

ТАРИХ, ФИЛОСОФИЯ ЖӘНЕ ӘЛЕУМЕТТАНУ
ИСТОРИЯ, ФИЛОСОФИЯ И СОЦИОЛОГИЯ
HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY

SRSTI 03.20

SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS OF LAND POLICY IN WESTERN KAZAKHSTAN
(SECOND HALF OF XIX - BEGINNING OF XX CENTURIES)

YESSETOV N.Y.

K.Zhubanov Aktobe Regional State University, Aktobe, Kazakhstan

Аңдатпа: Бұл мақалада Батыс Қазақстандағы жер саясатының әлеметтік-экономикалық белгілері туралы айтылады. Ресейдің ішкі губерниялар халықтарының көп бөлігінің Батыс Қазақстанға қоныстануы, облыстағы қазақтардың дәстүрлі қоғамына кері әсерін тигізгені жөнінде сипатталады. Автор бұл мақалада, казак аулдарының шаруашылық айналымынан сулы, нулы шұрайлы жер аудандарын экспроприациялау барысын, уезд және болыстарды құру кезіндегі жасанды шекаралық аймақтарды жасау, одан бөлек, қазатардың арасындағы жер қатынастарын шиеленістірген және ғасырлар бойы қалыптасқан жер пайдалану жүйесін бұзған, көшпелі казак қоғамының қызмет ету механизмінің ерекшеліктерімен санаспау фактілерін де қатар қарастырған. Сонымен қатар, автор Торғай облысындағы отарлық әкімшілік қазақтардың кедейлену, жерсіз қалу нәтижесінде оларды эволюциялық-өркениетті жолмен емес керісінше зорлық-зомбылық әдістері арқылы отырықшылыққа ауыстыру әрекеттері туралы хабарлайды.

Кілт сөздер: аграрлық саясат, патша үкіметі, отарлық әкімшілік, жер құқықтары, жер даулары, жер қатынастары, жер пайдалану, қоныстанушы-шаруалар, жер учаскелер, жер телімдері.

Аннотация: В статье рассказывается о социально-экономических факторах земельной политики в Западном Казахстане. Описывается процесс переселения огромной массы населения из внутренних губерний России и ее разрушительное воздействие на традиционное общество казахов в области. Автор в статье рассматривает процесс экспроприации плодородных земельных площадей и водных источников из хозяйственного оборота казахских аулов, создания искусственных границ при образовании волостей и уездов, факты игнорирования специфики функционирования механизма кочевнического общества казахов которые в свою очередь значительно обострили земельные отношения среди самих казахов и нарушили веками устоявшуюся систему землепользования. Кроме того, автор сообщает о колониальной администрации в Тургайской области, которая вследствие безысходности, обнищания и обезземеливания казахов пыталась перевести их на оседлость не эволюционно-цивилизованным путем, а насильственными методами.

Ключевые слова: аграрная политика, царское правительство, колониальная администрация, поземельное право, поземельные споры, землеотношения, землепользование, крестьяне-переселенцы, земельные участки, земельные наделы.

Annotation: The resettlement of huge masses of inhabitants from the internal provinces of Russia had a devastating impact on the traditional Kazakh society in the region. The expropriation of fertile land areas and water sources from the economic turnover of Kazakh villages, the creation of artificial borders in the formation of parishes and counties moreover the willful ignorance concerning the mechanisms of nomadic Kazakh society, significantly aggravated land relations among the Kazakhs themselves and violated the land use system that had been established for

centuries. The colonial administration in the Turgay district wanted to transfer the Kazakhs to settled not by evolution, in a civilized way, but by violent means owing to the hopelessness, impoverishment and lack of land.

Key words: centuries. The colonial administration in the Turgay district wanted to transfer the Kazakhs to settled not by evolution, in a civilized way, but by violent means owing to the hopelessness, impoverishment and lack of land.

One of the most important obstacles for the largely peaceful development of the economy among the Kazakh nomads of the region, were disputes over borders between parishes and between the auls and clans. The procedure for resolving land disputes was determined in §§ 214, 215 and 216 of the “Provision”. [1, 460 p.] In particular, the distribution of winter camps between kibite owners, i.e. the whole domestic economy of aul societies was provided to aul assemblies of elective and parish congresses. Consequently, the electors who run for the parish ruler and the aul elders enjoyed the enormous power of the peremptory decision-making on the distribution of winter quarters and land issues.

