan)*

*Akiner Shirin, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor of London University (Great Britain)*

*Alimbai Nursan, Doctor of History, professor, Director of the State Museum Republic of Kazakhstan (Kazakhstan)*

*Asylbekova Zhamilya Malikovna, Doctor of Historical Sciences, professor at*

*University of International Business, Almaty (Kazakhstan)*

*Azhigali Serik Eskendirovich, Doctor of History, professor, C.C. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. Science Committee Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Kazakhstan)*

*Bukanova Roza Gafarovna, Doctor of Historical Sciences, professor at Bashkir state university. Ufa (Russia)*

*Golden Peter, a professor at Princeton University (USA)*

*Zhumagulov Kalkaman Tursynuly, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Academician, professor of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Director of the Research Center on World History Studies, Emeritus Professor of German Göttingen University (Kazakhstan)*

*Ismagulov Orazak, Doctor of Historical Sciences, professor. Academician of National Academy of Sciences (Kazakhstan)*

*Kumekov Bolat Yeshmukhameduly, Doctor of Historical Sciences, professor, Academician of National Academy of Sciences (Kazakhstan)*

*Lamin Vladimir Alexandrovich, Doctor of History, professor, Corresponding Member. RAS, director of the Institute of History of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Россия)*

*Mansura-Haydar, professor (India)*

*Masov Rakhim Masovich, Масов Рахим Масович, Doctor of Historical Sciences, professor A Donish Institute of History, archeology and Ethnography (Tajikistan)*

*Mukhtar Abilseit Kapizuly, Doctor of Historical Sciences, professor, Director of the State Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve "Sarayshyk" in Atyrau (Kazakhstan)*

*Navrocki Karl PhD, Second world war museum director in Gdansk (Poland)*

*Osman Mert, professor of the Atatürk University (Turkey)*

*Sidhart S. Saxena, professor at Cambridge University (Great Britain)*

*Son Yong Hong, a professor of the Hanguk University of Foreign Languages (South Korea)*

*Sydykov Erlan Battashevich, Doctor of Historical Sciences, professor, Rector of the L.N. Gumilev Eurasian National University (Kazakhstan)*

*Jakub Aleksei Valerievich, Doctor of Historical Sciences, professor, Rector of the Omsk state university named after Dostoevski F.M. (Russia)*

**Жауапты редактор:**

Айжамал Құдайбергенова

**Редактор:**

Бота Жүнісова

**Компьютерде өңдеуші және дизайнер:**

Венера Зикирбаева

**Редакцияның мекен-жайы:**

050100, Қазақстан Республикасы,

Алматы қ., Шевченко көшесі, 28,

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты,

Отан тарихы журналының редакциясы

Телефон: +7 (727) 272-46-54

E-mail: [Otanhistory@gmail.com](mailto:Otanhistory@gmail.com)

Электрондық мекен-жай: <http://infohistory.info>

*Журнал 1998 жылдан бастап шығады*

*Қазақстан Республикасының Ақпарат және қоғамдық келісім министрлігінде*

*1998 ж. 9 наурызда тіркеліп, N 158-ж кәуәлігіне ие болды.*

*Мақалаларды қайта бастырып жариялағанда, микрофильмге және басқа да көшірмелерге түсіргенде міндетті түрде журналға сілтеме жасау қажет.*

Valikhanov Ch. O Bayan-Aulskom okruge// Sobranie sochineniy, V 5 tomakh. T.2. A-Ata, 1985. [in Russian].

Venyukov M.I. Opyt raboty voennogo obozrenia russkikh granis v Azii. SPb., 1875. [in Russian].

## IRSTI 03.09

### HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY OF XX CENTURY AND AT THE BEGINNING OF XXI CENTURY

**Begalieva Aysha Karypzhanovna<sup>1</sup>, Khairullayeva Venera<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Al-Farabi Kazakh National University,  
senior lecturer of the faculty Pre-College Education  
Almaty, Kazakhstan. E-mail: aysha.1958@mail.ru

<sup>2</sup>Associate professor of the University Narhoz. Almaty, Kazakhstan

**Abstract:** The paper examines stages of studying New Economic Policy by a historical science. Researchers' views on this problem are often defined by a political state of affairs. Recent works give an objective estimation of the purposes of New Economic Policy.

The periods of studying the New Economic Policy in the historical literature coincide in many respects with basic changes in the history of the country. But interest to this problem doesn't weaken. New Economic Policy experience is claimed in the period of economic reforms and during transitional economy development.

Among the radical democratic intellectual people of the late XX<sup>th</sup>- early XXI centuries, there was a conviction that the influence of political-ideological institutions on the content of the works of researchers substantially devalued their value for the modern reader. In our opinion, such an approach, having under itself some objective grounds, represents a real threat to the continuity of research in the field of the economic history of Russia in the 20th century, since it can lead to a distorted perception of the achievements of many authors of previous decades.

**Keywords:** historiography, Soviet power, region, New Economic Policy, agrarian policy, reform.

## ҒТАХР 03.29

### XX Ғ. 40-ЖЖ. - XXI Ғ. БАСЫНДАҒЫ ЖАҢА ЭКОНОМИКАЛЫҚ САЯСАТТЫҢ ТАРИХНАМАСЫ

**Бегалиева Айша Қаріпжановна<sup>1</sup>, Хайруллаева Венера<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Әл-Фараби атындағы ҚазҰУ,  
ЖОО-ға дейінгі дайындық кафедрасының аға оқытушы.  
Алматы қ., Қазақстан. E-mail: Aysha.1958@mail.ru

<sup>2</sup>Халық шаруашылығы университетінің қауымдастырылған профессоры,  
Алматы қ., Қазақстан

**Түйіндеме:** Мақалада тарих ғылымында жаңа экономикалық саясатты зерттеудің кезеңдері көрсетілген. Осы мәселеге деген зерттеушілердің көзқарасы саяси конъюнктурамен анықталды. Тек соңғы жылдары ғана жаңа экономикалық саясаттың міндеттері мен мақсаттарына объективті баға берген жұмыстар жарыққа шықты.

