

Z.G. Saktaganova<sup>ID</sup>, T.K. Sakabay\*<sup>ID</sup>

*Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan  
(E-mail: [zauresh63@mail.ru](mailto:zauresh63@mail.ru); [tolkinist78@mail.ru](mailto:tolkinist78@mail.ru))*

## **The Problem of Sedentarization of the Kazakhs of Central Kazakhstan in the 1930s**

The article discusses the characteristics and consequences of the policy of forced sedentarization carried out in Central Kazakhstan in the 1930s. The process of sedentarization was accompanied by political and economic campaigns, such as confiscation of wealth, collectivisation and processing of agricultural products, which led to fundamental changes in the economic life of the Kazakh population. The Soviet authorities regarded the resettlement of the Kazakh nomadic people as an integral part of economic transformation and ideological formation. However, this process was largely carried out by administrative order, without taking into account the natural and geographical conditions and the way of life of the local population. The authors examine the views and conclusions identified in scientific research on the scale and methods of implementation of the process of transition to colonisation, its socio-economic consequences. In addition, the article uses archival documents, to describe the implementation of sedentarization in the central region of Kazakhstan on the basis of data. The authors focus on the shortcomings in the implementation of the resettlement, such as the incorrect selection of resettlement sites, lack of water sources, insufficient arable land and hay meadows, lack of infrastructure and building materials, lack of educational work among the population, etc. The study also looks at the relationship between this policy and Soviet industrialisation. It shows that the task was to create oasis-style agricultural bases to provide food for the developing centres of non-ferrous metallurgy in the region. In addition, the article examines and explains the consequences of Soviet modernisation in the Kazakh steppe, such as forced sedentarization, on the basis of archival documents.

*Keywords:* sedentarization policy, Central Kazakhstan, famine, modernisation, agriculture, resettlement process, nomadic society.

### *Introduction*

Until the early 1930s, Kazakhstan was mainly a nomadic region, and the main form of agriculture was livestock farming. The nomadic way of life was reflected in the Kazakhs' relationship with nature and their adaptation to the harsh climatic conditions. It was also an integral part of their social and economic structure. However, with the arrival of the Soviet government, the transition to collectivisation and sedentarization began major changes in the economy of the nomadic people. Central Kazakhstan, like many other regions of the Soviet Union, became a place where these innovative but destructive changes were implemented. It was linked to the progressive industrialisation of the country. It is important to analyse the process of implementation of the sedentarization policy as a precondition for the famine of the 1930s. Therefore, the aim of the study is to analyse the problems and mechanisms of the resettlement of the nomadic population in the central region of Kazakhstan in the 1930s and the actions of the party-state organs in its implementation.

### *Materials and methods*

The article uses general scientific methods, such as analysis, synthesis, analogy, systematisation, comparison, and description. A retrospective method is applied to chronologically examine and reconstruct the processes of the transition to sedentarization. The historical-analytical method is used to analyse the causes, conditions, consequences and sequence of events of the resettlement process based on documents preserved in the archives. The comparative-historical method is utilized to determine the peculiarities, including the problems and changes, of the transition to sedentarization in the Central Kazakhstan region. One of the most important methods used in this article is the specific historical (ideographic) method, in which a particular plot, a particular problem is studied in detail and in depth, and its specificity is determined. The historical and typological method contributes to the systematisation of mechanisms in the implementation of the process of transition to settlement. These methods make it possible to describe the analysed process comprehensively and objectively. To assess the state of research on the subject, the work of domestic and

\* Corresponding author's e-mail: [tolkinist78@mail.ru](mailto:tolkinist78@mail.ru)

foreign researchers is taken into account. This, in turn, makes it possible to understand the mechanisms of the process of forced sedentarization, the fact that it was one of the reasons for the starvation of the population.

The documentary basis of the article is the documents kept in the funds of the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Karaganda Regional State Archive. Among them, in File No. 6 of Inventory No. 15 of the Fund “City Council of Deputies and Workers of Karaganda” of the Karaganda Region State Archive for 1931-1932. The minutes of decisions and meetings of the Central Executive Committee of the Kazakh ASSR, the report on the economic survey of the districts of the Karaganda region in File No. 606 of Inventory No. 4 of the “Karaganda Regional Water Management” Fund No. 640, the documents kept in the materials of the Sedentarization Committee and the bodies of the United State Political Administration (OGPU) have made it possible to determine the course of the sedentarization process and the mechanisms for its implementation. These documents contain statements, explanatory notes, telegrams from the regional and district executive committees on sedentarization issues. The documents collected in these archives provide information about the local authorities’ approach to forced sedentarization.

In the preparation of the article, collections of archival documents that were brought into scientific circulation in various years were also used. In particular, “Forced Collectivisation and Famine in Kazakhstan 1931–1933”, the multi-volume work “Asharshylyk. Golod. 1928–1934”, “Documents in the collections of archival documents and memories of the famine of 1931–1933 in Central Kazakhstan”, “Materials of the State Commission for the Full Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repressions” and other documents allow us to compare information on sedentarization in Kazakhstan, namely in the Central Kazakhstan region.

