



Қазақстан Республикасы
Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы
Тарих және этнология институты

ОТАН ТАРИХЫ

2025. №28 (4)

ISSN 1814-6961
E-ISSN 2788-9718



- ТАРИХ
- ЭТНОЛОГИЯ
- АРХЕОЛОГИЯ

ОТАН ТАРИХЫ

2025. №28 (4)



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

Отан тарихы
Отечественная история
History of the Homeland

Үш айда бір рет шығатын ғылыми журнал
2025. № 28 (4)

РЕДАКЦИЯ

Бас редактор

Қабылдинов Зиябек Ермұханұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының бас директоры (Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ.)

Редакциялық алқа

Әбіл Еркін Аманжолұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан Республикасы, Астана қ.)

Абдырахманов Толобек Әбілұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Қырғыз Республикасы Ұлттық ғылым академиясының корреспондент-мүшесі (Қырғыз Республикасы, Бішкек)

Апендиев Тимур Әкімханұлы – PhD докторы, доцент, жетекші ғылыми қызметкер, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты (Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ.)

Горшенина Светлана Михайловна – PhD, тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты; CNRS Eur'Orbem, UMR 8224, CNRS/Sorbonne университетінің зерттеу бөлімінің директоры (Франция, Париж)

Исмағұлов Оразақ Исмағұлұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР Қазақстан Республикасы Ұлттық музейінің физикалық антропология зертханасының меңгерушісі (Қазақстан Республикасы, Астана қ.)

Шиндзю Като – PhD (археология бойынша), Нарадағы мәдени құндылықтардың ұлттық ғылыми-зерттеу институты (Жапония, Нара)

Бирсель Каракоч – Уппсала университетінің түркі тілдерінің профессоры (Швеция, Уппсала қ.)

Мионг Сун-ок – антропология ғылымдарының докторы, қауымдастырылған профессор (Корея, Сеул)

Қозыбаева Махаббат Маликовна – PhD доктор; Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің «Алаш» мәдениет және рухани даму институтының жетекші ғылыми қызметкері (Қазақстан Республикасы, Астана қаласы)

Моррисон Александр – PhD, NewCollege профессоры, Оксфорд (Ұлыбритания, Оксфорд)

Мотузаите-Матузевичюте Гидре – археология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Вильнюс университетінің «Биоархеология» ғылыми орталығының жетекшісі (Литва, Вильнюс)

Муминов Әшірбек Құрбанұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, арабтанушы, профессор; ИКҰ (Орталық Азия) ұйымдастыру қызметінің бас директорының кеңесшісі (Түркия, Стамбул)

Нұрсан Әлімбаев – тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Ш.Ш.Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының бас ғылыми қызметкері (Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ.)

Отеева Гүлфира Елубайқызы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Ә. Марғұлан атындағы Павлодар педагогикалық университетінің профессоры (Қазақстан Республикасы, Павлодар қ.)

Оутрам Алан – археология ғылымдарының докторы, Эксетер университетінің археология және тарих кафедрасының профессоры (Ұлыбритания, Эксетер)

Романова Екатерина Назаровна – Солтүстіктің байырғы халықтарының мәселелері және гуманитарлық зерттеулер институтының этнологиялық зерттеулер орталығының жетекшісі (АН СР(Ы) ХР) (Ресей Федерациясы, Якутск қ.)

Рюосуке Оно – Васеда университетінің тереңдетілген гуманитарлық зерттеулер орталығының доценті (Жапония, Токио)

Сәбитов Жақсылық Мұратұлы – Жошы Ұлысын зерттеу ғылыми институтының директоры, PhD доктор (Қазақстан Республикасы, Астана қаласы)

Томохико Уяма – PhD докторы, Хоккайдо университетінің славян және еуразиялық зерттеулер орталығының профессоры (Жапония, Саппоро)

Финке Питер – PhD докторы, Цюрих университетінің Макс Планк институтының профессоры (Швейцария, Цюрих)

Шотанова Ғалия Айтжанқызы – тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының жетекші ғылыми қызметкері (Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ.)

Жауапты редактор

Абдулина Ақсұңқар Тұрсынқызы

Жауапты хатшы және редактор

Мырзаходжаев Қуаныш Мәдиұлы

Редакторлар

Қасымова Дидар Бейсенғалиқызы
Черниенко Денис Аркадьевич
Досымбетов Нұрлыбек Айдарбекұлы
Көбеев Рүстем Джаулыбайұлы

Техникалық көмек

Зікірбаева Венера Серікқызы
Копеева Сания Жуматайқызы

РЕДАКЦИЯ

Главный редактор

Кабульдинов Зиябек Ермуханович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, генеральный директор Института истории и этнологии имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова (Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы)

Члены редакционной коллегии

Абиль Еркин Аманжолович – доктор исторических наук, профессор (Республика Казахстан, г. Астана)

Абдырахманов Толобек Абилович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, член-корреспондент НАН КР (Кыргызская Республика, г. Бишкек)

Апендиев Тимур Акимханович – PhD, ассоциированный профессор, ведущий научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова (Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы)

Горшенина Светлана Михайловна – доктор PhD, кандидат исторических наук; директор по исследованиям CNRS Eur'Orbem, UMR 8224, CNRS/Университет Сорбонны (Франция, г. Париж)

Исмагулов Оразак Исмагулович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, заведующий лабораторией физической антропологии Национального музея РК (Республика Казахстан, Астана)

Като Синдзи (Shinji Kato) – PhD (в области археологии), Национальный научно-исследовательский институт культурных ценностей в Наре (Япония, г. Нара)

Бирсель Каракоч, профессор тюркских языков, Уппсальский университет (Швеция, г. Уппсала)

Мионг Сун-ок – доктор антропологии, ассоциированный профессор (Корея, г. Сеул)

Козыбаева Махаббат Маликовна – доктор PhD; ведущий научный сотрудник Института культуры и духовного развития «Алаш» Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева (Республика Казахстан, Астана)

Моррисон Александр – PhD, профессор NewCollege, Оксфорд (Великобритания, Оксфорд)

Мотузайте-Матузевичюте Гидре – доктор археологии, профессор, руководитель Научного центра «Биоархеология» Вильнюсского университета, (Литва, г. Вильнюс)

Мушинов Аширбек Курбанович – доктор исторических наук, арабист, профессор; консультант Генерального директора по организационной деятельности ОИК (Центральная Азия), (Турция, Стамбул)

Нурсан Алимбай – кандидат исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова (Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы)

Отеева Гульфира Елубаевна – доктор исторических наук, профессор Павлодарского педагогического университета им. А.Х. Маргулана (Республика Казахстан, г. Павлодар)

Оутрам Алан – доктор археологических наук, профессор департамента археологии и истории университета Эксетере (Великобритания, г. Эксетер)

Романова Екатерина Назаровна, руководитель Центра этнологических исследований Института гуманитарных исследований и проблем малочисленных народов Севера (ИГИ АН РС(Я)) (Российская Федерация, г. Якутск)

Рюосуке Оно – доцент, Центр перспективных гуманитарных исследований, Университет Васеда (Япония, г. Токио)

Сабитов Жаксылык Муратович – директор Научного института изучения Улуса Джучи, доктор PhD (Республика Казахстан, г. Астана)

Томохико Уяма – PhD, профессор Центра славянско-евразийских исследований университета Хоккайдо (Япония, г. Саппоро)

Финке Петер, доктор PhD, профессор Института Макса Планка, университет Цюриха (Швейцария, г. Цюрих)

Шотанова Галия Айтжановна – кандидат исторических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова (Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы)

Ответственный редактор

Абдулина Аксункар Турсуновна

Ответственный секретарь и редактор

Мурзаходжаев Куаныш Мадиевич

Научные редакторы:

Касымова Дидар Бейсенгалиевна
Черниенко Денис Аркадьевич
Досымбетов Нурлыбек Айдарбекович
Кубеев Рустем Джаулыбайулы

