

*S.K. Tulbassieva *¹*

¹*Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty. E-mail: sauletulbassieva@gmail.com*

COLLECTIVE FARM «MOUNTAIN GIANT» IN ALMA-ATA: HISTORIES OF LABOR VICTORIES AND TRAGEDIES OF THE 1930S.

Abstract

Recently, interest in the problems of everyday life has noticeably increased in historical science, especially at the regional level during a certain historical process. The last thirty years have become a period of radical rethinking of socio-economic history and testing of new methodological approaches. In addition, this actualizes the topic we have chosen.

The object of our study, we chose a special city of the Semirechye region, the city of Almaty and its history during the period of collectivization.

The subject of the study is the new rural life experienced by the peasantry as part of the city, which underwent a significant transformation during the formation of the Soviet state, associated with the implementation of a targeted state policy that had a tremendous impact on all spheres of life, which makes it possible to reveal key aspects of the history of everyday life, aimed at studying objective and subjective aspects of the historical process of this period for the residents of the city of Almaty.

The purpose of this article is to study the most important aspects of the daily life of the rural population of the city of Almaty in the period 1930-1934. The article covers key aspects of the formation of the Soviet collective farm in the 1920s as part of the collectivization policy aimed at uniting peasant farms into one whole to increase agricultural productivity and strengthen state power.

Keywords: Kazakhstan, Almaty, Mountain giant, Semirechye, Soviet period, Soviet power, collectivization, collective farm, everyday life, totalitarianism.

*С.К.Тулбасиева *¹*

¹*Казахский национальный педагогический университет им. Абая, Республика Казахстан. г.Алматы,
E-mail: sauletulbassieva@gmail.com*

КОЛХОЗ «ГОРНЫЙ ГИГАНТ» В АЛМА-АТЕ: ИСТОРИИ ТРУДОВЫХ ПОБЕД И ТРАГЕДИЙ 1930-Х ГОДОВ

Аннотация

В последнее время в исторической науке заметно возрос интерес к проблемам повседневности, особенно на региональном уровне в период определенного исторического процесса. Последние тридцать лет стали периодом кардинального переосмысления социально-экономической истории и апробации новых методологических подходов. И это актуализирует выбранную нами тему.

Объектом нашего исследования мы выбрали особый город Жетысуйского региона, город Алматы и его историю в период коллективизации.

Предметом исследования является пережитая крестьянством новая сельская жизнь в составе города, претерпевшая значительное преобразование в период становления советского государства, связанная с проведением целенаправленной государственной политики, оказавшей колоссальное влияние на все сферы жизни, что позволяет раскрыть ключевые аспекты истории повседневности, направленной на изучение объективных и субъективных аспектов исторического процесса этого периода для жителей города Алматы.

Целью данной статьи является исследование важнейших аспектов повседневной жизни сельского населения города Алматы в период 1930-1934 годов.

Статья охватывает ключевые аспекты формирования советского колхоза в 1920-е годы в рамках политики коллективизации, направленной на объединение крестьянских хозяйств в одно целое для повышения производительности сельского хозяйства и укрепления власти государства.

Ключевые слова: Казахстан, Алма-Ата, Горный гигант, Семиречье, Советский период, Советское правительство, коллективизация, колхоз, повседневность, тоталитаризм.

*С.К. Тулбасиева *¹*

*¹Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті. Қазақстан Республикасы. Алматы.
E-mail: sauletulbassieva@gmail.com*

АЛМАТЫДАҒЫ «ГОРНЫЙ ГИГАНТ» КОЛХОЗЫ: 1930 ЖЫЛДАРДАҒЫ ЕҢБЕК ЖЕҢІСТЕРІ МЕН ҚАСІРЕТІНІҢ ТАРИХЫ

Аңдатпа

Қазіргі таңда тарих ғылымында күнделікті өмірге деген қызығушылық айтарлықтай өсті, әсіресе белгілі бір тарихи процесс кезінде аймақтық деңгейде. Соңғы отыз жыл әлеуметтік-экономикалық тарихты түбегейлі қайта қарау және жаңа әдіснамалық тәсілдерді сынақтан өткізу кезеңі болды. Бұл біз таңдаған тақырыптың өзектілігін ашады.

Зерттеу нысаны ретінде Жетісу өңірінің ерекше қаласын, Алматы қаласын және оның ұжымдастыру кезеңіндегі тарихын таңдадық.

Зерттеу пәні-Алматы қаласының тұрғындары үшін осы кезеңнің тарихи процесінің объективті және субъективті аспектілерін зерттеуге бағытталған күнделікті өмір тарихының негізгі аспектілерін ашуға мүмкіндік беретін, өмірдің барлық салаларына орасан зор әсер еткен мақсатты мемлекеттік саясатты жүргізумен байланысты Кеңес мемлекетінің қалыптасу кезеңінде елеулі өзгеріске ұшыраған қала құрамындағы шаруалар басынан өткерген ауыл өмірі алынды.

Бұл мақаланың мақсаты 1930-1934 жылдар кезеңінде Алматы қаласының ауыл тұрғындарының күнделікті өмірінің маңызды аспектілерін зерттеу болып табылады.

Кілт сөздер: Қазақстан, Алматы, Горный гигант, Жетісу, Кеңестік кезең, Кеңес өкіметі, ұжымдастыру, колхоздастыру, күнделікті өмір, тоталитаризм

Introduction. The historical period of collectivization was marked by a number of important events in the formation of Soviet society. It was a time of mass socialization, upheavals, as a result of which millions of people changed their occupation and even their place of residence.

Relevance. The reforms of the Soviet state that unfolded in those years required huge funds and efforts, since the country was mainly agricultural, collective farms were supposed to become the main source from where the state could draw the necessary resources.

And this was the main reason for the agrarian reforms, which led to a complete change in the social situation and daily life of rural residents. As a result, Soviet reforms, including collectivization, eventually provoked a conflict between the old orders of the rural population and new state administrative organizations - artels, communes and collective farms, which destroyed the former way of life of the rural population.

Therefore, without studying the peculiarities of the development of the rural population, especially in a certain region, it is impossible to recreate a detailed and holistic picture of the daily life of the inhabitants of this region. The study of everyday life allows us to obtain more examples of human perception of new conditions during a period of social upheaval.

Recently, there has been a noticeable increase in interest in the problems of everyday life in historical science, especially at the regional level during a certain historical process. The last thirty years have been a period of radical rethinking of socio-economic history and testing of new methodological approaches. And this actualizes the topic we have chosen.