The parish electoral changed or affirmed the boundaries between the wintering villages, but the “foremen” could, at their discretion, modify the possessions of an individual, i.e. influence the financial situation of each Kazakh. And since the “foremen” were fully subordinate to the parish ruler, the latter became the real ruler and distributor for all land affairs.

The land rights of both the aul societies as a whole and the individual kibite owners were not clearly defined, since the wintering grounds were not separated from the rest of the land space which was in common ownership. Even more uncertainty was the use of summering (jailau), where the common rights of the Kazakhs - not only from different societies, parishes and counties - but even regions, clashed.

The order of use of pastures was determined solely by national custom. Meanwhile, with the influx of immigrants, the development of residency and agriculture inevitably collided with the emerging new conditions of life. Thus, for 8 years since the introduction of the “Provisional position” in the Turgai region, 26 “crimes” involving 155 people [2, 80 p.] were committed by the Kazakhs because of wintering, haymaking and watering.

Disputes due to the lack of precisely established boundaries between individual parishes as land consolidation tightened, occurred until the beginning of the First World War. So, in 1906, a conflict arose between the Tusunskaya and Chubalanskaya parishes of the Turgai district. Only after two weeks of negotiations, and as a result of the efforts of Korganbek Beremzhanov, was the border set between the mentioned parishes at the Kara-Takyr tract, which caused the actual dispute [3, p.17]. However, it was not always possible to reach such a quick ‘sweetheart’ agreement. In the conditions of land closeness, disputes covered every tract and every water source. Conflicts

between the Kazakhs because of land began to get protracted. Thus, negotiations on the provision of summer houses and winter camps of landless Kazakhs in the Kabyrginsky parish of the Irgiz district lasted more than 12 years.

For many years, negotiations were under way to resolve the conflict between the Kazakhs of Turgai district and those who were joining here for the summer, and sometimes the binge people to spend the winter here in the Sarysu district of the Akmola region. A land dispute between the Kazakhs of the two counties was considered at the extraordinary congress of electives in May 1872. No agreement was reached. Aware of the failure of the extraordinary congress, Governor-General of Western Siberia A. P. Khrushchev entered the Ministry of Internal Affairs with the proposal: a) for the passage of the Sarysu Kazakhs to the summer migrations to the Ishim River and back to designate a free strip of land within the Turgai district; b) 255 tent holders of Aktaz-Badan-Seit volost of Sarysu district, whose winter camps were located in the territory of Turgai district, be counted in this district [4, pp.122-123]. The proposal was not accepted by the Kazakhs of the Turgai district, since they did not see any advantage in moving 255 kibite owners onto their light pastures. Moreover, the Turgai district chief Yakovlev, according to a complaint from a Kazakh, Kozhenbaev, gave an order to the governor of Aktaz-Badan-Seit parish about wiping out winter places with the same people in the Aschily-Kuygal tract, belonging to the Kazakhs of the Turgai district, and also leaving them for the future not to come within the county entrusted to him” [5, p.138].

All this testifies to the ineffectiveness of the royal administrative reforms and the work of its colonial apparatus in eliminating the consequences generated by these reforms themselves. As a result, not finding other ways to resolve the land dispute between the Kazakhs of the Turgai and Sarysu districts, on October 7, 1874, the Orenburg Governor-General N.A. Kryzhanovsky ordered the military governor of the Turgai region to: a) “to designate with distinctive signs the highest approved border of one and the other region”; b) “to completely ban the Kirghiz people of the Turgai region from moving both for the summer and for the winter to the limits of the Siberian steppe, and to the Horde people of the Siberian department to move into the limits of the Turgai region; c) “to bring the Kirgiz guilty in the destruction of the signs indicating the border, or in the unauthorized crossings for the said border, to the court, according to the general criminal laws”; d) “to expel the Kirghiz of the Sarysu district, which have improperly arranged their winter quarters in the Turgai district, to the borders of the parishes to which they belong [6, p.142].

The Minister of Internal Affairs, whom N. Kryzhanovsky notified about his decision on the issue of force, showed complete ignorance in geography and understanding of the specifics of the nomadic economy. Supporting the instructions of the Orenburg Governor-General, he added: “The

land dispute explained is not so much due to the real need for Baganaly residents on their way through the territory of Turgai district for passing to the summer camps to the Ishim River, however resulting in erratic invasions of the Horde in foreign territories, damage to grassland and pasture areas and inconclusive disputes and complaints” [7, p.143].

