

Kazakh nomads: the road to socialism

Abstract. *The article deals with the history of socio-economic modernization of Kazakhstan in the 1920s-1930s. Based on the methodology of interdisciplinary approach the author has revealed the micro-sketches of the process of forced collectivization and its consequences. The relevance of the proposed study is the need to develop, a platform generally accepted historical concept of the Sovietization of the Kazakh aul, the definition of its regional specificity to understand the causes of such disastrous consequences. The spearhead of the permanent violence in the Kazakh steppe was directed to the eradication of the kin networks of the Kazakh aul and the formation of the Soviet identity of the Kazakh aul.*

The path to socialism destroyed the structural elements of the social life and traditional culture of the Kazakhs. Adaptation processes of Kazakh people conditioned new rules of Soviet social life, combined with applied survival strategies and practices of conformist behaviour. The content of the article is based on the analysis of adaptation practices of Kazakh nomads on documents and materials from archival fonds. The author shows daily, individual strategies of adaptation and survival of the population, in conditions of implementation of the program of social and economic modernization of the Kazakh aul.

The result of author's research is the analysis of two behavioural levels: fleeing - migrating and adaptation, that became a consequence of economic coercion and destruction of the social layer of «the former». Kazakh auls transferred the network of tribal communications and the system of traditional values to the collective farm, forming unique «Kazakh-style collective farms». Election campaigns to the grass-roots apparatus of the Soviet power became the place of clan battles. The power actively used intra- and inter-clan conflicts for realization of strategic tasks of socialist construction. However, the status ranking of clan structures provoked unethical forms of behaviour such as denunciation, incitement, and the use of compromising materials. The documents have preserved many micro-histories which focus on the fates of individuals and the tragedy of family breakdown because of confiscation, eviction, and divorce. These fragments of oral history reveal the reasons behind the Kazakh aul's nomadic move.

To summarize, the author noted that on the one hand clan traditionality was trying to solidify itself under Sovietism, while on the other hand it was trying to escape from direct conflict by fleeing. However, all the adaptive behavioural levels taken together could not save the nomads from starvation. The «imagined community» of the Kazakhs was destroyed not so much by generic contradictions as by the political will of the Soviet state, for the sake of forming a new Soviet identity, a new Soviet society. On the way to socialism the historical memory was transformed, and the ancestral memory of the Kazakh people was destroyed.

Key words: *collectivization; adaptation; nomadism; famine; sovietism; nomads; microhistory.*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-7255-2021-134-1-49-62>

Поступила: 11.01.2021/Одобрена к опубликованию: 05.02.2021

Introduction. The historical policy of the state structures the images of the past, focusing on certain events and landmarks. In the context of K. Tokayev's article «Independence is above all», the problematic issues of socio-economic modernization of Kazakhstan have once again come to the fore. The actualisation of the President's article is considered in connection with the need to develop a generally accepted historical position and an assessment of Soviet modernisation and its consequences for Kazakhstan. The interdisciplinary research approach in the study of the history of Kazakhstan of the Soviet period, expands the coordinates of historical knowledge, allowing us to see the specifics of certain events.

At the current stage there is an understanding that the destruction of the traditional social structure of the Kazakh people, has led to a catastrophic decline in the standard of living of the population. The slogan of «aggravation of the class struggle» became the main driver of the process of socialist construction in Kazakhstan. As a result, the way to socialism destroyed the commonness of everyday life of the Kazakh aul, conditioning the development of behavioural mimicry of the Kazakh population. Considering that the habitual format of socio-kin communications and hierarchical relations was destroyed by the process of sovietization, the everyday life determined new variants of adaptive behavior of Kazakh nomads. Kazakh traditional society, having assimilated the rules of Soviet existence, developed unique techniques for self-preservation. The Kazakhs have formed the individual strategy of survival, choosing tactics of open and hidden confrontation, behavioral reactions of short and long time of action. The activation of mimicry occurs when the population loses social support and does not see prospects for its future, which is the beginning of the destruction of the ethnos.

At the current moment there is an understanding that the destruction of the traditional social structure of Kazakh people, has led to a catastrophic decline in the standard of living of the population. The slogan of «aggravation of the class struggle» became the

main driver of the process of socialist construction in Kazakhstan. As a result, the way to socialism destroyed the commonness of everyday life of Kazakh aul, determining the development of behavioral mimicry of Kazakh population. Considering that the habitual format of socio-kin communications and hierarchical relations was destroyed by the process of socialization, the everyday life determined new variants of adaptive behavior of Kazakh nomads. Kazakh traditional society, having assimilated the rules of Soviet existence, developed unique techniques for self-preservation. The Kazakhs have formed the individual strategy of survival, choosing tactics of open and hidden confrontation, behavioral reactions of short and long time of action. The activation of mimicry occurs when the population loses social support and does not see prospects for its future, which is the beginning of the destruction of the ethnos.

An interdisciplinary system analysis of the adaptation practices of the Kazakh nomads conducted by the author demonstrates an attempt at socialization and adaptation to the rules of socialist existence. The development of survival strategies has been determined by the politics of violence, causing individual behavioral reactions, regardless of the attitude to power. The conformism of individuals built their own personal space in the conditions of a totalitarian regime and the implementation of repressive practices. The uniqueness of Kazakh conformism is a pronounced tribalism as a modus operandi of political adaptation. Its vivid element was «Kazakh-style collective farms», with colorfully expressed generic ties and contradictions, which were reflected in the party documents. The process of sovietization, the permanent violence of Kazakh steppe solved the main task - eradication of tribal bonds of Kazakh aul, formation of the Soviet identity of the Kazakh aul.

Materials and methods. The source includes materials from the archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan (AP RK), where the information was extracted from the funds of the Kazakh Regional Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) (F. 141).

Some additional materials were found in the regional archives: The State Archive of East Kazakhstan Oblast (GAVKO), the Centre for Historical Documents of Contemporary History (CIDNI) and the State Archive of Aktobe Oblast (Fy. 63). The extracted documents demonstrate the confrontation between the authorities and the people, show the administrative resource of violence and the daily reaction of the population.

The author involved archival materials of the East Kazakhstan Region Police Department. There have been archived cases of convicts in the period of collectivization and implementation of kulak operation according to order No. 00447. A part of the sources used by the author are introduced into the scientific turnover for the first time.