We have chosen a special city of the Semirechye region, the city of Almaty and its history during the period of collectivization as the object of our research. Specifically, using the example of one collective farm, we want to show the history of the formation of the Soviet economy in the city of Alma-Ata.

The subject of the study is the new rural life experienced by the peasantry as part of the city, which underwent a significant transformation during the formation of the Soviet state, associated with the implementation of a purposeful state policy that had a tremendous impact on all spheres of life, which allows us to reveal key aspects of the history of everyday life aimed at studying objective and subjective aspects of the historical process of this period for residents of the city of Almaty.

The purpose of this article is to study the most important aspects of the daily life of the rural population of Almaty in the period 1930-1934 and to show the objective factors of the transformation of everyday life. In particular, the main goal is to tell the story of the embodiment of Soviet modernization by the example of one collective farm in Almaty.

In accordance with this goal, the following tasks were set in the article:

- to highlight the socio-economic trends that have influenced the daily life of collective farms in Almaty; - to identify the features of social interactions and attitudes of the rural population during the period of collectivization on the example of one collective farm;

- to show the conditions, level, lifestyle and way of life of the rural population of the city of Almaty.

Materials and Methodology.

Materials. The methodological basis is based on the principles of historicism and a systematic approach. Problem-chronological, historical-comparative, and typological approaches were also used. General scientific research methods (analysis, synthesis, induction, deduction, etc.), special historical research methods, using specific examples, problem-chronological, frontal studies of archival data, etc. were also used. The source base of the topic under study is a complex of archival documents and materials.

During the preparation of the scientific publication, documents from the Fund-174, the City Archive of the city of Almaty were used, such as the Executive Committee of the Alma-Ata City Council of Workers' Deputies and the Fund-1714-List of kulak families who arrived in the city of Almaty. Additionally, materials from the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan (CSA RK) of Fund-44 (People's Commissariat of Workers' and Peasants' Inspections of the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic since 1929, Alma-Ata) were used; Fund-74 (People's Commissariat of Agriculture of the Kir ASSR (People's Commissariat of Agriculture) since 1929, Alma-Ata); Fonda-83 (People's Commissariat of Labor of the KirASSR (Kyrgyz People's Labor) since 1929 Alma-Ata); Materials of the secret department of the Central State Administration of the Republic of Kazakhstan Fund-251, Case-1102. Cases of the Mobile Supreme Court. Minutes of the Session 1920–1942; Materials of the Presidential Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan such as Fund-141, materials on the confiscation of property in the Alma-Ata district.

Control and discussion.

The relevance of the chosen topic lies in the insufficient study of the daily life of the rural population of the Alma-Ata region in the 1930s-1934s.

On the history of Kazakhstan, there are not enough scientific works on the study of historical data in the context of regions of this period. They were all considered generically and comprehensively. Therefore, one of the ways to create a retrospective of the 30s was the interest of researchers to study the history in the context of the region for a certain period.

The history of the creation, strengthening and activity of mass peasant organizations during the transition period, as well as the work of village councils, were considered in the work of M.K. Kozybaev [1.11-114]. He notes that the activities of peasant organizations were investigated unilaterally for some time.

According to him, the issues of relations between peasant organizations and their relations with village and village councils in the struggle for the construction of socialism, i.e. the mechanism of real participation of workers in historical creativity, have remained out of the field of view of scientists.

In the monograph devoted to the analysis of party leadership with mass organizations, Sh.A. Kusanova gives a general idea of the main directions of development of agrarian policy [2.8-19]. Focusing on the main focus of the party leadership, the author touched upon the issues of ideological and organizational strengthening of rural party organizations.

A significant place in Kazakh historiography is occupied by the works of S. L. Kovalsky [3. 59-70]. His scientific works show the problems of state farm construction in the pre-war period, the activities of production teams under the leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet state, and state farms of large agricultural detachments of the working class in the countryside.

The logical continuation of this problem in the new historical conditions was the work of S. L. Kovalsky and Kh. Madanov "Development of virgin lands of Kazakhstan" [4.56]. Where a wide range of issues related to the organization and development of state farm production on virgin lands of Kazakhstan in the pre-war and post-war periods is studied.

A. B. Tursunbayev was one of the first in Kazakhstan to show the life of the yard and village in the 20s and 30s, revealing the role of party organizations in spreading mass ideas of collectivization, pointing out the help of worker's settlements and yards in the construction of land reclamation systems, that collective farms and collective farmers enjoy a single agricultural tax [5.3-9.247]. Based on archival materials, the author traces the development of collectivization of farms in Kazakhstan and ways to solve two historical problems-the consolidation of personal farms into collective farms and the transition from a nomadic lifestyle to a sedentary one.

General studies of socio-economic problems and specific historical experience of the transition of Kazakh nomads and semi-nomads to a sedentary lifestyle under the Soviet regime are made up of the works of

G.F. Dahshleiger and K. Nurpeisov [6.4-20]. They are distinguished by a broad source base, a deep analysis of the material, and the validity of assumptions and generalizations on the most important issues of this period. A concrete historical review of the collective farm's victories in the republics of the Soviet East, including Kazakhstan, is described in the works of B. A. Tulepbaev [7.21, 15-42]. Among them, a special place is occupied by his monograph "Socialist agrarian Transformations in Central Asia and Kazakhstan". His work differs in that they analyze the political, economic and social prerequisites for collectivization.

Thus, it is possible to make a review of scientific works related to this period, but the historical review reveals an insufficient level of research of this period in the regional context.

As a source study basis for our research, we used archival data, primarily from the Almaty City Archive, the Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, and especially unused archival documents from an earlier research circle.

Specifically, we used the materials of the Foundation-70 Case of the Alma-Ata City People's Court in 1928-1936 [8.147].

The scientific novelty represents the first attempt at a comprehensive and general study of the daily life of the rural population of Almaty during the period of collectivization, when a new system of Soviet ownership was being formed.

During the period of our research, the city of Alma-Ata was the administrative center of Semirechye province. From September 3, 1928 to 1936, Alma-Ata was the capital of the Kazakh ASSR and the administrative center of the Almaty district.

In accordance with the decree of the Presidium of the Kazakh Central Election Commission dated December 17, 1930 "On new zoning", 126 districts were created in Kazakhstan. As the capital of Kazakhstan, Alma-Ata became the administrative center of a large district. It was joined by the localities of Malo Almatinsky, Leninsky Selsoviet of Kalininsky district and Gorno-Oktyabrsky Selsoviet [9.91]. As a result of the reform, 3,070 farms located on an area of 49,264 hectares were managed by 12 collective farms and 1 agricultural cooperative-artel. The total number of people served by the city council has reached 141,590.