### *Results*

Unfortunately, we have not come across any studies devoted to the implementation of the sedentarization process in Central Kazakhstan from a regional perspective. This study seeks to fill this gap.

The process of resettlement of the Kazakh people was one of the main features of Soviet modernisation during the 1920s–1930s. The beginning of the 1930s, out of the 700,000 Kazakh farms, 540,000 were nomadic and semi-nomadic (assuming that one family consists of 4-5 members, that is about 2.1–2.7 million people). Of these, 200,000 led a semi-nomadic lifestyle, and about 360,000 lived a “pure” nomadic lifestyle. 160,000 farms were settled, about 60,000 of them during the period 1920–1929, i.e., within ten years.

If in ten years only 60,000 farms were settled, then, the planned sedentarization of about 430,000 nomads and semi-nomads in the northern and southern regions of Kazakhstan in just three years (from 1930 to 1933) seemed an extremely difficult task for the authorities. The resettlement of the nomads in the districts of Central Kazakhstan could take even longer [1; 119].

Professor Zh. Abylkhodzhin, in his study, points to this feature as one of the causes of famine in 1931–1933. The plans for accelerated industrial development led to problems with grain throughout the Union. At the same time, the increase in grain exports and the need to supply the population of the growing cities with bread clearly reflected the relevance of the problem. The demand for grain grew from day to day. The state wanted to solve this problem by increasing grain production, by expanding the area under cultivation. A. Yakovlev paid special attention to this and made a statement at the XVI Congress of the CPSU (b): “... It can be assumed that Kazakhstan has 50–55 million hectares of arable land, of which 36 million hectares are in the Northern District... Here, wheat occupies only 5 % of the cultivated area. If we sow 30 % of the 36 million hectares suitable for this area with wheat, then at the end of the five-year plan we will get an additional 8–10 million hectares of wheat only from Kazakhstan itself...” [2; 224, 225]. The People’s Commissar was not puzzled by the fact that this land was pastureland for traditional animal husbandry. According to Zh. Abylkhodzhin, this indicates that the Kazakh nomads contradicted the goal of increasing the state’s grain production [3; 225]. The most important way out of this situation was the need for rapid, enforced sedentarization. That is why the Republican People’s Commissar for Agriculture K. Toktabayev declared at the VII Congress of Soviets of Kazakhstan (April 1929): “The first task to which special attention must be paid in increasing the arable land is the question of sedentarization of the Kazakh people”. In accordance with this, the Congress adopted the following resolution: “2. The development of grain cultivation in the region primarily concerns the sedentarization of the semi-nomadic and nomadic population in all parts of the republic” [3; 226]. After that, the policy of forced sedentarization of nomadic farms and their collectivization began to be actively implemented. In the nomadic regions, including the central region of Kazakhstan, the policy of increasing the area under cultivation was intensified. The local conditions were completely ignored in the farm management’s sowing plans. This can be seen in the documents of that time. For exam-

ple, T. Ryskulov cites the fact that “for 5 nomadic and semi-nomadic districts of the Karaganda region (Zhanaarka, Kyzyltu, Korgalzhyn, Sarysu, Enbekshilder), according to the plan, the area under cultivation was increased by 42 %, including for the Sarysu district, where 500–600 farms were left out of 7,000, an area of 2880 hectares was planned for 1931 instead of 300 hectares”. Despite the decline in the working age population and draught cattle, the shortage of seed resources and seed debt, the plan was increased. “It is possible that the districts will again allow the implementation of the sowing plan, which in turn will lead to migration and starvation of the population”. In the report by F.I. Goloshchekin “On collectivization in the Kazakh village” in the Regional Property it says: “In 3 years (from 1929 to 1931) the arable area on the Kazakh land increased by 100 % — from 1265.7 thousand hectares to 2561 thousand hectares”. T. Ryskulov refutes this data. He writes: “It is clear that big mistakes were made in the calculation of arable land... The Kazakhs have only recently started farming. Kazakh land is mainly located in an arid zone, the quality of the soil is low, there are not enough tractors, and no agrotechnical measures have been implemented. How could the arable land of the Kazakhs double in this situation?” [4; 323].

We believe that the process of sedentarization in Central Kazakhstan was carried out not only to solve the grain problem, but also to supply the populations of industrial cities, such as Karaganda and Balkhash, with agricultural products. This is evidenced by the report of an economic study in the Shet district of the Karaganda Regional Water Management Department, which is preserved in the fonds of the Karaganda Regional State Archive. The report states that the establishment of large industrial centres in Central Kazakhstan, which are developing on the basis of non-ferrous metallurgy, in desert and semi-desert areas poses the task of developing agriculture in a new way. It is noted that the need to supply the industrial centres with the necessary food products, such as milk, vegetables, melons, meat and animal fat, requires the urgent creation of large economic bases near the city. It is pointed out that such bases are necessary not only for the supply of food, but also for the sedentarization of the nomadic population, the preparation of fodder for livestock and the development of the region [5; 1–4]. The document contains the results of the economic survey of the Shet and Konyrat districts. This means that it is possible that the sedentarization of areas near industrial towns was carried out to provide the population of the towns with the essential resources, which was a prerequisite for the forced industrialisation at that time.

