

Zh.E. Ishpekbaev *¹, R.R. Ospanova², G. Oten³

¹ Candidate of Political Science, Associate Professor of the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan, E – mail: i.zhan65@mail.ru

² Candidate of historical sciences, associate professor of the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University E – mail: ablai_angel@mail.ru

³ O. Zhanibekov South Kazakhstan Pedagogical University, E-mail: uten63@bk.ru

CONFISCATION OF LARGE RICH FARMS IN KAZAKHSTAN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES (according to the materials of Semipalatinsk district)

Abstract

The paper provides an impartial examination of the historical campaign to liquidate wealthy people suppressed in Kazakhstan during the 1930s, as well as the introduction of generational sources related to deportation and the memory policy of independent Kazakhstan into scholarly discourse. Examination of scholarly literature about the investigation and identification of the interrelationship between the oppressive policies of the Soviet authorities towards the affluent and the policies of enforced collectivisation and sedentarization of nomadic Kazakhs. Archival papers provide evidence for the categorisation of affluent individuals exposed to political persecution in Kazakhstan throughout the 1920s and 1930s, based on cattle ownership. The article reveals deficiencies in the public's understanding of the policy on the confiscation of wealth from the affluent in each region. The class war was intentionally constructed between the affluent and the common residents of the regions. Particular emphasis was placed on the execution of the hand-to-hand strategy between the affluent and the general populace of the areas. Furthermore, it may be asserted that the primary objective is the expropriation of farms owned by affluent individuals who have given financial support and maintained pastures. We attempted to demonstrate via many cases that substantial affluent farms were expropriated, displaced, abandoned, and subjected to persecution. We examined the process of relocating affluent individuals from Semey to Shymkent and from Kostanay to Semey. A distinctive aspect of Soviet strategy was the directive to refrain from consolidating them into a single settlement. The text significantly enhances the overall understanding of political repression throughout the 1920s and 1930s, as well as the process of confiscating wealth from affluent individuals.

Keywords: Semey region, wealthy Kazakh people, estates, confiscation, relocation, decrees, repression, 20th century, political persecution.

The article was prepared as part of the implementation of the integration project "Development of the historical encyclopedia "Repressed Bai of Kazakhstan (based on new archival materials and memoirs)", funded by Abay Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Order No.05-04/368 dated 05/24/2024)

Ж.Е. Ішпекбаев *¹, Р.Р. Оспанова², Г.Өтен³

¹ саяси ғылымдарының кандидаты, Абай атындағы ҚазҰПУ-нің профессоры, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.
E – mail: i.zhan65@mail.ru

² т.ғ.к., доцент Абай атындағы ҚазҰПУ-нің доценті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.
E – mail: ablai_angel@mail.ru

³Ө. Жәнібеков ат. Оңтүстік Қазақстан педагогикалық университеті
E-mail: uten63@bk.ru

ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ІРІ БАЙ ШАРУАШЫЛЫҚТАРЫН ТӘРКІЛЕУ ЖӘНЕ ОНЫҢ ЗАРДАПТАРЫ (Семей округі материалдары бойынша)

Аңдатпа

Мақалада 1930 жылдары Қазақстанда қуғын-сүргінге ұшыраған байларды жою жөніндегі науқан тарихын объективті талдау, отарсыздандыру процесі мен Тәуелсіз Қазақстанды еске алу саясаты шеңберінде ұрпақтан-ұрпаққа берілетін дереккөздерді ғылыми айналымға енгізу. Зерттеу тақырыбы бойынша ғылыми әдебиеттерді талдау және байларға қатысты кеңес өкіметінің репрессиялық саясатының көшпелі қазақтарды күштеп ұжымдастыру және седентаризациялау саясатымен өзара

байланысының факторларын анықтау. Малдың санына байланысты 1920-1930 жылдары Қазақстанда саяси қуғын-сүргінге ұшыраған байлар санаттарының тізбесін айқындалғанын архив құжаттары дәлелдеп отыр. Мақала барысында ірі байларды тәркілеу саясатын халыққа түсіндіру жұмыстары әрбір аймақта жүргізілуі барысының өзінде олқылықтардың болғандығын. Тап күресін қолдан жасап аймақтардағы байлар мен қарапайым халық арасында жауластыру саясаты жүргізілгендігіне баса көңіл аударылған. Сонымен қатар әсіресе алашты қолдаған, материалдық көмек берген байлардың шаруашылықтарын тәркілеу басты назарға алынғандығын негіздеуге болады. Ірі байлардың шаруашылықтары тәркіленіп, жер аударылып, елінен жырақ кетіп, қуғын сүргін құрбаны болғандығын бірнеше мысалдар арқылы негіздеуге тырыстық. Семей байларын тәркілеуде Шымкентке, Қостанай байларын Семейге қоныс аударудың жүргізілуі барысы да талданған. Кеңестік саясаттың ұлтқа жасалған қиянатының бірі тіпті олардың басын бір ауылға біріктірмеуге нұсқау да берілген. Мақала ХХ ғасырдың 20-30 жылдарындағы саяси қуғын-сүргін-дердің жалпы көрінісін, ірі байларды тәркілеу барысын айтарлықтай толықтыруға мүмкіндік береді.

Кілт сөздер: Семей округы, ірі қазақ байлары, шаруашылықтары, тәркілеу, көшіру, жарлық, репрессия, ХХ ғасыр, қуғын-сүргін.