A significant part of the urban population was engaged in agricultural activities, the development of horticulture and horticulture along with the cultivation of grain crops. Until February 1930, agriculture existed as a handicraft association of collective farms; later this association was reorganized into the District Collective Farm Food Union, and later, after the creation of the City Council, it was created as the City Collective Farm Union. In the early 1930s, the city had 13 collective farms, including 1 commune and 12 artels. Collective farms comprised 1,065 households and 4,816 souls of the population, which accounted for 38.5% of the total urban population engaged in agriculture.

The size of agricultural activity of collective farms was determined by the following data: in 1929-30, 2128 hectares were sown with grain crops, 216.5 hectares with vegetable gardens, and 71.5 hectares with new gardens. The total area of the gardens was 834 hectares, of which 408 hectares were fruit-bearing gardens, 375 hectares were non-fruit-bearing gardens and 51 hectares were orchards. The biggest drawback in the organization of collective farms was the instability of the agricultural territory [10.105].

Some collective farms, for example, the artel "Bednota", had up to 100 land plots. In the early 1930s, a number of collective farms were allocated 575 hectares for the development of horticulture, and the aforementioned artel "Bednota" was granted 150 hectares in one massif, at the expense of land taken from the deprived and kulaks. Garden crops were sown in 1929 on 216.5 ha, in 1930-31 on 2128 ha, and according to the plan for 1930/31 on 1534 ha. Thus, garden crops were increased by 39.8 percent, and grain crops were reduced by 38.8 percent. While collecting materials on grain procurement in the city of Almaty, we came across the case of a collective farm that is part of the city. So we decided to take this object as the subject of our research.

So, in 1933, the newspaper "Kazpravda" published an article about a collective farm in the Alma-Ata district. The authors of the article are all the MTF brigades consisting of 28 people from one collective farm.

The article reports "That in the city of Alma-Ata there is one strong collective farm "Mountain Giant". In 1933, he exported 800 tons of Aport apples alone, not to mention other fruits and his wealth" [11.38]. This collective farm produced up to 50 varieties of wine.

Table 1. According to the materials studied, the composition and activities of the Gorny Gigant collective farm during this period were as follows:

workers	number of farms	number of consumers	number of able bodied
in 1934	382	1528	866

in 1935	445	1804	1010
---------	-----	------	------

Household chores:

Crop name	Number of hectares
Wheat	544
Millet	10
Barley	30
Oats	110
Potatoes	68
Vegetables	42.63
Sunflower	5.7
TOTAL	810.33 ha

Table 2. On the availability of livestock in the sole use of collective farmers of the Gorny Gigant collective farm:

Name of livestock	number of heads reported 1933-1 / 1-1934	number of heads reported 1934-1/1-1935
Cows	142,183	183
Heifers and calves	47	136
47,136 Pigs	-	124
Sheep	35	12
35,12 Bulls	-36	36
Donkeys	-	19
TOTAL:	228,614	614

Table 3. Information on the gross output of the Gorny Gigant collective farm

n /	a Crop name	Collection 1933 in centners	Collection 1934 in centners
1	Wheat	2994	7320
2	Millet	27	198
3	Oats	621	1990
4	Barley	567	348
5	Sunflower	24	68
6	Potatoes	2058	5207
7	Cabbage	269	1070
8	Cucumbers	392	338
9	Tomatoes	1478	1078
10	Other garden	products 56	531
11	Melon	production 177	313
12	Apples, pears, etc.	18999	7657
	Gross cash income	2401275	11151555-90

Table 4. Delivered to the State

n/a	Crop name	Collection 1933 in centners	Collection 1934 in centners
1	Wheat	398	1165
2	Oats	160-3	-
3	Barley	140	331
4	Potatoes	557	601
5	Cucumbers	174	73
6	Tomatoes	764	323
7	Cabbage	15	66
8	Apples, pears	8123	4254
	TOTAL	10331	6813

[12.4].

At first glance, it would seem that everything is fine.

During these years, the collective farm was often purged of alien elements. An example is the trial of 24 people at the Gorny Gigant collective farm in criminal cases against the management and members of the collective farm. In the same collective farm, a conference was held, that is, a meeting of collective farmers of 250 people, and as a result, in 1933, people were convicted of negligent attitude to the collective farm property "Mountain Giant".

Specifically, Anton Aleksandrovich Belousov, convicted of disrupting sowing, Nikifor Evstafievich Kakhnovich, accountant, convicted of accounting confusion, sold 8 tons of potatoes. Kostyukov Yakov Georgievich - kulak, exiled. Nikolai Nikolaevich Kurilov, foreman, convicted of negligence, sentenced to 6 months of forced labor. Pashenko Pavel Sergeevich - worked as a private in the second garden brigade for drunkenness. Solovyova Khionia Filippovna, foreman, convicted of squabbling under Art. 95, served 3 months before trial, acquitted by the court. Zhukov Vasily Nikolaevich - accused of involvement in the theft of bread and fruit [13.8].

For a comprehensive verification of the facts reported in the materials received by the City Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) a commission of five people was created: the chairman of the commission is Konuspaev. Members of the commission Elichev, Kladneva, Kuvarzin, Vasilenko [14.46].

In the received material addressed to the City Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and the City Council, it was stated that the surviving kulaks, as well as previously convicted socially alien, anti-collective farm elements, after serving their sentences, made their way to the collective farm management (board members, foremen), destroyed the collective farm, squandered property, etc.

As a result of an in-depth investigation, it was established: that throughout the entire period of work of the old collective farm board, headed by the former chairman of the collective farm Morozikhin, there was absolutely no criticism and self-criticism in the collective farm.

Often, the collective farmers' sensible demands, requests, and statements were completely ignored. The initiative of collective farmers was suppressed, educational work among collective farmers was not carried out. The collective farm board and its chairman worked according to the "steal as I want" method.

Collective farmers were intimidated. The chairman of the collective farm, Morozikhin, responded to the comments of the collective farmers: "I am the chairman of the collective farm and a member of the City Committee and the City Council, so what I want, I do in the collective farm." All this is confirmed by conversations with collective farmers, as well as by speeches of collective farmers at meetings.

For example, at the general meeting of the artel members on March 1, the collective farmers stated the following in their speeches:

Danilin: "Under the old leadership, we had almost no meetings."

Zolotareva: "the collective farmers hardly spoke at the rare meetings, because they were intimidated."