Жаңа экономикалық саясатты тарихи әдебиетте зерттеу кезеңдері Ресей Федерациясындағы түбегейлі өзгерістерге байланысты. Бұл тақырыпқа қызығушылық жоғары. ЖЭС тәжірибесі экономикалық реформалар жүргізгенде, өтпелі дәуірдегі экономиканың дамуына өте қажет.

XX ғ. аяғы - XXI ғ. басындағы радикалды-демократиялық зиялылардың арасында саяси-идеологиялық институттардың зерттеушілердің жұмысына ықпалы қазіргі оқырман үшін олардың құндылықтарын айтарлықтай көтереді деген сенім қалыптасты. Біздің ойымызша, кейбір объективті негіздерді біле отырып, мұндай тұрғыда қарау XX ғ. Ресей экономикалық тарихы бойынша зерттеулерге деген сабақтастыққа қауіп төндіреді, өйткені ол өткен он жылдықтардағы көптеген авторлардың жетістіктерін дұрыс қабылдамаға әкелуі мүмкін.

**Кілт сөздер:** тарихнама, кеңестік билік, аймақ, жаңа экономикалық саясат, аграрлы саясат, реформа.

**Introduction.** The New Economic Policy adopted in 1921 by the 10th RKP (b) Congress became a new stage in the formation and development of the Soviet economy. NEP had a significant impact on the subsequent course of Russian history.

The main components of the initiated reforms were: replacement surplus on food tax; the use of market mechanisms and various forms of ownership; attraction of foreign capital; holding monetary reform (1922-1924yy.), etc. Creating the economic basis of socialism through high rates of industrialization through agriculture became the basis of the internal economic policy of the Bolshevik Party. With the liberal reforms in the economy, the strengthening of the party-state bureaucracy continued.

Under these conditions, the Russian intelligentsia was excluded from solving the country's economic problems. The opposition that existed within the party could not be a source of alternative in the search for ways of reforms, economic transformations. The main political goal of NEP was to relieve social tension, strengthen the social base of Soviet power, which is based on an alliance of workers and peasants. In the economic sphere, it was necessary to prevent a further deepening of the economic crisis. It is these issues that have been the subject of study in most research scientists, both in our country and abroad.

The historiography of the New Economic Policy, the forms and methods of its implementation, social protests and many other things were interpreted differently in different periods. In the early twenties, the young Soviet government had no other alternative than by trial and error to realize that for which the socialist revolution was accomplished. The question is, were certain methods and forms justified in domestic policy? The possibility of alternative existed, it was manifested in the course of internal party discussions. But what was the guarantee that an alternative course would not lead to the same results. An objective assessment without an ideological stamp should be the basis for understanding the reforms of the 20s and the possibility of using their experience at the present stage of the country's development.

NEP in the understanding of V.I. Lenin meant the possibility of using in the interests of socialism commodity production, commodity-money relations, cost accounting and material incentives. He believed that trade is the only possible form of the connection of socialist industry with the petty-bourgeois peasant economy (Maslov S.S. M., 2007: 302).

Party functionaries understood the reforms as a temporary retreat, due to special internal conditions and the international situation. One of their active researchers of the New Economic Policy was L. Kamenev, who recognized that the upcoming road of building socialism would take a lot of time and, first of all, because of the underdeveloped economy of the country. In his opinion, the task of NEP was to give impetus to the development of industry based on peasant economy (Kamenev L., 1923: 7). L. Kamenev claimed that NEP was for a long time, since the task was not only of restoring, but of

further developing the country's economy.

Common, unified theoretical foundations among researchers of that period was not. They associated NEP with the political crisis and the events of March 1921 in Kronstadt and considered it a modified continuation of the policy of "war communism". NEP was a necessity of a transitional period with a temporary admission to the economy of capitalist elements, which should be eliminated in the future (Kaktyñ A., 1924: 130).

In 1929, a discussion on NEP was held at the Communist Academy. According to the researchers, NEP solved economic problems by this period, and this meant that further use of these principles was inappropriate. It was believed that this policy was dictated solely by the peculiarities of the structure of the economy of a country dominated by small-scale peasant farming. AT

1938 in the publication of the History of the CPSU (b). Short Course "the results of the first stage of studying the causes and consequences of the implementation of the New Economic Policy" were summed up.

**Methodology.** The article is based on general scientific principles of historicism and objectivity. During writing an article, the authors relied on the principle of historicism, which considers any event in the prism of the past and the future. The comparative method made it possible to investigate the historiography of the problem in close connection with the socio-political and historical situation, as a result of which it arose and acted.

The following methods were used: idiographic, describing the individual characteristics of individual historical facts and events, problem-chronological, reflecting facts and events in a logical sequence.

It should be noted that the key problem of analyzing and interpreting historiographic sources is the problem of combining history and modernity often solved and solved in relation to the development of Soviet and post-Soviet historiography of the economic history of Russia of the 20th century in a one-sided manner. If during the existence of the USSR, the development of this sphere of scientific creativity, provided that it was genetically connected with the assimilation of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and the support of party-state policy, was recognized as progressive, then after the collapse of the USSR an approach arose that questioned the ideological neutrality of Soviet historiography. .

In our opinion, historicism in the perception of historiographic sources involves the implementation of their interpretation based on the characteristics of the era in which they were created. In this case, we are talking about a whole complex of significant circumstances, which include the availability of information resources, the methodological and methodological basis that is available in a specific period of time, the range of theoretical assumptions and judgments available to specialists and the state of public consciousness, which means the ability to adequately perceive new information about the past. Actualization of historical knowledge is an assessment of their practical and scientific importance based on the conditions of modernity. Thus, from the standpoint of the second half of the 2000s, we can evaluate the development of the historiography of economic history in Russia at the beginning of the 20th century on fairly objective grounds as linear in the sense of consistent accumulation of factual knowledge and in many periods cyclical from the point of view of theoretical understanding of the course of creative life. In the second half of the 1980s, cyclicity was replaced by multivariate, although, in our opinion, the fruitfulness of never-ending theoretical research left a peculiar imprint on the development of professional activity.

