

<sup>1</sup> Mambetov B. M. \*, <sup>2</sup> Khazretali Tursun, <sup>3</sup> Rajabov Kh.K.

<sup>1</sup> Senior Lecturer of Shymkent University. Shymkent. [bek.kz.8080@mail.ru](mailto:bek.kz.8080@mail.ru)

<sup>2</sup> Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkestan,  
Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor. e-mail: [khazretali.tursun@ayu.edu.kz](mailto:khazretali.tursun@ayu.edu.kz)

<sup>3</sup> Chief researcher of the Institute History of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan, Doctor of Historical  
Sciences, Professor. City of Tashkent. e-mail: [kahramon-62@mail.ru](mailto:kahramon-62@mail.ru)

## SAKTAGAN BAISHEV - PROMINENT REPRESENTATIVE OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL AUTHORITY

### *Abstract*

The article considers the socio-political activities and creative heritage of Academician Saktagan Baishev from the point of independent historical knowledge. S.Baishev was recognized as a person who actively participated in the socio-political life of the country in the 30-60s of the last century. The fact that he took part in the Great Patriotic War and held a political post is quite personified in military history. He is also a person who held high positions in the field of the country's ideology and left a deep mark on the historical events of that difficult period. His service as Vice President of the Academy of Sciences was also the most prolific of that period. The socio-political activity and creative heritage of the person, who left a creative style in Kazakh science as a historian-economist, and passed the test of time and needs to be reassessed in accordance with modern historical knowledge. In the article, these issues are analyzed on the basis of archival data, the works of the scientist and the memoirs of contemporaries, and critical conclusions are drawn.

The purpose of the article is to conduct a scientific analysis of the biographical information and creativity of academician S. Baishev on a documentary basis, as well as to evaluate the activities of a figure who served Soviet ideology with new theoretical conclusions.

**Key words:** party-state nomenclature, Saktagan Baishev, Personalistics, critical analysis

<sup>1\*</sup> Б.Мәмбетов, <sup>2</sup> Х.Тұрсұн, К.Ражабов

<sup>1</sup> Қожа Шымкент университетінің аға оқытушысы. Шымкент қаласы. Қазақстан Республикасы.  
e-mail: [bek.kz.8080@mail.ru](mailto:bek.kz.8080@mail.ru)

<sup>2</sup> Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті, Түркістан қ., Қазақстан  
Республикасы. Тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор. e-mail: [khazretali.tursun@ayu.edu.kz](mailto:khazretali.tursun@ayu.edu.kz)

<sup>3</sup> Өзбекстан Ғылым Академиясы Тарих институтының Бас ғылыми қызметкері.  
Тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор. Ташкент қаласы. e-mail: [kahramon-62@mail.ru](mailto:kahramon-62@mail.ru)

## САҚТАҒАН БӘЙШЕВ – ҚОҒАМДЫҚ-САЯСИ БИЛІКТІҢ КӨРНЕКТІ ӨКІЛІ

### *Аңдатпа*

Мақала академик Сақтаған Бәйішовтың қоғамдық-саяси қызметі мен шығармашылық мұрасын тәуелсіз тарихи таным қағидаларымен қарастыруға арналған. Сақтаған Бәйішов өткен ғасырдың 30-60 жылдары еліміздің қоғамдық-саяси өміріне белсенді араласқан тұлға ретінде танылды. Оның Ұлы Отан соғысының қатысушысы ретінде және саяси қызмет атқарғандығы әскери тарихта жеткілікті тұлға деп танылғаны белгілі. Сол сияқты еліміздің идеология саласында түрлі биік лауазымды қызметтер атқарып, күрделі кезеңнің тарихи оқиғаларына терең із қалдырған тұлға саналады. Оның Ғылым академиясының вице-президенті қызметі де сол кезең үшін барынша жемісті болды. Қазақ ғылымында тарихшы-экономист ретінде шығармашылық қолтаңбасы қалған қайраткердің қоғамдық-саяси қызметі мен шығармашылық мұрасы уақыт тезінен өтіп, қазіргі тарихи таным ұстанымдарына сай қайта бағалауды қажет етеді. Мақалада осы мәселелер архивтік деректер мен ғалымның шығармалары және замандастарының естеліктері негізінде ғалыми талданып, сыни қорытындылар жасалады.

Мақаланың басты мақсаты академик аталған кезеңдегі қоғам және саяси қайраткер Сақтаған Бәйішевтің өмірбаяндық мәліметтері мен шығармашылығына ғылыми талдау жүргізу, сондай-ақ кеңестік идеологияға қызмет еткен қайраткердің қызметін жаңа теориялық тұжырымдармен бағалау болып табылады.

