

S.K. Tulbassiyeva *¹

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

THE NATURE AND SPECIFIC FEATURES OF THE POLICY OF DISENFRANCHISEMENT IN THE CITY OF ALMA-ATA (1920S–1930S)

Abstract

This article examines the practice of disenfranchisement as an important instrument of Soviet social and political policy during the 1920s-1930s. The study focuses on the category of citizens excluded from the electoral process and labeled as “lishentsy” (“disenfranchised persons”), as well as on the evolution of state policy toward this group. Particular attention is paid to the implementation of this policy in the city of Alma-Ata, which served as the administrative center of the Kazakh ASSR during the period under study.

The research analyzes the legal foundations of the institution of disenfranchisement, the social composition of those deprived of electoral rights, and the mechanisms used to identify and restrict their civil and political rights. The analysis is based on a range of normative legal acts, beginning with the 1918 Constitution of the RSFSR, as well as decrees and instructions issued by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, and subsequent regulatory acts governing electoral rights in the USSR. Special attention is given to legislative changes and the practical implementation of these norms at the local level.

The article also examines the specific features of implementing this policy in Alma-Ata, including the methods used to exclude particular social groups from voter lists, the role of local authorities in determining the status of disenfranchised individuals, and the impact of these measures on the socio-economic conditions of those deprived of their rights. The study also considers the broader consequences of this policy for the formation of the social structure of society, the intensification of social stratification, and changes in the legal status of various population groups. In addition, the reaction of the local population to these policies is discussed.

Key words: Deprivation Electoral rights, Soviet policy, Alma-Ata, Kazakh ASSR, 1918 Constitution of the RSFSR, Social structure, Political repression, Civil rights, Soviet modernization.

Acknowledgment. *This work was carried out within the framework of the project of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (IRN AP26195559) “Disenfranchised Persons in the Social Structure and Everyday Life of Kazakhstani Society in the Early 1920s – First Half of the 1930s: Socio-Legal Status and Problems of Adaptation”.*

Тулбасиева С.К. *¹

¹*т.ғ.к., Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті,
Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы.
e-mail: sauletulbassieva@gmail.com.*

САЙЛАУ «ҚҰҚЫҒЫНАН АЙЫРУ» САЯСАТЫНЫҢ АЛМАТЫ ҚАЛАСЫНДАҒЫ СИПАТЫ МЕН ЕРЕКШЕЛІКТЕРІ (1920-1930 ЖЫЛДАР)

Аңдатпа

Мақала 1920-1930 жылдары кеңестік биліктің әлеуметтік-саяси саясатының маңызды элементтерінің бірі болған сайлау құқығынан айыру тәжірибесін зерттеуге арналған. Зерттеудің негізгі нысаны – сайлау үдерісінен шеттетілген азаматтар санаты ретінде қалыптасқан «құқығынан айырылғандар» («лишенцы») институтының қалыптасуы мен эволюциясы және оның Қазақ АКСР-інің сол кезеңдегі әкімшілік орталығы болған Алматы қаласында жүзеге асырылу ерекшеліктері. Кеңестік билік бұл саясатты таптық қағидаларға негіздеп, қоғамның «қанаушы» немесе «әлеуметтік жат» деп танылған топтарын саяси өмірден шеттету құралы ретінде қолданды.

Зерттеу барысында «құқығынан айырылғандар» институтының құқықтық негіздері, олардың әлеуметтік құрамы, сондай-ақ азаматтардың саяси және азаматтық құқықтарын шектеу мен анықтау тетіктері кешенді түрде қарастырылады. Талдау 1918 жылғы РКФСР Конституциясынан бастап, Бүкілресейлік Орталық Атқару Комитетінің қаулылары мен нұсқаулықтарына, сондай-ақ КСРО-дағы сайлау құқықтарын реттеген кейінгі нормативтік актілердегі өзгерістерге сүйене отырып жүргізіледі. Сонымен қатар, құқықтық нормалардың жергілікті деңгейде іске асырылу тәжірибесіне ерекше назар аударылады.

Мақалада Алматы қаласында бұл саясаттың жүзеге асырылу механизмдері талданады: сайлаушылар тізімдерін құрастыру барысында белгілі бір әлеуметтік топтарды анықтау және оларды тізімнен шығару әдістері, жергілікті билік органдарының рөлі, сондай-ақ мұндай шаралардың «құқығынан айырылған» азаматтардың әлеуметтік-экономикалық жағдайына тигізген ықпалы қарастырылады. Сонымен бірге, қоғамдағы әлеуметтік жіктелудің күшеюі, азаматтардың құқықтық мәртебесінің өзгеруі және жергілікті тұрғындардың бұл саясатқа қатысты реакциясы мәселелері де қамтылады.

Түйін сөздер: Құқығынан айырылғандар, Сайлау құқықтары, Кеңестік саясат, Алматы, Қазақ АКСР-і, 1918 жылғы РКФСР Конституциясы, Әлеуметтік құрылым, Саяси қуғын-сүргін, Азаматтық құқықтар, Кеңестік модернизация.