Shevchenko: - "Morozikhin repeatedly scolded me, did not let me speak, excluded me from the collective farm and promised to put me on trial for noting shortcomings. Threatened, said: "I'm a member of the City Council, I do what I want."

Shishova: - "I came to the board more than once and talked about shortcomings in my work, Morozikhin drove me away, did not tell me to go, etc."

Kurilova (MTF): - "We had a big pressure on the collective farm from Morozikhin, -I worked as a drummer. The brigade added me to the list of drummers, and Morozikhin removed me from the list of drummers for asking me to be released from work for one day due to the illness of an infant."

Vutsyk (STF): - "Morozikhin suppressed the initiative of the collective farmers, treated the collective farmers rudely. There were many cases when many women cried because of Morozikhin's bullying."

The lack of criticism and self-criticism, the presence of naked administration in the work, the method of intimidation of collective farmers by the old leadership led to a clear weakening of labor discipline among the collective farmers, to irresponsibility and laxness on the part of the foremen - on the one hand, and on the other - gave a great opportunity антиколхозным for anti-collective, socially alien elements who had penetrated the collective farm to aimed at the disintegration of the collective farm.

Here are a few facts about the insufficient and incorrect use of labor on the collective farm:

a) 1. Bisimbaev R. has 566 working days, 2. Baylibaev P. has 526 working days, 3. Belenko F. has 625 working days, Total: 1,717 working days.

On average, each man worked 572 working days ($1717:3=572$). This is the average output. b) 1. Chingilbaev has 277 working days, 2. Abu Ishem has 263 working days, 3. Embaev D. has 325 working days. Total 675 working days.

On average, each man produced 258 tons/day ($775:3=258$). This is the minimum solution.

c) 1. Baitanov was allotted 126 working days, 2. Dutkaev has 120 working days, 3. Tezekpaev has 82 working days. Total 328 working days. On average, each man worked out 109 days ($328:3=109$). This is the minimum output.

In total, these 9 workers mentioned above actually worked 2820 days, i.e. 313 days on average each separately ($2820:9=313$). The collective farm has 397 able-bodied men. Based on the average figure of 313 days for each able-bodied man, they could work out only 124261 days ($397 \times 313 = 124261$). In fact, less was produced. Men's labor is used up by 70 percent.

Women's work: a) The maximum output of a woman is 274 working days; b) the average output of each woman is 169 days c) the minimum output of a woman is 58 days.

On average, each woman accounts for 167 tons / day. In total, there are 444 able-bodied women on the collective farm. Based on the calculation of the above-mentioned average actual output, all 444 women were able to produce 80140 tons / day during the whole of 1934. In fact, this is far from the case, women's labor is used only by half. Work of teenagers: a) The maximum output of adolescents is 153 days; b) the average output of each teenager is 48-days; c) the minimum output of a teenager is 5 days.

The average output of adolescents, therefore, is 69 tons / day. In total, there are 161 teenagers on the collective farm. Based on the average calculation, they could have worked out 11109 tons/day ($161 \times 69 = 11109$). In fact, they produced significantly less [15.52].

As a result, it turns out that all 1010 able-bodied people, together with teenagers, could easily have worked out 215510 tons/day during 1934, but in fact they worked out only 164,000 tons/day. Thus, labor on the collective farm is used up by 70 percent.

The poor organization of labor is explained solely by the fact that criticism and self-criticism, mass educational work among collective farmers, were not deployed. Extremely weak discipline. A significant part of collective farmers who have a garden and livestock in sole use, received assistance from the state and the collective farm, often did not go to work, more attention was paid to individual farming work in the garden, taking products to the market, and so on.

The management of the collective farm - the board, foremen, etc. - being class-alien elements, did not explain to the collective farmers the significance of the state's assistance in acquiring livestock, and deliberately did not use this greatest incentive to strengthen the collective farm, to increase profitability on the collective farm, and to improve the organization of labor and discipline.

As a result of all this, the grain harvest in 1934 was carried out far from satisfactorily, with a long delay. The harvesting of vegetables and fruits was particularly bad-250 tons of apples were frozen.

The former deputy chairman of the collective farm Kishkanov (son of okolotochny, father exiled in 1919) supervised the burtovaniye of beets and potatoes. As a result of his wrecking work, 100 tons of beets and 30 tons of potatoes in the Kolesnikov brigade were killed in burts.

As a result of the fact that the grain brigade was led by the class-alien element Milovanov (in 1919 Milovanov served in Annenkov's detachment as a forager, after the revolution he had seasonal workers, and since 1930 he had been conducting wrecking work on the collective farm), by his order, 4 stacks of straw were burned during the harvesting of grain crops, as well as the fallen bread on a spare area of 18 hectares: instead of organizing manual harvesting on the area of fallen bread, Milovanov deliberately used a reaping machine to warm up the bread, thereby trampling the bread, and at the end of the harvest, in order to hide the traces of the crime, the bread on this site was burned.

In order to organize the theft, during the delivery of bread from the currents to the barns, the Milovanovs organized the sending and acceptance of bread without weight. Thus, there is reason to believe that a lot of bread was stolen during the harvest.

Even after the cleaning, the former kulaks and white officers (Milovanov, Kishkanov, Chumin, etc.) continued their wrecking work. At the initiative and order of Milovanov and Kishkanov, 300 centners of well-preserved seed material were mixed with sprouted grain, as a result, the collective farm was forced to exchange seeds at the All-Union Office for Procurement and Sales of Grain Procurement Point.

As a result of criminal negligence in caring for livestock, especially for young animals, as well as staff turnover, 3 heads of the MTF were replaced during the year, 40 heads of calves and 4 heads of cattle were killed during 1934. This was reflected in the decline in revenue. Until 1934, the work of caring for cattle was poorly set up and conducted, the new board did not take drastic measures to eliminate the shortcomings, the horses were not cleaned and were in the mud. Random people worked as grooms, for example, Kapustin, and the horses under his supervision were in poor condition. To the question: "why don't you clean the horses?" He replied: «they need to be cleaned with a bag." In addition, Kapustins Philip and Peter conduct counter agitation, saying:

1. "They killed Kirov - that's good. He is buried with great honor; we will not be buried like this".
2. "Trotsky pursued the right policy, he was exiled incorrectly".
3. "MTS is organized in order to rob collective farms and so on".
4. "The Soviet government is scissors; it will cut everything".