**Кілт сөздер:** партиялық-мемлекеттік номенклатура, Сақтаған Бәйішов, тұлғатану, сыни талдау

*Мамбетов Б.\*<sup>1</sup>, Турсун Х.<sup>2</sup>, Ражапов К.К.<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> *старший преподаватель Шымкентского университета г. Шымкент, Республика Казахстан.  
E-mail: [bek.kz.8080@mail.ru](mailto:bek.kz.8080@mail.ru);*

<sup>2</sup> *доктор исторических наук, профессор Казахско-турецкого университета имени Ходжа Ахмеда Ясауи, г. Туркестан, Республика Казахстан. E-mail: [khazretali.tursun@ayu.edu.kz](mailto:khazretali.tursun@ayu.edu.kz)*

<sup>3</sup> *Главный научный сотрудник Института истории Академии наук Узбекистана, доктор исторических наук, профессор. Город Ташкент. e-mail: [kahramon-62@mail.ru](mailto:kahramon-62@mail.ru)*

## САКТАГАН БАИШЕВ – ВИДНЫЙ ПРЕДСТАВИТЕЛЬ ОБЩЕСТВЕННО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ ВЛАСТИ

### *Аннотация*

Статья посвящена рассмотрению общественно-политической деятельности и творческого наследия академика Сактагана Баишева на принципах независимого исторического познания. С. Баишев был признан человеком, активно участвовавшим в общественно-политической жизни страны в 30-60-х годах прошлого века. То, что он принимал участие в Великой Отечественной войне и занимал политический пост, достаточно персонифицировано в военной истории. Он так же является человеком, занимавшим высокие посты в области идеологии страны и оставившим глубокий след в исторических событиях сложного периода. Его служба в качестве вице-президента Академии наук была также самой плодотворной для того периода. Общественно-политическая деятельность и творческое наследие деятеля, оставившего творческий почерк как историка-экономиста в казахской науке, прошел испытание временем и нуждается в переоценке в соответствии с современными историческими знаниями. В статье эти вопросы научно анализируются на основе архивных данных, трудов ученого и воспоминаний современников, и делаются критические выводы.

Цель статьи провести научный анализ биографических сведений и творчества академика С. Баишева на документальной основе, а также оценить деятельность деятеля, служившего советской идеологии, с новыми теоретическими выводами.

**Ключевые слова:** партийно-государственная номенклатура, Сактаган Баишев, персоналистика, критический анализ.

### **Introduction**

In the period after the establishment of Soviet power, the key issue in the new socio-political system was the formation of the administrative apparatus. Not only the preservation of bolshevik power, but also the process of forming effective power structures were aimed at such goals. The new government, having destroyed the unquestioningly functioning bureaucracy of the colonial government along with the social structure, began to prepare a new group of administrators. Thus, from the mid-20s of the XX century, a new type of administrative corpus called the party-state nomenclature appeared.

Saktaган Baishev is of interest to researchers as a person who has passed through the ranks and is included in the list of this party-state nomenclature. In what directions was his socio-political activity and creativity formed and developed, being in these positions? What impact did his service and creativity have on the social development and political life of our country? The answers to these questions in our study should update our historical knowledge.

The main purpose of the article is to conduct a scientific analysis of the biographical information and creativity of Academician S. Baishev on a documentary basis, and to assess the activities of the figure who served the Soviet ideology with the new theoretical conclusions.

Revision of the personality of the activist, who was able to combine such political positions as editor of a republican publication, director of a scientific and political institute, vice president of the Academy of Sciences, positions of top party leaders with pedagogical and creative work in the field of science and education from the point of independent historical knowledge determines relevance of the topic. After all, the historical process, like a living organism, requires constant improvement, adjustment of views and values.

## Methods

During the period of independence, the direction of Personalistics in historical science has become a complex and deeply researched area. In a situation where the theoretical and methodological principles of Personalistics are not fully established, the emergence of different, conflicting views and scientific positions is a natural phenomenon. Therefore, it is very important to clarify the methods used in the study of the history of personalities.

Saktagan Baishev's socio-political activities in Soviet society and scientific creative heritage are quite complex in the paradigm of ideological values. Therefore, the possibilities of general historical methods as historical and comparative methods have been used to give a truly scientific assessment. The biographical approach is used to update the views and opinions formed in the direction of the study of historical personalism. When analyzing the activities and structure of the Soviet power, we were convinced of the effectiveness of using the methods of formulating the party-state nomenclature that has been formed in western historiography in recent years. We realized that this is the most optimal way to analyze and evaluate the official, civil and creative qualities of persons in high positions of power.

## Discussion

A number of studies were devoted to the formation of the terminology of the party-state nomenclature, which appeared as a new way of analyzing the phenomenon of the structure of power in Soviet society. For example, the concept of nomenclature, which often represents the opposite phenomenon according to the system of values, has a broad meaning and a deep history of formation. In ancient Rome, the slave who announced the names of the guests at the ruler's reception was called the "nomenclator", the Latin word "nomenclature" (Lat. *nomenklatura* "name") means a list of names or titles. In Soviet society, this word meant "a group of officials, the appointment or approval of which is under the jurisdiction of a higher body" [1, p. 338]. In the case of a party dictatorship, appointment to a position is carried out on the basis of a decision of the party bodies according to the principle called "nomenclature", list №1 (positions appointed by the Politburo, the Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee), list №2 (list of posts appointed by departments of the CPSU Central Committee and other party structures) became a mechanism providing the authority to appoint to important positions. These nomenclature lists were included in political practice in 1925 by decision of the Politburo [2, p. 149].

Thus, in Soviet literature, the concept of nomenclature was established in the sense of a list of positions included in the appointment of higher bodies. This definition does not sufficiently reveal the meaning of this political phenomenon. Even the definition as "The list of positions, the staff of which is approved by higher authorities, the positions included in such a list: occupying such positions" [4, p. 320] does not completely define the concept. In the textbook for higher party schools "Nomenclature is a list of the most important positions and candidates who are discussed, proposed and approved in the relevant party committee (district, city, regional party committees). A person included in the nomenclature of the party committee can be dismissed only with his consent. Nomenclature includes employees in responsible positions" [4, p. 300].