The instruction to take administrative and police measures to stop the “indiscriminate invasions of the Horde in foreign territories” was given by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Governor-General of Western Siberia A. P. Khrushchev [8, pp.147-148]. So "clumsily" were the attempts by the royal government to solve the problems of nomadic economy, the creation of new administrative borders between parishes, counties and regions resulted in increased tension and aggravation.

Many villages from the Ural region arrived to the Turgai district annually for summering. So, in 1899 about 5100 tents with 232,825 cattle belonging to them were brought here. The usual places of their migrations in the Turgai region were the parishes: Aktyubinsk, Karahobdinsk, Karatugai, Uysylnarın, Bestamak, Khobdinsk, Tuztobinsk and Iletsk[9, p.133].

Neglecting or incomplete accounting for the number of Kazakh auls from the Urals region and the periods of their habitation that migrated to Turgai district in these parishes became another source of conflict situation regarding land use.

One more contradiction, previously unknown to him, was introduced into the traditional Kazakh society by the “Provisional”, and then by the “Steppe position”. In particular, the question of renting land plots among the Kazakhs themselves remained unanswered and unexplained. So, in the summer of 1885, a dispute arose between the residents of Iletsk district — the heirs of RyspaiKaradosov and NurpeisBayganin because of the lease of the haymaking site. At the request of the county chief, the Turgay regional government had to look for an answer to the question of whether the Kazakhs have the right to lease the land plots set aside for their use by electoral assemblies [10, p.59].

In resolving this issue, the regional government relied on the following instructions of the Temporary Situation: a) “the lands occupied by the Kyrgyz nomad camps are state-owned and are only provided for public use by the Kyrgyz” (§ 210); b) The allocation of land, called winter camps (§ 212) and usually containing hay fields, is proportional to the size of the farm and the number of cattle (§§ 213, 215, 216); c) “Land occupied by outbuildings in the area entered into the use of each Kirghiz is transferred to hereditary use, as long as there are buildings; with the destruction of these lands they are returned to society” (§ 217). [11, p. 460]

The tragic consequences of the tsarist agrarian policy particularly affected the Kazakhs of the Turgai district, who had previously lived in the New Linear region. As is known, in art. 120 of the steppe position of 1891, it was stated: “The lands occupied by the nomads are left in the indefinite

public use of the nomads, on the basis of the customs and rules of this Provision. But the effect of this article did not extend to the Kazakhs of the Turgai district, who were wandering on the lands of the New Linear region of the Orenburg Cossack army [12, p.103].

For clarity, we will make some digression. In 1865, in order to further consolidate the colonial order, the Orenburg line, called the New Linear Region, was carried out in the steppe. The line was attributed to the lands occupied by the Orenburg Cossack army, and the Kazakhs who wandered in the area (hence the name: regional Kazakhs) were supposed to be gradually evicted beyond the line of the new line. It turned out, however, that this led to the oppression of the Trans-Ural Kazakhs, so it was decided to abandon the “deportation” of the Kazakhs in the New Linear area and they were allowed to arrange dwellings for wintering there and in the summer to wander ahead of the line. Such uncertainty in land use required the adoption of more specific measures, that the Cossacks especially insisted on and which was adjusted to oust the Kazakhs from their native places. Yielding to the pressure of the Orenburg Cossack army, the State Council, by its decision of May 23, 1878, took from 800 thousand to 1 million dessiatinas to the Kazakhs living in the New Linear region, assigning a withdrawal to the border of the Kazakh steppe”).

To compile detailed grounds for resettlement to a new district, commissions were seconded: in 1879 under the chairmanship of Actual State Counselor Lukoshin and in 1891 under the chairmanship of the Counselor Turgay of the regional government I.I. Kraft. The first commission found a piece of land indicated by the army commanders completely inadequate for arranging the life of the Kazakhs. The second commission drew up a detailed plan for the distribution of the aforementioned area among the Kazakhs in the above-mentioned upper commanded norm of the quota of 145 acres of convenient land.

But since the military authorities indicated caravan roads and unsuitable land for the farms as part of the allocation to the Kazakhs, it was impossible to arrange all the regional Kazakhs with the above settlement. In addition, from the same site, access (passage or nomadic routes) had to be allocated to the Trans-Ural steppe for the summer migrations of the Kazakhs.