In the context of interdisciplinary methods of analysis of social confrontation, the author applied the following sociological concepts: rivalry, adaptation, evasion, compromise, cooperation. Reliance on the theoretical concepts of modern historical science allowed to comprehend documentary artefacts, i.e. archival materials, historical sources in the focus of interaction with the socio-cultural structures that influenced their content.

Discussion. Debates on the most problematic issues of Kazakhstan's socio-economic modernization have been highlighted in the works of both domestic and foreign historians. Especially active debates have been held on issues of starvation, nomadism, demographic losses, and personal responsibility. The issues of force activities in the period of socio-economic modernization have been assessed and analyzed on a large scale in the works of well-known foreign authors. The authors' apodictic judgments demonstrate the relationship of economic violence, with the rural population's resistance to the state.

The issues of power activities of the period of socio-economic modernization have been assessed and analyzed on a large scale in the works of internationally known authors. The authors' apodictic judgement demonstrates the conditionality of the connection of economic violence, with the confrontation of the rural

population with the state. The village found itself under the pressure of arbitrary seizure, confiscation of property and forced collective farming.

The widespread practice of state violence, identified as a product of the Stalin era [1], was sounded in propaganda rhetoric as a successful socialist attack. Bolshevism shaped a new identity without roots, lineage, or tribe. The authorities sought to create a new man of the Soviet country, without the pre-existing traditional ties, which included family, religion, complete purification from the «gloom of the past» [2]. The Kazakh mentality, which had a built-up clan-hierarchical structure, did not fit the Soviet format at all. At the same time, promoted ideology of identity markers and the special privileges associated with it, had found people willing to accept and assimilate the language of power. This version of adaptation opened wide doors for its followers to ascend the career ladder.

The authoritarian regime's focus on permanent violence in the implementation of the apparently good cause of socio-economic modernization caused a terrible catastrophe. In the 1930s, famine began in Ukraine, the Volga region, the North Caucasus and Kazakhstan. R. Kindler [3], D. Verkhoturov [4] and I. Ogayon [5] associated the causes of the famine with the Bolsheviks' large-scale experiment in Central Asia - conversion of Kazakh nomads to sedentary life, which was the main postulate of the Soviet modernization project in Kazakhstan.

The path to socialism became a disaster path. The details of this path have not yet received proper coverage in the history of Kazakhstan, including famine as the most heinous crime of Stalinism. [6] Some authors have attempted to interpret the famine as an ethnic genocide of the Kazakhs and Ukrainians, given that two peaks of famine occurred in Kazakhstan and Ukraine, resulting in mass deaths. It can be agreed with the opinion that the famine caused complete dependence of the Kazakh population on the state controlled by Moscow and led to sedentarization [7]. The political terror against the peasantry caused widespread resistance. Peasant uprisings were considered as a national resistance to Soviet

power. There appeared such terms as «basmachi», «bandits», «rebels», «otkochetschiki», etc. in the NKVD's vocabulary. Almost all the participants in the uprisings who were convicted in 1930-1933 by the PP OGPU Troika were re-deported or shot under Order No. 00447 as part of the kulak operation.

However, analysis of daily, individual adaptation and survival strategies in the new social context has not received extensive thematic attention.

Results. The study includes an analysis of two behavioral levels. They are escape and adaptation. The first level relates to destruction of structural component of Kazakh aul, social level of «former» bays, clan-rulers and so on. They had a great prestige among the Kazakh nomadic population, not only because of their wealth, but also because of their education, patronage of arts and charity. To limit their influence in the system of patrimonial relations, it was necessary to break traditional nomadic communications. As a result, the complex system of economic relations and all its subjects were destroyed [8]. They have been discriminated at the legislative level, by various detrimental measures, such as disenfranchisement, eviction, or banishment, etc.

The first action of “debaization” was taken in 1928. It can be assessed as a programme of state transformation of Kazakhstan aimed at the cultural destruction of Kazakh society [6]. On August 9, 1928, the Politburo of Kazakhstan has suggested Kazkrajkom no later than September 1, 1928 to conduct the informal registration of large cattle breeders from the indigenous population, hindering by their property and social influence socialization of aul, according to the features provided by the decision of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee to make a selection of the most vicious of them. Based on this selection, send out lists of households subject to confiscation and eviction. [9, p. 79-85]. Legislative documents determined the timing of the confiscation of kulak and Baikal farms and the number of farms subject to confiscation and expulsion.

At the joint session of the KazCIC and SNK KASSR on August 28, 1928 it was stated that

«...representatives of the property classes and former privileged estates impede the main activities of the Soviet power in aul and kishlak, conduct malicious agitation, incite ethnic and patrimonial discord, using tribal relations...». [9, p. 91]. According to the OGPU, the Bai «... used the grassroots sovaprats, through direct infiltration or promotion of their proxies, which was used in the interests of domination of the Bai part of the population, as well as the preservation of old social relations...». [10, p. 238].

Daily permanent violence forced Kazakh nomads to develop a «compliance and non-compliance strategy» [11], loyalty or disloyalty, sociologically defined as «adaptation», this is the second level. In the kolkhozes created by the Soviet authorities, tribal relations were preserved. Kazakh aul, despite the construction of collective farms, was bound by kinship relations, common moral priorities, system of values, behavioural stereotypes, i.e. the whole system of traditional institutional relations [8]. Situationally, kinship communications were transferred to the collective farm, i.e. traditional daily life appeared in a modernized package. Such a conspicuous phenomenon as the non-extinct social structures was noted by F. Goloshchekin and the OGPU leadership. Hence the remark about the past revolution, reinforced by reports of the persistence of the influence of tribal authorities in the collective farms.

The tribal ties were based on social networks; accordingly, traditional veneration, tribal memory and tribal unity were actualised under the conditions of the Soviet directorship. The authority of the nomadic elite allowed them to be elected to the aulsovet and volispolkom. They became the heads of the grassroots Soviet apparatus of power. An unexpected phenomenon of collective farm building was the generic contradictions that resulted from the policy of forced sedentarisation. The policy of sedentarization implemented by the Soviet authorities was aimed at destroying the economic base of the nomadic economy as well as the system of clan relations [5].