Academician A.D.Sakharov for the first time in the Soviet Union reveals the historical and political background of the concept. He said that everything was kept secret without proper social research in the country, and that "in the 20s and 30s and post-war years, a special party-bureaucratic public group was formed in our country, calling themselves "nomenclature" and which M.Djilas called the "new class" [5, p. 19].

In his fundamental work "The New Class. Analysis of the Communist System" (1957) M.Djilas made theoretical conclusions on this issue. In this work a former member of the Politburo of the Communist party of Yugoslavia, politician, scholar and writer Milovan Djilas looks for an answer to a question "Who are the leaders?". And the Russian philosopher in exile N. Berdyaev gave his assessment of the newly formed ruling group: "The dictatorship of the proletariat, which has strengthened state power, misleads the whole country and its subordinates, and develops a huge bureaucracy. This new Soviet bureaucracy, much stronger than the bureaucracy of the tsarist government, is a high-ranking group that mercilessly exploits the people" [6, p. 300].

The answer to the questions "How in a socialist society, where there are no antagonistic groups according to the Marxist concept, a "new group" that "ruthlessly exploits the masses of the people appeared and who makes up its social base?" we can find in V.I.Lenin's categorical statement that "the state is an institution of coercion" [7, p. 110]. Since the state is the organization of the oppression of any class, its governance structure must be based on this principle.

The difference between this "party of a new model" and other parties lies in its mission, replacing the state and the state apparatus and internal structure. On this occasion, A. Avtorkhanov said: "On the one hand, this is a closed hierarchical organization with a personnel apparatus, on the other hand, this is an open mass party with a multi-million membership. Therefore, the party elite and activists felt like a "party within the party" [8, p.139].

R.Michels says that a collective society without a class will inevitably need the services of elite in the form of a bureaucracy, emphasizing that "public wealth can only be managed satisfactorily by creating a large group of

officials” [9, p.45]. Obviously, the social division of society is an inevitable necessity. Looking at the totalitarian content of the social structure of Soviet society, the researchers of the late XX century (*S.Huntington, Z.Brzezinski, M.Djilas, M.Voslensky and others.*) describe it as two opposing classes – the nomenclature, domineering over everything, and mass without right and property. These are too ideological views. It is not enough to analyze Soviet society with the help of class theory. In this society, ownership of property, which is the main feature of class, was completely absent. Although the Soviet nomenclature had the power to dispose of state property, it did not have the right to own property. The right to dispose of property has not become the right to own property.

The practice of nomenclature appointment was legalized by a special resolution “On organizational issues”, adopted at the XII Congress in 1923, which justified the appointment to vacant positions in all areas of government with the priority of this principle. After the congress of the Organizing Bureau of Central Committee of the Russian Communist party (bolsheviks) in 1923, the resolutions “On Appointments” on June 12 and “On the Selection and Appointment of Employees” on November 16 were adopted, clarifying the decisions of the congress. These resolutions actually became normative documents of nomenclature practice [10, pp. 26-27] and did not undergo fundamental changes until the dissolution of the party.

The phenomenon of the party-state nomenclature in the Soviet system of government was considered in Kh.Tursun’s studies [11], [12].

The second direction of our research is related to the scientific restoration of S.Baishev’s biographical history. A number of works on this theme have been published in Russian historiography. Among them, we note A.Nurshaiykov’s studies [13], S.Baishev’s students O.Sabden and A.Koshchanov’s [14] memoirs. In our published studies [15], [16], [17] related to the scientific personification of the figure, we expressed our first thoughts by analyzing archival data.

To date, the life, socio-political and creative activities of this figure have not been fully identified scientifically, and, accordingly, the tasks of the future will be to assess S. Baishev’s personal history, using a biographical approach and the conclusion of the party-state nomenclature.

### **Results**

The party-state nomenclature played the role of the elite in the system of Soviet elite formation and socio-political structure. In recent political literature, this nomenclature is mentioned among the highest elite group of of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist party (bolsheviks) (RKP(b)) - All-Union Communist party of bolsheviks (VKP(b)) - Communist Party of the Soviet Union members (CPSU), which includes representatives of the central, sectoral and regional authorities. In the case of Kazakhstan, we can say that S. Baishev, who was elected a member of the Central Committee of the Republican party organization several times and appointed to a number of high positions on the recommendation of this committee, is a typical representative of the party-state. Therefore, we are guided by this position when analyzing and evaluating the history of his socio-political activities.

On May 18, 1931 S.B.Baishev began his career at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, created by a decree of the Secretariat of the Kazakh Regional Committee under the Kazakh Central Executive Committee. From April 1933 this institution became the Kazakh Research Institute of Marxism-Leninism. From April 11, 1934, by the decision of the Bureau of the Kazakh Regional Committee of the VKP(b), it was reorganized as a branch of the United Party Archive of the VKP(b) in Kazakhstan and the Kazakh Institute of Marxism-Leninism-Engels-Lenin-Stalin. On December 2, 1939, by a decree of the Central Committee of the VKP(b), it was removed from the party archive and approved as the Kazakh branch of the Institute of Marx-Engels-Lenin of the Central Committee of the Communist party of bolsheviks of Kazakhstan.