Техническое сопровождение

Зикирбаева Венера Сериковна
Копеева Саня Жуматаевна

EDITORIAL TEAM**Editor-in-Chief**

Kabuldinov Ziyabek Ermukhanovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, general Director of Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology (Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty)

Editorial board members

Abil Erkin Amanzholovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana)

Abdyrakhmanov Tolobek Abilovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz Republic (Kyrgyz Republic, Bishkek)

Apendiev Timur Akimkhanovich – PhD, associate professor, leading researcher at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology (Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty)

Gorshenina Svetlana Mikhailovna – PhD, Candidate of Historical Sciences; Research Director of CNRS Eur'Orbem, UMR 8224, CNRS/Sorbonne University (France, Paris)

Ismagulov Orazak Ismagulovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Head of the Laboratory of Physical Anthropology of the National Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana)

Shinji Kato – PhD (Archaeology), Nara National Research Institute for Cultural Properties (Japan, Nara)

Birsel Karakoch – Professor of Turkic Languages, Uppsala University (Sweden, Uppsala)

Myong Soon-ok – PhD (Anthropology), Associate Professor (Seoul, Korea)

Kozybaeva Makhabbat Malikovna – PhD; Leading Researcher, Institute of Culture and Spiritual Development «Alash» of the L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana)

Morrison Alexander – PhD, Professor, New College, Oxford (United Kingdom, Oxford)

Motuzaitė-Matuzevichute Gidrė – Doctor of Archaeology, Professor, Head of the Scientific Center «Bioarchaeology» of Vilnius University, (Lithuania, Vilnius)

Muminov Ashirbek Kurbanovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Arabist, Professor; Consultant to the Director General for Organizational Activities of the OIC (Central Asia), (Turkey, Istanbul)

Nursan Alimbay – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology (Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty)

Otepova Gulmira Elubayevna – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at the A. Margulan Pavlodar Pedagogical University (Republic of Kazakhstan, Pavlodar)

Outram Alan – Doctor of Archaeological Sciences, Professor of the Department of Archaeology and History, University of Exeter (Great Britain, Exeter)

Romanova Ekaterina Nazarovna – Head of the Center for Ethnological Research, Institute for Humanitarian Research and Problems of Indigenous Peoples of the North (IHR RAS (Yakutia)) (Russian Federation, Yakutsk)

Ryuosuke Ono – Associate Professor, Center for Advanced Humanitarian Studies, Waseda University (Japan, Tokyo)

Sabitov Zhaksylyk Muratovich – Director of the Scientific Institute for the Study of the Ulus of Jochi, PhD (Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana)

Tomohiko Uyama – PhD, Professor, Center for Slavic-Eurasian Studies, Hokkaido University (Japan, Sapporo)

Finke Peter – PhD, Professor, Max Planck Institute, University of Zurich (Switzerland, Zurich)

Shotanova Galiya Aitghanovna – Candidate of historical sciences, leading researcher at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology (Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty)

Editor-in-Chief

Abdulina Aksunkar Tursunovna

Responsible Secretary and Editor

Murzakhodjaev Kuanysh Madievich

Scientific Editors:

Kasymova Didar Beysengalieвна

Chernienko Denis Arkadyevich

Dosymbetov Nurlybek Aidarbekovich

Kubeev Rustem Dzhaubayuly

Technical support

Zikirbaeva Venera Serikovna

Kopeeva Saniya Zhumataevna



Published in the Kazakhstan
Otan tarikhы
Has been issued as a journal
since 1998
ISSN: 1814-6961 (Print)
ISSN: 2788-9718 (Online)
2025. Vol. 28. Is. 4. Pp. 1009–
1019
Journal homepage:
<https://otan.history.iie.kz>



FTAXP / МРНТИ / IRSTI 03.20.

https://doi.org/10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_4_1009-1019

ПАВЛОДАР ОКРУГІНДЕГІ ЖЕРГІЛІКТЕНДІРУДІҢ ФУНКЦИОНАЛДЫҚ НОРМАСЫ ЖАҒДАЙЫНДАҒЫ ҰЛТТЫҚ КАДР САЯСАТЫ

Асель Маратқызы Ақшанова^{1*}, Гүлфира Елубайқызы Өтепова²,
Жұлдыз Дюсенбайқызы Қабиденова³

¹Әлкей Марғұлан атындағы Павлодар педагогикалық университеті
(60-үй, Олжабай батыр көшесі, 140002 Павлодар, Қазақстан Республикасы)
«Тарих» ББ докторанты
<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8570-1929>. E-mail: asselya-2012@mail.ru

²Әлкей Марғұлан атындағы Павлодар педагогикалық университеті
(60-үй, Олжабай батыр көшесі, 140002 Павлодар, Қазақстан Республикасы)
тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3495-4200>. Scopus Author ID –57194518893.
E-mail: g.otepova.hist@mail.ru

³Торайғыров университеті
(64-үй, Ломов көшесі, 64, 140008 Павлодар, Қазақстан Республикасы)
Phd доктор
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1478-1747>. Scopus Author ID – 57189321401.
E-mail: erasil_zhuldiz@mail.ru

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы ТЭИ, 2025

© Ақшанова А.М., Өтепова Г.Е., Қабиденова Ж.Д., 2025

Аңдатпа. *Kіріспе.* Мақала 1920 ж. аяғындағы Павлодар округіндегі әкімшілік жүйені жергіліктендіру саясатын енгізуге және іске асыруға байланысты, Қазақстан тарихындағы маңызды кезеңді қамтиды. *Мақсаты.* Ерте кеңестік кезеңдегі Павлодар округінде жергіліктендірудің практикалық тұрғыдан жүзеге асыру мәселелерін түсіндіру. Міндеті. Саясат кезеңдерін (атап айтқанда, функционалды кезенін) оның қайшылықтарын, тиімділігін талдау. *Материалдар мен әдістер.* Мақала Павлодар облысы Мемлекеттік мұрағатының іс жүргізу құжаттарына негізделген. Зерттеудің әдіснамалық негізі, саясаттың жалпы даму динамикасын және оның жекелеген кезеңдерін бақылауға мүмкіндік беретін проблемалық-хронологиялық тәсіл болып табылады. *Нәтижелер:* жергіліктендіру кезеңдері, саясаттың пайыздық нормасынан функционалды нормасына өту себептері зерттелді, билік органдары аппаратының кадрлық құрамының өзгеру градациясы, жергілікті билік құрылымдарының қалыптасу ерекшеліктері, сондай-ақ саясаттың аралық нәтижелері мен кейінгі міндеттері сипатталды. *Қорытындылар.* Мәдени-саяси көзқарас аясында жүргізілген жергіліктендіру, ресми мәлімделген теңдік саясаты мен оны жүзеге асырудың нақты тәжірибесі арасындағы қайшылықтарды анықтауға мүмкіндік берді.

Түйін сөздер: ұлттық саясат, этноөңір, Кеңестік Қазақстан, Павлодар округі, мәдени-саяси көзқарас, функционалды жергіліктендіру, пайыздық норма, кадрларды даярлау.