**Main part.** In addition, the process of self-organization of the community of researchers in the economic history of Russia of the 20th century turned out to be an area of creative and often political competition between them. Various groups of scholars, distinguished by heterogeneous professional training, sought, under the conditions of the formation of the Soviet authoritarian and then totalitarian regime of political power,

to create an interpretation of historical facts that would correspond to the ideological position of the ruling elite that was created in parallel. Therefore, until the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s, a deep scientific analysis of the historiographic heritage that had been formed in the field of studying the economic history of Russia of the 20th century was practically impossible. The formulated interpretations of this heritage were either limited to assessments of the political worldview of certain authors, or (which turned out to be more rare) contained only a bibliographic - descriptive, not analytical - assessment of published monographic studies and articles.

Only at the turn of the 1950s – 1960s as part of the activities of the Scientific Council for the Study of the Complex Problem “Historical Prerequisites of the Great October Socialist Revolution” under the leadership of A.L. Sidorov and in parallel in the framework of which began to take shape under the leadership of M.V. Nechkina scientific and historiographic school began to take shape a conceptual, comprehensive understanding of research on the economic history of Russia at the beginning of the 20th century already created in the period of the 1920-1950s. As a result, the bibliographic and ideological approaches to highlighting the accumulated creative heritage began gradually to be replaced by a historiographical approach in its modern intellectual and cultural sense. The process of this transformation was substantially curtailed for general political reasons at the turn of the 1960s – 1970s, which was reflected in the dramatic fate of many students of A.L. Sidorov, but in the late 1980s, he resumed with even more obvious force and, I think, became irreversible.

The exception was the study of domestic authors on the development of foreign historiography of the economic history of Russia of various periods, including the beginning of the 20th century. Regardless of their conceptual and methodological level, they were created from deliberately confrontational positions. Researchers who wrote works of this genre were supposed to uphold the thesis about the existence of absolutely reliable, based on the objective provisions of the Leninist concept of research by Soviet scientists and unreliable, reflecting the bourgeois capitalist values of the works of foreign experts. In the considered case, the distinction between criticized historiographic sources and critical literature does not represent the methodological difficulties that are present in the study of Russian historiography of the economic history of Russia at the beginning of the 20th century.

Thus, in order to overcome the indicated difficulties with regard to identifying works in which an array of Russian authors' studies on the economic history of Russia at the beginning of the 20th century would be assessed with the necessary degree of objectivity, only an even more subjective approach than that used in determining and analysis of similar works that were devoted to criticism of foreign historiography.

A radical change in the Soviet historiography on the problems of NEP occurred in the period from the 1930s. in the first half of the 1950s, when the complete dominance of the official communist ideology and economic practice was established in the USSR.

Radical changes in the countries of Western Europe in the second half of the twentieth century revived interest in the problems of New Economic Policy . Works have been published on the economic recovery of the twenties (Genkina E.B., 1954: 503).

Y. Larin, S.G. Strumilin, E.B. Genkina, Yu.A. Polyakov, I.B. Berkhin and other researchers considered NEP not only as the leading one, as a matter of fact, but also the only tendency in the development of the country's economic policy in the twenties. This led, perhaps, to a reassessment of NEP and its significance in terms of the degree of influence on the social and political processes in society. Objectivity in assessing the activities of the country's leaders, evaluating contradictions in the NEP and its crises, and the narrowness of economic reforms did not always suffice.

In the late 60s - early 70s, work appeared on the implementation of NEP at the regional level. This made it possible to include in the scientific circulation a large number



of new documents of a regional nature (Problemy agrarnoi..., 1969: 367).

In the second half of the eightieth years of the 20th century, significant changes were noted in historiography related to the changes that took place in the USSR. During this period, there are first attempts to deviate from ideological dependence in the interpretation of how to build socialism, and the possibilities of using the market mechanism in this process. Economists, historians have sought in NEP the sources of perestroika and arguments to analyze the causes of the deformation of socialism.

The transition to a market economy in the Russian Federation since the 90s. Twentieth century. attracted researchers to the history of the twenties of the twentieth century (NEP i hozraschet, 1991: 364). The problems of economic, social nature and features of development of the agricultural sector of the economy were studied (Mentaliteti agrarnoe, 1994: 440). This was an attempt to analyze the causes, mechanism and consequences of NEP for the Soviet economy and the prospects for socialist industrialization. The historiography of the nineties of the nineties, in contrast to the perestroika, was the rejection of overly optimistic assessments and the transition to a more objective coverage of its parties. Researchers paid great attention to the dynamics, crises, contradictions, the emerging system, the prospects of NEP. The experience and perspectives of Russian émigré economists of the 1920s and 1930s were studied (NEP. Vzgljad so storony, 1991: 304).

Of particular interest is the collective work "The Tragedy of the Soviet Village. Collectivization and dispossession. Documents and materials in 5 volumes 1927-1939." Edited by V. Danilov, R. Manning, L. Viola (Tragediia sovetskoï derevni, 1996). The publication on the basis of new documents demonstrates objectively, without ideological clichés, the beginning of reforms and counterreforms, the curtailment of new economic policies and the beginning of forced collectivization. The authors believe that the period from 1925 to 1927 was precisely the period of NEP without compulsory grain procurements. "Nevertheless, in such a short period, the ability of NEP through the expansion of market relations to intensify all available productive forces of the country, to provide a general economic recovery as the basis of the movement towards socialism, was revealed with sufficient conviction." (Tragediia sovetskoï derevni, 1996: 16).

During this period, the problem of the relationship between government and society, which remained outside the field of view of historians, developed. Most researchers believe that in the study of economic policy it is necessary to consider in connection with it both economic aspects, and political and ideological. By the mid-nineties, there were several approaches to studying the political system of the twenties. The first was to deny the difference between the political systems of the 20s and 30s, recognizing that at that time a totalitarian system had developed in the country. The second approach is based on the statement of significant differences between authoritarian NEP and totalitarianism 30s.

The reforms of the 20s and 80-90s have in common that they began and were regulated "from above", without taking into account the laws of economic development. In Soviet historiography there is no tradition of specifically linking political doctrines with socio-political and economic factors. This is explained by the dominant view of the role of ideology in the political struggle in the "upper ranks" (Tsakynov S.V., 1994: 11).