In 1937 Saktagan Baishev was appointed director of the Institute of Party history [18, p. 37]. Certainly, he understood that the scientific institution entrusted to him was a position that required morality and education, and great responsibility, and he focused on its further improvement and attraction of young specialists.

S.Baishev, who was in the leadership of the institute for only one year, from April 1938 until the start of the Great Patriotic War, became the editor of the newspaper “Sotsialistik Kazakhstan”, which was previously headed by such educated and influential cultural figures as Gabbas Tokzhanov, Gabit Musirepov, and Zhusipbek Arystanov, by the decision of the Central Committee of the KazKP(b) №49-10, April 9, 1938, signed by the secretary of the Central Committee of the KazKP(b) L.Mirzoyan [18, p. 21].

Although S. Baishev had no desire to move from the position of director of the Institute of Party history to the editorial office of the newspaper “Sotsialistik Kazakhstan”, he was appointed to the editorial position without his consent, on the recommendation of L.Mirzoyan. (*After S.Baishev, L.Mirzoyan’s wife Yu.T.Tevosyan became the director of the Institute of Party history - author*). Thus, since that time, S.Baishev had to work in the newspaper, as well as actively participate in the life of the entire republic under the direct supervision of L.I.Mirzoyan.

According to the tradition established at that time, the editors of the republican newspapers “Sotsialistik Kazakhstan”, “Kazakhstanskaya Pravda” regularly participated in meetings of the Bureau of the Central

Committee and various important republican events. The most important and complex problems of party, Soviet and economic life were analyzed comprehensively there. At these events, responsible persons of the republic – secretaries of the Central Committee, department heads, senior officials of the Council of People’s commissars, people’s commissars, heads of various sectors of the national economy, heads of farms and prominent scientists made reports. Participants exchange views on the issue discussed at the meetings, and make proposals. Thus, being appointed to a responsible position in the nomenclature of the regional committee, S. Baishev got the opportunity to participate in the socio-political life of the country.

He worked with educated and businesslike people as O.Isaev, S.Nurpeisov, O.Zhandosov, I.Kabylov, Zh.Saduakasov, A.Dosov, N.Nurmakov, I.Bogdanov, S.Eskaraev, F.Olikov, T.Zhurgenov, S.Segizbaev, I.Lazarev, V.Stepanov, K.Lavrentiev, S.Saparbekov, K.Sarymoldaev, N.Syrgabekov and others, who held various responsible positions in the Central Committee, at the republican and regional levels at that time.

The years when S.Baishev was the director of the party institute and the editor of the newspaper went down in history as a period of mass political repressions. Therefore, although he witnessed and went through the tragedy of the 20s and 30s and had a lot of understanding and conclusions about the tragedy of his people, he did not express his dissatisfaction, and we can see about his condition at that time from his creative heritage and archival documents that he left.

The secret of his “silence” about the dreadful events that befell the country, and even about the events that he witnessed or took a direct part, like many of his contemporaries, can be understood from the following document: S. Baishev wrote a receipt to the leadership of the institution, where he was appointed: “I am the undersigned Baishev Saktagan, being at work at the Institute of Party history (branch of IMEL – Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute) under the Central Committee of the Communist party (b) of Kazakhstan or being dismissed, I hereby agree to keep state secrets known to me owing to official position, as well as all information relating to the Institute of Party history (branch of IMEL) under the Central Committee of the Communist party and its work, not to disclose them under any circumstances and not to share them with anyone.

I know that I bear responsibility for the disclosure of state secrets, in accordance with the Decree of the president of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of June 9, 1947. I also undertake to inform about all changes in the information indicated in my questionnaire and, in particular, about relatives and acquaintances having connections with foreigners or who have gone abroad” [18, p.44]. This text, quoted in full for accuracy, shows the great secrecy and severity of the situation, as well as the corresponding responsibility.

A document of this kind was signed by all representatives of the party-state nomenclature and committed themselves to the party and the government. It is known that their political will and position were limited by this commitment. We make sure that this method of totalitarian power, which became a mechanism for keeping individuals in its fist, like the current code of civil servants, is the most effective.

Just like the ethical standards of civil servants, which are determined by regulatory documents, one of the duties of the members of the party-state nomenclature was keeping state secrets, and the power of such receipts, which limited the words and thoughts of the nomenclature workers, remained in force until the end of their lives. Therefore, we understand the secret of Saktagan Baishev’s “silence”.

S.Baishev’s leadership of the research center came at a time when the Soviet totalitarian system was in force, in other words, when the order to go hand in hand with the party, to be careful and watch the words was established. In addition, due to the unfavorable changes taking place in society, the Institute of Party history was obliged to keep and protect the secret affairs of the decision-making and execution body.

Those who accepted the “game rules” of the totalitarian government were appointed to high positions and continued to serve. And those who resisted the system a little were subjected to political persecution.

S.Baishev, who survived the war and returned to the country, was accepted by the authorities as “insider”. On January 3, 1946, by the decision of the Central Committee of the Communist party (CP(b)) of Kazakhstan, he was appointed head of the Department of Arts under the Council of People’s commissars of the Kazakh SSR. He was recommended by the Chairman of the Council of People’s commissars N. Ondasynov and the Secretary of the Central Committee S. Yakovlev.