Дәйексөз үшін: Ақшанова А.М., Отепова Г.Е., Кабиденнова Ж.Д. Павлодар округіндегі жергіліктендірудің функционалдық нормасы жағдайындағы ұлттық кадр саясаты // Отан тарихы. 2025. Т. 28. № 4. 1009–1019-бб. [ағыл.]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_4_1009-1019

НАЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ КАДРОВАЯ ПОЛИТИКА В ПАВЛОДАРСКОМ ОКРУГЕ В УСЛОВИЯХ ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ НОРМЫ КОРЕНИЗАЦИИ

Асель Маратовна Акшанова^{1*}, Гульфира Елубаевна Отепова²,
Жулдыз Дюсенбаевна Кабиденнова³

¹Павлодарский педагогический университет имени А. Маргулана,
(д. 60, улица Мира, 140002 Павлодар, Республика Казахстан)
Докторант ОП «История»
<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8570-1929>. E-mail: asselya-2012@mail.ru

²Павлодарский педагогический университет имени А. Маргулана,
(д. 60, улица Мира, 140002 Павлодар, Республика Казахстан)
доктор исторических наук, профессор
ORCID 0000-0003-3495-4200. Scopus Author ID –57194518893.
E-mail: g.oteпова.hist@mail.ru³

³Торайгыров университет
(д. 64, улица Ломова, 140008 Павлодар, Республика Казахстан)
Phd доктор
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1478-1747>. Scopus Author ID –57189321401.
E-mail: erasil_zhuldiz@mail.ru

© ИИЭ имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2025

© Акшанова А.М., Отепова Г.Е., Кабиденнова Ж.Д., 2025

Аннотация. *Введение* Статья охватывает важный период в истории Казахстана, связанный с внедрением и реализацией политики коренизации административной системы в Павлодарском округе в конце 1920-х годов. *Цель* исследования заключается в выяснении вопросов практической реализации коренизации в Павлодарском округе в ранний советский период. *Задача* состоит в том, чтобы проанализировать этапы данной политики (в частности, функциональный этап) и оценить ее эффективность. *Материалы и методы.* Статья основана на делопроизводственных документах Государственного архива Павлодарской области (далее ГАПО). Методологической основой исследования является проблемно-хронологический подход, который позволяет отследить динамику развития политики в целом и ее этапов. *Результаты:* исследованы этапы коренизации, причины перехода от процентной к функциональной норме политики, описана градация изменения кадрового состава аппарата органов власти, особенности формирования местных властных структур, а также промежуточные результаты и дальнейшие задачи политики. *Выводы.* Коренизация, проводимая в рамках культурно-политического подхода, позволила выявить противоречия между декларируемой политикой равенства и реальной практикой ее реализации.

Ключевые слова: национальная политика, этнорегионы, Советский Казахстан, Павлодарский округ, культурно-политическая компания, функциональная коренизация, процентная норма, подготовка кадров.

Для цитирования: Акшанова А.М., Отепова Г.Е., Кабиденнова Ж.Д. Национальная кадровая политика в Павлодарском округе в условиях функциональной нормы коренизации // Отан тарихы. 2025. Т. 28. № 4. С. 1009–1019. [на англ.] DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_4_1009-1019

NATIONAL PERSONNEL POLICY IN THE PAVLODAR REGION UNDER THE FUNCTIONAL NORM OF KORENIZATSIIA (INDIGENIZATION)

Assel Maratovna Akshanova^{1*}, Gulmira Elubayevna Otepova², Zhuldyz Dyusenbaevna Kabidenova³

¹ Pavlodar Pedagogical University named after Alkey Margulan
(60, Olzhabay Batyr Str., 140002 Pavlodar, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Doctoral student of the EP «history»
<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8570-1929>. E-mail: asselya-2012@mail.ru

² Pavlodar Pedagogical University named after Alkey Margulan
(60, Olzhabay Batyr Str., 140002 Pavlodar, Republic of Kazakhstan)
doctor of historical sciences, professor of the Higher School of Humanities
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3495-4200>. Scopus Author ID –57194518893.
E-mail: g.oteпова.hist@mail.ru

³ Toraighyrov University (64, Lomov Str., 140008 Pavlodar, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Phd doctor
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1478-1747>. Scopus Author ID –57189321401.
E-mail: erasil_zhuldiz@mail.ru

© Valikhanov IHE, 2025

© Akshanova A.A., Otepova G.E., Kabidenova Zh.D., 2025

Abstract. The article covers an important period in the history of Kazakhstan, associated with the introduction and implementation of the policy of korenizatsiia (indigenization) of the administrative system in the Pavlodar district in late 1920s. The purpose of the study is to clarify issues of the practical implementation of korenizatsiia in the Pavlodar district during the early Soviet period. The task is to analyze the stages of this policy (in particular, the functional stage) and assess its effectiveness. *Materials and methods.* The article is based on the administrative documents of the State Archive of Pavlodar Region (hereafter SAPR). The methodological basis of the study is the problem-chronological approach, which makes it possible to trace the dynamics of the policy as a whole and its stages. *Results.* The stages of indigenization are examined, the reasons for the transition from the percentage to the functional norm of the policy are described, as well as the changes in the staffing of government bodies, the specifics of forming local power structures, intermediate results, and the further tasks of the policy. *Conclusions.* Indigenization, carried out within the framework of a cultural-political approach, revealed contradictions between the declared policy of equality and the real practice of its implementation.

Keywords: national policy, ethno-regions, Soviet Kazakhstan, Pavlodar district, cultural-political campaign, functional korenizatsiia (indigenization), percentage norm, personnel training

For citation: Akshanova A.A., Otepova G.E., Kabidenova Zh.D. National personnel policy in the Pavlodar region under the functional norm of korenizatsiia (indigenization) // *Otan tarihy*. 2025. Vol. 28. No 4. Pp. 1009–1019. [in english]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_4_1009-1019

Introduction. The academic community of the post-Soviet space pays significant attention to ethnopolitical issues, both as a factor of socio-political development and as a question of nation-building strategy. The national question in the post-Soviet republics remains relevant due to the re-evaluation of state-building experiences in the context of searching for a model of national identity.

These questions have been pressing since the period of active nation-state formation. A vivid example can be found in the world history of the last century, when in the first half of that period the demarcation of the borders of new state entities took place. As Malte Rolf notes, “The Soviet ‘empire of nations’ was supposed to represent nothing less than the complete opposite of Tsarist Russia”, but in choosing a strategy of national policy, it developed its own fundamental principles, where “Lenin and other party leaders created a unique state, which they called the USSR, and imposed a special policy of indigenization”. What is important in his research that is reveals contradictions of indigenization with “simultaneous strategies of

Sovietization of culture and people, which subsequently contributed to the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship” [Rolf, 2020].

The history of the 20th century vividly demonstrates how the declared supranational Soviet universality in practice often ignored or diminished the ethnic identity of peoples in favor of the dominant cultural-linguistic model of the center. The establishment of Soviet power was accompanied by a large-scale transformation of the state apparatus. In the conditions of the need to strengthen local authority and legitimize the Bolshevik regime, the leadership of the RKP (b) initiated a course toward indigenization.

Korenizatsiia (indigenization), as a cultural-political campaign, was aimed at promoting local personnel into government bodies and introducing official paperwork in the languages of the indigenous population. Indigenization acted as a strategic mechanism for integrating ethnic minorities into the apparatus of power to increase loyalty and to form a stable regional nomenklatura capable of implementing the party line.

The importance of indigenization processes at the beginning of the Soviet state requires retrospective reflection from today’s standpoint. Nevertheless, the question also arises as to how korenizatsiia (indigenization) proceeded and ended in the Soviet state, and whether its results corresponded to the earlier declared goals. An analysis of these political processes allows us to identify the contradictions between the ideology of internationalism and the actual practice of national policy in the regions.

Materials and Methods. The article is based on the principles of objectivity and historicism. The research was conducted on the basis of primary sources, drawing on original archival materials. Special attention is given to the functional norm of the policy, since it was during this period that the center’s efforts to strengthen its power through support of national elites reached their highest intensity.

Bibliographic materials of domestic and foreign researchers devoted to the issues of national policy in ethno-regions of the former Soviet republics are presented. Based on the analysis of bibliographic sources and archival materials of SAPR, the Kazakhstani model of korenizatsiia (indigenization) is described, with an emphasis on its regional aspect in the Pavlodar district.