Мақала Абай атындағы ҚазҰПУ қаржыландыратын (24.05.2024 ж. №05-04/368 бұйрық) "Қазақстанның қуғын-сүргінге ұшыраған байларының (жаңа мұрағаттық материалдар мен естеліктер негізінде)" тарихи энциклопедиясын әзірлеу интеграциялық жобасын іске асыру шеңберінде дайындалған

*Иштекбаев Ж.Е.*¹, Оспанова Р.Р.², Отен Г.³*

¹кандидат политических наук, профессор КазНПУ имени Абая, Казахстан, г. Алматы

E – mail: i.zhan65@mail.ru

²к.и.н., доцент КазНПУ им. Абая, Казахстан, г. Алматы

E – mail: ablai_angel@mail.ru

³Южно-Казахстанский педагогический университет им. О. Жанибекова, E-mail: uten63@bk.ru

КОНФИСКАЦИЯ КРУПНЫХ ХОЗЯЙСТВ БОГАТЫХ В КАЗАХСТАНЕ И ЕЕ ТЯЖЕЛЫЕ ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ (по материалам Семипалатинского округа)

Аннотация

В статье представлен объективный анализ истории кампании по ликвидации крупных хозяйств богатых казахов, подвергшихся репрессиям в 1930-е годы, с учетом процессов деколонизации и политики увековечения памяти Независимого Казахстана. Рассмотрено введение в научный оборот источников, передающихся из поколения в поколение. Проведен анализ научной литературы по теме исследования и выявлены факторы взаимосвязи репрессивной политики советской власти по отношению к богатым с насильственной коллективизацией и оседлостью кочевого населения. Архивные документы свидетельствуют, что критерии отнесения к категории «богатых», подвергшихся политическим преследованиям в 1920–1930-е годы, основывались на количестве скота. В ходе исследования выявлены недостатки в работе по разъяснению политики конфискации крупных хозяйств среди населения различных регионов. Отмечено, что политика искусственного создания классовой борьбы способствовала разжиганию конфликта между богатыми и простыми людьми. Особое внимание уделено конфискации хозяйств богатых, поддерживавших движение Алаш и оказывавших материальную помощь. На основании конкретных примеров показано, что крупные хозяйства подвергались конфискации, их владельцы выслались из родных мест, а многие становились жертвами репрессий. Рассмотрены случаи переселения богатых семей из Семипалатинска в Шымкент и из Костаная в Семипалатинск. Подчеркивается, что одной из форм угнетения казахской нации в рамках советской политики был запрет на объединение переселенных в одном населенном пункте. Статья позволяет существенно дополнить общее представление о политических репрессиях и процессе конфискации крупных хозяйств в Казахстане в 1920–1930-е годы.

Ключевые слова: Семипалатинский округ, крупные казахские баи, хозяйства, конфискация, переселение, указ, репрессия, ХХ век, политические гонения.

Статья подготовлена в рамках реализации интеграционного проекта «Разработка исторической энциклопедии «Репрессированные баи Казахстана (на основе новых архивных материалов и воспоминаний)», финансируемого КазНПУ имени Абая (Приказ №05-04/368 от 24.05.2024 г.)

Introduction

Relevance. By the Decree of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan from November 24, 2020 the State Commission on full rehabilitation of victims of political repressions was established. The State Commission has set an important task to fully rehabilitate the victims of political repressions of the 20-50s of the XX century. In this regard, the study of repressions and the complete death of the Kazakh rich as a social group that played a major role in Kazakh society in the 20s-30s of the XX century is considered as a condition for the realization of the requirements of the Head of State.

The Soviet command-administrative system from the first years of its activity revived the institution of production with the use of confiscation elements. The Bolsheviks used deportation as a preventive measure aimed at excluding manifestations of dissatisfaction of the rich and rebellious part of the rural population with the new policy of the authorities, as well as at eliminating their potential opponents.

The new authorities understood perfectly well that the rich part of village is the most conservative part of society. For example, wealthy and influential representatives of the traditional Kazakh society, as well as the kulaks of Kazakhstan did not want and did not want to change their established way of life and voluntarily give up the wealth accumulated over years and decades, which caused mass repressions on the part of the Soviet authorities.

Systematic and comprehensive study of the disappearance of the rich as a social group in the late 20s and early 30s of the XX century based on sources on a regional basis. Full disclosure of the political, social portrait of the “Rich” in the region, study of the complete destruction of the “rich” as a social group.

Materials and methods:

The materials provide a new assessment of the political events of the 1930s in the country and Kazakhstan, in particular the negative aspects of the construction of socialism, industrialization, collectivization, famine of 1931-1933, political repression and the consequences of these years, which to some extent revealed the problems associated with Stalinism, repression under the totalitarian regime.

They include academician M.Kozybaev, K.Nurpeisov, historians V.P.Osipov, K.Aldazhumanov, N.Amrikulov, T.Omarbekov, B.Ailanov, L.Gurevich, K.Abuev, demographer M.Atimov and others. [1].

The historical reality of sedentarization, confiscation of the rich, hidden by the Soviet authorities in the last decade of the twentieth century G. Zhakupova [2], F. Kozybakova [3], J. Tanatarova [4], S. Zhakisheva [5], J. Zhumabaeva [6], K. Zhaulin [7] and others. The material basis for the disclosure of the general topic was this work.

The methodological basis of the research is based on the principles of historicity and objectivity, systematicity. When writing this project, we used general scientific and specific historical (problem-chronological, cause-and-effect, motivational) methods of cognition, as well as methods of analytical comparison, their structural and substantive classification, attracted archival materials, memoir literature, printed materials.

Discussion. The Land Decree of October 26, 1917 was accompanied by unauthorized and spontaneous seizure of lands of landowners and kulaks. Many landlords and kulaks were then looted, many of their owners were killed or expelled, and some were administratively expelled from their original place of residence in 1922-24 [8].