Characterising S.Baishev, S.Yakovlev writes that he is active in his work, well versed in matters of culture and art, reasonable and serious in solving problems. He also notes that he has a shortcoming like “excessive pride” [19, p. 37].

It is known that S.Baishev was appointed as an editor of the main republican publication with the expectation that he would demonstrate his versatility, ability to communicate with the public and organizational skills. Secretary of the Central Committee of the (CP(b)) of Kazakhstan N.A.Skvortsov noted that owing to S.Baishev, the newspaper “Sotsialistik Kazakhstan” was published in the language understandable for the Kazakh workers and according to the schedule. He says: “He is quite theoretically prepared, actively participates in the life of the party organization, and performs party instructions in good faith. Comrade Baishev may well

provide leadership of the editorial office of the newspaper “Sotsialistik Kazakhstan” [18, p. 22].

In 1946, during the period of restoration of public life after the war, by the party instructions, S. Baishev was appointed head of the Department for Arts under the Council of Ministers of the Kazakh SSR. We see that this appointment was made at the request of the nomenclature against S. Baishev’s will.

The person interested in science refused this work because of the wounds received in the war and due to health conditions. On January 2, 1945 he sent a letter to Zh. Shayakhmetov saying “Due to the failing health, requiring long-term and qualified treatment, I decided to switch to party-literary and scientific-pedagogical activities”. In the letter, he put forward the following reasons for his unwillingness to take this position: “1. I am completely unfamiliar with the system of art management work, therefore, I cannot cope with it. 2. Because of this, I will not be able to raise the work of the arts department to any extent, especially now, when the work of this section is running along the entire line, when, ranging from the department to the theaters, they are not staffed with qualified personnel. 3. I have no desire to work in the field of art. 4. I have the opportunity and desire to work in the line of scientific and pedagogical work. That is why I ask you to take these circumstances into account and give me the opportunity to devote my life to scientific and pedagogical work” [18, p. 33].

However, despite his opposition to this work, he was informed in the personnel department of the Central Committee that he was appointed to the center of art. Despite the cry of his heart that he was not familiar with the management system of the art center, unwillingness to work in the field of art, and his desire to work in the field of science and pedagogy, he had to work there for about a year.

However, resisting the appointment of a party for a nomenclature is tantamount to heroism. The desire to serve at his own prompted Saktagan to apply to higher authorities within the framework of party ethics. After a conversation with him, Nazarov from the art department of the Central Committee of the VKP(b) called Almaty and said: “The Central Committee of the VKP(b) considers it inappropriate to leave him at work any longer. We need to choose another candidate” [18, p. 35].

Regarding the secret of careerism inherent in representatives of the party-state nomenclature, one of Trotsky’s companions A.Ioffe said: “From top to bottom, from bottom to top - everything is the same. At the very bottom, the case is connected with a pair of boots and a tunic; higher - with a car, a carriage, a dining room of the Council of People’s Commissars, and an apartment in the Kremlin or in the “National”; and for those that are even higher and have all of these – with the status, great position and popularity” [20, pp. 379-380]. Therefore, based on these facts, we notice that the main driving force for those who joined the ranks of the ruling class of the Soviet system was the achievement of material wealth. There is no doubt that the denial of property relations and the persecution of owners as an exploiting class by the Soviet authorities was the only way to achieve material well-being by occupying positions of power that allowed property management. Can this conclusion be applied to S.Baishev? Of course, archival data on his socio-political activities show that he was not a careerist. Whatever position he was nominated by the Central Committee, his desire was not taken into account. But they drew attention to his business abilities and endless loyalty to the idea of the party.

In his letter to K.I.Satbaev from Moscow S.Baishev writes: “As soon as I arrive in Alma-Ata I will make a sacrifice and give charity and get rid of art. Now I will not go to any other job, even if they cut off my head. I want to devote the rest of my life to science” [21, p. 156].

There was true friendship and selfless respect between K. Satbaev and S. Baishev. Remembering the commotion associated with Kenessary, Academician Sh. Shokiuly said that at that time he and Kaneke (K.Satbaev) were reprimanded both from above and from below. “You know, Shake,” said K. Satbaev, “the director of the Institute of Party history Saktagan Baishev is one of the few people who did not participate in my exile” [22, p. 32]. At that time he knew S.Baishev from the outside. Kanysh Imantaiuly noted that S.Baishev, who was a member of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Kazakhstan, must have participated in striking at the “nationalists”, but S.Baishev remained at the height of nobility, ignoring the opportunity to rise even more on the wave of mass insanity.

On September 4, 1947, S.Baishev was appointed director of the history of the CP(b) of Kazakhstan – a branch Moscow Institute of Economics and Law of the Central Committee of the VKP (b). The participation of S.Baishev as a member of the editorial board in the publication of volumes I-II of the “History of the Kazakh SSR” (1949-1950) [18, pp.41-42] represents him not only as a witness and participant in that difficult period for the people, but also a person who comprehended and scientifically formulated these historical events.

The dismissal of S.Baishev from the post of director of the Kazakh Scientific Institute of Marxism-Leninism by the decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party on April 8, 1938, and the approval for the position of newspaper editor “Sotsialistik Kazakhstan” [18, p.25] indicates that Saktagan was a person who led the political and ideological propaganda during the “Great terror” in the republic. According to their official position, party and state leaders, such as Saktagan Baishev, were forced to deliver service to the totalitarian

government, or supported this service due to their political positions. Can they be blamed for these actions from today's perspective? This is the crux of the issue!