It is quite natural reaction of the bays and atkameners to be dissatisfied with the measures

taken by the Soviet authorities, which were destroying the regular life of the aul. A logical consequence of their discontent was anti-Soviet agitation, aimed at disintegration of collective farms, disruption of grain procurement, for migrating to China. Typical actions of aul authorities, as described by the OGPU, were reduced to Article 58 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR, to politicization of their behavioral motives to save themselves and their loved ones. Initially, the bai «deliberately cut down their cattle» in the climactic year of 1929, when the state of emergency was at an all-time high, joined the kolkhoz. It was then that the inability to fulfil the grain procurement plan began to be regarded as a deliberate political crime against the Soviet authorities. The growing tension and action of the collective farmers was noted as carrying out «demoralizing work against the communalization of livestock and public ploughing». A frequent phenomenon was the demonstration of quitting the collective farm just before the ploughing, in spring 1930. The collective farm «Karazha Tagam», which consisted of 80 farms, collapsed in March 1930. In the same year 1930 the agitation against giving up the bread surplus was activated, which was announced at the general meeting of the aul citizens: «... no bread, bread froze...», with comments of the bays: «You will not get anything, anyway, if you do not surrender, the authorities will not be satisfied» [12, p. 16].

The poor population of the aul stated the presence of «the enormous influence of bai Manapia Baysekenov...» [13, p. 36]. And such statement was commonly used, changing the names of the bays, but the meaning did not change. Further there was a list of merits «... he has been a governor under tsarism power for five years...». Already in 1929, he was deprived of the right to vote (dispossessed), confiscated, individually taxed, and was a candidate for eviction. The latest measure saved the authority's prestige and took the aul out of the bay's sphere of influence, such bays as Manapiya Baisekenov.

The authorities provoked Kazakh population with their actions by uniting several administrative auls although they were quite far apart, they had different tribal origins. As a

result, representatives of different tribal groups joined in the same administrative unit. As a result of forced communalization, the auls competed for a place in the sun when they became part of the collective farm.

The third force in the clan confrontation was the power structures based on the principle of «divide and rule». The authorities artificially fomented discord by appointing a representative from the exact opposite clan and locality as chairman of the kolkhoz.

As a result of forced communalization, the auls competed for a place under the sun when they became part of the collective farm. In the clan confrontation, the third force was the power structures based on the principle of «divide and rule». In the clan confrontation, a third force entered the power structures according to the «divide and rule» principle. The government falsely incited discord by assigning the chairman of the collective farm from the opposite tribe and locality.

The population of one aul, in the conditions of collective farm construction, belonged to two or four different tribes. As for example one part of the aul belonged to the Barlybai tribe, the other to the Baichuzak tribe. Both tribes are descended from Kazygul. Before the revolution, all the rulers came from the family Baichuzak. When the property of the influential bey Berikbol Maldybaev of the Baichuzak tribe was confiscated, some of the cattle went to the poor people of the Barlybay tribe. Nurakhmet Maldybaev, a relative of the «offended» Bay, joined the Soviet power structure and became an investigator. The poor people of the Barlybai tribe were forced to return the cattle they had taken. The Barlybai tribe at a collective farm meeting supported the decision to evict the Maldybaevs' Bay family from the aul [14, p.2].

Conflict has occurred in the tribal opposition of the poor people. For example, more active poor people in the collective farms were unwilling to take the poor people of another tribe in tow. The Barlybayans did not want to take on the Baichuvaks. There was a division within the tribe into active and passive. The passive part of the poor people called active group the traitors (supporting the Soviet power). The active

group called passive group the kuyirshyks, who supported the Baijbais. As a result the tribal drama evolved into open confrontation and conflict. Archival sources demonstrated the micro-history of tribal conflicts of collective farm construction. In the process of confrontation the issues of religious identity «you are not Muslims», national identity «not even Kazakhs», since they allowed to give away their bay, and send him to eviction [14, p. 33]. The Bolsheviks attributed this type of behaviour, when the population had tribal ties as a priority, to the backwardness and uncultivation of the poor people. Their uneducated nature did not allow them to break their ties with the tribe and being bays as well.

However, sometimes the Kazakh auls were not aware of the Bolshevik ideology of «class struggle». The reason for the conflicts was the land issue. The poverty and the farm work of the Saruleni aulsovet opposed the bay of Barabaev Gaisa because his cattle was located near their wintering grounds without their consent. A mass fight broke out between the auls' residents [14, p.39].

In other auls, however, to the delight of the Soviet authorities, the poor people were actively evicting and confiscating bays. For example, about 800-900 people came to Bogusov Husain's aul to take part in the confiscation of his property. Bogusov Husain addressed the poor people who arrived in his aul: «I do not deny that my father - Bogus was a volost's governor, and exploited your labor. He received gifts from the tsarist government. But I cannot be considered a semi-feudal. I was not a governor and a lord. I was a nobody, I went to Mecca, you gave me the honorary title of a Khoja. Now you have decided to criticize me. I did not exploit anyone, I did not force you to work. I always made concessions when you need something; God is my judge, let Him judge. Finishing my word, I will say do it deliberately, I beg and persistently ask for exclusion of me from the list of evictees, because I am not harmful, I am waiting for pardon from God and you» [14, p. 23].

The road to socialism became a road of disaster [3, p. 7], destroying family ties, destroying family continuity and generational memory. At first, the initiators of family disintegration

were the Bay themselves, trying to adapt and, most importantly, to survive under the threat of eviction and confiscation. The Soviet narrative has preserved the practice of accommodation by the evicted bays. Many of them did not wait for the evictees to come to them, they sought in advance to shelter their cattle, to rewrite their property, to draw up a fictitious divorce, as did L. Baizhekin and others. Most of all they and their families were not afraid of confiscation but of eviction, loss of connection with the family land. As a result of this behaviour, the male part was subjected to eviction [14, p.2]. A new phenomenon in Kazakh steppe was divorce initiated by women. It is a kind of steppe emancipation. According to the instructions of the Chairman of the KAZCIK, divorcing wives were not subject to eviction. Moreover, they were entitled to part of the property left by the bay after the confiscation. Women with children and part of their property remained in their places of residence, which was an indication of the family's hearth and enabled them to survive. As a result, the woman kept the hearth of the family until her husband returned. In some auls, women were involved in the confiscation commission and cried with the family of the evicted bay at the time, mourning their fate in a traditional poetic style.