A major contribution to the historiography of NEP was made by the collective work "NEP. Acquisitions and losses" (Devis R.Э, Dmitrenko V.P., 1994: 217), which examined the experience of conducting reforms in the USSR. During this period, peasant themes, traditional for Russian historiography, were developed, issues of cooperative construction, etc. (Shmelev G.I., 2000: 225). According to a number of authors, thanks to the efforts of the Bolsheviks, the "fists" were knocked out of the state of economic stability, lost most of their land holdings and ceased to be the basis for the stable development of agriculture. The artels that replaced them, the collective farms, for the most part, were

characterized by mismanagement and lack of organization.

Recently, generalizing works have been published in which the contradictions of the establishment of a market economy in the 1920s and its results have been investigated (Hodiakov M.V., 2001: 300). A number of foreign historians have shown interest in this issue in connection with changes in the modern history of Russia. But they are all united in the understanding of NEP as a result of a sharp political confrontation in the Bolshevik party in the struggle for power (Sokolov J., 2006: 560).

Changes in the socio-political system, economic policy contributed to a new understanding of the problems of the New Economic Policy . Was it possible to use the NEP methodology in the conditions of economic reforms of the transitional period of the end of the 20th - beginning of the 21st centuries? How will society respond to these changes? Was it possible to take into account the experience and mistakes of the twenties in order to carry out cardinal reforms with minimal losses for society? The success and possibilities of NEP and the fact that, largely due to the premature, unreasonable actions of the authorities, these reforms were interrupted, were evaluated in a new way. On the other hand, government regulation in the economy of such a country as Russia was, and the previous period, characterized by the incompleteness of the reforms initiated, justified such a degree of state intervention.

A somewhat different interpretation of NEP was formulated in the Soviet historical encyclopedia of 1967.10, where, in particular, it was stated that the main task of NEP was to strengthen the alliance of the working class with the peasantry on an economic basis. This point of view was confirmed and in the Great Soviet Encyclopedia 1974. The authors of such a respectable publication as the multivolume History of the USSR 1967 left no further in their submissions. In its VIII volume in the section "New Economic Policy - the Road to Socialism" it was stated that this policy required reconstruction projects across the entire economic front to determine ways of strengthening the economic union of the working class and peasants, ways of building socialism in the transition period

A number of works continue to show the perception of NEP as a policy of temporary reforms, concessions to the problems of transition and the recognition by the young Russian government of the need to move away from the direct construction of socialism (MynchaevSh.M., Ystinov V.M., 2008).

A new trend in the historiography of NEP began in the second half of the 1980s. From interpretation as a transitional period to industrialization and collectivization, they proceeded to isolating it more as an independent period of Soviet history. The great interest of researchers was aroused by discussions within the ruling party, the features and nature of the opposition's activities. The works of L. Trotsky, G. Zinoviev, L. Kamenev, N. Bukharin and other party leaders of that period became available. The attention of scientists to a greater extent than before, began to attract the activities of various sectors of the economy, and above all the cooperative and private. The multistructure nature of the economy, interaction in the conditions of the Soviet market, its various participants are considered in the works of V.I. Kasyanenko, L.N. Liu-tova, A.P. Kilina, Yu.P. Bokareva, S.M. Petrova, S.F. Grebenichenko, D.V. Kovalev.

Different points of view on NEP were also presented in the textbook "The Newest History of the Fatherland of the Twentieth Century", edited by A.F. Kiselev and E.M. Shchagin (1998). The authors concluded that there are two views on the issue of the New Economic Policy . On the one hand, NEP was a narrow anti-crisis platform, on the other hand, a broad program of building a socialist society based on commodity-money relations. In essence, it is only these ideas that limit the diversity in understanding the essence of the policy of the Soviet state of the 1920s.

At the beginning of the 21st century, works appeared whose authors try to objectively evaluate the experience of NEP. Both errors and positive results of the activities of the government and the Bolshevik Party are taken into account. Various issues of reform of

the twenties of the twentieth century are considered through the general problems of restoration and further reconstruction of the economy and social relations in Russian society (Telitsyn V.L., 2002; Plehanov A.M., 2006; Danihno S.N., 2007).

NEP in terms of the sum of its economic and political events was one of the classic phenomena of the transition period for a country with an underdeveloped industry, with a predominantly rural population. The monopolization of industry and its leading industries contributed only to short-term success, and in the social and political sphere this led to dictatorship. Without denying the effectiveness of measures taken in the field of economics in the twenties and thirties of the twentieth century, they carried in new, more serious issues that required resolution. Indeed, in the future, the government has repeatedly tried to reform both the economy and social relations within the framework of socialist social relations.

A separate issue in the historiography of NEP is the peasant question and protest actions at the initial stage of the peaceful formation of Soviet power (Krestianskieistorii, 2001; Istorია Sovetskogo krestianstva, 1986). This period can be considered a continuation of the civil war in the special conditions of the formation of a new socio-political system. For Russia, this question is eternal, like the land issue. In their frank letters, the peasants expressed an objective state of affairs in the village, in the peasant household. "Like everyone else, the Soviet government also knows that the peasants of Soviet Russia are in a critical situation and eke out a miserable existence" (Litvin A.L., 2004; Krestianskieistorii, 2001). The peasantry took the position that was determined by the agrarian policy of the government, which meant the solution of land and food issues. This was the cause of the conflict between the state and the peasantry. "Often a person turned out to be on one side or the other of the front for purely everyday reasons, having nothing in common with the ideology of the opposing camps. The peasant war of 1917-1921. - a consequence of the policy of the Bolsheviks, who by their regulation tried to turn the peasantry "into state farm laborers" (Telitsyn V.L., 2002).

The problem of collectivization in the historical literature to this day is of keen interest and discussion. But most authors agree that this story of the Russian village was tragic and erroneous, was the beginning of a radical change of the peasant economy. The studies analyze the problems of vital activity, the position and role of the peasantry in socio-economic transformations, the policy of the party and the interaction of various economic structures in the perestroika village.