As is known, the wealthy farms in nomadic and semi-nomadic areas of Kazakhstan had a significant economic and socio-political influence in the Kazakh village than the kulakdom in the European part: Russia: here the Bolsheviks faced a revolving kinship weapon [9].

A number of Soviet and party leaders accused of “national evasion” opposed the repression and fomentation of the prosperous part of the village and villages, many of whom were soon expelled from the republic. Some of them remained unemployed. F.I.Goloshchekin, who recently held high positions in the leadership of the republic, expressed particular disagreement with the direction of S.Sadvakasov, S.Khodjanov, S.Seifullin, N.Nurmakov, S.Mendeshev. For example, Smagul Sadvakasov put forward the idea of a “special tax on the rich” and proposed this measure to keep the Kazakh village quiet, because as a result of expropriation of property and livestock the rich were deprived of the opportunity to raise a large herd of cattle. But the leadership of the republic considers him a Bolshevik.

For example, Smagul Saduakasov put forward the idea of a “special tax on the rich” and proposed this measure to keep the Kazakh village quiet, because as a result of the expropriation of property and livestock the rich were deprived of the opportunity to raise a large herd of cattle. But the leadership of the republic openly accused him of undermining Bolshevik ideas and positiveness [10].

But the Soviet authorities had a tradition of a developed way of life among the Kazakhs. With their voluntary measures, the Bolsheviks destroyed the best and wealthy part of the Kazakh society, which for centuries had a rational experience of animal husbandry.

As can be seen from the top secret conclusion of the PP USPA for the KASSR on the state and activity of the wealth in connection with the confiscation of property dated August 10, 1928, the following three tendencies in the development of the wealthy farms were revealed in the conditions of the new company of August 20, 1928: “the activity of the wealth associated with the confiscation of their property during this period of time is particularly evident on three main points: a) on the way to the mass sale of livestock in order to preserve the value of their property in currency; b) on the way to further dismantling of their farms with measures of distribution. With these points, the political level of wealth is also determined” [11].

Protocol №10 of the meeting of the All - Union Communist Party (b) of the Kazakh Regional Committee of August 30, 1928, defined the areas of resettlement and resettlement of rich households: “ 1) areas of resettlement from the Syrdarya and Zhetysu districts to the Ural district; Uralsk-Zhetysu; Guryev-Petropavlovsk; Karkaralinsk-from Kostanai; from Pavlodar to Aktobe; from the city of Semey to Shymkent; from Petropavlovsk to Aktobe; from the city of Kyzylorda to Adaev; from Akmola to Guryev; from Aktbe to Karkarala; From Kostanai to the city of Semey. 2) not to create from the departed “separate villages; resettle them in the existing villages ” [12].

Earlier from the privileged classes and groups: a) sultans, khan's and dikhan's descendants; b) deprivation of the right of land use and permanent residence from field managers who received irremovable and special awards, and c) representatives of the clergy: Aziret, Ishanov, Kaziev and their families, leading the economy with the use of hired labor, their relationship with the surrounding population;

The analysis of some key documents that emerged in connection with this task, such as the decree of the People's Commissars of the USSR dated 21.05.1929. “on the signs of ear farms”, the definitions of fist and wealthy peasants show that they turned out to be so broad and inaccurate that rather poor farms could also be categorized as ear farms: “systematic use of hired labor, the presence of a mechanically powered mill, water or windmill, oil mill, shavings, wool packing or other similar” industrial enterprise”; engaging in trade, usury, commercial intermediation or other incapacitating income (including ministers of worship) [14].

The analysis of some key documents that emerged in connection with this task, such as the decree of the People's Commissars of the USSR dated 21.05.1929. “on the signs of ear farms”, the definitions of fist and wealthy peasants show that they turned out to be so broad and inaccurate that rather poor farms could also be categorized as ear farms: “systematic use of hired labor, having a mechanically powered mill, water or windmill, oil mill, shavings, wool packing or other similar” industrial enterprise”; engaging in trade, usury, commercial intermediation or other incapacitating income (including ministers of worship) [15].

Most often called “kulaks” those who did not agree with collectivization or refused to join the collective farm. According to the same commission, even experienced “whistleblowers” could find it very difficult to “classify” peasants “[16].

By carrying out this repressive Action, the impoverishment of rich Kazakh cattle breeders was achieved, and the political influence of the most educated, authoritative peak of the traditional village was broken. Initially it was planned to confiscate 226000 heads (converted to cattle), but 144474 heads were confiscated from “Semi-feudal” cattle. This is actually 2/3 of the planned figures. 4614 or 6.4% of this number was left to pause from the calculation of the labor rate, with the confiscation of 841 heads or 1.2%, 4899 heads or 6.8% - for the wages of peasant farms and payment of taxes due to the state, 1431 heads or 2% - transferred as breeding cattle to land authorities and state farms, all other animals were distributed among personal farms and collectives in 113919 [17].