Central Kazakhstan, which is mainly a steppe and semi-desert region, was particularly vulnerable to such reforms, as the local population traditionally practised nomadic livestock herding adapted to the natural conditions. As a result, there were a number of shortcomings in the process of sedentarization in this region. The archival documents show that the policy of resettlement in Karkaralinsk, a large district in Central Kazakhstan, was carried out with administrative, environmental, and economic coercion. The fact that the transition to sedentarization was implemented based on exaggerations and mistakes on the part of the local authorities is clearly evident from the confidential data of the OGPU authorities. For example, the information from the OGPU plenipotentiary dated 10 August, 1930 shows that a number of negative facts occurred during the sedentarization work in the Karkaraly district. The district organisations did not carry out any preparatory work for sedentarization, the problems with the sedentarization sites were not addressed, so the lands selected as sedentarization sites were not surveyed. Last year, melioration works were carried out in Shubartau district covering an area of 1,500 hectares. However, the irrigation facilities were still not being utilised and had not been taken into account when working out the problem with the settlement sites. In a number of places intended for settlement, construction work was halted due to a shortage of building materials, labour and food and the land reclamation work was also suspended. District Land Administration (OKRZU) did not consider the material basis in the local areas. In Balkhash and Berkara districts, the planned construction of 11 barns, 2 granaries, 2 machine sheds, 2 forges, and 1 land preparation centre had not been built. Due to the lack of preparatory and educational work, the population was not ready to switch to sedentarization. There were no arrangements for sowing and hay harvesting. There were cases in some areas (Berkara) where inconvenient places were chosen as settlement sites. In all these cases, the authorities realised that the rich are hindering the transition of the population to sedentarization without considering the mistakes they made. For example, in village no. 8 of Balkhash district, 108 collective farmers refuse to settle due to the influence of rich relatives, citing the lack of arable and hay land as the reason [6; 166]. The document is an important source that reflects the true implementation of the policy of transition of the nomadic population to sedentarization in the Karkaraly district. From the content of the document, it is clear that there is a lack of both institutional and social readiness to carry out the transformation of traditional farming. At the same time, we see in the document the official implementation of policies by the local authorities, without considering the specific circumstances, the organisational and social crisis.

Only ten days later, on 20 August, 1930, the CPSU (b) of the United State Political Administration (OGPU) again informed the Kazakh regional committee about the failure of the sedentarization work in the Karkaraly district. It pointed to the indifferent, irresponsible attitude of the district structures, which made gross mistakes, as the main reason for the failure of the resettlement process. Until August 1, the commission for the inspection of the settlement areas was not organized, only an agronomist carried out the inspection of the settlement areas and selected unsuitable areas. The requests of the residents of villages No. 11 and No. 14 of Berkara district for housing in the Sarnabulak ravine were ignored. The document also states that work to build the infrastructure necessary for the sedentarization had failed. The construction of only 78 of the 168 planned houses in the Berkara district had begun. There were also no building materials for the construction of houses, it was alleged that there were not enough carts and harnesses for the delivery of materials [7; 181]. This is evidence of gross errors in the implementation of the sedentarization policy in Karkaraly district.

The lack or complete absence of building materials at the settlement sites was noted in large numbers in the information provided by the OGPU authorities. For example, in the information of 1 October, 1930 on the exaggerations in the implementation of various campaigns in the Kazakh SSR, it is stated that construction was not carried out in the Balkhash and Berkara districts of the Karaganda region due to the lack of building materials and labour. It was claimed that the transport of stones for the foundations of the houses was slow and that there was almost no wood material [8; 225].

At the beginning of 1932, the same situation was observed in the process of sedentarization. In a short note from the special department of the OGPU, infrastructural and organisational errors are highlighted using concrete examples. For example, the population in the Tonkerei district (villages No. 12 and 5), in the Atyrau district, was settled on land without water reservoirs and wells. In the settlement of Sary-Tumar in the district of Beynetkor, 107 farms were evacuated to a place where there was no water at all. It should be emphasised that the funds and building materials provided by the state were not used for their intended purpose. For example, no houses were built in the collective farms Zhana Enbek and Sartuga of village No. 6 in the Telman district, due to the lack of wood materials. The document states that the process of sedentarization, in addition to material and organizational errors, actually became an administrative and coercive measure. From this we can see that the work on sedentarization in the region was in crisis [9; 67–74].

According to R. Kindler, the campaign was used by resourceful, active functionaries for personal enrichment and financed from funds allocated for the “implementation of sedentarization”. In the Karkaraly district, for example, it was planned to resettle 9,000 people in 1932, but the actual number declined by one third. However, the people in charge of the district had no problems with this fact and said: “We don’t care that there are fewer people, the important thing is that we get more money and the necessary equipment to work on the ground”. None of the 50 places, where people could be accommodated, were checked for suitability for housing, and when they were pointed out to them that most of them had no water, they said, “We don’t care about that problem, it’s better if you tell us the total number of places where the population can live and the total amount of estimated costs you have set”. Some used the land management campaign to take revenge on their arch-rivals, by deliberately locating them in the most unfavourable places [10; 187].