The collective farm incorporated tribal groups resulting in different active and passive practices of adaptation. Egalitarianism accepted only the Soviet identity, all other identification parameters were not considered, although in repressive practices they were taken as a basis. The duality and inconsistency of the behavioural motivations of the poor, was evident in the issues of bay confiscation. The involvement of the poor people in the policy of bay confiscation concealed the usual mercantile sentiments. In the case of real economic benefits from confiscation, the poor people became active. In cases where there was no economic benefit from confiscation, there was a passive, sometimes even loyal attitude towards the victim of confiscation [14, p. 34]. Confiscation served as a kind of incentive for the poor people, an opportunity to change their social status with the help of confiscated goods. In some aulsoverts, when discussing the list of persons subject to confiscation and eviction, the aul's citizens tried

their best not to give up their bays. They were supported by members of party, speaking at meetings in defence of the bays. Tribal unity sometimes played a decisive role in the choice of behavior strategy, motivated the tribal solidarity of commission members, participants of meetings [5].

The presence of tribal groups in the collective farm, and their penetration into the grassroots administration was regarded by party officials as «anti-Soviet activity of bayism». Their activities were regarded as a shadow office, under the influence of which was the grassroots of the Soviet apparatus, which carried out the will of the Kazakh bayism [15, p.10]. The active position and authority of the bay top brass was manifested in the election campaign of 1925-1926. During the election period, tribal networks and Soviet slogans were used to the maximum extent; there was a political and physical battle for the aul; the latter, to the surprise of Kazkraikom, was beyond its influence [4, p. 67]. During the period of election campaigns to the grassroots organs, the rivalry of tribal groups intensified, where Kazakhs did not shy away from the usual denunciations. In the assessment of the aul, the bay, elected as the chairman of the aul council or the voli executive committee, further strengthened the status of the tribe under the Soviet regime. During the next campaigns of attack on themselves, the so-called bai activists infiltrated the collective farms. Some of them became collective farm leaders, showing loyalty and adapting to conditions alien to themselves [16, p. 50].

As aul activists they took part in the grain procurement campaigns but did not fulfil their personal plan. Their behaviour caused negative evaluation and rejection on the part of the ideological patriots of the Soviet power, who knew about their origins. The results of the «active group struggle» in the auls impressed the Soviet figures with their results, when entire electoral committees were placed under the control of clans, «deprived» people were restored in their voting rights, loyal decrees on taxation were passed and even decisions on the creation of collective farms were postponed [17].

The processes of infiltration of the Baikal elite into the collective farms were prolonged

throughout the first half of the 1930s. Documents dating from 1933-1934 suggest that both the bay and their descendants and relatives used every opportunity to obtain administrative status. The former bays, volost governors, their descendants and close relatives were members of the Bolshevik Party, held positions and created, according to the classification of the Chekists, «false collective farms» and «false TOZs». In 1935 in Makanchi district of Alma-Ata region there was a pseudo collective farm «15th Anniversary of Kazakhstan» of bays and «smugglers» [18]. During the reduction of the Soviet apparatus, they were purged from collective farms, prosecuted and fined. The «formers» tried to obtain a certificate of poor origin from the aul council using their status opportunities and the grassroots Soviet apparatus for their own purposes. Then, as quickly as possible, they dissolved into the space of Soviet Kazakhstan, and even, if possible, went into hiding outside it.

Kazakhs did not want to forget their tribal origins due to disappointment, unfulfilled Bolsheviks' promises, and constant pressure. However, the goal of socio-economic modernization was aimed at eradicating the tribal identity markers. A new «imaginary» community was created, where clan traditions and culture, clan memory, family memory frame were considered a vestige of feudalism [5]. After all, the former identification markers associated with the system of nomadic cattle breeding were superseded by the new Kazakh identity. The goal of Stalin's transformations was to create a Soviet identity, with the common name - Soviet people [6].

It is important to note the phenomenon of tribal information networks, which supplied the tribe's elite with the latest news about the events held and planned. The authority of this or that bay allowed to determine the news trend for their relatives, i.e., to influence the content of the aul information space. Traditional aul dastarkhans became a source of information, such as «confiscation began with us, the bays, then will go to you, the middle class, and will end with you, the kedei. There, in a narrow circle, playing on the ego of his relatives, the owner of the table could

say: «what collective farmers you are, you cannot dispose of your property». Evidence of the fact that the clan elite had tremendous authority, even after losing property, were the facts of hidden and open help from fellow tribesmen, relatives and even the aulsovet. The content of the material assistance included not only financial but also food, such as: «...five carcasses of meat, several cows, ...gold and silver». It is possible to note the documentary-procedural help, as for example separate bays received the approving review (characteristic) signed by the population of aul and certified by aulsovet, bays were searched for lawyers, through the person in power rendered the state support. Sympathy and support for the bays was massive, even in their places of exile [19, p. 88-89].

In 1928, along with collectivization, peasants were subjected to collection of the agricultural tax, grain procurements, self-taxation, placement of a peasant loan, eviction of the bays and kulaks, confiscation of their property, etc. There were reasons that shaped the protest movement such as political and economic disfunctioning of the system, the administrative collapse and social dissatisfaction of the population [11], the blatant arbitrariness and corrupt practices of the Soviet officials. Military resistance was the ultimate breaking point. It was a radical attempt to defend one's interests. More than 300 peasant uprisings occurred in Kazakhstan. The largest were the Abralin, Chubartau and Chingistau uprisings. Participants of the uprisings, marked as «bandits», «counter-revolutionary grouping», «armed groups», etc., due to the food crisis, were involved in the looting of cooperation, semifund, smashed aulsoviets, and demanded the restoration of the volost governors' institution [20].

Migration was one of the most popular behavioral responses of the Kazakhs at this level. On the one hand, fleeing allowed them to escape Soviet violence and. On the other hand, they avoided direct confrontation. Note that Kazakh population was not only fleeing from the permanent violence that was destroying their usual world. The first wave were the refugees, saving their lives from the persecution of the

OGPU, who were engaged in eradicating auls after uprisings. The second wave were refugees hoping to save themselves from hunger.