As a result of research work in SAPR, materials reflecting the practical side of the policy, the training of national personnel, measures for conducting agitation-propaganda and cultural-pedagogical activities, as well as the interim results of korenizatsiia (indigenization) of the administrative apparatus in the Pavlodar district in the late 1920s, were studied and systematized.

The archival materials were classified by type, among which the following administrative documents are of the greatest interest:

1. Important information on the practical implementation of the policy is presented in reporting documents (SAPR. F. 11. D. 24: “Minutes of meetings at the district executive committee from October 19, 1928, on the organization of interdepartmental courses for the training of Kazakh employees of the district staff, courses on learning the Kazakh language, compilation of the indigenization plan. Reports of the district executive committee on the state of indigenization in connection with the transition to the district administrative system, of the district and industrial-cooperative society of hunters and fishermen on their work for 1928. Information from the district executive committee, its departments, district institutions and organizations, the state insurance committee and its departments, on the staffing of urban institutions and organizations for 1928. 297 sheets”), (SAPR. F. 11. D. 55 “Minutes of the plenary session of the district executive committee, meetings of the district commission. Reports of the district congress and its subordinate bodies, participation in the grain procurement campaign, on organizational-mass Soviet work in the district, city, Irtysh, Koryakov, Maksim-Gorky districts, and on the implementation of national policy in the district, the work of the district and Bayanaul district administrative departments, development of agriculture in the district, inspections of the collective farm system in the Maksim-Gorky district for 1929–1930. 604 sheets”), (SAPR, F. 11, D. 93 “Documents, directives, appeals, etc. Plan for the celebration of the 10th anniversary of Kazakhstan, report on korenizatsiia of administrative apparatus in the district for 1930. 77 sheets”), (SAPR, F. 11, D. 113 “Protocols of the organizational and ceremonial plenary sessions of the district executive committee (okrispolkom), dedicated to the 11th anniversary of the Workers’ and Peasants’ Red Army, held from February 23 to April 1, 1929. 77 sheets”).

2. Statistical and accounting materials contain important information about the stages of the policy (SAPR. F. 12 D. 140: “Information on the staffing of the district executive committee, its departments, volost executive committees, village councils, institutions, organizations of the district for 1927. 209 sheets”), (SAPR. F. 11. D. 64: “Plan for korenizatsiia of institutions for 1929 and documents (minutes, reports on courses in studying the Kazakh language, information on the staffing of district institutions with an

indication of the number of Kazakhs proficient in Kazakh, representatives of other nationalities, etc.) on its implementation for 1929. 376 sheets”).

3. Directive documents reflect specific measures of the cultural-pedagogical complex of activities (SAPR. F. 12. D. 54: “Circular letters of the Main Administrative Department of the NKVD of the Kirghiz SSR, Semipalatinsk provincial executive committee, district executive committee on the introduction of the Kirghiz language into office work and staffing of institutions with Kirghiz employees. List of members of the district commission on the introduction of the Kirghiz language into office work as of June 4, 1924”).

Discussion. The formation of the political system of the young Soviet government was directly connected with solving the national question, which was considered one of the priority areas of domestic policy during the establishment of the new state. Seeking to preserve the integrity of the former empire and to secure the support of the peoples of the national peripheries, the Bolshevik leadership pursued a deliberate policy of integrating representatives of indigenous peoples into the organs of state administration. Within this strategy, the cultural-political campaign of *korenizatsiia* was initiated.

The ideological foundations of the policy were laid in the resolution of the 10th Congress of the RCP(b) (1921) “On the Immediate Tasks of the Party in the National Question,” which emphasized maximum assistance to representatives of non-Russian peoples in the development and strengthening of the Soviet state system at the local level, in forms corresponding to the national and everyday traditions of national minorities [Stalin, 1947: 33–44].

Bernard Olivier identifies these processes in Soviet national policy as “*korenizatsiia*” and draws a parallel with “indigenization,” “nationalization,” and, when applied specifically to republics, “Ukrainization,” “Belarusization,” “Uzbekization,” “Kazakhization,” etc. [Olivier, 1990: 77].

The historiography of *korenizatsiia* in Kazakhstan has undergone a complex evolution - from ideologized Soviet interpretations to modern readings based on critical approaches. Soviet historians such as B. N. Rodnevich, M. Ryadnin, V. I. Belyakov, K. F. Kotov, and others presented *korenizatsiia* as an “unconditionally successful solution to the national question” and as an instrument of socialist modernization. In the 1960s–1980s, works by S. Zimanov, G. S. Sapargaliyev, and M. A. Binder began to display more balanced assessments, acknowledging both the positive aspects of the campaign and its contradictions.

After Kazakhstan gained independence, research began to view *korenizatsiia* as an ambivalent process reflecting the systemic problems of Soviet national policy. Comprehensive studies by S. Sh. Kaziev, E. N. Burdina, Zh. U. Kydyralina, V. Yeshpanov, and A. A. Kulshanova outline the main directions of the Soviet state’s national policy in Kazakhstan as a whole and during specific historical periods. Within the context of *korenizatsiia* and its components, these works address issues such as interethnic trust, implementation of language legislation, and the formation of the local nomenclatura. Regional research by G. Mukanova and I. K. Ternova, as well as stage analyses by E. Zhanykulov, K. Abenov, and L. Shotkabaeva, reveal concrete practices of this policy.

One of the most well-known theories interpreting the experience of *korenizatsiia* is Professor Terry Martin’s concept known as the “affirmative action empire” or policy of positive discrimination, aimed at supporting previously oppressed ethnic groups. According to this theory, the originality of Soviet policy lay in the fact that it promoted the external forms of existence of national minorities to a greater extent than those of the Russian majority. In their joint work, T. Martin and R. G. Suny demonstrate that Soviet national policy combined elements of support and repression, creating a unique experience of state management of ethnicity in the 20th century. A similar view is held by D. Hosking, who evaluates the USSR’s policy of national-state building as unprecedented in the world with regard to formerly colonized peoples and as protectionist in nature - aimed at their cultural and economic development and at involving non-Russian peoples in governance. However, as practice shows, theoretical principles were far from always successfully implemented in reality.

Each ethno-region of the former Soviet state had a unique experience of state-building, connected with the historical, ethnocultural, and economic characteristics of the area. Often, the Soviet political-ideological model came into conflict with the local cultural and social specifics of the regions. In the North Caucasus, the local population regarded new leaders from their midst with suspicion, considering them detached from ethnic roots. Additional difficulties were created by the influence of the Muslim clergy and strong clan ties [Tufanov, 2017: 86]. In the northeastern regions of the RSFSR, particularly in Yakutia, despite strengthening cultural autonomy through the development of the Yakut language, political struggle intensified amid national issues [Borisov, 2019: 225]. In Buryat-Mongolia, educated Buryats trained in Buddhist monasteries

did not support the Soviet regime [Bazarova, 2008: 54]. In Tatarstan, despite formal successes and an increase in the share of Tatars in the state and economic apparatus, indigenization was hindered by the lack of systematic work and hidden resistance from some Russian workers [Garipova, 2009]. Traditional, cultural, social, and other factors influenced the national policy of the party in the early stages and prompted repeated revisions of policy methods, with attempts to adapt them to regional specifics.

The main activities to form national cadres within the framework of indigenization went through three stages: the first stage, 1923–1926; the second, 1927–1932; the third, 1932–1936. At the first stage, national cadres were to be formed by means of a percentage (quantitative) norm, the essence of which was a mandatory percentage of local indigenous employees in the staff of an institution. As a result of the set of measures developed and implemented in 1923–1926, the number of Kazakhs in the administrative system increased proportionally. However, the positions intended for Kazakh employees were not specified, which caused imbalances in the national composition of staff. Leadership and service positions were more successfully staffed with national cadres, while the middle executive level was less affected. Appointing representatives of the indigenous population to leadership positions had important political significance. It demonstrated “proletarian justice” and “equality of peoples” legitimizing authority in the eyes of the local population. The middle level, as the backbone of the administrative system, was supposed to be ideologically reliable and professionally competent. However, the qualifications of local cadres did not meet the requirements of the Soviet administrative system. Training middle-level officials required considerable financial and administrative resources. Appointing indigenous people to lower positions (coachmen, watchmen, and other service roles) did not require special training or theoretical knowledge, which made these positions the most accessible. By the mid-1920s, courses were opened in a number of cities to train lower-level administrators from among the indigenous population, and the number of students in Soviet-Party schools also increased. Under the percentage norm, the activities of institutions, according to the objectives of the policy, practically did not change [Anisimova, 2017: 27].