Telegram to conduct explanatory work on the reports of commissioners of the Semipalatinsk District Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks (b), minutes and extracts from the minutes of party meetings, the decree of the KazCEC and CKPC on the confiscation of the property of the big rich people. Important Example: For Markakol district, the following campaign outreach objectives are presented with a report on the results of the implementation:

1. Explanation of the essence of the ongoing confiscation, its political significance and purpose.
2. Formation of public opinion among the broad party, Komsomol and non-party masses, as well as countering the propaganda of the rich, officials and other anti-kind elements of the village and city.
3. Involvement of the poor, mercenaries and close to them middle peasants of the KOSSI Union, as well as the Soviet intelligentsia in the countryside in political activity, participation in the conduct of this campaign (support, direct assistance, etc.).
4. Creation of favorable conditions for the final expansion of the village through the implementation of this politically important activity. Along with similar tasks, data are given to determine the level of general preparatory work for the confiscation of the large rich on explanatory work [17]. These issues raised at the

meetings were practically not discussed, and were considered only formally. The situation of the councils is characterized by the lack of connection with the real life of the village and rural areas. Such important issues, which are being dealt with by the All union communist party - collectivization of agriculture, development of cultural work - have not become the subject of the main work of the councils. Actualization of these issues, especially their consideration on the basis of self-criticism, work among the poor and their involvement in the work of the councils, does not play a key role in the work of the councils. In this regard, many village and hamlet councils do not know their minimum tasks and goals. There were cases when during the grain campaign the commissioners and local leaders did not adopt the right approach to work with the poor. These shortcomings left their mark. Demands were made on the poor by incorrectly explaining to them the importance of grain procurement and giving them orders. Poor people who did not fully meet the requirements. Such cases were observed both at party meetings and at the level of commissioners. Also involvement of the poor in the explanatory work on the decrees. In the conditions of such unpreparedness in villages and hamlets began explanatory work on the decree of the KazTsIK on the expulsion and confiscation of property of the large rich and semi-feudal. In the archival documents of that period, when there was no systematic work with the poor, the organization of meetings of the poor passed with great difficulties. In some cases, there were disruptions of meetings (for example, in Alekseevka). sometimes the poor were forced to attend meetings only under personal signature. These circumstances clearly demonstrated the imperfection of approaches to work with the poor and the low level of readiness of organizations. The rural poor, including the Russian poor, were unprepared for this political campaign. As a consequence, their lack of organization was evident at the meetings. Without explaining the essence and meaning of the political campaign, the meetings were not organized. For example, in the words of the commissioner: "The property of the rich and semi-feudal should be confiscated, because they rob us by grazing their cattle on our hayfields". "The decisions of the Government are good, of course, but by this we are increasing poverty. If the poor lose their livestock, it will be difficult for them to live, so we will hurt ourselves." "Without livestock in the countryside, we will be left without meat. The government is taking very tough steps in this matter." Regarding the disorganization of the rural poor and the influence of the rich, disorganization and political ignorance was evident among the poor during the rural campaign. The members of the Union KOSSI did not understand the essence and objectives of their organizations. The chairman of the Union KOSSI in Tore-Ayryk, Batal Ryspaev (an average peasant), and his secretary, Kaitbar Sultanbek (a poor man), admitted that they did not know the purpose of their union and the work they had to do. Due to the poor's disorganization and weakness, some of them have fallen under the influence of the rich. Because the poor were unorganized and weak, some of them fell under the influence of the rich. The rich influenced the poor with their economic and political power. Some poor people, instead of opposing the rich, favored friendly relations with them. For example, Kunakan Koshybaev (a middle peasant) said at a meeting: "It is good that there will be no confiscation in our district. We live in friendship, we do not quarrel with the rich. The main problem of confiscation: in Markakol district there was a misconception that this government had stopped the fight against wealth, because the decree on confiscation of the property of the rich and their deportation was not implemented. On the whole, despite all the difficulties, the poor of the village and the Russian countryside supported the government's initiative. Most of them approved of the measures to confiscate and deport the rich. The explanatory work reached most of the poor and middle peasants, who gradually began to understand their class interests. Most of them approved of the measures to confiscate and deport the rich. It is noted that the sensitization work reached most of the poor and middle peasants, who gradually began to understand their class interests.

Also, the all-civil assembly of the village of Alpsybai-Janibek in Semipalatinsk oblast considers the government's measures to confiscate the property of the rich and resettle them to be correct. They believe that the implementation of these measures will allow to get rid of old patriarchal attitudes in the village and create favorable working conditions for poor and middle peasants. At the general meeting of Gorny village, 30 people support the government measures, but they say that earlier in the village rich people carried out resettlement by their own strength and social authority, but the government has not taken any measures and this is empty talk. In the opinion of Russian peasants among Kazakhs: "We live among Kazakhs, their cattle will be stolen from us, and if we make an agreement with the government, they will take revenge on us and destroy us completely. Now the poor earn their living only thanks to the rich, and if not the rich, the poor will starve, and this summer they will starve like the Russian poor. Got the grain, swept up to the last grain, promised to give seeds, but in the end gave nothing. How dare the peasants, after sowing, an agronomist who came to the village with a trier and formalin, sorted the seeds, and then wrote that my sowing campaign went well, agronomic assistance was provided. And people looked at water and kefir and did not see bread for weeks. At that time, the grain taken away from us remained empty in the cooperative warehouses. In general, according to the results of propaganda and explanatory work carried out in Markakol district, on the decree of the government of Kazakhstan in the issue of confiscation and deportation of large rich and semi-feudal can be made the following conclusion: despite

the weakness and shortcomings of systematic work of district party, Komsomol and public organizations, the most important thing is the lack of systematic work for this campaign. Despite the fact that he did this important work, not enough results [17].

Despite the fact that the task set was to increase the political activity of the poor in the village, batraks and the KOSHCHI union, the speeches of the poor did not acquire a clear class character. During the explanatory work it became clear that the poor and middle peasants in the countryside did not understand their class responsibilities. The rich, taking advantage of the weakness of the explanatory work, at some meetings tried to attract some of the poor and middle peasants to their side, and there were also cases when they tried to protect the small rich and fight against them.