In general, resettlement in Karkaraly district is not the result of consistent government policy, but rather reflects an attempt to implement political plans in the face of institutional incompetence, resource scarcity and administrative constraints. Systematic management errors and disregard for local conditions led to the population largely withdrawing from the resettlement project and settling down. These factors not only brought the resettlement campaign to a standstill, but also laid the foundations for the mass famine of 1932–1933 and the socio-economic crisis in a number of areas.

### *Discussion*

The scientific community has drawn several conclusions about the process of sedentarization of the Kazakhs. Researchers have assessed both the extent and methods of the implementation of the sedentarization campaign and its socio-economic consequences in different ways. In Soviet historiography, the processes associated with the agrarian changes in the Kazakh steppe were viewed from the positive side in accordance with ideology and evaluated as a legal phenomenon [11–13]. Even in the official documents of the Soviet authorities of that time (reports, letters of instruction, resolutions, orders, etc.), the transition of the Kazakhs to sedentarization was seen as a great achievement of Soviet power in Kazakhstan in the policy of the nation, which opened up opportunities for raising the cultural level of the Kazakhs and had a great economic effect. Traditional agriculture was also regarded as a progressive and objectively necessary stage of modernisation [14; 1–5, 22]. In the post-Soviet period, however, these positions began to be revised.

Since the 1990s, local researchers have begun to look at the processes of agricultural modernisation in the 1920s and 30s from a new perspective. T. Omarbekov, for example, noted that “the Union government did not attach much importance to the process of sedentarization in Kazakhstan. For the Soviet administration, there was nothing more important in those years than the collectivisation of the peasants. However, sedentarization remained under the guise of this collectivisation and was seen as a secondary campaign, as an obligation. It accelerated the exodus of the Kazakh people from their ancestral settlements, brought them into the slump, and led to famines and made them refugees” [15; 235, 246]. Zh. Abylkhozhin notes that the policy of agricultural resettlement, which was accompanied by collectivisation, was carried out by force and was not based on a natural, material and technological basis [16; 151]. According to Abylkhozhin Zh.B., the main factor in the transition of the Kazakhs to sedentarization — the ratio between the number of animals and the area of pastures — is not taken into account. From this it is concluded that the huge concentration of livestock on small pastures led to the end of foraging, and the acceleration of the resettlement policy was associated with the problem of grain [3].

In the works of national researchers published in the 2000s, the process of sedentarization was explained by the fact that “forced sedentarization, carried out without taking into account the economic, social and national characteristics of Kazakhstan, led the Kazakh people into the flee “Kyzyl-taban”, abandoned their ancestral settlements, suffered famines” [17; 34] and “without a comprehensive study, the policy aimed at destroying the traditional economy and customs of the indigenous population, together with failure, led to the nomadic population, in order to survive, being forced to flee and leave their homeland to save their lives” [18; 60] — the given assessment demonstrates the serious consequences of the sedentarization process.

Foreign studies have developed various approaches to the problem of sedentarization of the Kazakhs. For example, the British historian R. Conquest points out in his work *The Harvest of Sorrow*, published at the end of the 1980s, that the campaign to convert the Kazakh population to a sedentary lifestyle was an integral part of the collectivisation policy. In his opinion, the decision to adopt a sedentary lifestyle is considered a “necessary condition” for the successful implementation of collectivisation in Kazakhstan within the framework of the political and ideological tasks of the Organizational Bureau of the Central Committee, noting that the process of transition to sedentarization was carried out using the method of coercion as a necessary measure. At the same time, R. Conquest notes that the large-scale plans for sedentarization did not correspond to the actual resource, organisational and climatic conditions in the districts, and provides data on the lack of housing, infrastructure, water resources and agricultural equipment [19; 288–291].

Matthew Payne emphasises the violent nature of the campaign, and believes that resettlement contributed directly to the Famine of 1931–1933, as it was accompanied by the sharing of livestock and the destruction of the nomadic structure [20; 87].

Scholars R. Davies and S. Wheatcroft, who have studied the history of the economy in the Soviet Union, in their book *The Years of Hunger: Soviet Agriculture, 1931–1933*, point to the resettlement of the Kazakh population as one of the five interrelated factors that caused the famine in the Kazakh steppe. They note that sedentarization was accompanied by a collectivist campaign [21; 329–332].

Isabelle Ogion, author of an extensive work on sedentarization, considers that the first phase of the transition to a sedentary way of life, accompanied by collectivisation in 1929–1930, was full of confrontations and very hard [22; 159].

Meanwhile, Robert Kindler noted that “the sedentarization campaign was largely used to disguise interests that had nothing to do with the welfare of the nomads. Referring to this campaign, they managed to simplify the plan for the preparation of grain, meat, or in the event of failure to fulfil the plan they referred to it as an excuse. The campaign was conducted only on paper or was limited to the pursuit of people on desolate land in dilapidated old houses and stinking dugouts” [10; 196].