Quantitative indicators of national cadres did not ensure full implementation of the policy. As of 1925, all Pavlodar institutions had 16% of positions indigenized; a year later this figure grew to 20–21%, and after the transition of the district to district-level administration, to 27%. Beyond that, the level of korenizatsiia did not rise. By the end of the first stage, the representation of Kazakhs at all levels of the party-state apparatus was significantly lower than planned. Low results were explained by the fact that the funds allocated for implementing the policy remained at the center and did not reach the peripheries. On May 20, 1926, the Presidium of the KazCEC condemned percentage-based indigenization and dissolved the indigenization commission, transferring its functions to the People’s Commissariat of the Workers’ and Peasants’ Inspectorate [Kaziev, 2015: 31].

At subsequent stages, methods of policy aimed solely at increasing the number of national cadres were deemed ineffective. This became the reason for transitioning to the functional method of korenizatsiia. The new stage envisioned ensuring that all levels of positions in administration and the state apparatus were staffed with national cadres as well as Europeans who were literate in and spoke the Kazakh language. The main goal of functional indigenization was to guarantee one hundred percent efficiency and alignment of the service system with the needs and requirements of the indigenous population. For this, the apparatus had to be indigenized not only quantitatively but also qualitatively, and not in one sector but across all sectors without exception.

To monitor the implementation of government resolutions and directives at the local level, special administrative-party commissions called “korenizatsiia troikas” were created. The Central Statistical Office of Kazakhstan and its agencies conducted records of state and cooperative institutions, covering the composition of staff, those who had passed or failed purges, issues of candidate promotion, the social composition of the apparatus, and its “contamination”. By order of the District Executive Committee, each institution submitted quarterly staffing schedules (number of employees in each position, how many were Kazakhs literate in Russian, how many were of other nationalities fluent in Kazakh, and others). Reporting meetings were also held, where managers presented reports on the actual implementation of indigenization tasks. District offices developed detailed indigenization plans based on a standard model plan. Quarterly control over plan implementation was carried out by authorized committees (UKOM) and “korenizatsiia troikas”. The plans specified the institution, group, and number of employees, including Kazakhs fluent in Russian, representatives of other nationalities fluent in Russian, and others [SAPR. F. 12. In. 1. D. 140. L. 84–85]. Changes to the plan were allowed only by including institutions not covered in the initial plan. At general city and cell (party, professional) meetings, methods and ways of indigenization were discussed. By

decision of the Presidium of the Pavlodar Region Executive Committee, a special inspector from the staff of the Pavlodar Region Executive Committee, N. Kadochkin, was appointed to monitor functional indigenization [SAPR. F. 11. In. 1. D. 24. L. 346]. The main work on forming national cadres was carried out precisely during the functional norm period.

According to the 1926 All-Union Census of the RSFSR and its regions, the population of the Semipalatinsk province, which included the Pavlodar region, totaled 1430808 people - of whom 120622 were urban residents and 1310186 rural residents. In the Pavlodar region itself, the total population numbered 294639 people, including 17949 urban and 276690 rural inhabitants [Perepis, 1926]. By 1928, at the time of the establishment of the district executive committee (okrispolkom), the region was characterized by the following socio-economic indicators: instead of the 24 rural areas (volosti) previously existing within the district, 9 new rural districts (rajony) were organized: Bayanaul'skij, Irtyshskij, Koryakovskij, Kzylagachesvskij, Maksimo-Gor'kovskij, Pavlodarskij, Sejtenevskij, Terengul'skij, Cyurupinskij. In place of 154 village councils (sel'aulsovety), 172 were created (88 Kazakh and 84 Russian). The total population of the district reached 336,000 people, of whom 56% were Kazakhs and 44% represented other nationalities [SAPR. F. 11. In. 1. D. 113. L. 3].

However, the system of administrative-organizational measures did not lead to the expected results. In Pavlodar, by 1927, indigenization of the apparatus, which coincided with the transition to the district administration system, had practically not changed. Of the 1,297 positions in district bodies, only 12.72% were indigenized by Kazakhs and 15.03% by other nationalities [SAPR. F. 11. In. 1. D. 24. L. 83]. In Yakovlev's report "On the Korenizatsiia of the State Apparatus in the Pavlodar Region" at the meeting of the Presidium of the Semipalatinsk Provincial Committee of the VKP(b) in 1927, the implementation of functional indigenization and compliance with government and party directives on the issue were deemed weak. The report noted a misinterpretation by the UKOM (district committee of the Komsomol) of the methods of implementing the policy, which led to duplication of functions between the UKOM and the District Executive Committee, negatively affecting the progress of the policy as a whole [SAPR. F. 12. In. 1. D. 140. L. 99].

By the end of 1928, in 45 institutions of the city, with a total staff of 1,220 employees, 185 people (15.2%) were indigenized at the expense of Kazakhs, 193 people (15.8%) at the expense of Russians and other nationalities, while 842 positions (58.9%) remained unindigenized. The contingent of Kazakhs who had completed training but were not employed numbered fewer than 20. The reasons varied, from candidates not meeting requirements for recommended positions to reluctance to work for the assigned low wages. The phrase "changed circumstances," used without proper clarification, also served as a formal pretext for refusing employment [SAPR. F. 11. In. 1. D. 64. L. 325]. That practice demonstrates the existence of hidden mechanisms of discrimination disguised as neutral administrative reasons. Moreover, the practical implementation of the policy encountered distorted perceptions at the local level. Some managers believed that responsibility for carrying out korenizatsiia lay with a specialized body, resulting in a lack of personal accountability for fulfilling the relevant measures within their institutions. To counter such tendencies, special meetings were held, where korenizatsiia plans were reviewed with an emphasis on personal responsibility for failing to meet the fixed targets.

By 1929, in 46 institutions of the district, 379 of 781 positions were subject to korenizatsiia, but in fact only 129 positions were indigenized. In the administrative apparatus, there were 1,350 employees, including 195 Kazakhs literate in Russian and their native language, and 183 representatives of other nationalities fluent in Kazakh [SAPR. F. 11. In. 1. D. 55. L. 492]. Protocols and reports noted the spontaneous nature of the policy, the lack of systematic training of national cadres, and the actual inaction of responsible structures in this direction. Approved plans were often not fulfilled, and there was opposition and misunderstanding of national policy issues by some managers.

By 1930, the situation had not significantly changed either quantitatively or qualitatively, as the figures remained stable at the same level. That was mainly explained by the fact that the percentage of qualified workers among the indigenous population was not high. Other reasons for the low results included seasonal campaigns (spring sowing, fodder procurement, etc.). To train mid-level employees from among the indigenous population, six-month courses for 75 people were organized at the district executive committee. Measures were also taken to contract highly qualified workers out of those who had graduated from universities and other educational institutions [SAPR. F. 11. In. 1. D. 55. L. 107].