Another important issue in the context of this theme is the course of decision making for the campaign. For example, in the data of the reports on the imputation of rich farms: The Bureau of the Chingistau cell with the participation of the party activists of the region/is fully connected to the decisions of the July plenum of the Central Committee and decides: Points of the Semokruzhkom resolution to be implemented accordingly:

1. In addition, the Office warns against the application of Article 62(1). Despite the fact that the Criminal Code in Chingistau province does not put pressure on individual rich people, such as politically significant feudal and semi-feudal lords, and including a small proportion of middle peasants, the problem has been affected.

2. The instructions of the provincial five and accordingly directives through the provincial court and local procuratorate sent a number of gross mistakes to the judicial officers, which must be prevented.

- 3- Conflict arose between the poor and the rich over the return of confiscated livestock and property to the rich, the big rich were able to separate the poor from the Party and the government to a certain extent. There are already conflicts between one section of the poor.

4. Considering that about 6 months have passed according to paragraph 2 of the Seventh Circle Committee's resolution of August 1 of this year.

When the confiscated property and livestock are returned to their former owners by the organization of the Koschy Union, the work of the Koschy Union is not justified under any circumstances, and it is also reviewed by the bureau in order to protect the active part of the poor. Even if collective farms are not distributed to the poor, the confiscated farms should refrain from returning property and livestock to their former owners. Such basic versions also began to be distributed [17]. At the same time, reports were made about the activities of the rich. In Semipalatinsk, Prygov, Zhenko Bychkov, Zvanarev, Dolgov: we are talking about the Charmanov Sadbaevs, we selected all their property to bring the Charmanov Sadbaevs to court for concealing the objects of taxation and confiscation. For that, we sent Zhangazin, the manager of "Selbank". The decision of the trio on February 5 "Comrade. In response to the authorized committee and the week, Zhangazin should command the Allekin boly and assign social tasks to him to conduct a taxation campaign, to sue the families of Chormanovs and Satbaevs for agricultural tax credit, closure of taxation objects and artificial division of farms. In February, Zhangazin returned to Pavlodar, declared that he had completed the task, and officially showed the following results: 131 soms before taxation. hidden 14 cows, 25 horses, artificially crushed farms were not found, he gave the Chormanovs a loan of 2,500 rubles to cover with money, 12,795 of the total amount of social tax was charged to the Chormanovs, according to him 3600 rubles. Zhangazin raised the issue of leaving the province and limited himself to the result, assuming that his work was finished. On February 20, after the negotiations in the OKO, the following open telegram was issued: "Bayan-aul" should be handed over to Omarov, Asanov, and try to confiscate 2/3 of all Karmanov's cattle, hidden cattle. Zhangazin wrote that it is necessary to demand payment of the Chormanovs' loan on March 1, distribute 70% self-taxation measures to their sons, if possible, up to 150% additional self-taxation of the Chormanovs. On that day, a telegram with the following content was sent through the court. Semipalatinsk: take the same measures as for the Chormanovs in relation to the Satpaevs. Please select your materials carefully so that you do not have the opportunity to protest our actions later. At the same time, I am replying to your telegram about self-taxation. We will meet your request. Confiscated goods were allowed to be transferred to the collective farms of the poor peasant committees on credit before the harvest. To the questions on what basis to distribute confiscated cattle between villages and to which organizations in the villages should be handed over.

Semipalatinsk: in order to speed up collectivization, cattle should go mainly to the village. There were also instructions to spread animal husbandry through farming. The fate of the rich in this period continued differently. For example, the above-mentioned Chormanov/Shormanov Zynda (Shah-Zynda) Isauli) was born in 1869. Pavlodar region, Bayanaulsky district, Akkelin village (now Musa Shorman village). He received his education from the village mullah, knew Arabic graphics, read the Koran.

Married, wife of Magid Ablaev (daughter of Ablai Konyrkuljin)
was born from sister Ch.Ch. Valikhanova Badygul-Jamal
Valikhanova. 3. Shormanov had 9 children. At the time

three children lived with him during the confiscation: Rapyk, Bakiy, Adiy. Communicated with famous personalities from the past from Bayanaul: Mashhur Zhusup Kopeev, Imantay Satpaev, Kanish Satpaev, Shapyk Chokin and others.

As of January 1, 1928, in terms of large, he had 1,147 heads of cattle, 3 yurts, 1 wooden 4-room house, 1 cart, 2 haystacks and a hay mower, and employed 10 hired workers. The type of farm is semi-nomadic. Pavlodar region, Bayanaul district, Akkelin village/Tendik village (now Musa Shorman village). Resolution of the Kazakh Central Executive Committee of August 28, 1928. A large cattle owner, a strong personality who hindered the Sovietization of the village. Resolution of the Pavlodar District Commission of October 14, 1928. Aktobe region, Irgiz district, Aktobe city. In 1933, Z. Shormanov moved to the Gandich station in the Omsk region, where his wife M. Ablaeva died in 1934, then he moved with the families of his sons Karim and Adiya to the Gandich station in the Omsk region. Maryanovka, Omsk region, where he died in the summer of 1935, and was buried near the village of Karabas [18].

According to the decree of 1928, the list of the rich subject to confiscation by region:

There are 88 rich people in Semey district, of which 77 are the first group, 11 are the second group[19]. In general, it is known that the confiscation campaign was carried out by involving the local population as much as possible. However, the fact that the local population did not support this campaign, it is true that there were those who opposed it. However, the Soviet policy did not deny itself. The gatherings held by the representatives were not aimed at uniting the poor and the rich, but on the contrary, they were held in the direction of slogans calling for open robbery of each other. After all, the welcome of the poor to the traditional Kazakh life did not satisfy the visiting representatives.