By the decision of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the CP of Kazakhstan of April 20, 1959, S.Baishev was approved as the Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Kazakh SSR. It was his highest position in the public service.

The President of the Scientific Academy of the Kazakh SSR K.Satpaev also highly appreciated S.Baishev's personal behavior and in his letter (29.03.1963) to the Central Committee of the Communist party said that S.Baishev showed himself to be businesslike and reasonable in organizing scientific work, respected by many people in his fruitful scientific and social activities, and had extensive experience in scientific and organizational work. K.Satpaev asked for consent to his appointment as vice-president of the National Academy of Sciences [18, pp. 72-73].

S.Baishev was able to actively participate in ideological work throughout his career. In this direction, speaking on behalf of the official authorities, he openly expressed the party's position on national values. For example, "Professor M.Auezov is a prisoner of his former ideological mistakes" ("Sotsialistik Kazakhstan" March 14, 1947), "The new alphabet of the Kazakh language" ("Kazakhstanskaya Pravda" November 19, 1940), "About the urgent tasks of Kazakh literature and literary studies" ("Sotsialistik Kazakhstan", "Kazakhstanskaya Pravda". March 15, 1947), "Some issues of the terminology of the modern Kazakh language" ("Adebiyet zhane Iskusstvo", No1. 1954), "Some problems of socio-economic terminology of the Kazakh language (introductory article to the collection "Kazakh Terminological Dictionary" (Published by the Academy of Sciences of the KazSSR. 1948. Alma-Ata). Judging by the current national positions, the issues raised in these articles are not worth discussing.

On October 12, 1981, S.Baishev and Soviet party veterans Damme Mikhail Nikolaevich, Izbassarov Zhumagali, Zhardemaliev Kadyr, Vorozheeva Anna Ivanovna, Nigmatov Ermekgali, Issabekov Bolebay wrote a letter of recommendation addressed to the first secretary of the Central Committee of the CP of Kazakhstan D.A.Konaev about the celebration of Seyitkali Mendeshov's 100th anniversary. The authors of the letter told about S. Mendeshov's party and state activities, taking into account his services to the Communist party and the Soviet state, and ask to consider the possibilities of celebrating his 100th anniversary. In this regard, the following specific recommendations are given: "In June 1982, mass meetings dedicated to the celebration of S. Mendeshov's 100th anniversary in the cities of Almaty, Uralsk and his native Zhangali district; Installation of a monument in Almaty; assigning his name to the Guryev Pedagogical Institute and to the state farm in the Uralsk region; opening of the house-museum of S.Mendeshov in the Zhangali district; preparation and publication of a book about S.Mendeshov's life and work; publication of an article dedicated to S. Mendeshov's 100th anniversary in the newspaper "Izvestiya" in June 1982 (the article will be written on behalf of S.A.Imashev or B.A.Ashimov)" [23, pp. 2-5]. It was an offer that was made ahead of time. Because among those who were subjected to political persecution, S. Mendeshov was justified in the legal sense, but the strict principles of the totalitarian ideology did not allow them to be politically justified. First of all, the Soviet government needed only faithful servants devoted to the communist idea, and only their political and creative morality could become the ideal of education. Therefore, the mentioned proposals to the republican leadership remained unanswered. The current research work, initiated by the decree of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan K.Tokayev on the complete justification of the victims of political persecution, contributes to the search in the archives and the disclosure of the secrets of that tragic period. We are pleased with these efforts of S.Baishev, who worked hand in hand with politically repressed figures and was brought up on their morals, to fulfill his civic duty. However, it is a pity that the person who witnessed the tragic period and a historical event in which he was directly involved did not have significant memories.

The third stage of persecution in Kazakhstan affected members of the intelligentsia. Their sharp mind could criticize the shortcomings in society. Therefore, the brave people, who could not hide their thoughts, were persecuted. This also applies to S.Baishev. The persecution policy of the Soviet government took place when one of the prominent Kazakh intellectuals K.I. Satpayev found himself in a difficult position. The type of persecution of S.Baishev was dismissal from his post. During the fight against the "bourgeois nationalists", K.I. Satpaev was dismissed from his post of President of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR. S.Baishev took a bold step by supporting K. Satpaev. This support was considered a gross ideological mistake, so he was dismissed from the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR and from the leadership of the Economic Institute he founded [18, p.75]. He was dismissed from the post of vice-president of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR and then A.Nusipbekov was appointed in his place [19, 99p.]. On August 22, 1967, the Central Committee of the Communist party of Kazakhstan removed S.Baishev from the post of chairman of the republican society "Bilim" and A.B.Tursynbaev was appointed in his place [18, p. 76].

Every day the "aggression" of the totalitarian order in society intensified. That was a difficult time, when



they were looking for a reason to denigrate a person and it affected Saktagan Baishev. In his memoirs, his student describes the period when a black cloud hung over his head: “The people know the truth about how Saktagan was removed from the post of vice president. In any case, it’s unfair, he was not even left in the economic institute he built. My teacher was 60 years old when he suffered greatly” [21, p. 40].