Table 1. Percentage of indigenized positions by the end of the second half of the 1920s

Year	Number of administrative employees	Percentage of indigenized positions (held by Kazakhs and other nationalities)
1925	-	16%
1926	-	20-21%
1927	1279	27%
1928	1220	31 %
1929	1350	28%

Strategically, korenizatsiia (indigenization) functioned as a tool of manipulation over the political and cultural life of the country, with tasks aimed at forming a unified Soviet identity within a multinational state. At the same time, the economic sphere—including resource distribution, industrial management, and staffing policies at key enterprises—remained under strict centralized control. In a number of institutions (“Pavlodar Credit-Cooperative Society”, “Pavlodar State Bank Agency”, “Hunting Union”, “Office of the 1st Joint-Stock Transport Society”, “Pavlodar Cooperative Grain Union”, “Pavlodar District Communications Office”, “Pavlodar State Notarial Office”, “Pavlodar Agency of the Siberian State Shipping Company”), by the late 1920s there were no Kazakh employees. Subsequent industrialization and the urbanization that accompanied it did not serve as a catalyst for recruiting specialized workers (except for infrastructure projects) from among the local population.

The policy required a comprehensive approach, including not only administrative and staffing measures but also pedagogical and educational efforts. The cultivation of new cadres progressed poorly due to the shortage of higher-level Kazakh schools. Lack of teachers and continuity, and weak socio-political education were identified as growth points in this area [SAPR. F. 11. In. 1. D. 55. L. 509]. One of the key tasks in addressing these problems became the creation of a system of training and advanced education for cadres, both from the indigenous and the European population of the district. First-order measures were carried out by sending Kazakhs to educational institutions in the country and by organizing local courses. By 1930, up to 500 Kazakh youths from the Pavlodar district were sent to schools, courses, technical schools, and other institutions [SAPR. F. 11. In. 1. D. 93. L. 11]. However, the results of that work proved unsatisfactory, due to irregular attendance of students, difficulties in providing educational and bibliographic materials, unstable salaries for lecturers, and insufficient attention to course work from the leadership of institutions and trade union organizations.

Publishing and the release of periodicals in the language of the indigenous population became one of the key areas of the policy. It was assumed that publishing would encourage the “culturally backward” population toward literacy and serve as the main tool for propagating the new ideology. The Provincial Committee of the Youth Union initiated a campaign to support Kirghiz-Kazakh publishing, which was to be financed through funds collected during village meetings. Propaganda about the importance of Kazakh-language publishing, the organization of exhibitions of Kazakh press, distribution of subscription lists, small-group fundraising, and other forms of agitation activities were carried out by the district commission [SAPR. F. 12. In. 1. D. 54. L. 12–13]. By 1929, two newspapers were published in the district: *Kenes Tui* in Kazakh and *Soviet Village* in Russian. Despite their official importance, propaganda and agitation often lacked proper organizational preparation. The absence of control over the execution of agitation-propaganda activities resulted in many of them being conducted only formally.

Despite these shortcomings, by early 1930s certain positive shifts appeared, influencing the partial success of the campaign. Unlike the rigid adherence to percentage norms, functional korenizatsiia provided a more flexible and pragmatic approach, oriented toward the concrete needs of the administrative system and the socio-economic features of the region. That was expressed in the growth of the number of Kazakhs at all levels of positions in district and regional government bodies, the expansion of the network of national educational institutions for training cadres, and the increase in the share of the indigenous population among the students of Party and Soviet schools.

The third stage of korenizatsiia began with the resolution of the Regional Committee of the VKP(b) of April 4, 1933, and the decree of the Council of People’s Commissars (SNC) of May 17, 1933, on the korenizatsiia of the apparatus, which stated: “Indigenization of the apparatus is a strictly class-based measure

of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the most important means of struggle against nationalist, Alash-Orda elements, and against counterrevolutionary bai elements” [Zhanykulov, 2013]. A positive consequence of the policy was the provision of a social lift for Kazakh youth. It was just during the korenizatsiia times that a special term was introduced into office work and the practice of Soviet-Party institutions: “vydvizhentsy” (promoted individuals) — persons of indigenous nationality who were promoted into the state apparatus [Mukanova, 2025: 426]. The task of coopting workers into state administration was set by Lenin on the eve of the October Revolution and in the first years of Soviet power. It was specified in the decisions of the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 13th Party Congresses, as well as in the resolution of the Central Committee of the VKP(b) of March 7, 1927, “On the Tasks of the Party in Promoting Workers and Peasants into the State Apparatus” [Lenin, 1968]. Promotion (vydvizhenchestvo), directed by the Party, played a significant role in creating the new Soviet state apparatus, forming the Soviet intelligentsia, and strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat. During the third stage, the cleansing of the administrative apparatus of “unreliable” employees increasingly combined with the practice of promotion, giving it an instrumental character. Starting in the early 1930s, the policy declined, giving way to planned training of specialists. It was believed that indigenization had fulfilled its purpose, ensuring accessibility of the administrative apparatus for the population and providing representation for Kazakhs in the party-state apparatus.

Findings. The experience of korenizatsiia in the 1920s revealed significant contradictions between political directives and real possibilities on the ground. The requirements to involve the indigenous population in governing bodies were hampered by the shortage of qualified personnel. The system of training cadres was often formal in nature and was accompanied by economic and resource constraints. The lack of effective mechanisms to support the regions hindered the implementation of national personnel policy targets.

The transition from the percentage method to the functional norm did not produce stable results, due to the low level of cadre preparation, weak methodological and organizational work, as well as the lack of real political will among part of the local leadership. The drafting of plans, monitoring by specially created bodies, and regular reports did not lead to the expected results. By the late 1920s, the indicators of korenizatsiia in the Pavlodar region remained consistently low.

The cultural-educational component, including the development of Kazakh-language press and publishing, also had limited effect. Despite efforts at propaganda and mobilization of resources, institutional and cadre instability did not allow for the creation of a solid system of ideological and educational influence on the population. By the early 1930s, indigenization, like the system of promotion (vydvizhenchestvo), acquired an instrumental character. The policy was simultaneously used to combat “nationalist elements” and as a cover for personnel purges.

Conclusion. Throughout the history of the Soviet state, the national question was accompanied by ideological and practical contradictions, and the early Soviet period was no exception. The creation of national administrative units in the 1920s, and the resulting administrative decentralization, were often compensated for by strict centralization through the rigid vertical structure of Party authority. The policy revealed the shortcomings and flaws of a centralized approach to solving the national question. Social and political practices in the field of nation-building, carried out by the Communist Party, resembled the practices of an “empire.” As Peter Blitstein noted, “imperial practices can be applied by a nation-state, and nationalizing practices - by an empire” [Blitstein, 2006: 197]. The Soviet leadership simultaneously applied both imperial and nationalizing practices: building a unified political nation while at the same time preserving, and in some cases even reinforcing, numerous ethnocultural differences.

The presented research results show how the ambitious goals set at the highest Party-state level turned out to be utopian when implemented in practice at the local level. In the Pavlodar region, korenizatsiia did not become a factor of significant change in the administrative-management system. The policy, conceived as a tool of nation-building and the formation of a loyal nomenklatura, remained largely declarative, accompanied by staffing failures and local resistance, expressed both covertly and sometimes openly. Despite the importance of the stated goals and the potential transformative force, without clear coordination, proper control, stable resource support, and attention to regional specifics, the results proved limited. Forced methods with distortions at the local level also negatively affected the final outcomes of the policy. Beginning in the 1930s, the central cultural-linguistic model once again began to strengthen, undermining and leveling the goals, objectives, and positive results of the policy. The experience of korenizatsiia (indigenization) in the Pavlodar district reflects the systemic problems and contradictions of Soviet national policy in the ethno-regions.