Алғыс: Жұмыс ҚР БҒМ ІРН АР АР26195559 «1920 жылдардың басы-1930 жылдардың бірінші жартысындағы Қазақстан қоғамының әлеуметтік құрылымы мен күнделікті өміріндегі «құқықтарынан айырылғандар»: әлеуметтік-құқықтық мәртебесі және бейімделу мәселелері» атты жоба аясында орындалды.

С.К. Тулбасиева *¹

¹к.и.н., *Казахский национальный педагогический университет им. Абая, Алматы Республика Казахстан.*
e-mail: sauletulbassieva@gmail.com.

ХАРАКТЕР И ОСОБЕННОСТИ ПОЛИТИКИ ЛИШЕНИЯ ИЗБИРАТЕЛЬНЫХ ПРАВ В АЛМА-АТЕ В 1920–1930-е ГОДЫ

Аннотация

Статья посвящена исследованию практики лишения избирательных прав как одного из важных инструментов социальной и политической политики советской власти в 1920-1930-е годы. Основное внимание уделяется категории граждан, исключённых из избирательного процесса и получивших статус «лишенцев», а также эволюции государственной политики в отношении этой группы населения. Особый акцент сделан на реализации данной политики в городе Алма-Ате, который в рассматриваемый период являлся административным центром Казахской АССР.

В исследовании рассматриваются правовые основы института «лишенцев», их социальный состав, а также механизмы выявления и ограничения гражданских и политических прав. Анализ проводится на основе нормативно-правовых актов, начиная с Конституции РСФСР 1918 года, постановлений и инструкций Всероссийского Центрального

Исполнительного Комитета, а также последующих нормативных документов, регулировавших избирательные права в СССР. Особое внимание уделяется изменениям в законодательстве и практике его применения на местном уровне.

В статье также анализируются особенности реализации данной политики в Алма-Ате: методы исключения определённых социальных категорий из списков избирателей, роль местных органов власти в процессе определения статуса «лишенцев», а также влияние этих мер на социально-экономическое положение граждан, лишённых прав. Рассматриваются последствия данной политики для формирования социальной структуры общества, усиления социальной дифференциации и изменения правового статуса отдельных групп населения. Кроме того, затрагивается вопрос реакции местного населения на проводимую политику.

Ключевые слова: Лишенцы, Избирательные права, Советская политика, Алма-Ата, Казахская АССР, Конституция РСФСР 1918 года, Социальная структура, Политические репрессии, Гражданские права, Советская модернизация.

Благодарность. *Работа выполнена в рамках проекта МНВО РК, ИРН АР26195559 «Лишенцы в социальной структуре и повседневной жизни общества Казахстана в начале 1920-х - первой половине 1930-х годов: социально-правовой статус и проблемы адаптации».*

Introduction. The 1993 Law on the Rehabilitation of Victims of Mass Political Repression marked a significant step toward acknowledging the injustices of the Stalinist regime. However, despite its importance, the law did not fully address all categories of victims, particularly those affected by the mass repressions of 1937-1938 in Kazakhstan, where the масштабы persecution were exceptionally severe. Representatives of the Kazakh intelligentsia-writers, poets, and scholars-were systematically targeted, resulting in executions, forced labor, and the deliberate erasure of their intellectual and cultural legacy.

The political campaigns of 1928-1932, followed by the catastrophic famine of 1931–1933, constitute one of the most profound tragedies in the history of Kazakhstan. Contemporary scholarship increasingly emphasizes that these events were not solely the result of environmental or economic factors, but rather the consequence of deliberate state policies, including forced collectivization, dekulakization, and coercive sedentarization. These measures led to the destruction of the traditional socio-economic structure of Kazakh society, particularly through the mass confiscation of livestock, ultimately causing widespread demographic and cultural loss.

Within this broader context, disenfranchisement emerged as a key instrument of Soviet governance and social engineering. Codified in the 1918 Constitution of the RSFSR, the deprivation of political rights targeted individuals classified as “class enemies,” effectively excluding significant segments of the population from political participation. While electoral restrictions were not unique to the Soviet Union, the Soviet model was distinguished by its explicit ideological and class-based criteria, which enabled the systematic marginalization of broad social groups.

Despite the growing body of research on political repression and collectivization, the issue of disenfranchisement as a socio-legal and everyday practice in Kazakhstan remains insufficiently explored. In particular, there is a lack of comprehensive analysis of how disenfranchisement functioned not only as a legal mechanism, but also as a lived social reality that shaped patterns of adaptation, survival strategies, and social exclusion at the local level.

This study seeks to address this gap by examining the socio-legal status of disenfranchised individuals and the challenges of their adaptation within the social structure and everyday life of Kazakhstani society in the early 1920s to the mid-1930s. Special attention is given to urban contexts, particularly Alma-Ata, as an administrative and cultural center where mechanisms of political control and exclusion were actively implemented.

The novelty of this research lies in its integrated approach, combining legal analysis with social history and the study of everyday practices. By situating disenfranchisement within the broader framework of Soviet political repression, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how

mechanisms of exclusion shaped long-term transformations in social structure, collective memory, and civic identity.

Understanding these historical processes is essential not only for restoring historical justice but also for critically reassessing the legacy of totalitarian governance. In the context of contemporary Kazakhstan, such reflection plays an important role in strengthening civic consciousness, national identity, and a more nuanced engagement with the past.