A large number of horses were infected with scabies, with bruised backs and shoulders. The veterinarian Slesareva-the wife of the Socialist-Revolutionary, criminally treated it. Despite the approach of the sowing season, she did not start treating horses with scabies, staying in her garden for several days at a time.

In 1933, in the Milovanov brigade на участке, an MTF was built on the Baiserke site in the swamp, at a cost of 4 thousand rubles. As a result of the wrecking work of Milovanov and the builders, this building collapsed in the spring of 1934.

Morozikhin, the former chairman of the collective farm management board Морозихин, squandered the collective farm funds without control; without the knowledge of the collective farm management and collective farmers, the Morozikhins issued funds, ostensibly for medical treatment, to the following persons:

1. Chervyakova-secretary of the collective farm - 1000 rubles.
2. Pashentsev-accountant - 600 rubles
3. Bukhantsev-accountant-1000 rubles.
4. Butsyk Pelageya - 664 rubles.
5. Lydia Mikhailova - 325 rubles.

Total: -3586 rubles.

In addition, at the initiative of Morozikhin, a large number of different goods were bought by the collective farm board on "blackmail", for example, from a freight forwarder, without documents, prices were compiled and paid for goods at the discretion of the revolutionary commission (chairman rev. Chumin, an old officer), these goods were sold to collective farmers several times more expensive (a kilogram of plantar leather was sold to collective farmers for 53 rubles).

All this led to the squandering and embezzlement of collective farm funds. As a result, the monetary income of the collective farm in 1934 turned out to be several times lower than in 1933: the income of 1933 was expressed in the amount of 2,402,000 rubles, of which 231,574 rubles were allocated to the indivisible fund, 272,454 rubles were allocated to production expenses (construction, purchase of materials, inventory), 1,627,589 rubles were allocated to workdays, i.e. 15 rubles, in 1934, according to the plan, they should have received an income of 4,010,191 rubles, but they received 1,004,000 rubles, i.e. almost 3 times less than the planned plan and 2.5 times less than the actual income received in 1933.

As a result, collective farmers receive 4 rubles per t/day, 26 kopecks. moreover, there are no funds for issuing collective farmers for t/days - all the money is in the cost of wine and accounts receivable: there are 60,000 liters of wine in the amount of 350 thousand rubles, and debt to various organizations is 156,782 rubles.,

It should be noted that a significant part of the cash income is reduced as a result of a low harvest of apples and their sale is cheaper than in 1933.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that the great decline in monetary income is due: first, to the strong contamination of the collective farm management by class-alien elements decomposing, whose destructive work undoubtedly led to the squandering of collective farm funds, to the decomposition of labor discipline and the death of a huge number of fruits and vegetables from frost; second, to the misuse of labor collective farmers, the presence of absenteeism and the lack of a correct Bolshevik organization of collective farmers for a successful harvest in 1934.

Class-alien elements that have made their way to the collective farm management have also done some work in confusing the accounting and reporting of the collective farm in the presence of a competent accounting apparatus. As a result of 1934, a huge number of workdays (1,418) were not counted during the distribution of income, and some collective farmers lost up to 90 days: 1. Gorchakov pigman - 89 days, 2. Orinich wachman-31 days, 3. Minzhulin ordinary - 23 days, 4. Kolesnikov A. miller - 73 days.

In 1933, 24 people were convicted of anti-collective farm activities. Some of them are wealthy peasants. Of those recruited, they remained on the collective farm, for example, the foreman was N. Kurilov, convicted of negligence under Art. 3 and sentenced to 6 months' hard labor. The collective farm used forced labor; there was no control from the collective farm. Kurilov has been working as a master since 1934. Solovyova brigadier of the garden brigade, member of the collective farm board. The preparation for sowing in her team is extremely unsatisfactory. The brigade came to the review unprepared.

As a result of the inspection and investigation, it was established that, having made their way into the collective farm by deception, class-alien elements took up positions of responsibility-deputy chairman of the board, members of the board, foremen, and all the time conducted wrecking and corrupting work on the collective farm.

1. Milovanov-former foreman of the grain brigade, in 1934 he worked as a deputy head of the Department. A former officer who had served in Annenkov's detachment in 1919, his father and he had kept seasonal workers before the revolution. In 1930, Milovanov joined the collective farm and since then has been working on corruption.

2. Chumin is the former chairman. revolutionary commission. A member of the collective farm commission, an officer who served in Tashkent until 1918 in the White Army, his grandfather Chumin, who raised him, had a factory and a mill, after the revolution he was dispossessed and exiled.

3. Kishkanov-storekeeper, former deputy. Chairman of the kolkhoz board, relative of Milovanov, son of the district police officer, father exiled in 1919.

4. Polumiskov-former kulak, had his own winery, worked as a winemaker on a collective farm. In 1934, at the request of Morozokhin, Oleynikov, Milovanov, Kishkanov and a number of others, he was restored to his rights. Polumiskov during his work as a winemaker on the collective farm, together with Milovanov, Kishkanov, Chumin squandered fruit and wine, as a result of his wrecking work, 288 liters of cherry wine were poisoned in

order to poison the prepared wine drinks. Polumiskov passed the wine through a zinc grate. On a regular basis, Polumiskov's apartment Полумискова was used for drinking parties with Kishkanov, Milovanov, Chumin and with the participation of Morozikhin and Oleynikov. As a result, Morozikhin and Oleynikov provided active assistance in restoring the rights of the deprived kulak Polumiskov and in joining the collective farm.

5. Minyailov, who filed an application for dominance in the Kulakov collective farm, worked very poorly himself, as a foreman, was engaged in drunkenness, killed a collective farm horse, sold collective farm bread, hung up collective farmers, and had an association with the Mali speculator.

All the above-mentioned outrages, the wrecking work of individual class-alien elements, led the collective farm to the fact that the collective farm was very poorly prepared for sowing in 1934. A test visits on February 23 showed the collective farm's lack of preparation for sowing, weak discipline among the collective farmers, great laxity among the foremen, lack of sufficient care for the draft power, poor quality of repair of agricultural equipment, etc.

Based on this, measures were taken and the following activities were planned:

1. On the basis of the development of criticism and self-criticism, the elaboration of a new charter of the agricultural artel, to strengthen discipline in the collective farm, to eliminate the shortcomings noted above, especially to eliminate the shortcomings in the preparation for sowing. Conduct sowing on time and in a high-quality manner.

2. Start treating sick horses immediately. Veterinarian Slesareva, for a criminal attitude to cattle, should be removed from work and brought to justice.