These memories remain as a reflection of the moment when he spoke from the bottom of his heart: “I still remember when Seke (S.Baishev) was in the central hospital with an incurable disease. When we went to see him, his face was sad, he looked like a man who thought back over his life full of struggle and action, and came to a reasonable conclusion. He said: “I am satisfied with my lot. In the twenties, when I came to Karsakpay following a caravan of camels with my Komsomol card from the small town of Temir, which used to be a large shopping center in a remote corner of Aktobe, I was driven by a big dream. It was a feeling and a goal to serve my country and people, which were born in my heart at that time. It seems I have gone down this path. There were joys, difficulties and regrets. But wherever I am, I feel that I have fulfilled my civic duty to society. Perhaps, we made a mistake during the great revolution. And even when I was under a lot of pressure during my work as an editor, I didn’t slander anyone. My conscience is clear” [21, p.47]. These memories remain in memory as a reflection of the moment when the person speaks from the heart.

The involvement of representatives of the national elite in the Soviet power structures in the early years can be seen as a temporary situation in which the bolsheviks had to compromise. I.V. Stalin expresses his attitude to this issue in his letter to E.D.Stasova after the establishment of the Kyrghyz (Kazakh) revolutionary committee regarding A.Baitursynov: “I did not consider him either a communist-revolutionary or its supporter, and I never think, but despite this, he should be a member of the revolutionary committee” [24, p. 112]. Although this conciliatory situation did not last long, it became a real experience of the social and political phenomenon of the time. And when the party-state positions were established, it became impossible to talk about such a political compromise in relation to national personnel.

National values were replaced by internationalist values, representatives of the party-state nomenclature, who were required to strictly observe the principles of class and party principles were completely subordinated to the Soviet totalitarian government service.

### **Conclusion**

The system of the party-state nomenclature, which was a special phenomenon in the Soviet governance structure, became the mechanism for implementing all reforms and modernization processes in the state. Since the activities of this group took on the most political and ideological character, each member included in it glorified class and party values and lived by them. It became the success and tragedy of an entire generation. Academician Saktagan Baishev, one of the typical representatives of this ruling group, who developed his social and political activities in this environment. A scientific assessment of S. Baishev’s personality as a nomenclature worker appointed to high positions in the political and public sphere of the republic means conducting research on his contemporaries. Although the values of Soviet society are preserved in modern independent historical knowledge and experience, we are convinced that there can be no one-sided approach to this issue.

#### *Пайдаланылган әдебиеттер тізімі:*

1. *Словарь иностранных слов. -12-е изд., стереотип. – М., 1985. – 608 с.*
2. *Теория государства и права: часть 1 Теория государства. Под ред. Венгерова А.Б. – М.: Юрист. -1995. – 256 с.*
3. *Новые слова и значения. -М.: Сов. Энциклопедия, 1971. -543 с.*
4. *Партийное строительство. Изд. 6-ое изд., доп. – М.: Госполитиздат, 1981. – 300 с.*
5. *Сахаров А.Д. О стране и мире. - Нью-Йорк, 1975. – 290 с.*
6. *Бердяев Н. Истоки и смысл русского коммунизма. - М.: Наука, 1990. - 220 с.*
7. *Ленин В.И. Полное собрание сочинения. изд. 5-е. –М.: Политиздат, 1981. - т. 35. – 599 с.*
8. *Авторханов А. Происхождение партократии. Октябрь. 1991. - №2. – С.133-163*
9. *Михельс Р. Социология политической партии в условиях демократии. «Диалог». – 1991. - № 3. – С.40-48*
10. *Коржухина Т., Фигатнер Ю. Советская номенклатура: становления, механизмы действия. «Вопросы истории». – 1993. – № 7. – С.25–38.*
11. *Тұрсұн Х. Партиялық-мемлекеттік номенклатураның қалыптасу мәселелері. Поиск-Ізденіс. 2006. №3.*
12. *Х.Тұрсұн. Түркістанда партиялық-мемлекеттік номенклатураның ұлттық мәселелерді шешудегі қызметі. әл-Фараби атындағы ҚазҰУ хабаршысы «Тарих» сериясы, 2006.-№3. - 40-43-бб.*
13. *Нуришаихов А. Дорогой памяти: Из фронтовых тетрадей. (О комиссаре С. Башиеве). - М., 1985. 512 с.*



14. Сабден О., Кошанов А. Ученый с большой буквы. *Казахстанская правда*. 2009. 2 октября
15. Б.Мамбетов. Сақтаған Бәйішұлына 100 жыл толды. *Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ Ұлттық университетінің Хабаршысы. Тарих сериясы*. – Алматы, 2010. – №2 (57)
16. Б.Мамбетов. Сақтаған Бәйішев туралы. *Абай атындағы Қазақ Ұлттық педагогикалық университетінің Хабаршысы. «Тарих және әлеуметтік ғылымдар» сериясы. №2 (25), 2010*
17. Б.Мамбетов, Х.Тұрсұн. Академик С.Бәйішевтің қызметін зерттеуде биографиялық тәсілді қолдану. *Абай атындағы ҚазҰПУ. №3 (74), қараша, 2022. (268-289)*
18. ҚР ПА. Ф.708., оп. 75., Д.37
19. ҚР ПА Ф. 811, оп.11, Д. 10
20. Волкогонов Д.А. Троцкий. *Политический портрет в 2 кн. – М.: Новости, 1994. -Т. 1. – 416 с.*
21. Академик С. Бәйішев. – Алматы: Ақыл кітабы. 2000. - 56 б.
22. Шөкіұлы Ш. Өмірдің төрт мезгілі. – Алматы. 1956. - 120 б.
23. ҚР ҰҒА архивы. Қ.109, 1 тізбе, 138 іс
24. РГАСПИ Ф. 17, оп. 86, д. 129