Methods and materials. This study employs an interdisciplinary methodological approach that integrates historical, legal, and socio-cultural analysis to examine the phenomenon of disenfranchisement in Kazakhstan during the 1920s–1930s, with a particular focus on Alma-Ata.

The historical-diachronic method allows for tracing the evolution of electoral legislation, political practices, and the broader socio-political context of disenfranchisement. This approach makes it possible to analyze how deprivation of electoral rights developed as part of Soviet state-building and class policy.

A key role is played by documentary and archival analysis, including primary sources such as legislative acts, electoral protocols, party and Soviet reports, and judicial materials. These sources enable the reconstruction of the mechanisms of disenfranchisement, identification of targeted social groups, and examination of how these policies were implemented in practice.

The study also applies socio-historical analysis, focusing on the impact of disenfranchisement on different social and ethnic groups, as well as their participation-or exclusion-from political processes. This is complemented by a comparative approach, which situates the case of Alma-Ata within the broader Soviet context, revealing both common patterns and regional specificities.

To deepen the analysis, phenomenological and anthropological approaches are employed. These methods allow for the exploration of lived experiences, perceptions, and adaptive strategies of individuals subjected to disenfranchisement, drawing on memoirs, letters, and testimonies. This makes it possible to move beyond formal legal frameworks and examine disenfranchisement as a social and cultural phenomenon.

First, A. N. Nusupbekov's book "The formation and development of the Soviet working class in Kazakhstan (1917-1940)" [1]. This paper, based on the analysis of changes in the structure of the working class during the NEP period, is indeed an important contribution to the study of the history of the working class in Kazakhstan. While the main focus is on the working class, it would also be useful to address issues related to other social groups, such as the peasantry and intelligentsia, especially in the context of repressive and discriminatory measures, including disenfranchisement. Secondly, the three-volume work "History of the working Class of Soviet Kazakhstan: The Working Class of Kazakhstan in the period of consolidation and development of socialism (1938-1960)" is also a valuable contribution to Kazakh historiography [2, p. 462]. This work covers an important period when Kazakhstan began to actively develop the industrial base of the Soviet economy, and also demonstrates the mechanisms of political control through the working class, which is connected with the broader processes of strengthening the totalitarian regime.

Third, scientific work of Zh. B. Abylkhozhin "Traditional structure of Kazakhstan. Socio-economic aspects of functioning and transformation (-1920-1930)" is also of interest, as it covers the process of transformation of the traditional structure of Kazakh society under the Soviet regime, especially in the context of land reforms, forced collectivization and liquidation of the Kazakh aristocracy [3, p.238].

However, despite the value of these works, the issue of disenfranchisement and its socio-political consequences for the Kazakh population, including the peasantry, intelligentsia and other social groups, has long remained on the periphery of historical analysis. Your research, which addresses this particular topic, fills an important research gap by linking legal and political aspects to the specific social reality of the Kazakh people during the years of collectivization and repression.

Fourth, S. T. Rysbekov's scientific work "The Soviet experience of social modernization of traditional society: lessons and historical significance (1920-1936)" is an important study that significantly complements existing scientific works on the socio-economic development of Kazakhstan during the early Soviet Union [4]. Rysbekov analyzes in detail the modernization

process that was carried out by the Soviet government in relation to traditional Kazakh society, including the rural population, culture, traditions and social institutions. In his work, an important aspect is the introduction of new sources, which allows us to better understand exactly how the transition from traditional society to the Soviet socialist state was carried out. The study helps to highlight the complex processes associated with forced collectivization, agrarian reform, the elimination of the kulaks and the formation of a new social structure, as well as how these changes were perceived by various segments of the population. Applying a broader approach, the author takes into account both external and internal factors that influenced socialist modernization. One of the important aspects of the dissertation is the analysis of social changes in the context of political and legal reforms, including disenfranchisement, which played a key role in controlling various social groups. Despite the fact that the work focuses on socio-economic modernization, it also reveals the role of political repression and restrictions on rights as a means of implementing state policies. S. T. Rysbekov's scientific work is of interest to both historians and social researchers seeking to understand the consequences of Soviet modernization for the peoples of Kazakhstan and, more broadly-, for the entire Soviet Union. HNash aa A study that focuses on the legal aspects and specific consequences of disenfranchisement can perfectly complement this picture, deepening our understanding of social transformation and its impact on civil liberties in the context of that time.

We note that there are many scientific works that are central to the study of collectivization and punitive measures against the peasantry in Kazakhstan during the period of Soviet totalitarianism. These works are of great importance for understanding the tragedy that the Kazakh people went through in the 1920s and 1930s. Abylkhozhin Zh. B., M. Tatimov, Kozybayev M. K., Aldazhumanov Kh. C. "Collectivization in Kazakhstan: the tragedy of the peasantry" [5, p. 36.] and their next joint work Zh. B. Abylkhozhina and M. K. Kozybayev and Kh. S. Aldazhumanov "Totalitarian socialism: reality and consequences" [6, p. 28.]. These are fundamental studies that focus on the tragic consequences of collectivization for the peasantry. These works reveal not only the violent and brutal policy of the Soviet state, but also its social and economic consequences for the peasants, who were forced to go through the processes of dekulakization, forced transfer to collective farms and mass deportation.