And the representatives who came did not like the activity of local rich people. After that, the representatives openly pitted the poor against the rich and intensified the class struggle in rural areas. The end of it was the principle of commonality, i.e. sharing the wealth and comfortable land of the rich with open sharing. Such scenes were repeated in all regions of Kazakhstan as a phenomenon peculiar to the Kazakh villages at that time.

On August 30, 1928, the local authorities proposed to complete the confiscation and deportation of the rich in the category of representatives of the ruling class by November 1, 1928. According to the resolution: "The area of settlement of settlements in other districts of Kazakhstan should be determined as follows: In the resolution, from Semey district, Syrdaria district, Kostanay district,

Rich people were forcibly relocated to Semey district. At the same time, even though the Soviet government changed some of its decisions regarding the expropriation of the rich, it later reconsidered and tried to implement the decision. Especially those related to the Alash service were treated strictly. For example, Mamyrbek Makazhanuly was born in 1888 in village No. 1 (Akshoky, Kishkene-Astau, Sasykbastau) of Kokpekti district (at that time Zaisan district) of the present East Kazakhstan region. He was the son of a wealthy Makazhan pilgrim, one of the prominent citizens of the Kutan country, from the Muryn clan, who lived in the Okpeti settlement in the range of the Tarbagatai mountains of the present Ayagoz district.

Mamyrbek Makazhanuly's wife, Nugmanova Kulbagi, was the daughter of the Kazakh philanthropist Nugman Kasenov, who ruled the Urzhar district for 30 years, was fluent in Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Chinese and Russian, and who provided significant moral and financial support to the Alash movement. As one of the intellectuals of his time, Nugman Kasenov was one of the highly respected and educated people of that region.

According to the data of August 10, 1928, he owned 300 head of cattle, 1000 head of small cattle and 10 decyats of land and had workers under him. At that time, he was a rich and influential business owner.

In 1928, Mamyrbek was included in the list of those to be deported as a rich man, but he was freed from this pressure by applying to the People's Committee of Kazakhstan, and in September 1928, he moved to the village of Karasu, Urzhar district, i.e. his wife's birthplace. However, on February 13, 1929, it was confiscated by local authorities. The Soviet government considered his resistance and disobedience as acts of hostility to the Soviet system, considered him an organizer of protest protests and perceived him as a "dangerous" person. He was arrested in 1933 and shot on September 9 of this year by the decision of the "three".

Mamyrbek is known among the local population for his anti-Soviet views, supported the White Guards, and actively participated in the organization of the Elders' Court and group struggle. When the Soviet government began mass confiscation, it was not only concerned with protecting its property, but also distributed its livestock to the local people in order to save the people from poverty. In addition, he also provided financial assistance to poor people.

Mamyrbek's actions in the 1920s against the Soviet reforms aimed at destroying the collectivization and traditional way of life are a clear manifestation of his struggle for justice. He perceived these reforms as a threat not only to his personal well-being, but also to the future of the Kazakh people as a whole, because these measures could lead to the destruction of centuries-old customs and freedoms of the people. Mamyrbek opposed the policy of the Soviet government, together with Kazakh rich man Adilev Ike, organized political resistance. They made a

series of attacks against Soviet farms and tried to return confiscated livestock to the people. We understand that the main reason for Mamyrbek's support for the Alash movement is that he was a vigilant citizen who clearly understood that Soviet power was dangerous for the Kazakh people and that human rights were being violated [20].

Maldybaev Berikbol son of Maldybaya volost, grandson of Mynbaya, son of Zhyrau Zholdybaya.

Year of birth: 1879 Place of birth: Ayaguz village

Ayaguz volost of Lepsinsky district of Semipalatinsk region (now Abay region). Beginning in 1905, for twelve years he was the volost governor of the settlements of Middle Ayaguz. He boldly shared the opinions of the leaders of Alash Orda: Alikhan Bukeikhanov, Akhmet Baitursynov, Mirzhakyp Dulatov, in connection with which, together with Baltabek-kazhy and Zhumakhan Karipzhanuly, he willingly provided material support to a special hundred of the Alash Orda regiment, which was popularly called "Tor ala atty Alash", constantly supplying it with riding horses, clothing, and presented the regiment with ten yurts.

On June 6, 1922, the Sergiopol (Ayagoz) "troika" (chairman Zhanamanov, members: Matveyev, Kurmangaliyev) confiscated the property of Berikbol, Nurakhmet, Rakhmet Maldybaev. In addition to the large house, the entire list of property consisted of more than thirty items: chests, furniture, imported beds, a Singer sewing machine, and more. Of greatest interest are the bookcase and dressing table mirror, the gramophone with many records, and the camera, acquired between 1905 and 1914. Their livestock was confiscated: 1,111 horses, an uncountable number of small cattle, and large enterprises: a tannery (owned by Rakhmet), a leather goods factory, and a butter factory (butter factory). Before his exile, he lived at the Sergiopol station. June 6, 1922 (In 1921, a "purge" of people involved in Alashorda took place in Lepsinsky District. Nine people, led by Baltabek Baysultanov, a batyr, kazhi, ethnographer, and chronicler, were shot without trial or investigation by the Cheka "troika" from Zhetysu. That same year, around June 2, Berikbol Maldybaev was also under threat. The Union of Poor Kazakh Farmhands of the Lepsinsky District Bureau issued a certificate No. 176 stating that there was a decision not to confiscate cattle and small animals. The witnesses were Chairman Zh. Yesirgepov, Acting Secretary Samuratbekov, and Clerk Sukhanov). Charge: bai status, obstruction of the Sovietization of the aul. Resolution of the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars of the Kazakh Autonomous SSR of August 27, 1928 "On the eviction with confiscation of property of large bais who have preserved semi-feudal, patriarchal and clan relations, and who with their property and social status are hindering the sovietization of the village."