For the inhabitants of the aul, migration was a serious challenge. For example, the bays of the fourth aul of Stalin volost decided to migrate, after the trial of the bay Akpai Amanichev in March 1928. Bays wanted to be convinced that the policy of the Soviet authorities was really directed against them. In case of a negative court decision for them, they planned to emigrate to China immediately. As a result, forty-seven yurts, three yurts of bays, fifteen middle-aged and twenty-nine poor people migrated from Stalin volost. The OGPU cited tax policy, self-taxation, grain procurements, and the assignment of Kazakh youth to conscription stations as the reasons for the defections. The lack of explanatory work among the Kazakh population led to the spread of ridiculous rumors: «The poor were not advised to go to the collectives, as these are communes where there is no property and even the wives will be common...». [21, л. 39]. Such ridiculous rumors were a sign of fear, «a widespread epidemic of fear» [22, p. 58].

Data on people who were migrating in the 1930s has been preserved in the materials of the OGP. This information has been kept secret in the Archive of the President of Kazakhstan until quite recently. It is considered that these archive sources cannot be completely objective because in the 1930s divisions of the Political Department often « falsified» cases in the interests of party purposes. In reports of the OGPU it was often sounded information on the organization of forced migration accompanied by «a gang of armed Kazakhs». These reports stated that «migration takes place under the cover of armed gangs, both local and foreign origin and partially with the obvious assistance of the Chinese authorities to the migrants» [23, p. 179].

The intensity of the migration in February and March 1930 was reported by the 50th Zaisan border detachment. They reported unprecedented « illegal and arbitrary violations of the border». The refugees were described as a criminal people who had fled from responsibility for their criminal deeds. They «...found like-

minded people among Kazakh population in Chinese borderland and broke the border with armed assistance of the mentioned Chinese people. They attacked and committed outrage over border population, robbed them and took them to the Chinese territory».

The Kazakh population was forcibly taken to China. For example: «On February 10th, 50 bandits of Masalimov from the valley Kobuk attacked the 2nd aulsovet of Tarbagatai district through the Chagan-Abo mountain pass, seized 100 Kazakh farms and along with their cattle and property went to the Chinese territory» [24, p. 107-116]. The entire aul practically «forcibly fled». In the same manner as the report of the border detachment, sounded the remark of F.I. Goloshchekin in a letter to the first secretary of the West-Siberian regional committee R.I. Eikhe. The first leader of Kazakh autonomy believed that the migrations «...were not of the nature of starvation refugees...», it is only a way of class struggle, it is only a fact of resistance of being bay which does not want to fulfill the plans of agricultural procurement [25, p. 19].

The objectivity of fragments of oral history extracted from archival materials and archival and investigative files raises reasonable doubts. For example, it is hardly possible to «... take away thirty bays» from four auls, as well as the presence in all auls of «counter-revolutionary bays» organizations». [26, л. 158]. Its content reflects the agitation of the bays, calling for migration, as interpreted by party officials and OGPU investigators. There are quotations from the «propaganda appeals» of the bays: «Life has become impossibly difficult. The Soviet authorities started robbing us, all the bays. We must cross the border to China»; «We wish we had known earlier about such campaigns as grain procurement and confiscation - robbery of the people, otherwise we would have been able to sell our cattle and go to China in advance»; «The Soviet authorities want to completely ruin the population. The grain harvests, self-taxation, loans, and other campaigns do not give us a chance to live. Migration abroad is the only way out of the Soviet regime» [23, p. 180]. [23, л. 180]. In some speeches of the bays there was

an accusation against the authorities: «The Soviet authorities and communists, hiding under their plans, have robbed us of our bread and cattle, and then it will come to poor people. Let us better get out of the collective farm and move to China» [27, p. 56].

«The purpose of my migration to China was due to the fact that I could no longer tolerate remaining in the USSR, because I do not like the activities carried out by the Party and the Soviet authorities at all, in China I hoped to live freely, as previously engaged in farming» [28, p. 88].

«They will confiscate everyone. Do not enjoy your social status. there is no difference between poor people, a middle-class people, or a bay people. You have to get out of the country, there is only one way out, sell off your cattle, get out of the collective farms» [29, p. 135] «It is better to run abroad and feel safe from all pressures and there» [29, p. 137]; «We are going to run abroad and feel safe from all pressures and semfonds». [29, l. 137]; «...we are going to run away to China, let...gather with us, otherwise the Soviet authorities will confiscate us all and you will starve to death» [12, l. 6]; «the Soviet authorities give us no peace, let us run away 5-6 yards [12, l. 16]. The key words of the cited oral history fragments are «dislike, displeasure, patience, fleeing, hunger, situation». The choice between a relatively peaceful life and violence, was determined in favour of relatively peaceful life.

The second wave of migration should be considered as an escape from hunger.

It was a survival strategy, attempting to avoid the famine and saving their lives. «This famine was one of the deadliest in the USSR and led directly to the death of about one third of the Kazakh population and caused the emigration of several hundred thousand survivors ...». [5]. D. Verkhoturov believes that the famine was a cultural trauma: «This tragedy left a sharp chopping imprint on the Kazakh people, on their worldview and culture» [4].

The images of famine recorded in archive documents are horrifying and pitiful: «...she took the waste from her lunch to the pit and met 10 Kazakhs at the pit, who took the waste from her and immediately ate it in front of her eyes...».

[30, л.100]. The anthropological dimension of the victims of the famine does is not amenable to quantification. Only family memories have kept fragments of history.

Ogayon I. believes that the famine was the result of a political project of cruel transformation [5]. Kazakh historians call it «Goloschekin genocide» [31]. There is an opinion that the famine in Kazakhstan began earlier than in Ukraine, and it was provoked mainly by grain requisitions, mass death of cattle, which occupied the main place in the daily ration of Kazakh nomads [7]. Unfortunately, the issue of famine is increasingly acquiring a political connotation and becoming a bargaining chip for the political ambitions of newly appearing experts. The evaluation of a large-scale event is at the forefront, while a man, a victim of the famine is once again left out of the frame. The Soviet country has been gone for thirty years, but the methodological tools have not changed. Relying on closed archives, on destroyed documents in the background of sources cited by foreign authors in published editions, sounds extremely unprofessional. There are no «special folders», no specific folders where it would be written «the Kazakh famine». There is a disordered state of sources, containing snippets, excerpts, fragments about the tragic events of those days. The systematic, detailed, all-encompassing work in the archives of republican and regional significance for verification of documents can bring the result that has been waited for decades. Documents cannot remain silent for so long. They have already «shouted» about the destinies of those who died. We certainly agree with D. Verkhoturov in his assessment of the generalised nature of the materials on the history of the famine. We do not know the destiny of the people and the names of the auls that have disappeared [4]. The anthropological mosaic of famine and its historical geography await its researcher. It was the most terrible result of the modernization of the Kazakh aul. It was the most tragic experiment of accelerated economic development of the region, which was not ready for Sovietization. None of the chosen strategies of survival, not even the attempt to adapt, to integrate into the Soviet society gave any chance of survival.