According to the Italian researcher N. Pianciola, the sedentarization campaign was carried out very slowly, more slowly than the collectivisation and preparatory campaigns. According to him, during his work in the Party and State Archives in Moscow, and Almaty, as well as in the regional and district archives of Kazakhstan, he did not find a single document that could prove the forced sedentarization of the nomadic Kazakhs. Even access to the OGPU archives does not change the situation. “Obviously, the transition of nomads to sedentarization was a low-priority campaign for the Stalinist system, and in the chaos of the first five-year plan, the Kazakhstan administration did not take this issue seriously” — that was his conclusion [20; 86–88].

Thus, historiographically, two different views on the process of transition to sedentarization have emerged among researchers. According to the first view, the resettlement was carried out by force (Zh. Abylkhozhin, R. Conquest, I. Ohayon), representatives of the second view (T. Omarbekov, R. Kindler, N. Pianciola) estimate that it was a secondary campaign and was implemented on paper. In our opinion, the resettlement policy was an integral part of a bundle of measures that accompanied collectivisation and had an agitational character. At the same time, the authorities, who did not understand the basics of nomadic agriculture and the natural and climatic conditions, made a number of mistakes in the process of resettlement. The result of all this was the collapse of livestock farming and the starvation of the population.

### *Conclusion*

Considering the implementation of the resettlement policy in the late 1920s–1930s, we came to the following conclusions:

- the process of transition to sedentarization has been considered in research in the context of the famine of the 1930s;
- researchers have different assessments of the extent and methods of implementation of the resettlement campaign;
- in Soviet studies, agrarian changes were viewed from a positive perspective and evaluated as a legal phenomenon;
- since 1990, national researchers have begun to look at the processes of agricultural modernisation in the 1930s from a new perspective;
- historiographically, researchers have developed two different views on the process of transition to a sedentary way of life: the first, when the transition to sedentarization was forced (Zh. Abylkhozhin, R. Conquest, I. Ohayon), the second is that the representatives of this approach (T. Omarbekov, R. Kindler, N. Pianciola) evaluated it as implemented on paper;
- the nomadic Kazakhs resisted the state's order to increase grain production; the main way out of this situation was the need for rapid, forced sedentarization;
- at the VII Congress of the Soviets of Kazakhstan (April 1929), the issue of resettling the Kazakh people in the settlement area was declared the first task to be given special attention;
- after the Congress, a policy was introduced to increase the arable land in the remote regions, including the Central Kazakhstan region;
- as the territory of Central Kazakhstan consists mainly of steppe and semi-desert, the local climatic, geographical, and economic characteristics are not taken into account when settling in the region;
- in some areas of Central Kazakhstan, the process of resettlement was carried out to supply industrial cities, such as Karaganda and Balkhash, with agricultural products;
- since the territory of Central Kazakhstan consists mainly of steppe and semi-desert, there are disadvantages to resettlement in this region;
- the policy of sedentarization in the region was carried out with administrative, economic and managerial force;
- there are deficiencies in planning, organisation, irrigation, construction, harvesting, and awareness raising in the region, including Karkaraly district;
- there were no institutional, social, or infrastructural preparations for the transformation of the traditional economy.

### *References*

- 1 Сактаганова З.Г. «Ашаршылық — Великий джунт» 1931-1933 гг. в Центральном Казахстане: к постановке проблемы / З.Г. Сактаганова // Вестник Карагандинского университета. Серия История. Философия. — 2021. — № 2. — С. 117–128.
- 2 Насильственная коллективизация и голод в Казахстане 1931–1933 гг.: сб. док. и материалов. — Алматы: Фонд «XXI век», 1998. — 263 с.
- 3 Абылхожин Ж.Б. Традиционная структура Казахстана. Социально-экономические аспекты функционирования и трансформации (1920–1930-е гг.) / Ж.Б. Абылхожин. — Алма-Ата: Ғылым, 1991. — 240 с.
- 4 Рыскулов Т. Докладная записка в ЦК ВКП (б) И.В. Сталину, копия: в сельхоз отдел ЦК ВКП (б) Л.М. Кагановичу и СНК СССР В.М. Молотову / Т. Рыскулов // Собр. соч. — Алматы, 2009. — Т. 3. — С. 323.
- 5 Қарағанды облысының Мемлекеттік архиві (әрі қарай ҚОМА). — 640-к. — 4-т. — 606-іс. — 1-4-п.