The New Economic Policy and its consequences for the Kuban region, and the subsequent collectivization and industrialization, are represented by a wide range of studies (Bondarev V.A., 2006; Fitzpatrik Sh., 2001; Oskolkov E.N., 1991. Kabanov V.V., 1988. Kondrashin V.V., 2008.). The region had a number of features that determined the course, methodology, mechanism and results of the reforms. The border southern outskirts of Russia with the dominant rural, Cossack population, class contradictions, difficult land management, poorly developed industry, focused on the processing of agricultural products - these facts formed the centers of contradictions in the transition period and served as objects of research. The protest actions of the Cossacks against the Bolsheviks were expressed in the fighting of the "white-green" detachments in the most active phase in 1921-1922. But later on, the "white-green" formations for two years created problems for the Soviet government, being reborn from a political into a criminal element. Cossacks actively opposed reforms, and the Bolsheviks sought to destroy the economic foundations of individual peasant farming.

The literature review character, evaluating the complex originality of the Soviet historical science and its individual subject areas, also includes textbooks. Most of them were published in the period from the 1970s to the beginning of the 1980s, when, including under the influence of administrative pressure, there were recent discussions of Soviet scholars on the problems of Russian history, temporary stability of ideological

evaluations was established and, therefore, the ground was formed for generalizing observations. Among the educational publications published in these years, there are manuals edited by P.P. Smirnova and I.I. Mintsya In the second half of the 2000s, specialists from M. Lomonosov Moscow State University presented their own textbook on the historiography of national history. In it, the definition of the professional significance of the content of monographs and articles of many Soviet researchers was combined with the recognition of the negative effects of the ideological pressure of party and state structures on the daily practice of scientific creativity. Further, within the limits of the first group of studies indicated by us, it is necessary to single out works relating to the study of various aspects of the development of research life in the USSR.

During the so-called “ideological” stage of the restructuring of the late 1980s, and especially in the 1990s, this period of formation of the Soviet type of historical science began to be perceived in a negative manner in the spirit of the introduction of new political values for the development of historiographical creativity in Russia.

**Conclusion.** In the course of revolutionary transformations, we try to find idols for ourselves, and often to comprehend and substantiate contradictory phenomena in our history. The story goes in such cases to the service of politicians and authorities. Power can not be independent, as well as society. If we violate these principles, the temptation of a biased interpretation of historical events appears. When considering the problems of NEP, one should proceed from the fact that they have experienced the process of nucleation, development and extinction. We should not idealize the New Economic Policy, it has fulfilled its tasks within the framework of the existing political system. No one had any practical experience in building a socialist society, so it would be wrong to assert that NEP was a temporary phenomenon. The implementation of NEP had the most serious influence on the economic and political conditions for the development of the country, the culture of the masses, and the basis for the formation of the structures of the new government.

The period of the second half of the 1980s had a transitional character from the point of view of the ideological impact on the content of historical and economic research. Scientists were able to express different opinions about the peculiarities of Russia's development in the pre-Soviet and even in the Soviet period, but the supporting positions of their theoretical thinking - a conviction in the historical perspective of socialist production relations and their humanistic advantage over socialist economic practice - remained unshakable.

In world practice, certain trends can be traced during the transitional period of the state's development. The more complex and problematic the conditions, the more the formation characteristics are lost, resulting in problems defense, international security, social problems are growing. Under these conditions, contradictions between the political superstructure and the ongoing economic reforms are manifested, and there is a temptation to move to authoritarian methods of leadership and “aggressive” state intervention in the economy and its full regulation. Russia in its historical development passed precisely this way.

In this regard, it is concluded that without the historiographic heritage formed in the period 1957-1991 by Soviet researchers of the economic history of the 20th century, modern research achievements accumulated in the post-Soviet period would not be possible.

#### **Литература:**

Бондарев В.А. Крестьянство и Коллективизация: многоукладность социально-экономических отношений деревни в районах Дона, Кубани и Ставрополя в конце 20-х-30-х годах XX века. Ростов-на/Д: Изд-во СКНсВШ, 2006. 520 с.

Валентинов Н. Новая экономическая политика и кризис партии после смерти Ленина: годы работы в ВСН во время НЭПа. Воспоминания современника. М., 1991. 367 с.

Верт Н. История Советского государства. М.: Весь мир, 2006. 560 с.

История советского крестьянства: в 5 т. Т.1. М., 1980. 300 с.

Галин В.В. Запретная политэкономия. Красное и белое. М.: Алгоритм, 2006. 608 с.

Генкина Е.В. Переход советского государства к новой экономической политике (1921-1922 гг.). М.: Госполитиздат, 503 с.

Голдентул И. Земельные отношения на Кубани. Краткий очерк. Краснодар: Буревестник, 1924. 126 с.

Голод 1932-1933 годов: сб.ст. / отв. Ред., вступ.ст. Ю.Н.Афанасева. М.: Рос.гос.гуманит.ун-т, 1996. 120 с.

Фитспатрик Ш. Сталинские кретьяне: социальная история Советской России в 30-е годы. М.: РОСПЕЕН, 2001.336 с.

Данилин А.Б. Нэповская Россия: «социалистическая рационализация» рынка труда // Новый исторический вестник. 2001. - № 3. URL: [http:// www.niveb1nik.ru](http://www.niveb1nik.ru).

Данихно С.Н. Рабочие Юго-Востока России в годы нэпа: история, генерации и многомерность повседневной жизни социальной группы. Ростов-на/Д: Изд-во СКНсВШ, 2007.343 с.

Девис Р.Ю., Дмитриенко В.Р., Мау В.А. НЭП: приобретение и потери. М.: Наука, 1994.217 с.

Ербинин С.А. Становление большевистской власти на Дону и Кубано-Черноморьеи ее общественное восприятие. Славянск-на-Кубани: Изд-во Центр СГПИ, 2006. 164 с.

Кабанов В.В. Крестьянское хозяйство в условиях «военного коммунизма» М.: Наука, 1988.302 с.

Каменев Л. Положение в стране и в партии. М.: Красная нов, 1923.120 с.

Кактына А. Новая экономическая политика и «ножницы» (очередные задачи экономической политики). М.: Красная нов, 1924. 130 с.

Кон С. Опыт Советской национализации //НЭП. Взгляды со стороны: сборник/ сост. В.В. Кудрявцев М.: Московский рабочий, 1992. С. 18-35.

Коллективизация сельского хозяйства на Северном Кавказе 1927-1937 гг. / под ред. П.В. Семерника, Е.Н. Осколкова. Краснодар, 1972. 832 с.

Конюков И.А. О расслоении крестьянских хозяйств Кубани. Краснодар, 1928. 160 с.