At the same time, these studies largely focus on macro-level processes-industrialization, collectivization, and class transformation-while the issue of disenfranchisement as a specific socio-legal practice and everyday experience remains insufficiently studied, particularly in the context of Kazakhstan. In Russian historiography, disenfranchisement has been examined as part of broader discriminatory policies, yet its regional implementation and social consequences require further investigation.

Thus, this research addresses an important gap by linking legal mechanisms of disenfranchisement with their concrete social manifestations and consequences for various groups of the population.

The empirical basis of the study consists of extensive archival materials from the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan, regional archives, and the Presidential Archive. These include:

- complaints of citizens regarding deprivation of rights and property confiscation;
- minutes of commissions on dekulakization and electoral exclusion;
- lists of disenfranchised individuals and deportees;
- judicial materials, including cases from the Alma-Ata People's Court (1928-1935);
- documents of state institutions such as the People's Commissariats of Agriculture, Labor, and Workers' and Peasants' Inspection.

These sources are particularly valuable as they provide insight not only into official policies but also into their perception by the population, revealing the gap between legislation and lived experience.

The novelty of this study lies in its focus on disenfranchisement as a multidimensional phenomenon, combining legal, political, and socio-cultural perspectives. Unlike previous research, which primarily addresses macro-level transformations, this study examines how disenfranchisement functioned in practice at the local level and how it affected everyday life, social adaptation, and identity formation.

By integrating legal analysis with social history and micro-level evidence, this research contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of Soviet political control mechanisms and their long-term impact on Kazakhstani society. It also provides important insights into the historical roots of contemporary issues related to civil rights, political participation, and collective memory.

Discussion. The inclusion of Article 65 in the 1918 Constitution of the RSFSR institutionalized disenfranchisement as a fundamental element of the Soviet political system. By legally defining categories of citizens deprived of electoral rights, the Soviet state established a mechanism for excluding so-called “class enemies” and socially “unreliable” groups from political participation. These categories included individuals engaged in wage labor for profit, private traders, former representatives of the tsarist administration, clergy, and others associated with the pre-revolutionary order. Thus, disenfranchisement functioned not only as a legal norm but as an instrument of ideological control and social restructuring.

Archival materials demonstrate that disenfranchisement in Kazakhstan had a wave-like character, closely linked to broader political campaigns. The first wave (1924-1929) coincided with the intensification of collectivization and dekulakization. During this period, large segments of the peasantry were deprived of political rights alongside the confiscation of property and forced displacement. Disenfranchisement became an integral tool in eliminating economically independent groups and consolidating Soviet authority in rural areas.

A temporary decline in repression in 1930-1931 did not signify a shift in policy but rather a tactical adjustment. The second wave (1933-1934), associated with preparations for elections, marked a renewed expansion of disenfranchisement practices. This phase reflected the strengthening of totalitarian control and the continued use of electoral exclusion as a means of regulating political participation and suppressing dissent.

The adoption of the 1936 USSR Constitution formally abolished disenfranchisement by proclaiming universal suffrage. However, this legal shift did not eliminate repressive practices; instead, mechanisms of political control were transformed and continued through other institutional channels. This contradiction between formal rights and political reality highlights the dual nature of Soviet governance.

The case of Alma-Ata provides an important urban perspective on these processes. Following its transformation from Verny into Alma-Ata and its integration into the administrative structure of the Kazakh SSR, the city became a key political and administrative center. Despite relatively slow population growth in the early 1920s, by the mid-1920s the city experienced gradual expansion driven by migration and socio-economic changes associated with Soviet modernization.

Administrative reorganization, particularly the division of the city into 23 districts, played a crucial role in implementing electoral policies. This structure enabled more effective control over voter registration, election procedures, and the identification of disenfranchised individuals. Local electoral commissions, operating within this framework, not only organized elections but also enforced political criteria for participation, excluding categories deemed undesirable by the state.

Thus, disenfranchisement in Alma-Ata was embedded in both legal norms and administrative practices, serving as a mechanism of political control at the local level. Its implementation reveals the interaction between central policies and local governance, demonstrating how broader processes of collectivization, repression, and social engineering were realized in everyday urban life.

Overall, the analysis shows that disenfranchisement was a dynamic and adaptive инструмент of Soviet власти, which evolved in response to political priorities and crises. It played a key role in reshaping the social structure, limiting civic participation, and reinforcing the foundations of the totalitarian system.

In particular, in this order:

**Correspondence of the Alma-Ata City Council with suburban collective farms
(1.02.1934-19.10.1934).**

1-table:

Item No	Name	of the city's districts.	For example.	TOTAL	PRESENCE. to the report. sobr.
---------	------	--------------------------	--------------	-------	--------------------------------

1.1	th district	--	–	378	129
2.2	th district	513	315	828	80
3.3	-2nd district	600	402	1002	77
4.4	-2nd district	149	155	304	72
5.5	-2nd district	182	158	335	80
6.6	-2nd district	--	–	384	92
7.7	th district	197	151	312	95
8.8	-th district	--	–	200	68
9.9	th district	--	–	230	91
10.10	th district	109	21	124	86
11.11	-2nd district	245	270	517	86
12.12	-2nd district	589	486	761	126
13.13	-2nd district	438	218	500	130
14.14	-2nd district	301	260	570	150
15.15	-2nd district	339	374	405	200
16.16	-2nd district	259	193	452	200
17.17	-2nd district	--	–	158	82
18.18	th district	135	153	414	123
19.19	-2nd district	502	271	698	126
20.20	-2nd district	--	–	1400	328
21.21	th district	523	370	590	120
22.22	-2nd district	--	–	415	280
23.23	th district	87	89	170-5168	–
		5168	3886	11147	2821

[7, p.8].