- 6 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.13. Государственные акты и документы по насильственной коллективизации, принудительному оседанию, заготовительным и другим политическим кампаниям. Сборник документов и материалов. Сост. тома: Е.А. Әбіл, С.А. Жакишева, М.М. Козыбаева, А.М. Смагулова. — Астана, 2022. — 296 с.
- 7 Қазақстан Республикасы Президентінің архиві (әрі қарай — ҚР ПА). — 719-қ. — 2-т. — 125-іс. — 181-п.
- 8 Ашаршылық. Голод. 1928-1934. Документальная хроника. Сб. док. / Отв. редактор Б. Әбдіғалиұлы. — Алматы, Атамұра, 2021. — Т. 2.: 1932-1934. — 1240 с.
- 9 Қазақстан Республикасының Орталық мемлекеттік архиві. — 30С-қ. — 7С-т. — 108-іс. — 67-74-п.
- 10 Киндлер Р. Сталиндік көшпенділер. Қазақстан билігі және ашаршылық / Р. Киндлер; ауд. Ө. Ахмет. — Астана: Фолиант, 2023. — 432 б.
- 11 Дахшлейгер Г.Ф. Из опыта истории оседания казахских кочевых и полукочевых хозяйств (до массовой коллективизации) [Электронный ресурс] / Г.Ф. Дахшлейгер. — Режим доступа: [https://docs.yandex.kz/docs/view?tm=1749143752&tld=kz&lang=ru&name=eoarchive\\_1966\\_4\\_003\\_dakhshleiger](https://docs.yandex.kz/docs/view?tm=1749143752&tld=kz&lang=ru&name=eoarchive_1966_4_003_dakhshleiger)
- 12 Дахшлейгер Г.Ф. История крестьянства Советского Казахстана / Г.Ф. Дахшлейгер, К.Н. Нурпеисов. — Алма-Ата: Наука, 1985. — 247 с.
- 13 Турсынбаев А.Б. Победа колхозного строя в Казахстане / А.Б. Турсынбаев. — Алма-Ата: Казгосиздат, 1957. — 326 с.
- 14 ҚР ПА. — 141-қ. — 1-т. — 2896-іс. — 1-5, 22-п.
- 15 Омарбеков Т. 20-30 жылдардағы Қазақстан қасіреті: көмекші оқу құралы / Т. Омарбеков. — Алматы: Санат, 1997. — 320 б.
- 16 Абылхожин Ж.Б. Очерки социально-экономической истории Казахстана. XX век / Ж.Б. Абылхожин. — Алматы, Университет Туран, 1997. — 360 с.
- 17 Мұхатова О. Қазақстандағы XX ғасырдың 20-90 жылдарындағы аграрлық өзгерістер тарихнамасы / О. Мұхатова. — Алматы: Ғылым, 1999. — 177 б.
- 18 Таңатарова Ж.Т. Қазақстанның Батыс аймағындағы күштеп отырықшыландыру және оның ауыр зардаптары (1930-1937) / Ж.Т. Таңатарова. — Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 2000. — 186 б.
- 19 Конквест Р. Жатва скорби: советская коллективизация и террор голодом [Электронный ресурс] / Р. Конквест; пер. с англ. И. Коэн, Н. Май; под. ред. Хейфеда. — Режим доступа: [http://sd-inform.org/upload/books/Antitotalitarism/Repressii/zhatva\\_skorbi.pdf](http://sd-inform.org/upload/books/Antitotalitarism/Repressii/zhatva_skorbi.pdf).
- 20 Пианчола Н. Сталинская «иерархия потребления» и великий голод [Электронный ресурс] / Н. Пианчола. — Режим доступа: <https://www.academia.edu/37560126/> (Дата обращения: 23.12.2024)
- 21 Дэвис Р. Годы голода. Сельское хозяйство СССР. 1931–1933 / Р. Дэвис, С. Уиткрофт. — М., 2011. — 543 с.
- 22 Огайон И. Седентаризация казахов СССР при Сталине. Коллективизация и социальные изменения(1928–1945 гг.) / И. Огайон. — Алма-Ата: Санат, 2009. — 368 с.

З.Г. Сактаганова, Т.Қ. Сақабай

### 1930 жылдардағы Орталық Қазақстан қазақтарын отырықшылыққа көшіру мәселесі

Мақалада 1930 жылдардағы Орталық Қазақстанда жүзеге асырылған күштеп отырықшыландыру саясатының ерекшеліктері мен салдары қарастырылған. Отырықшылыққа көшіру үдерісі байларды тәркілеу, ұжымдастыру, ауылшаруашылығы өнімдерін дайындау сияқты саяси-шаруашылық науқандармен бірге жүріп, қазақ халқының шаруашылық өмірінде түбегейлі өзгерістерге алып келген болатын. Кеңестік билік көшпелі қазақ халқын отырықшылыққа көшіруді экономикалық қайта құру мен идеологиялық қалыптастырудың құрамдас бөлігі ретінде қарастырды. Алайда, бұл үдеріс көбіне табиғи-географиялық жағдайлар мен жергілікті халықтың тұрмыс-салты ескерілмей, әкімшілік бұйрық арқылы жүргізілді. Авторлар отырықшылыққа көшіру үдерісінің жүзеге асырудың ауқымы мен әдістерін, оның әлеуметтік-экономикалық салдары бойынша ғылыми зерттеулерде қалыптасқан көзқарастар мен тұжырымдарын зерделеген. Сонымен қатар архивтік құжаттарға сүйене отырып, мақалада отырықшыландырудың Орталық Қазақстан өңірінде іске асырылуын деректер арқылы сипаттайды. Отырықшыландырудың жүзеге асырылуындағы қоныстандыру орындарының дұрыс таңдалмауы, су көздерінің тапшылығы, егістік пен шабындық жерлердің жеткіліксіздігі, инфрақұрылым мен құрылыс материалдарының болмауы, халық арасында алдын ала түсіндіру жұмыстарының жүргізілмеуі т.б. жіберілген кемшіліктер туралы айтылған. Осы зерттеуде бұл саясаттың кеңестік индустриализациямен байланысы да қарастырылған. Аймақта дамып келе жатқан түсті металлургия орталықтарын азық-түлікпен қамтамасыз ету үшін оазистік үлгідегі ауыл шаруашылық базаларын құру міндеті болғанын көрсетеді. Мақалада архивтік құжаттар негізінде

күштеп отырықшылыққа көшіру сияқты кеңестік жаңғыртудың қазақ даласындағы салдары зерделеніп, түсіндірілген.