3. Remove Brigadier Solovyova from work, as she did not provide leadership of the team.

4. Remove Chumin (a former officer) from his job as an accountant and bring him to criminal responsibility. Raise a question at the general meeting of collective farmers about his exclusion from the collective farm.

5. Immediately remove the winemaker wealthy peasant Polumiskov from work, expelling him from the collective farm and bringing him to criminal responsibility. Instruct the party group of the City Council to consider the correctness of restoring its rights.

6. Suspend from work and bring to criminal responsibility for wrecking and corrupting work on the collective farm kulak, a white officer Milovanov.

7. Remove from work and bring to criminal responsibility Kishkanov-the former deputy chairman of the collective farm board for allowing the death of beets and fruits in burst, for wrecking and decomposing work, being attacked by the collective farm board to the grain brigade during harvesting.

8. Instruct the management board to discuss the issue at the general meeting of collective farmers about Menyailov, applying appropriate measures to him for criminal work on the collective farm.

9. Instruct the collective farm management board to immediately recover funds from persons who have illegally received collective farm money.

10. Review the number of accounting employees to reduce them to a minimum.

11. Categorically suggest that Kolesnikov resolutely eliminate all shortcomings in his work, while at the same time warning that if the shortcomings in the preparation for sowing are not eliminated, he will be removed from work and brought to justice.

12. Choose from the best collective farmers-drivers, grooms and oblige to clean and care for horses.

13. Take note that in the course of the commission's work, Peter and Philip Kapustins were suspended from work, excluded from the collective farm, and brought to justice by the board and the general meeting of collective farmers of March 1, 1934.

14. To ask the City Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) to bring to party responsibility the former chairman of the collective farm Mirozikhin, for lack of revolutionary vigilance, mismanagement, suppression of criticism and self-criticism, for weakening the class sense, for allowing theft of collective farm property and for illegal purchase of goods by "blackmail".

15. To instruct the prosecutor general personally, t. Yerimbetov will finish the investigation of all materials of the collective farm "Gorny Gigant" within 3 days. Wreckers, kulaks, and crooks who fraudulently entered the collective farm should be brought to criminal responsibility by organizing an open trial on the collective farm.

16. Instruct the kolkhoz board to discuss the present conclusions of the commission at all meetings of collective farmers and collective farmwomen in brigades [16.67].

The trial of 24 people in 1933, and the isolation of this gang of pests created favorable conditions for working on the collective farm "Mountain Giant". The efforts of people loyal to the Soviet government, their struggle to preserve collective farm socialist property with the tireless help of individual party leaders, enabled the collective farm to receive a gross income of about three million rubles. This made it possible for the collective farm to become prosperous. In the future, the most favorable conditions were created for the successful operation of the collective farm. The collective farm received a large influx of people of various specialties, because of which the quantitative and qualitative growth of the collective farm almost doubled.

But the remaining families of convicts, their relatives, comrades, kulaks who survived the trial, as well as those who served their sentences and were accepted back into the collective farm managed to organize and conduct profitable work for themselves.

The Kulak part of the collective farm became stronger, and began to drag its own people in elections to members of the board, to the positions of foremen and storekeepers. By organizing an unworkable revolutionary commission, thereby clearing the way for further sabotage. Honest collective farmers, and especially the activist, went into a panic, as a result of which the escape from the collective farm began. They have filed complaints more than once. So, on behalf of the collective farmers, Grischuk wrote a complaint on February 12, 1935 (12/II-35). It said: "The collective farm "Mountain Giant", occupying the best possessions, has all the conditions for its development and for building a prosperous life in it. However, the great dominance of the kulaks in it, and their wrecking activity prevents the collective farm from building a tolerable life. From the day of organization in 1930, the collective farm suffered great need and only in 1933, after the defeat of the kulaks, isolation of them after the trial of 24 people, the collective farm was able to expand its work and give good indicators with a gross income of about three million rubles. Such a good result of the work of the collective farm has raised its prestige, created better conditions for further work and strengthening of the collective farm. Nevertheless, the kulaks remained "undefeated", gathered their forces, organized and took command positions, carried out wrecking work, completely failed the work of 1934, so that at present the collective farmers have nothing to share " [17.52].

In the struggle against the Kulaks, Nikolai Andreevich Nikolaev, a member of the party, played the biggest role in the establishment of the collective farm.

Nikolayev, like an old Bolshevik, an experienced man, a fully developed, immaculately honest and sober man, worked tirelessly to transform the collective farm into a Bolshevik one, and the collective farmers into prosperous ones. Beginning in 1930, when T. V. Nikolaev was a representative of the organization patronizing the collective farm, invested his work in the collective farm and since that time has earned authority among most collective farmers and especially activists.

"With the transfer of Comrade Nikolaev to work in production at the end of 1933, among 1,200 people, the kulaks were able to re-organize, and the party leadership that remained on the collective farm was unable to suspend kulak wrecking work. There was no certainty that in the future the Kulaks would abandon their villainous activities, especially since they had infiltrated the command top of the collective farm. We collective farmers appeal to the Party of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and strenuously ask to leave Nikolaev to work on the collective farm, who with his honest work, dedication to the cause, using great authority, will be able to establish a household, eliminate the outrages that are happening on the collective farm and prevent possible crimes, " the complaint said. The City Council, as in the previous case, created a commission, conducted an investigation, and conducted a second purge of "alien elements" in the collective farm.

Exclusion from the collective farm, as a rule, was accompanied by severe consequences. After all, most collective farmers did not have an alternative source of income. Many farmers who left the collective farms were unable to obtain the return of their property from the local authorities. As a rule, they left the collective farm without land, horses, or agricultural equipment.

Nevertheless, the vital signs of the Gorny Gigant collective farm showed progressiveness. In particular, the economic indicators for the collective farm "Mountain Giant" as of January 1, 1935:

In 1934, there were 362 farms on the collective farm. With a total of 1,528 people. Of these, 866 people are able-bodied.

In 1935, the collective farm consists of 413 farms. In January and February, 31 farms joined the collective farm. There are 1,547 eaters in total.

Of these, 841 are labor-friendly

Women work on an equal basis with men, and perform their work in a high-impact way.

Table 5. Kolkhoz indicators: Number of livestock

№	Cattle	1933	1934
1	Horses	108	110
2	Young	animals 17	22
3	Oxen	8	22
4	Cows	81	84
5	Young	animals 63	126
6	Pigs with young	animals 44	128
7	Sheep	-	100
Cattle from collective farmers 1933 1934			
8	Cows	144	183

9	no calves and calves	47	136
10	Pigs	no	124
11	Bulls	no	36
12	Donkeys	no	19
13	Rabbits	no	104

[18.67].