Классовая борьба и кулачество на Кубани. Ростов на/Д. М., 1931. 78 с.

Кондрашин В.В. Голод 1931-1933 годов: трагедия российской деревни. М.: Р ОССПЕН, 2008.519 с.

Крестьянские истории: Российская деревня 20-х годов в письмах и документах / сост. С.С. Крюкова. М.: Р ОССПЕН, 2001. 231 с.

Кринко Е.Ф., Хлынина Т.П. История Северного Кавказа в 1920-1940-е гг.: современная российская историография. Ростов-на/Д: Изд-во ЮНТс РАН, 2009. 455 с.

Крестьянство в первой десятилетии советской власти 1917-1927 / отв.ред. В.П. Данилов. М.: Наука, 1986. 455 с.

Литвин А.Л. Красный террор в России. 1918-1922 гг. М.: Эксмо, 2004. 285 с.

Лютова Л.Н. Промышленность России в годы НЭПа (1921-1929 гг.). Ульяновск, 2000.260 с.

Маслов С.С. Колхозная Россия. М.: Наука, 2007.302 с.

Менталитет и аграрное развитие России (XIX-XX вв.): матер.межд.конф. г. Москва, 14-15 июня. 1994 г./ под ред. В.П. Данилова, Л.В. Милова. 440 с.

- Мунчаев Ш.М., Устинов В.М. История Советского государства. – М.: Норма, 2008. – 720 с.
- Никаноров Г.Л. Надрыв: правда и ложь отечественной истории XX века. М.: КомКнига, 2007.220 с.
- НЭП и хозрасчет. Экономика. М., 1991. 364 с.
- НЭП. Взгляд со стороны: сборник / сост. В.В. Кудрявцев. - М.: Московский рабочий, 1991. 304 с.
- Осколков Е.Н. Голод 1932-1933 гг. Ростов на/Д., 1991. 91 с.
- Плеханов А.М. ВЧК-ОГПУ: отечественные органы государственной безопасности в период новой экономической политики 1921-1928 гг. М.: Кучково поле, 2006. 704 с.
- Шмелев Г.И. Аграрная политика и аграрные отношения в России в XX веке.М.: Наука, 2000. - 225 с.
- Штейн Б.Е. Торговая политика и торговые договора Советской России 1917-1922 гг. М.; Пгб.:Госиз-во, 1923.247 с.
- Шарипов В.В. Империализм от Ленина до Путина. М.: Алгоритм, 2007. 256 с.
- Смиринский В.И. Динамика коллективного земледелия и социальная структура. Проблемы аграрной истории советского общества: матер.науч.конф. 9-12 июня, 1969 г./ отв.ред. М.П. Ким. М.: Наука, 1071. 367 с.
- Соколов Ж. Бедная деревня. История России 1815 года до наших дней. М.: Весь мир, 2006.560 с.
- Телитцын В.Л. «Бесмертный и бесподобный»?...Феномен крестьянского бунта 1917-1921 гг. М.: Рос.гос.гуманит.ун-т, 2002. 338 с.
- Трагедия советской деревни. Коллективизация и раскулачивание. 1927-1939 // Документы и материалы: в 5 т.Т.1. Май 1927- ноябрь 1929 / под ред. В. Данилова, Р. Маннинга, Л. Виолы. М.: РОССПЕН,1999. - 880 с.
- Царкунов С.В. В лабиринте доктрины. Из опыта разработки экономического курса страны в 1920-е годы. М., 1994. 191 с.
- Ходяков М.В. Децентрализм в промышленной политике регионов России: 1917-1920 гг. Спб.: Изд-во СПбГУ, 2001.300 с.
- Фитспатрик Ш. Сталинские крестьяне: Социальная история Советской России в 30-е годы. М.: РОССПЕН, 2001. 336 с.

#### References:

- Bondarev V.A. Krestianstvo i kollektivizatsiia: mnogoukladnost sotsialno-ekonomicheskikh otnoshenii derevni v raionah Dona, Kubani Stavropoliavkontse 20-h-30-h godah XX veka. - Rostov/D: Izd-vo SKNTsVSh, 2006.520s. [in Russian].
- Danilin A.B. 2001. Nepovskaia Rossiia: «sotsialisticheskaia ratsionalizatsiia» rynkatruda // Novyiistoricheskiivestnik. № 3. URL: [http:// www.niveb1nik.ru](http://www.niveb1nik.ru). [in Russian].
- Danihno S.N. Rabochielugo-VostokaRossii v godynepa: istoriia, generatsiimmogomernostpovsednevnoijznisotsialnoigruppy. Rostov n/D: Izd-voSKNTsVSh, 2007.343 s. [in Russian].
- Devis R.Э, Dmitrenko V.P., Mau V.A. NEP: priobreteniaipoteri. М.: Nauka, 1994. - 217 s. [in Russian].
- Erbinin S.A. Stanovlenie bolshevistskoi vlastina Donui Kubano-Chernomoreieë obestvennoevospriatie. Slaviansk - na - Kubani: Izd. tsentr SGPI, 2006. - 164 s.[in Russian].
- Fitspatrik Sh. 2001.Stalinskie krestiane: sotsialnaiaistoriiaSovetskoiRossii v 30-e gody. М.: ROСПPEN. 336 s.[in Russian].
- Galm V.V. Zapretnaiapolitekonomiia.Krasnoe I beloe. М.: Algoritm, 2006. 608 s. [in Russian].