*Кілт сөздер:* отырықшылыққа көшіру саясаты, Орталық Қазақстан, ашаршылық, модернизациялау, ауыл шаруашылығы, отырықшылыққа көшіру үдерісі, көшпелі қоғам.

З.Г. Сактаганова, Т.Қ. Сақабай

## Проблема оседания казахов Центрального Казахстана в 1930-е годы

В статье рассматриваются особенности проведения и последствия политики насильственного оседания в Центральном Казахстане в 1930-е годы. Перевод кочевого населения на оседлый образ жизни осуществлялся параллельно с ключевыми политико-хозяйственными кампаниями советской власти — конфискацией имущества баев, коллективизацией и заготовкой сельскохозяйственной продукции. Эти меры привели к коренным преобразованиям в хозяйственной жизни казахского народа. Советская власть рассматривала переход кочевого казахского народа к оседлому образу жизни как неотъемлемую составляющую экономической перестройки и идеологического переустройства. Однако этот процесс зачастую осуществлялся административными методами, без учета природно-географических условий и традиционного уклада жизни местного населения. Авторы рассматривают сложившиеся в научных исследованиях взгляды и выводы, касающиеся масштабов и методов перевода на оседлый образ жизни, а также его социально-экономических последствий. Кроме того, опираясь на архивные документы, статья с использованием фактических данных описывает реализацию политики оседлости в Центральном Казахстане. Авторы обращают внимание на допущенные при осуществлении оседлости ошибки, такие как неправильный выбор мест для поселения, нехватка водных ресурсов, недостаток пахотных и сенокосных земель, отсутствие инфраструктуры и строительных материалов, а также недостаток предварительной разъяснительной работы среди населения и другие недочеты. Кроме того, в исследовании рассматривается взаимосвязь данной политики с советской индустриализацией. Отмечается, что одной из её задач было создание сельскохозяйственных баз оазисного типа для обеспечения продовольствием развивавшихся в регионе центров цветной металлургии. Кроме того, в статье, опираясь на архивные документы, изучаются и поясняются последствия насильственного перевода кочевого населения на оседлый образ жизни, который являлся одним из главных направлений советской модернизации казахской степи.

*Ключевые слова:* политика оседания, Центральный Казахстан, голод, модернизация, сельское хозяйство, кочевое общество, седентаризация.

### References

- 1 Saktaganova, Z.G. (2021). «Asharshylyq — Velikii dzhub» 1931–1933 gody v Tsentralnom Kazakhstane: k postanovke problemy [“Famine — Great jute” 1931–1933 in Central Kazakhstan: towards the formulation of the problem]. *Vestnik Karagandinskogo universiteta. Seriya Istorii. Filosofii — Bulletin of Karaganda University. History. Philosophy series*, 2, 117–128 [in Russian].
- 2 (1998). *Nasilstvennaia kollektivizatsiia i golod v Kazakhstane 1931–1933 gg.: sbornik dokumentov i materialov* [Forced collectivization and famine in Kazakhstan 1931–1933. Collection of documents and materials]. Almaty: Fond “XXI vek” [in Russian].
- 3 Abylkhozhin, Zh.B. (1991). *Traditsionnaia struktura Kazakhstana. Sotsialno-ekonomicheskie aspekty funktsionirovaniia i transformatsii (1920–1930-e gg.)* [The traditional structure of Kazakhstan: socio-economic aspects of functioning and transformation (1920s–1930s)]. Alma-Ata: Nauka [in Russian].
- 4 Ryskulov, T. (2009). *Dokladnaia zapiska v TsK VKP (b) I.V. Stalinu, kopiiia: v selkhozotdel TsK VKP (b) L.M. Kaganovichu i SNK SSSR V.M. Molotovu* [Memorandum to the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) to I.V. Stalin, copy: to the agricultural department of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) to L.M. Kaganovich and the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR to V.M. Molotov]. *Sobranie sochinenii — Collected works, Vol. 3*. Almaty [in Russian].
- 5 QO MA [The State Archives of the Karaganda region]. — 640-q. — 4-t. — 606-is. — 1–4-p [in Kazakh].
- 6 Abil, E.A., Zhakisheva, S.A., Kozybaeva, M.M., & Smagulova, A.M. (Comp.). (2022). *Saiasi qugyn-surgin qurbandaryn tolyq aqtau zhonindegі Memleketтік komissiiіnyn materialdary (XX gasyrdyn 20–50 zhyldary) = Materialy Gosudarstvennoi komissiiі po polnoi reabilitatsiiі zhertv politicheskikh repressiiі (20-50 gody XX veka)* [Materials of the State Commission for the Full Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repressions (20–50 years of the XX century)]. T. 13. *Gosudarstvennye akty i dokumenty po nasilstvennoi kollektivizatsii, prinuditelnomu osedaniiu, zagotovitelnyim i drugim politicheskim kampaniiam — Vol. 13. State acts and documents on forced collectivization, forced sedentarization, procurement and other political campaigns. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov — Collection of documents and materials*. Astana [in Kazakh, in Russian].
- 7 QR PA [The Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — 719-q. — 2-t. — 125-is. — 181-p. [in Kazakh].