Migration to a foreign land did not save people from famine. In China our tribesmen also faced famine: «In 1932-1933, as a seven-year-old boy in Xinjiang I saw crowds of hungry people in the streets of Chuguchak. I remember them as a monochrome, grey mass of living corpses: grey tattered clothes, ash-grey disheveled hair, grey transparent skin tightly covering faces and hands, burning, wandering eyes, sunken to the back of the head. Those were Kazakh refugees... They stood in a dense, swaying crowd of thousands. People were not shouting, not talking, not begging, but just holding out their hands...». [32, с.2].

Conclusion. Nowadays, we realise that the road to socialism for the Kazakh nomads has been so rapid that its echoes have been heard for several decades. Meanwhile, the toll has been so high that it has not yet been objectively assessed. The behavioural adaptation practices of Kazakh society had no structural basis. On the one hand, the tribal traditionalism was trying to solidify itself under the Sovietism, adapting to the rules of socialist society. On the other hand, the mass migration of Kazakhs to foreign lands was a response to the intensification of the forcible practices of economic modernization. The specifics of traditional culture formed adaptive behavioural levels to meet the needs of the current situation, but they could not save them from famine.

A unique phenomenon of Kazakh conformism under Sovietisation was tribalism, which combined both internal frontier confrontation and external frontier unity. Tribal relations with tribal segment authority transformed the party directives and formed « collective farms in Kazakh way», «shadow office». The aul nominees, the grassroots administration defended the tribal «ideologemes», solved the internal issues and saved the tribesmen. The political tools of the Soviet power did not need the «imaginary community» of Kazakhs. The imaginary community was destroyed by the violent modernization, which was artificially strengthened by the party officials. The historical memory, the custodians and authorities of the tribe were eradicated for the purpose of creating a new Soviet identity and a new Soviet society.

References

- 1 Верт Н. Террор и беспорядок. Сталинизм как система / Н. Верт. - Москва: РОССПЭН, 2010. - 448 с.
- 2 Baberowski, J. Verschleierte Feinde. Stalinismus im sowjetischen Orient. Geschichte Und Gesellschaft. 2004. 30(1). P. 10–36. Available at:<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40186098>. (Accessed: 01.01.2021).
- 3 Киндлер Р. Сталинские кочевники в Казахстане: власть и голод в Казахстане / Р. Киндлер. - Москва: Политическая энциклопедия, 2017. - 382 с.
- 4 Верхотуров Д. Ашаршылык: история Великого голода / Д. Верхотуров. - Москва: ЛитРес, 2019. - 370 с.
- 5 Ohayon I. The Soviet State and Lineage Societies: Doctrine, Local Interactions, and Political Hybridization in Kazakhstan and Kirghizia During the 1920s and 1930s. *Central Asian Affairs*. 2016. 3(2). P. 163–191. Available at:<https://doi.org/10.1163/22142290-00302004>. Accessed: 02.01.2021).
- 6 Камерон С. Голодная степь: Голод, насилие и создание Советского Казахстана / С. Камерон. - Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 2020. - 360 с.
- 7 Pianciola N. Ukraine and Kazakhstan: Comparing the Famines. *Contemporary European History*. 2018. 27(3). P. 440–444. doi:10.1017/S0960777318000309
- 8 Абылхожин Ж. На пике строительства Турксиба земляные работы вручную выполняли 30–40 тыс. человек [Электрон. ресурс]. – URL: <https://vlast.kz/pages/clique/load-next/?id=20076&preview=true> (дата обращения: 14.10.2020)
- 9 Государственный архив Актюбинской области (далее ГААО) Ф. 63. О. 2. Д. 106. Л. 79–85.
- 10 Специальный государственный архив Департамента полиции Восточно-Казахстанской области (далее СГА ДП ВКО) Ф. 19. О. 2. Д. 1035.
- 11 Gábor T. Rittersporn, Anguish, Anger and Folkways in Soviet Russia, (University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, 2014, 396 p.)
- 12 СГА ДП ВКО Ф. 19. О. 12. Д. 846.
- 13 СГА ДП ВКО Ф. 19. О. 1. Д. 818.
- 14 Центр документации новейшей истории Восточно-Казахстанской области (далее ЦДНИ ВКО) Ф. 3. О. 1. Св. 2. Д. 22.
- 15 ЦДНИ Ф. 3. О. 1. Св. 15. Д. 209.
- 16 СГА ДП ВКО Ф. 19. О. 2. Д. 2481.
- 17 СГА ДП ВКО Ф. 19. О. 2. Д. 2433, 3303, 3549.
- 18 СГА ДП ВКО Ф. 19. О. 2. Д. 3030.
- 19 Архив Президента Республики Казахстан (далее АП РК) Ф. 141. О. 1. Д. 3321.
- 20 СГА ДП ВКО Ф. 19. О. 2. Д. 2676.
- 21 СГА ДП ВКО Ф. 19. О. 1. Д. 1310.
- 22 Фицпатрик Ш. Сталинские крестьяне. Социальная история Советской России в 30-е годы: деревня. / Ш. Фицпатрик. - Москва: «Российская политическая энциклопедия» (РОССПЭН), 2001. - 422 с.
- 23 АП РК. Ф. 719. О. 2. Д. 126.
- 24 Государственный архив Восточно-Казахстанской области (далее ГАВКО) Ф. 788. О. 1. Д. 35.
- 25 АП РК Ф. 141. О. 1. Д. 5192.
- 26 СГА ДП ВКО Ф. 19. О. 1. Д. 1953.
- 27 СГА ДП ВКО Ф. 19. О. 2. Д. 2451.
- 28 СГА ДП ВКО Ф. 19. О. 2. Д. 2575.
- 29 СГА ДП ВКО Ф. 19. О. 2. Д. 2426.
- 30 ГАВКО Ф. 1 О. 1. Д. 78.
- 31 Абылхожин Ж. Очерки социально-экономической истории Казахстана. XX век. / Ж. Абылхожин. - Алматы: Университет «Туран», 1997. - 360 с.
- 32 Жандабекова О. В. Под грифом секретности. Откочевки казахов в Китай в период коллективизации. Реэмиграция 1928–1957 гг. Сборник документов. / О. В. Жандабекова. - Усть-Каменогорск, 1998. - 100 с.