Sources

SAPR – State Archive of Pavlodar Region

Literature

- Blitstein, 2006 – *Blitstein P.A.* Nation and Empire in Soviet History, 1917–1953. *Ab Imperio*. 2006. № 1. Pp. 197–219. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1353/imp.2006.0000>.
- Анисимова, 2017 – *Анисимова И.В.* Становление советской власти в Казахстане и реализация политики коренизации административного аппарата в 1920–1926 гг. // *Известия Алтайского государственного университета*. 2017. Т. 94. № 2. С. 21–27.
- 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.
- Борисов, 2019 – *Борисов А.А.* Исторический опыт нациестроительства в Якутии (1922 – конец 1930-х гг.) // *Новейшая история России*. 2019. № 1. С. 214–232.
- Всесоюзная перепись населения, 1928 – *Всесоюзная перепись населения* 1926 года. М: ЦСУ Союза ССР, 1928. Т. 9 С. 2–13. Т. 14 С. 2–3. URL: https://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/rus_26.php?reg=381
- Гарипова, 2009 – *Гарипова З.Г.* Осуществление политики коренизации в Татарстане в документах. 1920–1930-е гг. Казань: Институт истории АН РТ, 2009. 272 с.
- Жаныкулов, Абенов. 2013. – *Жаныкулов Е.Ж., Абенов К.К.* Коренизация в Казахстане в начале 20-х годов XX века, как способ привлечения в аппарат управления местных кадров // *Вопросы истории Кыргызстана*. 2013. № 3–4. С. 131–141.
- Казиев, 2015. – *Казиев С.Ш.* Политика коренизации и проблемы межэтнического доверия в Казахстане (1923–1936 гг.) // *Омский научный вестник*. 2015. Т. 136. № 2. С. 29–32.
- Ленин, 1968. – *Ленин В.И.* Очередные задачи Советской власти, Полн. собр. соч. 5 издание. Рабочий класс в управлении государством (1926–1937 гг.). М. 1968. Т. 36.
- Муканова, 2025 – *Муканова Г.К.* Плюсы и минусы коренизации. на примере Акмолинской губернии, 1920-е гг. // *Оман тарихы*. 2025. Т. 28. № 2. С. 446–459. https://doi.org/10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_2_446-459
- Сталин, 1947 – *Сталин И.В.* Сочинения. Т.V. М. 1947. С. 33–44.
- Olivier, 1990 – *Olivier B.V.* Korenizatsiia. *Central Asian Survey*. 1990. № 9(3). Pp. 77–98. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634939008400716>
- Rolf, 2020 – *Rolf Malte.* Nationalizing an Empire: The Bolsheviks, the Nationality Question, and Policies of Indigenization in the Soviet Union (1917– 1927). The First World War and the Nationality Question in Europe. *Global Impact and Local Dynamics. Series: National Cultivation of Culture*. 2020. V. 23. Pp. 65-86. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004442245_005
- Туфанов, 2017 – *Туфанов Е.Ф.* Коренизация как инструмент формирования региональной номенклатуры на материалах Северного Кавказа В 1920–1930-е гг. // *Научная мысль Кавказа*. 2012. № 3. С. 84–85. <https://doi.org/10.23683/2072-0181-2017-91-3-84-89>

References

- Anisimova, 2017 – *Anisimova I.V.* Stanovlenie sovetskoj vlasti v Kazaxstane i realizaciya politiki korenizacii administrativnogo apparata v 1920–1926 gg. [The Establishment of Soviet Power in Kazakhstan and the Implementation of the Korenizatsiia Policy in the Administrative Apparatus, 1920–1926]. *Izvestiya Altajskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. 2017. Т. 94. № 2. Pp. 21–27. [in Russian].
- Bazarova, 2008 – *Bazarova V.V.* Korenizatsiia gosudarstvennogo apparata v Buryat-Mongolii kak opy`t nacional`noj politiki v 1920–1930-x gg. [Korenizatsiia of the State Apparatus in Buryat-Mongolia as an Experience of National Policy in the 1920s–1930s]. *Vlast`*. 2008. № 3. Pp. 53–55. [in Russian].
- Blitstein, 2006 – *Blitstein P.A.* Nation and Empire in Soviet History, 1917–1953. *Ab Imperio*. 2006. № 1. Pp. 197–219. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1353/imp.2006.0000>
- Borisov, 2019 – *Borisov A.A.* Istoricheskij opy`t naciestroitel`stva v Yakutii (1922 – konec 1930-x gg.) [The Historical Experience of Nation-Building in Yakutia (1922 – Late 1930s)]. *Novejshaya istoriya Rossii*. 2019. № 1. Pp. 214–232. [in Russian].
- Garipova, 2009 – *Garipova Z.G.* Osushhestvlenie politiki korenizacii v Tatarstane v dokumentax. 1920–1930-e gg. [Implementation of the Korenizatsiia Policy in Tatarstan in Documents: 1920s–1930s]. Kazan`: Institut istorii AN RT, 2009. 272 p. [in Russian].
- Kaziev, 2015 – *Kaziev S. Sh.* Politika korenizacii i problemy` mezhe`tnicheskogo doveriya v Kazaxstane (1923– 1936 gg.) [The Korenizatsiia Policy and the Problems of Interethnic Trust in Kazakhstan (1923–1936)]. *Omskij nauchny`j vestnik*. 2015. Т. 136. № 2. Pp. 29–32. [in Russian].
- Lenin, 1968. – *Lenin V.I.* Ocheredny`e zadachi Sovetskoj vlasti, Poln. sobr. soch. 5 izdanie. Rabochij klass v upravlenii gosudarstvom (1926–1937 gg.) [The Immediate Tasks of Soviet Power, Complete Collected Works, 5th Edition. The Working Class in State Administration (1926–1937)]. М. 1968. Т. 36. [in Russian].

- Mukanova, 2025 – *Mukanova G.K.* Plyusy` i minusy` korenizacii. na primere Akmolinskoj gubernii, 1920-e gg. [The pros and cons of indigenization. On the example of Akmola province, 1920s.]. *Otan tarihy*. 2025. T. 28. № 2. Pp. 446–459. [in Russian]. URL: https://doi.org/10.51943/2788-9718_2025_28_2_446-459
- Olivier, 1990 – *Olivier B.V.* Korenizatsiia. *Central Asian Survey*. 1990. № 9(3). Pp. 77–98. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634939008400716>
- Perepis`, 1926 – *Vsesoyuznaya perepis` naseleniya 1926 goda*. M.: Izdanie CzSU Soyuz SSR, 1928. T. 9. Pp. 2-13. T. 17. Pp. 2-3. [in Russian]. URL: https://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/rus_26.php?reg=381
- Rolf, 2020 – *Malte Rolf*. Nationalizing an Empire: The Bolsheviks, the Nationality Question, and Policies of Indigenization in the Soviet Union (1917– 1927). The First World War and the Nationality Question in Europe. *Global Impact and Local Dynamics. Series: National Cultivation of Culture*. 2020. V. 23. Pp. 65–86. URL: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004442245_005
- Stalin, 1947 – *Stalin I.V.* Sochineniya [Collected Works]. T. V. M. 1947. Pp. 33–44. [in Russian].
- Tufanov, 2017 – *Tufanov E.F.* Korenizatsiia kak instrument formirovaniya regional'noj nomenklatury` na materialax Severnogo Kavkaza V 1920–1930-e gg. [Korenizatsiia as an Instrument for the Formation of Regional Elites: A Case Study of the North Caucasus in the 1920s–1930s]. *Nauchnaya my`sl` Kavkaza*. 2012. № 3. Pp. 84–89. URL: <https://doi.org/10.23683/2072-0181-2017-91-3-84-89>
- Vsesoiuznaia perepis naselenia, 1928 – *Vsesoiuznaia perepis naselenia 1926 goda*. M.: SSU Soiuz SSR, 1928. T. 9 Pp. 2–13. T. 14 Pp. 2–3. URL: https://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/rus_26.php?reg=381
- Zhany`kulov, Abenov, 2013 – *Zhany`kulov E.Zh., Abenov K.K.* Korenizatsiia v Kazaxstane v nachale 20-x godov XX veka, kak sposob privlecheniya v apparat upravleniya mestny`x kadrov [Korenizatsiia in Kazakhstan in the Early 1920s as a Means of Involving Local Personnel in the Administrative Apparatus]. *Voprosy` istorii Ky`rgy`zstana*. 2013. № 3–4. Pp. 131–141. [in Russian].