The collective farm fulfilled its obligations to the people and the State in a timely manner. I provided myself completely with seeds and fodder.

Collective farmers received 3,215 kg of bread and 1.5 kg of potatoes for their workday. Apples-116 gr. honey-15 gr. grain waste-64 gr., money-4 rubles 51 kopecks (four rubles 51 kopecks).

Collective farmers worked well and received a sufficient amount of bread, for example, Ordinary collective farmers who worked in the brigade:

1. Baylyavbayev Bek with his family has-1180 working days received bread-37.87 prices. 2. Butsik Semyon has-1247 working days received bread-41 prices. 3. Zagrebov Mikhail has trudoney-1123, received bread-36 prices. In 1935, the collective farm did a lot of work to organize cultural events: 1. Building a stable club-20-25 thousand rubles. 2. Construction of red corners in teams equipped with radio and equipped with books, newspapers, music, etc. The collective farm spent 35 thousand rubles on this.

Women actively fought for a prosperous cultural life. In this collective farm, 25 women were awarded for the best performance. 2 women worked as foremen. The best drummers of the collective farm: Dzhumabayeva Kaicha-had 382 labor days working as a milkmaid for the 4th year. Awarded by the collective farm, repeatedly participated in the rally. Gordeeva Alexandra had 216 labor day private, awarded. Kurilova Natalia, private, awarded for 219 labor days. Goloborodko Alexandra, worked as a private, had 272 working days. Women took an active part in preparing for the sowing campaign. Most of the gardening teams consisted of women.

Conclusion

This article is written on the basis of collected materials and archival data on a specific object-the collective farm "Mountain Giant" in Alma-Ata in the period 1930-1934. As described above, this is the period of formation and the first steps of collectivization, difficulties, and sometimes misunderstanding and a wary attitude to new changes in life. Hence the confrontations between the lower, middle and affluent segments of the population.

Examples are given of specific individuals who hindered the work of the collective farm and engaged in wrecking and theft of collective property.

Using concrete examples, we tried to show how new socio-economic trends affected the daily life of the population, changing their habitual way of life, adopting innovations, and striving to get results from collective work. (statistics of indicators are shown in the tables above).

The results of the first years of work of the collective farm were not satisfactory, so measures were taken: - to eliminate shortcomings, - to improve the quality of work carried out and get good results. Measures were taken to control pests that deliberately obstructed work on the collective farm. New charters and regulations on the conduct of work on the collective farm were created and approved.

The collective farm was actually a state-owned enterprise. Therefore, the state alone decided on the production and distribution of crops and dictated all other issues to the collective farms. Thus, in theory, collective farmers became "co-owners" and instead of receiving a salary were entitled to "profit" at the end of the year. The state forcibly purchased the collective farmers' products at a low price, thereby depriving them of making a profit. This manipulation of the supply of products to the state at a low price put collective farms in bonded conditions. In addition, collective farmers were excluded from state social security.

However, the growth of material well-being occurred not due to general modernization, but due to the predominance of traditions over innovations. In this context, the cultural model of the rural population was focused on the social experience of the previous generation and was subordinated to the goals of survival. Therefore, the need to preserve historical roots was determined primarily by the practical needs of everyday life.

Rural residents-employees of collective farms were mainly engaged in field and livestock production. Workers of machine and tractor stations (MTS) serviced and provided equipment to several nearby collective farms at once. When growing grain and grain crops, the most important types of work were sowing and harvesting campaigns. The specialty of a rural machine operator had to be mastered not only by men, but also by women and teenagers. To encourage people to work and stimulate their work, socialist competitions were held.

The accelerated task of transition to an industrial society proceeded unevenly. Against this background, there was a split in the countryside, forced modernization caused the majority to hate the structures of collective farms, and the majority were doubtful about the future of unprepared collective farms.

The peasant popular protest became widespread during the years of collectivization and took a wide variety of forms. In our example, this is, firstly, the theft of state and collective farm property-which was proof of the hostile activity of the class enemy, who seeks to trip up the construction of socialism. Secondly, it was the writing of many collective complaints. The collective farmers did their best to protect and preserve their way of life, which was also subjected to political, ideological and economic attacks. The most common offenses on collective farms were theft of grain, theft of food, which caused significant damage and was a manifestation of one of the forms of hindering the development of socialist construction.

Therefore, the struggle against the theft of public property was a struggle against the class enemy that resists the construction of socialism.

When studying court documents, it can be immediately noted that in all cases and in the sentences of convicted persons, преступлением, признавалось в большинстве случаев, negligent attitude to the work of collective farm accountants, accountants, foremen and collective farmers with agricultural machinery was recognized as a crime in most cases, such workers were accused of violating the law and sentenced to up to 10 years in prison [19.39].

The documents show that they were responsible for everything: the death of a lame, half-dead horse, for working horses and oxen, for the breakdown and unsuitability of tractors, untimely execution of field work, various minor offenses, and it was also easy to slander them. When studying these cases, it can be concluded that in fact, in most cases, it is impossible to find the fact of a crime for which one should be tried. Most of the convicts at the time of harvesting were peasants who took (stole part of the harvest) for their family, for their children.

An active struggle against the "kulaks" and the "elimination of the kulaks as a class", in practice, meant the physical destruction of the well-to-do peasants.

Thus, the considered archival documents of collectivization, articles of collective farmers and complaints to the City Council of the CPSU (b) recreate a picture of the life of ordinary rural residents - collective farms of the city of Alma-Ata during the 1930s of the twentieth century. Thus, we are convinced that the history of the Almaty region, as an integral part of the history of Kazakhstan, needs further study.

The excessive campaign of collectivization has brought the Great Steppe into an unprecedented humanitarian catastrophe. Our people did not lose heart, despite all the hardships. This strengthened their unity and solidarity. After independence, we started to justify our citizens, we raised the names of thousands of innocent people who were once punished.

Last year, a State commission for the full rehabilitation of victims of repression was established. The commission is concerned about Kazakhs with dances affected by left-wing politics. This is a duty not only of the state but of the entire society. It is impossible to separate the tragic periods in our genealogy from our national identity. Therefore, we pay tribute to the victims of political repression and the Holodomor and remember their names forever. We will learn from history and do everything possible to ensure that such a tragedy will never happen again.