А.С. Жанбосинова

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Нұр-Сұлтан, Қазақстан

Қазақ көшпенділері: социализмге жол

Аңдатпа. Мақалада ХХ ғасырдың 20-30-жылдарындағы Қазақстанның әлеуметтік-экономикалық жаңғырту тарихының мәселелері қарастырылады. Автор пәнаралық тәсіл әдіснамасы негізінде күштеп ұжымдастыру үрдісінің жеке көріністерін және оның зардаптарын анықтады. Ұсынылып отырған зерттеудің өзектілігі қазақ ауылын кеңестендірудің жалпы қабылданған тарихи тұжырымдамасының тұғырнамасын әзірлеу қажеттілігі, осындай ауыр зардаптардың себептерін түсіну үшін оның аймақтық ерекшелігін айқындау болып табылады. Қазақ даласындағы ұласпалы күштеудің ұшы қазақ ауылының рулық байланыстарын жоюға, қазақ ауылының кеңестік сәйкестігін қалыптастыруға бағытталды.

Социализмге жол қазақтардың әлеуметтік күнделікті өмірі мен дәстүрлі мәдениетінің құрылымдық элементтерін жойды. Қазақ халқының бейімделу үрдістері қолданылып жүрген өмір сүру стратегияларымен және конформды мінез-құлық тәжірибесімен ұштастырыла отырып, кеңестік қоғамдық тұрмыстың жаңа ережелерін негіздеді. Мақала мазмұнының негізіне мұрағат қорларының құжаттары мен материалдары бойынша қазақ көшпенділерінің бейімделу тәжірибесін талдау алынған. Автор қазақ ауылын әлеуметтік-экономикалық жаңғырту бағдарламасын жүзеге асыру жағдайында халықтың өмір сүруі мен бейімделуінің күнделікті, жеке стратегиясын көрсетеді.

Авторлық зерттеудің нәтижесі экономикалық мәжбүрлеу мен «бұрынғы» әлеуметтік қабаттың бұзылуының салдары болған екі мінез-құлық деңгейін, яғни қашу – қоныс аудару және бейімделуін талдау болып табылды. Қазақ ауылдары колхозға рулық байланыстар жүйесін, дәстүрлі құндылықтар жүйесін енгізіп, бірегей «қазақша колхоздар» құрды. Кеңес өкіметінің төменгі аппаратына сайлау науқандары рулық шайқастардың орнына айналды. Билік социалистік құрылыстың стратегиялық міндеттерін жүзеге асыру үшін ішкі рулық және ру аралық қайшылықтарды белсенді пайдаланды. Алайда, рулық құрылымдардың мәртебелік дәрежеге жіктелуі сөз тасу, азғырушылық және ымыралы материалдарды қолдану сияқты әдепсіз мінез-құлықтарды тудырды. Құжаттарда тәркілеу, жер аудару және ажырасу нәтижесінде адамдардың тағдырын, отбасының күйреу қасіретін көрсететін көптеген микротарих сақталыңды. Ауызша тарихтың берілген үзінділері қазақ ауылының шет елге көшу себептерін ашады.

Қорытындыларды түйіндей келе, автор бір жағынан, рулық дәстүршілдік кеңестік негізде ынтымақтауға тырысқанын, екінші жағынан, тікелей қақтығыстан қашуға тырысқанын атап өтті. Алайда, барлық бейімделу мінез-құлық деңгейлері көшпенділерді аштықтан құтқара алмады. Қазақтардың «Қиялдағы қоғамдастығы» тек рулық қайшылықтармен емес, жаңа кеңестік бірегейлікті, жаңа кеңестік қоғамды қалыптастыру үшін кеңес мемлекетінің саяси ерік-жігерімен жойылды. Социализмге барар жолда тарихи жады өзгерді, қазақ халқының рулық жадысы жойылды.

Түйін сөздер: ұжымдастыру; бейімделу; қоныс аудару; аштық, кеңестік; көшпенділер; микротарих.

А.С. Жанбосинова

Евразийский национальный университет им. Л. Н. Гумилева, Нур-Султан, Казахстан

Казахские кочевники: путь в социализм

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются вопросы истории социально-экономической модернизации Казахстана 20-30-х годов ХХ века. На основе методологии междисциплинарного подхода автор выявила микросюжеты процесса насильственной коллективизации и ее последствий. Актуальность предложенного исследования заключается в необходимости выработки, платформы общепринятой исторической концепции советизации казахского аула, определение ее региональной специфики для понимания причин столь катастрофических последствий. Острое перманентного насилия казахской степи было направлено на искоренение родовых сетей казахского аула, формирование советской идентичности казахского аула.

Путь в социализм разрушил структурные элементы социальной повседневности и традиционной культуры казахов. Адаптационные процессы казахского народа обусловили новые правила советского общежития, в сочетании с применяемыми стратегиями выживания и практикой конформного поведения. В основу содержания статьи положен анализ адаптационных практик казахских кочевников на документах и материалах архивных фондов. Автор показывает повседневные, индивидуальные стратегии приспособления и выживания населения, в условиях реализации программы социально-экономической модернизации казахского аула.

Результатом авторского исследования стал анализ двух поведенческих уровней: бегство – откочевка и приспособление, ставшие следствием экономического принуждения и разрушения социального слоя «бывших». Казахские аулы перенесли в колхоз сеть родовых коммуникаций, систему традиционных ценностей, сформировав уникальные «колхозы по-казахски». Избирательные кампании в низовой аппарат советской власти становились местом родовых баталий. Власть активно использовала внутриродовые и межродовые противоречия для реализации стратегических задач социалистического строительства. Однако, статусное ранжирование родовых структур спровоцировало неэтичные формы поведения, как доносы, подстрекательство, использование компрометирующих материалов. Документы сохранили множество микроисторий, в фокусе которых показаны судьбы людей, трагедия распада семьи, как результат конфискации, выселения и развода. Приведенные фрагменты устной истории раскрывают причины откочевки казахского аула,

Резюмируя итоги, автор отметила, что с одной стороны, родовая традиционность пыталась солидаризироваться под советскость, а с другой, пыталась спастись от прямого конфликта бегством. Однако все вместе взятые адаптивные поведенческие уровни не смогли спасти кочевников от голодной смерти. «Воображаемое сообщество» казахов было уничтожено не столько родовыми противоречиями, сколько политической волей советского государства, ради формирования новой советской идентичности, нового советского общества. По пути в социализм трансформировалась историческая память, уничтожалась родовая память казахского народа.