- 8 (2021). Asharshylyq. Golod. 1928–1934. Dokumentalnaia khronika [Famine. 1928–1934. Documentary chronicle]. *Sbornik dokumentov — Collection of documents*. Vol. 2. 1932–1934. Almaty: Atamura [in Russian].
- 9 QR OMA [The Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — 30C-q. — 7C-t. — 108-is. — 67–74-p. [in Kazakh].
- 10 Kindler, R. (2023). Stalindik koshpendiler. Qazaqstan biligi zhane asharsylyq [Stalin's Nomads: Power and Famine in Kazakhstan]. (*O. Akhmet, Trans*). Astana: Foliant [in Kazakh].
- 11 Dakhshleiger, G.F. (1966). Iz opyta istorii osedaniia kazakhskikh kochevykh i polukochevykh khoziaistv (do massovoi kollektivizatsii) [From the experience of the sedentarization history of Kazakh nomadic and semi-nomadic farms (before mass collectivization)]. *docs.yandex.kz*. Retrieved from [https://docs.yandex.kz/docs/view?tm=1749143752&tld=kz&lang=ru&name=eoarchive\\_1966\\_4\\_003\\_dakhshleiger](https://docs.yandex.kz/docs/view?tm=1749143752&tld=kz&lang=ru&name=eoarchive_1966_4_003_dakhshleiger) [in Russian].
- 12 Dakhshleiger, G.F., & Nurpeisov, K.N. (1985). *Istoriia krestianstva Sovetskogo Kazakhstana* [The history of Christianity in Soviet Kazakhstan]. Alma-Ata: Nauka [in Russian].
- 13 Tursynbayev, A.B. (1957). *Pobeda kolkhoznogo stroia v Kazakhstane* [The victory of the collective farm system in Kazakhstan]. Alma-ata: Kazgosizdat [in Russian].
- 14 QR PA [The Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — 141-q. — 1-t. — 2896-is. — 1–5, 22-p. [in Kazakh].
- 15 Omarbekov, T. (1997). 20–30 zhyldardagy Qazaqstan qasireti [The tragedy of Kazakhstan in the 20–30s]. Almaty: Sanat [in Kazakh].
- 16 Abylkhozhin, Zh.B. (1997). *Ocherki sotsialno-ekonomicheskoi istorii Kazakhstana. XX vek* [Essays on the socio-economic history of Kazakhstan. The XX-century]. Almaty, Universitet Turan [in Russian].
- 17 Mukhatova, O. (1999). *Qazaqstandagy XX gasyrdyn 20–90 zhyldaryndagy agrarlyq ozgerister tarikhnamasy* [Historiography of agrarian changes in Kazakhstan in the 20–90s of the XX century]. Almaty: Gylym [in Kazakh].
- 18 Tanatarova, Zh.T. (2000). *Qazaqstannyn Batys aimagyndagy kushtep otyryqshylandyru zhane onyn auyr zardaptary (1930–1937)* [Forced sedentarization in the Western Region of Kazakhstan and its serious consequences (1930–1937)]. Almaty: Qazaq universiteti [in Kazakh].
- 19 Konkvest, R. *Zhatva skorbi: sovetkaia kollektivizatsiia i terror golodom* [Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and Terror by Famine]. (I. Koen, N. Mai, Trans). *sd-inform.org*. Retrieved from [http://sd-inform.org/upload/books/Antitotalitarizm/Repressii/zhatva\\_skorbi\\_.pdf](http://sd-inform.org/upload/books/Antitotalitarizm/Repressii/zhatva_skorbi_.pdf). [in Russian].
- 20 Pinciola, N. *Stalinskaia "ierarkhiia potrebleniia" i velikii golod* [Stalin's "hierarchy of consumption" and the Great Famine]. *www.academia.edu*. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/37560126/> [in Russian].
- 21 Devis, R., & Uitkroft, S. (2011). *Gody goloda. Selskoe khoziaistvo SSSR. 1931–1933* [Years of Hunger. Agriculture of the USSR. 1931–1933]. Moscow [in Russian].
- 22 Ohayon, I. (2009). *Sedentarizatsiia kazakhov SSSR pri Staline. Kollektivizatsiia i sotsialnye izmeneniia (1928–1945 gg.)* [Sedentarization of the Kazakh USSR under Stalin. Collectivization and social changes (1928–1945)]. Almaty: Sanat [in Russian].

#### Information about the authors

**Saktaganova Zauresh** — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor of the Department of Archaeology, Ethnology and National History, Head of the Centre for Ethnocultural and Historical-Anthropological Research, Karaganda National Research University named after academician Ye.A. Buketov, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5881-482X>

**Sakabay Tolkynay** — PhD student, Karaganda National Research University named after Ye.A. Buketov, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-0042-9168>