Archival materials on voter registration and election reporting in Alma-Ata provide valuable insight into the mechanisms of Soviet electoral practices in the 1920s. Statistical tables reflecting the number of voters by districts, their gender composition, and participation in reporting meetings demonstrate that electoral campaigns were not merely administrative procedures, but instruments of political control. These data reveal significant variation in participation rates across districts, indicating differences in political mobilization and social organization. At the same time, the absence of gender data in certain districts suggests either inconsistencies in record-keeping or the специфический характер отдельных территорий в рамках избирательного процесса.

The preparation of such records was closely linked to the broader ideological to the tasks of the Soviet state. Election campaigns were accompanied by intensive propaganda aimed at mobilizing the population and legitimizing the власти. Consequently, many official documents, including electoral reports, combined administrative data with agitation functions, reflecting not only reality but also the desired image of political participation.

The legal framework of these processes was established by the 1918 Constitution of the RSFSR and subsequent electoral instructions, which regulated both the procedure of elections and the categories of citizens excluded from participation. Disenfranchisement was thus embedded in the institutional structure of the Soviet state and functioned as a mechanism of social selection, ensuring the dominance of politically loyal groups while excluding those labeled as “alien elements” [8]

A key feature of electoral practice was the classification of the population along social, professional, and ideological lines. Voters were categorized as workers, peasants, employees, and other groups, reflecting the class-based approach of Soviet policy. At the same time, additional criteria-such as party membership, military status, and level of education-were systematically recorded. This detailed classification allowed the authorities not only to monitor the composition of the electorate but also to shape it by privileging certain groups and marginalizing others.

Particularly significant was the inclusion of party affiliation (members of the CPSU (b) and Komsomol) as a separate category, which highlights the central role of ideological loyalty in the

political system. Similarly, the учет уровня грамотности demonstrates the link between electoral practices and broader state policies aimed at social modernization and the elimination of illiteracy.

At the local level, electoral processes in Alma-Ata were tightly controlled by city authorities and party structures. The division of the city into districts facilitated detailed monitoring of the population and the systematic exclusion of disenfranchised individuals from electoral lists. Local commissions played a crucial role not only in organizing elections but also in implementing repressive measures, including the verification of social status and the removal of “unreliable” elements.

This system reveals a fundamental contradiction of Soviet electoral policy. On the one hand, it proclaimed the participation of workers and peasants as the foundation of political power; on the other hand, it systematically excluded broad segments of the population whose socio-economic activities did not fit the ideological model. Professions related to trade, handicrafts, or small-scale entrepreneurship were often classified as “exploitative,” despite their importance for everyday survival. As a result, individuals engaged in such activities were deprived not only of political rights but also frequently subjected to economic sanctions, confiscation of property, and social stigmatization.

The classification principles embedded in electoral instructions thus functioned as tools of both integration and exclusion. While formally aiming to organize and mobilize society, they simultaneously imposed rigid ideological frameworks that marginalized significant groups of the population. Disenfranchisement became a key element of this system, operating at the intersection of legal regulation, administrative practice, and political repression.

Archival evidence further suggests that the application of disenfranchisement was often inconsistent and dependent on local interpretations. The duration and severity of restrictions could vary depending on social origin, occupation, and perceived political reliability, indicating a significant degree of arbitrariness in enforcement. In practice, deprivation of electoral rights was frequently accompanied by broader repressive measures, reinforcing its role as a tool of coercion [9].

Thus, the electoral system in Alma-Ata in the 1920s-1930s functioned not simply as a mechanism for forming representative bodies, but as an instrument of social engineering and political control. It allowed the Soviet state to restructure society in accordance with ideological principles, regulate participation in public life, and suppress alternative social and economic practices. This analysis highlights the complex interplay between formal legal norms and their practical implementation, revealing the deeply contradictory nature of Soviet policy.

For example: In the materials on the case of meetings of the grain procurement assistance commissions and the list of sowers of the 12th district of Alma-Ata for 1930, the ode on grain procurement is preserved with a squeak and subject to eviction as Kulak farms from the village of Nikolaevsky Kalinsky district.