13) On October 6, 1928, by decision of the Ayaguz District Commission (protocol No. 12), he was exiled to Siberia along with all family members.

14) In connection with the voluntary transfer of all his property, he was allowed to leave for a free settlement in Uzbekistan, and the whole family settled in the city of Tashkent. In 1934, he attended the funeral of Turagul, Abai's son, in Chimkent. Then, in 1963, he moved to Karaganda to his youngest son Saidakhmet, where he died in 1966 at the age of 87 and was buried in the city of Karaganda [21].

The result: during the study of the history of the exploitation of large rich farms in the 20-30s of the 20th century, the achievements of the large-scale research of the sources stored in the archives, the use of new methods, the description of the dark pages of history with new concepts contribute to the decolonization of public consciousness.

Conclusion: In the article in the early 1930s

As part of the "Little Kazan" policy in Kazakhstan, archival documents were used as a basis for the explanatory works of the Soviet system related to the confiscation of rich Kazakhs who were exiled as a result of Soviet economic and political campaigns in the Kazakh countryside. In 1928-1930, the collection of wealthy Kazakhs was divided by districts. Mainly included information on Semey district. The use of domestic research achievements, new methods in the comprehensive study of political repression helps to reconstruct the objective historical reality related to the policy of extermination of the Kazakh rich, contributes to the formation of decolonization of public consciousness, the formation of a new conceptual approach to the problem, the modernization of historical consciousness, the promotion of national history in systematic research and in the world scientific space does.

Reference:

1. Kozybayev M. *History and Modernity*. Alma-Ata, 1991; Kozybayev M., Abilkhozhin Zh., Aldazhumanov K. *Collectivization in Kazakhstan: the tragedy of the peasantry*, - Alma-Ata, 1992. - 35 p.; Kozybayev M. *Zhaudy shashtym tu bailap*. - Almaty, 1994. - 192 p.; Aldazhumanov K.S., Aldazhumanov E.K. *Deportation of Peoples - the Crime of the Totalitarian Regime*. Almaty, 1997; Ayaganov B. *The State of Kazakhstan: the Evolution of Social Systems*. Almaty: Zhazushy, 1993. - 148 p.; Amrekulov N.A. *The Secret of the Personality Cult and Its Exposure. The Era of Stalinism, the Logic of Its Development and Elimination*. - Alma-Ata: Gylym, 1991. - 240 p.;

2. Zhakupova G. *Destruction of the traditional agrarian structure of Kazakhstan (1920s): abstract for a PhD thesis, Candidate of Historical Sciences, A.1999.*
3. Kozymbakova F. *Eradication of "exploiting classes" and private farms in Kazakhstan's agriculture: history and consequences (1926-1933): Ph.D. dis., prepared for the degree. abstract, 2002*
4. Tanatarova T. *Forced resettlement of Kazakh peasants and economic resettlement of refugees (on the basis of materials from Western Kazakhstan and its neighboring regions, 1930-1937): Ph.D. dis., prepared for the degree. abstract, 2002*
5. Zhakisheva S. *Bai semi-feudal lords at the turn of the 20-30s of the 20th century: historical source study analysis of the problem: diss. candidate of historical sciences. A. 1996. 219 p. -1806.*
6. Zhumabaeva J.K., Moldasheva S.K. *Ethno-demographic processes of the Atyrau region during the Soviet era // "Kazakh history" magazine No. 5. 2021.*
7. Jaulin K. M. *Forced collectivization of farms in West Kazakhstan: history and lessons (1928-1933): Ph.D. blood diss. A: 1997. - 265 p.*
8. CGA RK. - F. 1380. - Op. 1, d. 135, l. 1.
9. Zelenin I.E. *Implementation of the policy of liquidation of the kulaks as a class (autumn 1930-32). // History of the USSR. - M., 1990. - No. 6. - P. 31-49.*
10. Baigisheva 3. *Confiscation of property of semi-feudal bais. // Thought. - Almaty, 1998. - No. 6. - P. 89-91. - P. 89.*
11. CGA RK F. 5. Op. 10. D. 88. L. 69-73.
12. AP RK. F.141. Op. 1. D. 2289. L. 10-11.
13. AP RK. F. 141. Op. 1. D. 1687. L. 38-41.
14. *Collectivization of agriculture in Kazakhstan (1926 – June 1941): documents and materials / edited by A. B. Tursunbaev. Alma-Ata: Kazakhstan, 1967. Part 1. 576 p.; Collectivization of agriculture. The most important resolutions of the CPSU Soviet government. 1927-1935. – M., 1957. – P. 163.*
15. *The Fates of the Russian Peasantry. From a series of scientific works. Under the general editorship of Afanasyev Yu.N. – M.: Russia: XX century, 1996. – 624 p. – P. 198.*
16. *Materials of the State Commission for the Full Acquittal of Victims of Political Repression (20-50s of the 20th Century). T. 31. Confiscation of baisky farms in Kazakhstan at the turn of the 20th-30th century. Monograph. Author: Zhakisheva S.A. / Pod community. ed. E.T. Karina. - Astana, 2022. - 176 p. 22.*
17. *Semipalatinsk District Committee of the VKI(b) F-3, T-1, IS-3, Құржам-25.*
18. *Chermanova M. The Golden Gene Pool of the Nation // Pages of Tragic Fates. Collection of Memories of Victims of Political Repressions in the USSR in the 1920s-1950s / Comp. E.M. Gribanova, A.S. Zulkasheva, A.P. Ipmagambetova et al. – Almaty: Zheti Zhargy, 2002. P. 317-321*
19. *Sharafutdinov Z. G. How the rich were confiscated. - Ural: "KhugylaPrint", 2024. Page 88.*
20. *Central State Archive Republican State Institution. 135- Fund, 1- list, 558 – documents*
21. *Maldybaev Berikbol. Ayagoz. // Alash preface: 10 volumes. 9th book. Saryarka. Almaty: Art, 2011. - 320 p. - 109-6.*