- Genkina E.B. 1954. PerehodSovetskogogosudarstva k novoiekonomicheskopolitike (1921-1922 gg.). M.: Gospolitizdat, 503 s. [in Russian].
- Golodentull. 1924.ZemelnyeotnosheniianaKubani. Kratkiiiocherk. Krasnodar: Burevestnik, S. 96. [in Russian].
- Golod 1932-1933 godov: sb. st. 1996. / otv. red., vstap.st.Iu.N. Afanaseva. M.: Ros. gos. gumanit. un-t. 96 s. [in Russian].
- Hodiakov M.V. Detsentralizm v promyshlennoipolitikeregionovRossii: 1917-1920 gg. SPb.:Izd-voSPbGЭ, 2001.300 s. [in Russian].
- IstoriiaSovetskogokrestianstva: v 5 t. T.1. M., 1980. 300 s. [in Russian].
- Kabanov V.V. Krestianskoe hoziaistvo v usloviiah «voennogo kommunizma». M.: Nauka,1988. 302 s.[in Russian].
- Kamenev L. Polojnie v stranei v partii. M.: Krasnaianov, 1923.S. 7. [in Russian].
- Kaktyñ A. Novaia ekonomicheskaiia politikai «nojnitsy» (ocherednye zadachi ekonomicheskoi politiki). M.: Krasnaianov, 1924. 130 s.[in Russian].
- KlassovaiaborbaikulachestvonaKubani. Rostov n/D, 1931. S. 78. [in Russian].
- Kon S. OpytSovetskoinatsionalizatsii // NEP. Vzgliady so storony: sbornik / sost. V.V. Kudriavtsev. M.: Moskovskiiirabochii, 1992.S. 29.[in Russian].
- Kollektivizatsiia selskogo hoziaistva na Severnom Kavkaze 1927-1937 gg. / pod red. P.V. Semernika, E.N. Oskolkova. Krasnodar, 1972.832 s. [in Russian].
- Koniukov I.A. O rassloeniikrestianskihhoziaistvKubani.Krasnodar, 1928.S. 56.[in Russian].
- Kondrashin V.V. Golod 1932-1933 godov: tragediuarossiiskoiderevni. M.: ROSSPEN,2008. 519 s.[in Russian].
- Krestianskieistorii: Rossiiskaia derevnia 20-h godovv pismahi dokumentah / sost. S.S. Krukova. M.: ROSSPEN, 2001.232 s. [in Russian].
- Krinko E.F., Hlynna T.P.IstoriiaSevernogoKavkaza v 1920-1940-e gg.:sovremennaiarossiiskaiaistoriografia. Rostov n/D:Izd-voluNTs RAN,2009. 304 s.
- Krestianstvo v pervoedesiatiletieSovetskoivlasti 1917-1927. / otv. red. V.P. Danilov. M.: Nauka,1986. 455 s. [in Russian].
- Kubanskogookruga.Krasnodar, 1930.Vyp. 2. S. 63. [in Russian].
- Liutova L.N. Promyshlennost Rossii v gody NEPa (1921-1929 gg.).Ulianovsk, 2000. - 260 s. [in Russian].
- Litvin A.L. Krasnyi terror v Rossii.1918-1922 gg.M.: Eksmo,2004. - 285 s.
- Maslov S.S. KolhoznaiaRossiia M.: Nauka,2007.302 s. [in Russian].
- MentalitetiagramoerazvitieRossii (XIX-XX vv.): materialymejdunar. konf., g. Moskva, 14-15 iunia 1994 g. / pod red. V.P. Danilova, L.V. Milova. M. 1994. 440 s. [in Russian].
- Munchaev Sh.M., Ustinov V.M. Istoriia Sovetskogo gosudarstva. M.: Norma, 2008. - 720 s.[in Russian].
- Nikanorov G.L. Nadryv: Pravda i loj otechestvennoi istorii XX veka. - M.: Kom Kniga, 2007.[in Russian].
- NEP ihozraschet.Ekonomika.M.,1991.364 s. [in Russian].
- NEP. Vzgliad so storony: sbornik / sost. V.V. Kudriavtsev. M.: Moskovskiiirabochii, 1991. 304 S.; Formirovanieadministrativno-komandnoisistemy (20-30-e gody): sb. st. / pod red. [in Russian].
- Oskolkov E.N. Golod 1932-1933 gg.Rostov n/D,1991. - 91 s.[in Russian].
- Plehanov A.M. VChK-OGPЭ: otechestvennyeorganygosudarstvennoibezopasnosti v period novoi ekonomicheskoi politiki 1921-1928 gg. M.: Kuchkovo pole,2006.704 s.[in Russian].
- Shmelev G.I. Agrarnaiapolitikaiagrarnyeotnosheniia v Rossii v XX veke. M.: Nauka, 2000. - 225 s.[in Russian].
- Shtein B.E. TorgovaiapolitikaitorgovyedogovoraSovetskoiRossii 1917-1922 gg. M.;

P.: Gos. izd-vo, 1923. 247 s.[in Russian].

Shapinov V.V. Imperializm Lenina do Putina. M.: Algoritm, 2007. 256 s. [in Russian].

Smirnskii V.I. Dinamika kollektivnogo zemledeliia i sotsialnaia struktura

Problemy agrarnoi istorii sovetskogo obestva: materialy nauch. konf., 9-12 iyunia 1969 g. / otv. red. M.P. Kim. M.: Nauka, 1971. S. 367.[in Russian].

Sokolov J. Bednaia derjava. Istoriia Rossii s 1815 goda do nashih dnei. M.: Izd. Dom GUVShE, 2008. S. 888;

Telitsyn V.L. «Bessmyslennyi bespoadnyi»?... Fenomen krestianskogo bontia 1917-1921 gg. M.: Ros. gos. gumanit. zn-t. 2002. - 338 s.[in Russian].

Tragediia sovetskoi derevni. Kollektivizatsiia i raskulachivanie. 1927-1939 // Dokumenty i materialy: v 5 t. T.I. Mai 1927-noiabr 1929 / pod red. V. Danilova, R. Manninga, L. Violy. M.: ROSSPEN, 1999. - 880 s.[in Russian].

Tsakunov S.V. V labirintedoktriny. Izopytarazrabotki ekonomicheskogo kursa strany v 1920-e gody. M., 1994. 191 s. [in Russian].

Valentinov N. Novaiia ekonomicheskaia politika i krizis partiiposlesmertii Lenina: godyraboty v VSNH vovremia NEPa. Vospominaniia sovremennika. - M., 1991. - 367 s. [in Russian].

Vert N. Istoriia Sovetskogo gosudarstva. M.: Ves Mir. 2006. 560 s. [in Russian].