Name of the locality	Surname First name and patronymic	Nationality	Age	Number of family members	Who did not serve in the Red	List of property and other sources of income	Amount paid in s x n	Was subjected to dekulakization and other reprisals for refusing to perform state duties, which was expressed in dekulakization.	Information about deprivation of rights	Politfizanomiya
----------------------	--	-------------	-----	--------------------------	------------------------------	--	----------------------	--	---	-----------------

Nikolaevskoe village	Tregubov Semyon Vasilyevich wife: Alexandra Pavlovna - - - - - son: Nikolay Semyon.	Russian	45 28 7	3	net	House in 3 rooms dining room, and 2 barns, outbuildings Caravanserai	311 RUB.	He was fined for not handing over surplus bread and confiscated, was	deprived of a maternity hospital in 1928, and is currently	politically unreliable , sitting in a residential building for beating up a member of the village council
of the Village of Nikolaevskoye	, Samigullin Hafiz Khusnutdin. wife: Gazizi - - - children: Gulsima - - - - // - Farida - - // - Ibrahim - - - - // - Ishmael - -		60 38 28 7 4 1	6	net	House of trees. 2 com. Outbuildings, 2 horses, cow, small trade	38 rubles.	He was not dekulakized, was arrested in 1920 . For speculation kozlamstvo	Deprived in 1928.	In 1927-28 and 1929. Traded and insured several times for non-wear of the level of collection, there are signs of sheltering livestock.

[10, p.204].

This list illustrates the practice of administrative decisions when disenfranchisement was linked to property status and political trustworthiness. For example, Tregubov Semyon Vasilyevich has been deprived of his rights since 1928, was fined, and his property was partially confiscated. Samigullin Hafiz Khusnutdin has also been deprived of his rights since 1928, was previously arrested for profiteering, and was accused of harboring cattle. Such documents are important for analyzing the mechanism of repression and social stratification in early Soviet Kazakhstan. And another interesting point, which reflects the close interaction of various authorities in the USSR to implement the policy of restricting electoral rights. This indicates a high level of centralized control and strict accounting of persons falling under the categories excluded from the electoral process.

In this case, it can be seen that the exclusion mechanism was supported by legislative norms, for example, through Article 69 of the second part of paragraph " e " of the Constitution of the RSFSR. This article referred to persons who were declared incapacitated due to mental illness. Such a policy illustrates the attempts of the state not only to regulate the electoral process, but also to form a "socially suitable" composition of voters, which also fit into the general context of building a socialist society [11, p.62].

A special emphasis on requests from the City Council (in this case, to a psychiatric hospital) highlights how bureaucratically detailed the process of excluding citizens from the electoral register was. This confirms that such measures were implemented not only for the purposes of social control, but also to demonstrate discipline and order in the work of state structures. For example, this analysis underscores the complex interplay between formal legal norms and their practical implementation, revealing the inherently contradictory nature of Soviet policy.

Special part. Lists of persons deprived of their electoral rights

No in order	Surname first name and patronymic	gender	nationality	what was he doing before the February revolution	what is he doing now	A D R E S	Notes
1	Zhdanov Alexey Romanovich	M.	Russian	Psalmist	Deacon.	B. st. 2 124 St.	
2	Belanov Moisey Ivanovich	--	-	Priest	Priest	Soldatskaya	

3	Khlebnikov Alexander Flegont.	-	-	-	-		
4	Markovsky Alexey Petrovich	-	-	-	Protonest	At the Alekseevskaya church	
5	Markovsky Alexander Alex.	--	-	Psalmist	Psalmist	t o w e	
6	Shavrov Alexey Alekseevich	--	-	Priest	Priest	Commander-Kashgarsk. 1694	
7	Tikhonravov Gavriil Petrovich	-	-	Sacred. service.	The first one. service.	Sartovskaya 74	
8	Urazov Yakub Urazovich	-	Mus.		Ponomar. kaz. tser.	Tashk. Aleya D. Urdabayeva	
9	Khasanov Akhmed Khasanovich	-	Taranch.		Mullah tar. the sword.	Узын-Агач. ул.д.при м. 58	
10	Галиев Гашир Галиевич	-	-		Пон. тар. Mecha	Sartovsk.st per quart. 20	K A K S L U W I T E L I R E L I G I O Z N O G O K U L T A
11	Abakov Gomar Abakovich	-	-		Mon. tar. sword on the berg. Alma-Alm. and bargain st. zh.	naber. st. sob. d. glinob. 73	
12	Khamidhajiev Gali Khamidhaj.	-	Kashgar.		Phnom and Kashgar sword. on Tokmak street	Tokmak street on kvar. d	
13	Rahmatkhodjaev Golaskar Rahm.	-	Sart		Pon. to Chalakazaksk. mosques in B. stanitsa.	In the courtyard of Chalakakzak sword.	
14	Mirfaizov Niriaz Mirfaiz.	-	-		in Sart. mosques in the old cemetery. st	. Starokldb. sob. d. 27	
15	Abdul-karimov Abdulkhali A-K.	-	Taranch.		Pon. Taranch. sword. in klevern. uch. for the Tatars is weak.	Klevern. uch. za tatarsk. slob. 2 own street. house 156	
16	Talibov Barat Talibovich	-	-	Shoemaker	Azanchi Taranch. mosques on Stanichnaya street	Taranch. st. cathedral house.21	
17	Jalilev Gabdulkadir Jalil.	--	-	Mul. v Kar. vol.	Mullah of the Kashgarlyk mosque in Kuznechny.	Grasshopper row. rows on kvar. 66	
18	Kasymov Kambar Kasymovich	-	-	Azanchi (Ponomarsky)	Azanchi (nom.) Kashk. mosques in kuznechn.	Grasshopper row.	
19	Rakhmatullin Shaidulla Nigm.	--	-	Grain grower	Azanchi (panom.) Tatars. mosques on Lep. st	. Sergipolsk st. sob. d. 31	
20	Gafarov Shakir Akhmedtanov.	-	Mullah of the Tatar Slabodki	Mul. in Tatar sl.	Mosque in Tatar.	slob. on kvar. 13	
21	Mukhamediev Gakhimdzhan Akhmedzh.	--	-	Pch. iAz. in tat sl	Azanchi (panom.) Tatars. mosques in Tatarsk. slabod.	Tatarskaya slab. sobr. 53	
22	Gabdullin Habibulla Gabdul.	-	Dungan	The Mullah	Mullah Upper Dung Mullah.	. At the mosque	