References:

1. Kozybaev, 1992 - Kozybaev M.K. *Aktanaktar akikaty. Almaty, Kazakh University, 1992. - 272 b. [in kazakh].*
2. Kusanova, 1976-Kusanova Sh. A. *Party leadership in the activities of mass organizations of Kazakhstan based on the materials of Kazakhstan, 20s-30s). Alma-Ata, Kazakhstan, 1976. 180 p.[in Russian].*
3. Kovalsky, 1973-Kovalsky S. L. *From Istria polemics of the late 20s and early 30s on the development of land resources in Kazakhstan. Voprosy istorii-Alma-Ata, KazGU Publ., 1973, vol. 5, pp. 59-70.[in Russian].*
4. Kovalsky, 1986- Kovalsky S. L., Madanov Kh. M. *Development of virgin lands in Kazakhstan. Alma-Ata, Nauka Publ., 1986, 224 p. [in Russian].*
5. Tursunbayev A. B. *Kazakh aul in three revolutions. Alma-Ata, Kazakhstan, 1967. 483 p. [in Russian].*
6. Tursunbayev, 1977 – Tursynbayev A. B. *Actual problems of historiography of the history of pratiya rukavodstvo by the socialist transformation of agriculture in Kazakhstan. Great October is the main event of the twentieth century. Alma-Ata, Nauka Publ., 1977, 252 p. [in Russian]*
7. Dakhsheiger, 1985-Dakhsheiger G. F., Nurpeisov K. N. *History of the peasantry of Soviet Kazakhstan. Almaty, Nauka Publ., 1985, vol. 1, 247 p. [in Russian].*
8. Tulepbaev, 1984-Tulepbaev B. A. *Socialist agrarian transformations in Central Asia and Kazakhstan, Nauka Publ., 1984, 270 p. [in Russian. Tulepbaev, 1971 - Tulepbaev B. A. The triumph of Lenin's ideas of socialist transformation of agriculture in Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Moscow, 1971. 482 p. [in Russian].*

9. Tulepbaev, B. (1984), *Sotsialisticheskie agrarnye rekonstruktsii v Srednoi Azii i Kazakhstane* [Socialist Agrarian reconstructions in Central Asia and Kazakhstan]. Institute of History, Archeology and ethnography imeni Ch. Ch. Valikhanov. Academy of the Kazakh SSR. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1984, 269 p. [in Russian].
10. GAA. F..70, d. 11. Op. 1. L.147.
11. Central State Administration of the Republic of Kazakhstan. F. 74. Op. 1. D. 205. L. 91.
12. Central State Administration of the Republic of Kazakhstan. F. 74. Op. 1. D. 205. L. 105.
13. GAA. F..174. Op. 13. D..142 L. 38.
14. GAA. f.. 174. Op. 16. d.. 1b. l. 4.
15. GAA. F..174. Op. 13. D..142. L. 8.
16. GAA. F..174. Op. 13. D..142. L. 46.
17. GAA. F..174, Op. 13. D..142, L. 52.
18. GAA. F..174, Op. 13. D..142, L. 67., GAA. F..174. Op.9. D..46. L.39.
19. State Advisor: *The State Commission for the Complete Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repression has completed its work.* // <https://www.akorda.kz/ru/gosudarstvennaya-komissiya-po-polnoy-reabilitacii-zhertv-politicheskikh-repressiy-zavershila-svoyu-rabotu-2611356>.

Список использованной литературы:

1. Козыбаев, 1992 - Козыбаев М.К. *Ақтаңдақтар ақиқаты*. Алматы, Қазақ университеті, 1992. - 272 б.
2. Кусанова, 1976 - Кусанова Ш.А. *Партийное руководство деятельностью массовых организаций Казахстана на материалах Казахстана, 20-е-30-е годы*. Алма-Ата, Казахстан, 1976. 180 с.
3. Ковальский, 1973 – Ковальский С.Л. *Из истории полемики конца 20-х начала 30-х годов по поводу освоения земельных ресурсов Казахстана. Вопросы истории –Алма-Ата, изд., КазГУ, 1973. вып. 5, с 59-70.*
4. Ковальский, 1986 - Ковальский С.Л., Маданов Х.М. *Освоение целинных земель в Казахстане*. Алма-Ата, Наука, 1986. 224 с.
5. Турсунбаев А.Б. *Казахский аул в трех революциях*. Алма-Ата, Казахстан, 1967. 483 с.
6. Турсунбаев, 1977 – Турсунбаев А.Б. *Актуальные проблемы историографии истории пратийного руководства социалистическим преобразованием сельского хозяйства Казахстана. Великий Октябрь-главное событие XX века*.-Алма-Ата, Наука, 1977. 252 с.
7. Дахилейгер, 1985 - Дахилейгер Г.Ф., Нурпеисов К. Н. *История крестьянства Советского Казахстана*. – Алматы, Наука, 1985. - Т.1. - 247 с.
8. Тулепбаев, 1984 - Тулепбаев Б.А. *Социалистические аграрные преобразования в Средней Азии и Казахстане М., Наука, 1984. – 270 с.*
9. Тулепбаев, 1971 - Тулепбаев Б.А. *Торжество ленинских идей социалистического преобразования сельского хозяйства в Средней Азии и Казахстана*. М., 1971. 482 с. Тулепбаев, 1984, - *Социалистические аграрные реконструкции в Средней Азии и Казахстане: /Б.Тулепбаев; представитель ред. М.П.Ким; Институт истории СССР. Институт истории, археологии и этнографии имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова. Академия Казахской ССР. Москва, Наука, 1984. 269 с.*
10. ГAA. Ф.70, Д.11. Оп.1. Л.147.
11. ЦГА РК. Ф.74. Оп.1. Д.205. Л.91.
12. ЦГА РК. Ф.74. Оп.1. Д.205. Л.105.
13. ГAA. Ф.174. Оп.13. Д.142 Л. 38.
14. ГAA. Ф.174. Оп.16. Д.16. Л. 4.
15. ГAA. Ф.174. Оп. 13. Д.142. Л.8.
16. ГAA. Ф.174. Оп. 13. Д.142. Л.46.
17. ГAA. Ф.174, Оп.13. Д.142, Л.52.
- 18 ГAA. Ф.174, Оп.13. Д.142, Л.67. ГAA. Ф.174. Оп.9. Д.46. Л.39.
19. Государственный советник. Государственная комиссия по полной реабилитации жертв политических репрессий завершила свою работу // <https://www.akorda.kz/ru/gosudarstvennaya-komissiya-po-polnoy-reabilitacii-zhertv-politicheskikh-repressiy-zavershila-svoyu-rabotu-2611356>.