IRSTI 03.29.00

### EPISTOLARY CULTURE: LETTERS AND POEMS FROM THE FRONT

**Shaimerdenova Mendygany D.**

Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate professor  
Professor of T.K. Zhurgenov Kazakh national academy of Arts.  
Kazakhstan, Almaty. E-mail:mena\_ms@mail.ru

**Abstract:** The article is devoted to the study of the epistolary heritage of the Great Patriotic War, in particular the letters of the Kazakh man, by the will of fate and the Fatherland, who became a soldier, who wrote in a poetic form to his loved ones from the front. The article actualizes the kind of epistolary culture, which does not lose its significance in the modern global era, on the contrary, becomes great importance, since it reveals the Kazakh culture and philosophy. Despite the fact that so much time has passed, the correspondence of people of the war period, the stylistic characteristic of letters as a form of literary speech and epistolary culture attracting greater attention of researchers. The analysis of the translation of these texts from Kazakh into Russian is an important aspect, demonstrating Kazakh versification in its philosophy and beauty, indicating the richness of the Kazakh language in its epistolary genre.

**Keywords:** epistolary heritage, Great Patriotic War, poems, Kazakh philosophy, stylistic characteristic, versification, epistolary genre, letters from the war.



**Мазмұны  
Содержание  
Contents**

**ДЕРЕКТАНУ ЖӘНЕ ТАРИХНАМА  
ИСТОЧНИКОВЕДЕНИЕ И ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ  
SOURCE STUDING AND HISTORIOGRAPHY**

Мухатова О.  
ҚАЗАҚ ДАЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ҮЛТ-АЗАТТЫҚ ҚОЗҒАЛЫСТАР  
ТАРИХЫНЫҢ ЗЕРТТЕЛУІ (XIX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ  
ЕКІНШІ ЖАРТЫСЫ – XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАС КЕЗІ).....5

Begalieva A., Khairullayeva V.  
HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY IN  
40-YEARS OF XX CENTURY AND AT THE BEGINNING  
OF XX CENTURY.....20

Shaimerdenova M.D.  
EPISTOLARY CULTURE:  
LETTERS AND POEMS FROM THE FRONT.....31

Абдирайымова А.С., Сарсенбаев А.Б.  
ТӘУЕЛСІЗ ҚАЗАҚСТАН ТАРИХЫНЫҢ КЕЗЕҢДЕЛУ МӘСЕЛЕСІ.....43

**ЖАҢА ЗАМАН ТАРИХЫ  
НОВАЯ ИСТОРИЯ  
NEW HISTORY**

Кабульдинов З.Е., Козыбаева М.М.  
ОРЕНБУРГСКАЯ ЭКСПЕДИЦИЯ (КОМИССИЯ) 1734-1744 гг.  
ПО КОЛОНИЗАЦИИ КАЗАХСКОЙ СТЕПИ:  
ЦЕЛИ, ЭТАПЫ, ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ.....58

Бимолданова А. А.  
ВОЛОСТНОЙ УПРАВИТЕЛЬ И ВОЛОСТНОЙ ПИСАРЬ  
В АППАРАТЕ МЕСТНОГО УПРАВЛЕНИЯ КОЧЕВЫХ  
ВОЛОСТЕЙ АКМОЛИНСКОЙ ОБЛАСТИ ВО ВТОРОЙ  
ПОЛОВИНЕ XIX – НАЧАЛЕ XX ВЕКОВ.....72

Бектанов А.А.  
ШЫҢЖАҢДАҒЫ XIX ғ. 70-жж. САЯСИ ДАҒДАРЫС  
ЖӘНЕ ҚҰЛЖА СУЛТАНДЫҒЫНЫҢ РЕСЕЙ  
ИМПЕРИЯСЫНЫҢ ҚҰРАМЫНА КІРУІ.....87

**ТАРИХ ТОЛҚЫНЫНДА  
В ПОТОКЕ ИСТОРИИ  
IN THE STREAM OF HISTORY**

Бекназаров Р.А. АҚТӨБЕ ӨҢІРІНДЕГІ МҮСЫЛМАНДЫҚ САНАНЫҢ ҚАЛЫПТАСУЫ.....	102
Капаева А.Т. КУЛЬТУРНАЯ ПОЛИТИКА В КАЗАХСТАНЕ: ЦЕЛИ, МЕТОДЫ, РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ.....	111
Мұхитов Қабібек КАСПИЙ-ОРСК МҮНАЙ ҚҰБЫРЫНЫҢ САЛЫНУ ТАРИХЫ.....	124
Жанбосинова А.С., Қарибаев М. ВОПРОСЫ АДАПТАЦИИ РЕПАТРИАНТОВ В ПРОЕКТЕ ПРООН НА ПРИМЕРЕ ВОСТОЧНОГО КАЗАХСТАНА.....	134

**ХАЛЫҚТАНУ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ  
ПРОБЛЕМЫ НАРОДОНАСЕЛЕНИЯ  
POPULATION ISSUES**

Смагулов Б., Тылахметова А. ТУЛЕНГУТЫ В ЭТНИЧЕСКОМ СОСТАВЕ КАЗАХОВ (XVIII – НАЧАЛЕ XX В.).....	146
Kamaljanova T.A. IMPACT OF LABOUR MIGRATION ON THE LIVES OF “LEFT BEHIND”.....	158

**ЭТНОЛОГИЯ ЖӘНЕ АРХЕОЛОГИЯ  
ЭТНОЛОГИЯ И АРХЕОЛОГИЯ  
ETHNOLOGY AND ARCHEOLOGY**

Рогожинский А.Е., Железняков Б.А. КЛЕЙМА И ТАМГИ НА ДВУХ СЕРЕБРЯНЫХ СОСУДАХ ИЗ ДОЛИНЫ ШУ И МОНГОЛИИ.....	167
Novozhenov V.A., Sydykov A.Zh. BRONZE AGE TRANSEURASIAN COMMUNICATIONS.....	184
Қартаева Т. МАҢҒЫСТАУ, ҮСТІРТ ҚАЗАҚТАРЫНЫҢ ДӘСТҮРЛІ ГИДРОТЕХНИКАЛЫҚ БІЛІМІ.....	206
Шашаев Ә. Қ., Тәлім А.Т. ҚАРАҚАЛПАҚТАРДЫҢ ОТБАСЫЛЫҚ-НЕКЕЛІК ҚАТЫНАСТАРЫНА БАЙЛАНЫСТЫ ӘДЕТ-ҒҰРЫПТАР.....	223