Пайдаланылған әдебиеттер тізімі:

- 1 *Козыбаев М. История и современность. - Алма-Ата, 1991; Козыбаев М., Абилхожин Ж., Алдажуманов К. Коллективизация в Казахстане: трагедия крестьянства, - Алма-Ата, 1992. - 35 с.; Козыбаев М. Жауды шаптым ту байлап. - Алматы, 1994. - 192 б.; Алдажуманов К.С., Алдажуманов Е.К. Депортация народов - преступление тоталитарного режима. - Алматы, 1997; Аяганов Б. Государство Казахстан: эволюция общественных систем. - Алматы: Жазушы, 1993. - 148 с.; Амрекулов Н.А. Тайна культа личности и ее разоблачение. Эпоха сталинизма, логика ее развития и изживания. - Алма-Ата: Фильм, 1991. - 240 с.*
- 2 *Жакупова Г. Разрушение аграрной традиционной структуры Казахстана(1920-е годы): автореферат на соискание уч.степ., к.и.н. А. -1999. -28*
- 3 *Козыбақова Ф. Қазақстан ауыл шаруашылығындағы «қанаушы таптарды» және жекешелер қожалықтарын жою: тарихы және салдары (1926-1933жж.): т.ғ.к. дәрежесін алу үшін дайындалған дис. авторефераты, 2002ж.-27с.*
- 4 *Таңатарова Т. Қазақ шаруаларын зорлап отырықшыландыру және босқындарды шаруашылықтық орналастыру (Батыс Қазақстанның және оған көрші аймақтардың материалдары негізінде 1930-1937жж.): т.ғ.к. дәрежесін алу үшін дайындалған дис. авторефераты, 2002.-25с.*
- 5 *Жакишева С. Баи — полу-феодалы на рубеже 20–30 –х гг XX века: историко — источниковедческий анализ проблемы: дис..к.и.н. А. 1996. — 219 с. -180 б.*

- 6 Жумабаева Ж.К., Молдашева С.К. Атырау аймағының Кеңес заманындағы этно-демографиялық үдерістері// «Қазақ тарихы» журналы № 5. 2021 ж.
- 7 Жаулин К. М. Батыс Қазақстандағы шаруа қожалықтарын күшіпен ұжымдастыру: тарихы мен тағылымы (1928-1933жж.): т.ғ.к. кан. дисс. А: 1997. – 265 б.
- 8 ЦГА РК. – Ф. 1380. – Оп. 1, д. 135, л. 1.
- 9 Зеленин И.Е. Осуществление политики ликвидации кулачества как класса (осень 1930-32 гг.). //История СССР. – М., 1990. - № 6. – С. 31-49.
- 10 Байгисиева З. Конфискация имущества баев-полуфеодалов. //Мысль. – Алматы, 1998. - № 6. – С. 89-91. – С. 89.
- 11 ЦГА РК Ф. 5. Оп. 10. Д. 88. Л. 69-73.
- 12 АП РК. Ф.141. Оп. 1. Д. 2289. Л. 10–11.
- 13 АП РК. Ф. 141. Оп. 1. Д. 1687. Л. 38-41.
- 14 Коллективизация сельского хозяйства Казахстана (1926 – июнь 1941 гг.): документы и материалы / под ред. А. Б. Турсунбаева. Алма-Ата: Казахстан, 1967. Ч. 1. 576 с.; Коллективизация сельского хозяйства. Важнейшие постановления КПСС и Советского правительства. 1927-1935. – М., 1957. – С. 163.
- 15 Судьбы российского крестьянства. Из серии научных трудов. Под общ. ред. Афанасьева Ю.Н. – М.: Россия: XX век, 1996. – 624 с. – С. 198.
- 16 Саяси қуғын-сүргін құрбандарын толық ақтау жөніндегі Мемлекеттік комиссияның материалдары (XX ғасырдың 20-50 жылдары) = Материалы Государственной комиссии по полной реабилитации жертв политических репрессий (20-50 годы XX века). Т. 31. Конфискация байских хозяйств в Казахстане на рубеже 20–30-х гг. XX в. Монография. Автор: Жакишева С.А. / Под общ. ред. Е.Т. Карина. – Астана, 2022. – 176 с.
- 17 Семипалатинский Окружной Комитет ВКИ(б) Ф-3, Т-1, ІС-3, Құжат-25.
- 18 Черманова М. Золотой генофонд нации // Страницы трагических судеб. Сб. воспоминаний жертв политических репрессий в СССР в 1920-1950-е гг. / Сост. Е.М. Грибанова, А.С. Зулкашева, А.П. Ипмагамбетова и др. – Алматы: Жеті жарғы, 2002. – С. 317-321
- 19 Шарафутдинов З. Ғ. Байлар қалай тәркіленді. – Орал: «ШұғылаПринт», 2024 ж. 88-бет.
- 20 Орталық мемлекеттік архив Республикалық мемлекеттік мекемесі. 135- Қор,1- тізбе, 558 - құжат
- 21 Малдыбаев Берікбол. Аяғөз. // Алаш көсемсөзі: 10 томдық. 9-шы кітап. Сарыарқа. – Алматы: Өнер, 2011. – 320 б. – 109-б.