Ключевые слова: коллективизация; адаптация; откочевка; голод, советскость; кочевники; микроистория.

References

- 1 Vert N. Terror i besporiadok. Stalinizm kak sistema. [Terror and disorder. Stalinism as a system]. (ROSPEN, Moscow, 2010, 448 p.) [in Russian].
- 2 Baberowski, J. Verschleierte Feinde. Stalinismus im sowjetischen Orient. Geschichte Und Gesellschaft. 2004. 30(1). P.10-36. Available at:<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40186098>. (Accessed: 01.01.2021).
- 3 Kindler R. Stalinskie kochevniki v Kazakhstane: vlast' i golod v Kazakhstane [Stalinist Nomads in Kazakhstan: Power and Hunger in Kazakhstan] (Politicheskaja entsiklopedija, Moscow, 2017, 382 p.) [in Russian].
- 4 Verkhoturov D. Asharshylyk: istoriia Velikogo goloda [Asharshylyk: the history of the Great Famine] (Litres, Moscow, 2019, 370 p.) [in Russian].
- 5 Ohayon I. The Soviet State and Lineage Societies: Doctrine, Local Interactions, and Political Hybridization in Kazakhstan and Kirghizia During the 1920s and 1930s. Central Asian Affairs. 2016. 3(2). P. 163–191. Available at:<https://doi.org/10.1163/22142290-00302004>. Accessed: 02.01.2021).
- 6 Kameron S. Golodnaia step': Golod, nasilie i sozdanie Sovetskogo Kazakhstana [The Hungry Steppe: Famine, Violence, and the Creation of Soviet Kazakhstan] (Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, Moscow, 2020, 360 p.) [in Russian].
- 7 Pianciola N. Ukraine and Kazakhstan: Comparing the Famines. Contemporary European History. 2018. 27(3). P. 440-444. doi:10.1017/S0960777318000309
- 8 Abylkhodzhin Zh. Na pike stroitel'stva Turksiba zemlianye raboty vruchnuiu vypolniali 30-40 tys. Chelovek [At the peak of the construction of Turksib, 30 to 40 thousand people performed manual earthworks] Available at: <https://vlast.kz/pages/cliq/load-next/?id=20076&preview=true>. (Accessed: 08.01.2021). [in Russian].

- 9 Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Aktiubinskoi oblasti (dalee GAAO) [State Archive of Aktobe Oblast] F. 63. O. 2. D. 106. L. 79-85. [in Russian].
- 10 Spetsial'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Departamenta politsii Vostochno-Kazakhstanskoi oblasti (dalee SGA DP VKO) [Special State Archive of the East Kazakhstan Oblast Police Department] F. 19. O. 2. D. 1035. [in Russian].
- 11 Gábor T. Rittersporn, Anguish, Anger and Folkways in Soviet Russia, (University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, 2014, 396 p.)
- 12 SGA DP VKO F. 19. O. 12. D. 846. [in Russian].
- 13 SGA DP VKO F. 19. O. 1. D. 818. [in Russian].
- 14 Tsentr dokumentatsii noveishei istorii Vostochno-Kazakhstanskoi oblasti [East Kazakhstan Regional Centre for Documentation of Contemporary History] (dalee TsDNI VKO) F. 3. O. 1. Sv. 2. D. 22. [in Russian].
- 15 TsDNI F. 3. O. 1. Sv. 15. D. 209. [in Russian].
- 16 SGA DP VKO F. 19. O. 2. D. 2481. [in Russian].
- 17 SGA DP VKO F. 19. O. 2. D. 2433, 3303, 3549. [in Russian].
- 18 SGA DP VKO F. 19. O. 2. D. 3030. [in Russian].
- 19 Arkhiv Prezidenta Respubliki Kazakhstan (dalee AP RK) [Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan] F. 141. O. 1. D. 3321. [in Russian].
- 20 SGA DP VKO F. 19. O. 2. D. 2676.
- 21 SGA DP VKO F. 19. O. 1. D. 1310.
- 22 Fitspatrik Sh. Stalinskie krest'iane. Sotsial'naia istoriia Sovetskoi Rossii v 30-e gody: derevnia [Stalin's peasants. Social History of Soviet Russia in the 30s: the Village] (ROSSPEN, Moscow, 2001, 422 p.) [in Russian].
- 23 AP RK. F. 719. O. 2. D. 126. [in Russian].
- 24 Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Vostochno-Kazakhstanskoi oblasti (dalee GAVKO) [State Archive of East Kazakhstan Oblast] F. 788. O. 1. D. 35. [in Russian].
- 25 AP RK F. 141. O. 1. D. 5192. [in Russian].
- 26 CGA DP VKO F. 19. O. 1. D. 1953. [in Russian].
- 27 SGA DP VKO F. 19. O. 2. D. 2451. [in Russian].
- 28 SGA DP VKO F. 19. O. 2. D. 2575. [in Russian].
- 29 SGA DP VKO F.19. O. 2. D. 2426. [in Russian].
- 30 GAVKO F.1 O.1. D.78. [in Russian].
- 31 Abylkhodzhin Zh. Ocherki sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii Kazakhstana XX vek. [Essays on the socio-economic history of Kazakhstan. XX century]. (Almaty: Universitet «Turan», 1997. 360 s.) [in Russian].
- 32 Zhandabekova O.V. Pod grifom sekretnosti. Otkochevki kazakhov v Kitai v period kollektivizatsii. Reemigratsiia 1928-1957 gg. [Under the seal of secrecy. Migration of Kazakhs to China during the period of collectivization. Re-emigration 1928-1957] (Ust'-Kamenogorsk, 1998. 100 p.) [in Russian].

Information about the author:

Zhanbossinova Albina Sovetovna – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan.

Жанбосинова Альбина Советовна – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Нұр-Сұлтан, Қазақстан.