					mosques on Dungansk. ul	
23	Yakubov Maksim Yakubovich	--	-	Azanchi (ponomarsky)	Azanchi (porom.) in Verkhne-dung. mech. on dung. r	Kashgarskaya St. sob. d. 51.24
24	Santyashuyev Sanukhun Santyash	--	-	Azanchi and bread.	Azanchi (nom.) in nizhne-dung. mech. on dung.	Kirghizskaya St. cathedral 1
25	Rozhdestvensky	-	Russian	Priest	House of farms.	Starokladbishchenskaya
26	Belarusians Konstantin Pavel	-	-	-	-	Krasnoarmeyskaya 67

[12, p. 23-37].

This example perfectly illustrates how the practices of the Soviet government not only ensured control over the composition of voters, but also linked this to the concept of social "duty" and labor contribution. The City Council's requests to the tax and finance departments emphasize that the exclusion from the electoral rights of people living on unearned incomes was not just a declaration, but a clearly structured process.

This policy reflected the ideology of the Soviet state, where priority was given to workers, and "non-labor elements" were considered undesirable from the point of view of participating in the formation of Soviet power. This was in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the RSFSR (for example, Article 69 of part I of paragraph "b"), which explicitly referred to persons living on income from private trade, exploitation or other types of "unearned" income [13].

For example, the City Council urgently asks for information about the trade of the citizen Brodsky Iosif Iosifovich, since according to the data available to them, the citizen once engaged in trade, and now his wife is trading [14, p. 37].

This is a good example that shows how deeply the state bodies of the USSR interfered in the private lives of citizens, pursuing the goal of monitoring compliance with ideological norms and social policies. Specifically, in this case, we are talking about identifying "non-labor elements" and preventing their participation in political life through the electoral process.

Following an interesting fact, a request was sent to the City Council from the SAGA Light Cavalry Work Department. In the request "to the light cavalry group of the SAGU Faculty of Work, we ask you to provide information about a student of the Faculty of Work who lived with his brother in the city of Alma-Ata on Kaskelenskaya Street, 75 before admission. Student Niyazov Abdurakhim Mustafievich is listed in our social status-a worker, but there are no documents on physical experience, and there is information that he is the son of a mullah, please indicate the social status of his father in the past and present, as well as the property status of his brother, and indicate the place of residence (Alma-Ata county, Tolit-Kara village)" [15, p. 21]. The survey was not limited to information about the student, but also included information about his family, in particular about his father (mullah) and brother. This demonstrates how the Soviet government considered not only the personal merits of citizens, but also the influence of their family background. Mullahs, as representatives of the religious class, as well as the property status of the brother could be associated with suspicions about social origin, which was an important criterion for assessing political credibility.

Some materials demonstrate the process of rehabilitation and restoration of rights after a citizen was deprived of them by social status (in this case, as a fist). The example of Yelisey Artemovich Teslenko shows how the Soviet system could not only restrict the rights of certain categories of citizens, but also provide for the possibility of their restoration if certain conditions were met. For example, the application of citizen Telenor Yelisey Artemovich for restoration of electoral rights, deprived as a kulak [16, p. 67]. Since 1930, citizen E. A. Teslenko worked continuously in the distance of way 17-as a stable boy, treated work conscientiously. Given that citizen Teslenko E. A., for 5 years worked in good faith, did not have a single delay and absenteeism, the commission decided to restore his rights.

The key aspects of the repressive policy of the Soviet regime that we have discussed are indeed that disenfranchisement was one of the means of combating "undesirable elements" in a socialist society. It was a kind of social and political isolation used to maintain discipline, loyalty, and ideological purity.

Conclusions. Disenfranchisement often involved people with a certain social background, such as "kulaks", peasants with capitalist tendencies, or members of the old classes whose existence did not correspond to the ideals of socialist economics and social justice. This not only deprived them of a political voice, but also effectively marginalized them, making them an object of repression.

Disenfranchisement was part of a broader repressive policy aimed at eliminating political and social enemies, "class" opponents, and people with potentially "wrong" behavior. The desire to create an ideal socialist society included a strict separation of "enemies of the people" and other counter-revolutionary elements.

The Soviets, within the framework of their ideology, were determined to eliminate those who could threaten the socialist society under construction. Professional affiliation, background, financial status, or even personal connections could lead to disenfranchisement, as the authorities placed great importance on social affiliation and loyalty.