#### References:

1. Slovar` inostranny`kh slov. [Dictionary of foreign words] -12-e izd., stereotip. – М., 1985. - 608 s. [in Russian].
2. Teoriya gosudarstva i prava: chast` 1. Teoriya gosudarstva [Theory of State and Law: Part 1. Theory of State]. Pod red. Vengerova A.B. -М: Yurist. -1995. 256 s. [in Russian].
3. Novy`e slova i znacheniya [New words and meanings]. -М.: Sov. E`ncziklopediya, 1971. - 543 s. [in Russian].
4. Partijnoe stroitel`stvo [Party construction]. Izd. 6-oe izd., dop.- М.: Gospolitizdat, 1981. –300 s. [in Russian].
5. Sakharov A.D. O strane i mire [About the country and the world]. -N`yu-Jork: 1975. –290 s. [in Russian].
6. Berdyayev N. Istoki i smy`sl` russkogo kommunizma [The origins and meaning of Russian communism]. -М.; Nauka, 1990 -220 s. [in Russian].
7. Lenin V.I. Polnoe sobranie sochineniya [Complete works]. izd. 5-e. -М.: Politizdat, 1981. -t. 35. – 599 s. [in Russian].
8. Avtorkhanov A. Proiskhozhdenie partokratii [The origin of partocracy]. Oktyabr`. 1991. -#2. - S.133-163 [in Russian].
9. Mikhel`s R. Socziologiya politicheskoy partii v usloviyakh demokratii [Sociology of the political party in a democracy]. «Dialog». – 1991. - # 3. -S.40-48. [in Russian].
10. Korzhikhina T., Figatner Yu. Sovetskaya nomenklatura: stanovleniya, mekhanizmy` dejstviya [Soviet nomenclature: formations, mechanisms of action]. «Voprosy` istorii». – 1993. –# 7. -S.25–38. [in Russian].
11. Kh.Tursun. Partiyaly`q-memleketti`k nomenklaturany`n qaly`ptasu maseleleri`. Poisk-I`zdeni`s. 2006. #3. [in Kazakh].
12. Kh.Tursun. Turki`standa partiyaly`q-memleketti`k nomenklaturany`n ultty`g maselelerdi` sheshudegi` qy`zmeti` [The role of the party-state nomenclature in solving national problems in Turkestan]. al-Farabi aty`ndagy` KazYPU khabarshy`sy` «Tarikh» seriyasy`, 2006.-#3.-40-43-bb. [in Kazakh].
13. Nurshaikhov A. Dorogoj pamyati: Iz frontovy`kh tetradej. (O komissare S. Baisheve) [The path of memory: From front-line notebooks. (About Commissioner S. Baishev)].-М., 1985. 512 s. [in Russian].
14. Sabden O., Koshanov A. Ucheny`j s bol`shoj bukvy`. [Scientist with a capital letter] Kazakhstanskaya pravda. 2009. 2 oktyabr`. [in Russian].
15. B.Mambetov. Saktagan Baji`shyly`na 100 zhy`l toldy`. [100th anniversary of Saktagan Baishuly] al-Farabi aty`ndagy` Qazaq Ylty`q universiteti`ni`n Khabarshy`sy`. Tarikh seriyasy`. Almaty`, #2 (57) 2010 [in Kazakh].
16. B.Mambetov. Saqtagan Baji`shev turaly`. [About Saktagan Baishev] Abaj aty`ndagy` Qazaq Ylty`k pedagogikaly`k universiteti`ni`h Khabarshy`sy`. «Tarikh zhane aleumetti`k gy`ly`mdar» seriyasy`. #2 (25), 2010 [in Kazakh].
17. B.Mambetov, Kh.Tursun. Akademik S.Baji`shevти`n qy`zmeti`n zertteude biografialy`k tasi`ldi` qoldanu [The biographical approach in the study of the activities of Academician S. Baishev]. Abaj aty`ndagy` KazYPU. #3 (74), qarasha, 2022. (268-289) [in Kazakh].
18. KR PA. [Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan] F.708, op. 75, D. 37.
19. KR PA [Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan] F. 811, op.11, D. 10
20. Volkogonov D.A. Troczkij. Politicheskij portret v 2 kn. [Trotsky. Political portrait in 2 books] - М.: Novosti, 1994. -Т. 1. 416 s. [in Russian].

21. Akademik S. Baji`shev. [Academician S. Bayishev]-Almaty`: Aqy`l ki`taby`. 2000. -56 s. [in Kazakh].
22. Shoki`uly` Sh. Omi`rdi`n tort mezgi`li`. [Four seasons of life] -Almaty`. 1956. -120 b. [in Kazakh].
23. KR YGA arkhivy`. [Archive of the National Academy of Sciences of the RK] F.109, op.1, D. 138 i`s
24. RGASPI7 F. [Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History] F.17, op. 86, D. 129.