МАЗМҰНЫ/ СОДЕРЖАНИЕ/CONTENT
ОТАН ТАРИХЫ. 2025. Т. 28. № 4

<i>Uryustyumova A., Sadvakassova Zh., Omurova Zh.</i> KAZAKHSTAN–KYRGYZSTAN CULTURAL DIPLOMACY (2015–2025): THE ROLE OF TURKSOY AND OTHER CULTURAL PLATFORMS.....	990
<i>Sailaubaeva A.K., Zhumatai S.</i> THE ROLE OF THE AKHMET RIZA MADRASAH IN THE EDUCATIONAL AND ENLIGHTENMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE SEMEY REGION.....	1000
<i>Akshanova A.M., Otepova G.E., Kabidenova Zh.D.</i> NATIONAL PERSONNEL POLICY IN THE PAVLODAR REGION UNDER THE FUNCTIONAL NORM OF KORENIZATSIYA (INDIGENIZATION).....	1009
<i>Kapassova G., Sadvakassova Zh., Kaliyeva K.</i> HISTORICAL FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT TRENDS OF TOURISM IN THE ALAKOL AND ISSYK-KUL REGIONS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS.....	1020
<i>Dossymova M.K.</i> THE GENERAL SITUATION OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AND RUSSIA IN THE FINAL STAGES OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR.....	1033
<i>Baigabatova N., Abdrakhim M.</i> ADAPTATION CHALLENGES OF ETHNIC REPATRIATES IN POST-SOVIET KAZAKHSTAN: A HISTORICAL-CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS.....	1050
<i>Dalayeva T., Idrissova A.</i> VISUAL SYMBOLISM OF ECONOMIC HISTORY IN TEXTBOOKS ON THE MODERN HISTORY OF KAZAKHSTAN (SECOND HALF OF THE 20TH–EARLY 21 CENTURIES).....	1063
<i>Sadvakassova Zh., Kapassova G.</i> KAZAKHSTAN KYRGYZ AND KYRGYZSTAN KAZAKHS: ETHNODEMOGRAPHIC TRANSFORMATION AND MIGRATION IN THE FIRST DECADE OF INDEPENDENCE.....	1080
<i>Zhussip S.A., Nurpeisov Y.K., Maslov Kh.B.</i> ALASH ORDA'S SOVEREIGN FOREIGN POLICY: NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE CZECHOSLOVAK DELEGATION (1918-1920).....	1091
<i>Токашева А.Н., Жуманова А.З.</i> 1944 ЖЫЛҒЫ БҚП(Б) ОРТАЛЫҚ КОМИТЕТІНДЕГІ ТАРИХШЫЛАР КЕҢЕСІ: КЕҢЕС ТАРИХНАМАСЫНДАҒЫ ИДЕОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ БАҒЫТ.....	1107

- Сулейменова А.Т.**
РЕСПУБЛИКАЛЫҚ БАҚЫЛАУ КОМИССИЯЛАРЫНЫҢ ҚҰЖАТТАРЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДА
1925–1933-ЖЫЛДАРЫ ЖҮРГІЗІЛГЕН НАУҚАНДАРДЫ
ЗЕРТТЕУДІҢ ТАРИХИ ДЕРЕККӨЗІ РЕТІНДЕ.....1117
- Абсаликов А.А., Бисенова Г.А.**
ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЕ ИСТОЧНИКИ О КОК ОРДЕ (СИНЕЙ ОРДЕ) И АК ОРДЕ
(БЕЛОЙ ОРДЕ): ПРОБЛЕМЫ ЛОКАЛИЗАЦИИ И РЕКОНСТРУКЦИИ
В ИСТОРИКО-ГЕОГРАФИЧЕСКОМ КОНТЕКСТЕ.....1136
- Молдин Б.А., Мәден А.Т.**
XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 20-30 ЖЫЛДАРЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ
ХАЛЫҚ НАРАЗЫЛЫҚТАРЫ МЕН КӨТЕРІЛІСТЕРІ МӘСЕЛЕСІНЕ
ТАРИХНАМАЛЫҚ ШОЛУ.....1148
- Бейсенбаева Г.К., Касенова А.Д., Богенбаева А.К.**
ПОЛЕВЫЕ АРХЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ ДЛЯ ШКОЛЬНИКОВ.....1166
- Рахметова Ә., Сарсембаева Г.**
ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ДЕМОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ ДАМУДЫҢ ЖАҢА
БАҒЫТТАРЫ (2021–2025 жж.).....1177
- Есназарова З.Б.**
АДМИНИСТРАТИВНО-ТЕРРИТОРИАЛЬНОЕ И СОЦИАЛЬНО-
ДЕМОГРАФИЧЕСКОЕ РАЗВИТИЕ ГОРОДОВ
КАРАКАЛПАКСТАНА. 1873–1926 гг.....1189
- Базарбаев К., Амирбек А., Акдениз Э.**
XX ҒАСЫР БАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚ ЗИЯЛЫЛАРЫНЫҢ ҚОҒАМДЫҚ-
САЯСИ САНАСЫНДАҒЫ ТҮРКИЯ ФАКТОРЫ.....1205
- Шолахов М.Г., Алтысбес М.А.**
РЕФОРМЫ ЖАНГИР-ХАНА.....1215
- Мамраймов С.Д.**
1937 ЖЫЛҒЫ №00447 БҰЙРЫҚ ЖӘНЕ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ
КЕҢЕСТІК РЕПРЕССИЯЛЫҚ АППАРАТТЫҢ
ҚҰРЫЛЫМДЫҚ-ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛДЫҚ ТЕТІКТЕРІ.....1230
- Ескалиев С.А., Айтенов Ж.К.**
КОММУНИСТІК ПАРТИЯ МЕН КЕҢЕСТІК МЕМЛЕКЕТТІЛІК:
ТОТАЛИТАРЛЫҚ ЖҮЙЕНІҢ ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛДЫҚ ЭВОЛЮЦИЯСЫ
(ТАРИХИ АСПЕКТ).....1245
- Сағнайқызы С., Сартаев С.А., Нусунбаева С.А.**
КОРРУПЦИЯ И ПОЛИТИЗАЦИЯ: ОТРАЖЕНИЕ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ
ПРАВООХРАНИТЕЛЬНОЙ СИСТЕМЫ КАЗАХСКОЙ АССР НА СТРАНИЦАХ
ГАЗЕТЫ «ЕҢБЕКШІ ҚАЗАҚ» (КОНЕЦ 1920-х – НАЧАЛО 1930-х ГОДОВ).....1260

- Қуаныш С.О., Айдосынова Г.Ж., Мурзаходжаев Қ.М.**
АТЫРАУ Өңіріндегі қуғын-сүргін: өлім жазасына
кесілген дін өкілдері.....1271
- Хайдаров Т.Ф., Бейсембаева А.Р.**
XIV ғасырдың екінші жартысында жошы ұлысында
болған індет.....1284
- Түлебаев Д.Ж., Симтиков Ж.К.**
Қазақ халқының тарихындағы тілдің әлеуметтік рөлі.....1293
- Ашимова У.А., Қалшабаева Б.К.**
Қазақ әйелдерінің дәстүрлі киіміндегі трансформациялық
үрдістер: мәдени жад пен ұлттық бірегейлік түйісінде.....1304
- Kabuldinov Z.Y., Mussabalina G., Beisembayeva A.**
KAZAKH-OIRAT RELATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF REGIONAL
TRANSFORMATIONS IN CENTRAL ASIA (15th – EARLY 17th CENTURIES).....1319
- Ерзабылов А.Е.**
Жетісу және Іле алабындағы ортағасырлық қалалардың
зерттелуіндегі кейбір өзекті мәселелер
(1991-2023 жж. зерттеулер негізінде).....1331



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