The restoration of voting rights based on labor achievements, as in the case of Teslenko, showed that the main condition for restoration -is compliance with social discipline. Thus, the system supported the mechanism of repression and at the same time provided citizens with a chance to be "rethought" through work and loyalty.

Problems related to insufficient training of staff, lack of coordination between different authorities, and the complexity of registration have indeed played a major role in shaping a repressive and discriminatory system in which many people may have been unfairly deprived of their rights.

One of the key reasons for disenfranchisement was the origin of citizens and their income, which did not correspond to the principles of the new socialist society. The ideology of Soviet power was based on class struggle, and any "unearned" income (for example, from trade or private practice) was perceived as a threat to socialist construction. This contributed to the exclusion of certain segments of society from the political process.

In addition, disenfranchisement entailed a number of restrictions on residence, employment in the public sector, higher education, and participation in social systems.

In this regard, in the late 1920s, the number of disenfranchised persons increased rapidly, and in the early 1930s, an important issue for local governments was determining the number of applicants for the restoration of these rights.

References:

1. Nusupbekov A. N. *Formation and development of the Soviet working class in Russia Kazakhstan (1917-1940).* Alma-Ata: NaukaPublishing House, Kazakh SSR, 1966. 243 p.
2. Nusupbekov A. N. *Istoriya rabocheho klassa Sovetskogo Kazakhstana [History of the working class of Soviet Kazakhstan].* In 3 volumes, volume 2, Alma-Ata: Nauka, 1988. 462s.
3. Abylkhozhin Zh. B. *Traditional structure of Kazakhstan. Socio-economic aspects of functioning and transformation (1920-1930).* Alma-Ata: Gylym, 1991. 238 p.
4. Rysbekova S. T. *Soviet experience of social modernization of traditional society: lessons and historical significance (1920-1936)* 2010, *Uralsk*, 370 p.
5. Abylkhozhin Zh. B., Tatimov M., Kozybaev M. K., Aldazhumanov Kh. *"Collectivization in Kazakhstan: the tragedy of the peasantry"* Almaty, 1992. 36 p.
6. Kozybaev M. K., Aldazhumanov Kh. S. *"Totalitarian Socialism: reality and consequences" of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan.* Kazakhstan. Ualikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology Уалиханова, Kazakhstan. Adilet Island (Justice) - Almaty: XXI vek, 1997. 28c.
7. GAA. f. 174. Op. 1. d. 143. p. 11.
8. GAA. F. 174. Op. 15, D. 22. p. 234.
- 9 GAA. f. 174. Op. 9. d. 8. c. 62.
10. GAA. F. 174. Op. 1, d. 12. p. 37.

- 11 ГАА. ф. 174. Оп. 1, д. 4. п.138.
- 12 ГАА. ф. 174. Оп. 1, д. 2. п.98.
- 13 ГАА. 174. Оп. 1, д. 12. с 62.
14. ГАА. Ф. 174. Оп. 1, д. 12. п. 23-62.
15. ГАА. 174. Оп. 1, д. 12. с 102.
16. ГАА. Ф. 174. Оп. 1, д. 4. п. 138.

Список использованной литературы:

1. Нусупбеков А. Н. *Формирование и развитие рабочего класса в Казахстане (1917–1940 гг.)*. - Алма-Ата: Наука, 1966. - 243 с.
2. Нусупбеков А. Н. *История рабочего класса Советского Казахстана. В 3 т. Т. 2.* - Алма-Ата: Наука, 1988. - 462 с.
3. Абылхожин Ж. Б. *Традиционная структура Казахстана: социально-экономические аспекты функционирования и трансформации (1920–1930 гг.)*. - Алма-Ата: Гылым, 1991. - 238 с.
4. Рысбекова С. Т. *Советский опыт социальной модернизации традиционного общества: уроки и историческое значение (1920-1936 гг.)*. - Уральск, 2010. - 370 с.
5. Абылхожин Ж. Б., Татимов М., Козыбаев М. К., Алдажуманов Х. *Коллективизация в Казахстане: трагедия крестьянства*. - Алматы, 1992. - 36 с.
6. Козыбаев М. К., Алдажуманов Х. С. *Тоталитарный социализм: реальность и последствия*. - Алматы: XXI век, 1997. - 28 с.
7. Государственный архив Алматинской области (ГАА). Ф. 174. Оп. 1. Д. 143. Л. 11.
8. ГАА. Ф. 174. Оп. 1. Д. 143. Л. 234.
9. ГАА. Ф. 174. Оп. 15. Д. 22. Л. 62.
10. ГАА. Ф. 174. Оп. 9. Д. 8. Л. 37.
11. ГАА. Ф. 174. Оп. 1. Д. 12. Л. 138.
12. ГАА. Ф. 174. Оп. 1. Д. 4. Л. 98.
13. ГАА. Ф. 174. Оп. 1. Д. 2. Л. 62.
14. ГАА. Ф. 174. Оп. 1. Д. 12. Л. 23-62.
15. ГАА. Ф. 174. Оп. 1. Д. 12. Л. 102
16. ГАА. Ф. 174. Оп. 1. Д. 4. Л. 138.