Despite this agreement, the Orenburg Cossack army adhered to the course of the complete ousting of the Kazakhs from the New linear region; Cossacks raided Kazakh auls. Both the board of the Orenburg Cossack army and the Turgay regional government constantly received complaints of oppression perpetrated by the Cossacks. For example, a representative from the Kazakhs of the aul number 2 of the Chubar parish of the Kustanai district, Irmankul Yarmukhamedov. In the complaint addressed to the military governor of the Turgai region in July 1898, it detailed the systematic invasions carried out by the Cossacks on the village of Kateninsky in their winter camps. The latter forcibly used land plots attributed to the use of the inhabitants of the Chubarsky parish according to

the results of the 1894 demarcation. The military governor of the region, transmitting the petition of I. Yarmukhamedov, a copy of the attendance journal of the Military Economic Administration of August 11, 1898 and a copy of the announcement of the Turgai Cloud Administration of August 27 of the same year, indicated that the documents of the settlement of Kateninsky[13, p.8].

Often, the confusion in land use between the Orenburg Cossack army and the Turgai region was caused by the lack of precise, delineated boundaries of the “million withdrawal”. The law of May 23, 1878 on the location of the Kazakhs in the New Linear region within the "million withdrawal" was enforced according to the regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers approved on May 39, 1898. The order and time of resettlement for the allotted “million withdrawal”, according to the results of the disengagement, were to be determined by mutual agreement of the Turgai regional and Orenburg economic boards. Separation of the millionth allotment was accompanied by correspondences to changes in the boundaries of the Orenburg province and the Turgai region, which also led to frequent land disputes between the Russian villages of the province and the Kazakhs of the Turgai region. Thus, in March 1907, a meeting of the Trinity District Court was held, which examined the case of the Kazakhs of village number 6 of the Saroy volost of Kustanai district to the peasants of the Orenburg province SpiridonKutsyuk and others, among 27 people, who had arbitrarily relocated in 1906 to the territory of “a million withdrawal ”.

In general, the agrarian policy of the tsarist government in the region was aimed at settling its land suitable for agriculture by the Slavic population by displacing the indigenous people to desert and semi-desert areas. The demographic map of the settlement of Russians and Kazakhs subsequently began to reflect more and more the designs of the pioneers of the tsarist colonial strategy. The Slavs were torn, first of all, in Kustanai and Aktobe counties, where black soil prevailed. Soil fertility decreased from north to south and, respectively, the two southern districts of Turgai and Irgiz, according to soil and climatic conditions, were suitable only for cattle breeding. In the southern parts, these two counties represented completely waterless and barren spaces, where even the herding of cattle was impossible. Accordingly, with the climatic conditions, the indigenous population and the non-native foreigners gradually settled down.

The former became outcasts on their own land; enduring the land shortage for livestock management, they increasingly built winter camps in Turgai and Irgiz counties, and the latter concentrated in the north - Aktobe and Kostanay counties. In the North, on the pathways of traditional wandering in the summer heat now stood Russian villages. Wintering and their crops, which violated the former system of wandering, became a source of continuous conflicts. The desperate picture of the situation in which the indigenous population of the region found itself already at the end of the 19th century is described in official documents as follows: “And only

nomads who have fully adapted with their herds to the surrounding nature can live in these barren steppes. The southern half of Irgiz district (6 parishes) is not touched by the plow at all, in the Turgai district there are plowing, although very rarely, up to the southern border, but also in areas chosen from the vast area of the southern half of the county and used artificial irrigations, which require large expenditures of labor and time, crops are completely burned by summer heat and farmers do not collect any grain from the arable land” [14, p.2].

A direct consequence of the Tsarist resettlement policy was the massive deprivation of the Kazakhs. It forced the population, in turn, to move to a settled way of life and engage in agriculture, which was possible mainly in the northern districts that were occupied by Russian immigrants.

In 1912, almost one million people lived in the Turgay district, of which the first half consisted of immigrants who “settled in new places” taken from the indigenous population. “The other half — the natives — the Kirghiz,” wrote military governor M. Eversman to the tsar, were “knocked out by relocation from the general rut of their nomadic life and had begun to experience the difficult transition from shepherding to sedentary agricultural life” [15, p.42].

The government supported the transfer of the Kazakhs to settled life and this was presented as concern for him. However, the cunning idea of the colonialists was different. This was stated in the Orenburg leaflet as follows: “In this way, the government seeks to select the fertile lands of the Kirghiz. His intention to replace herding with grassland in the steppe conditions is unlimited arbitrariness in relation to the local population” [16].

The military governor of the region, Ya. Barabash, wrote: “The only way to force the nomads to go to settlement is to strengthen the Russian colonization in the Kyrgyz steppe and the withdrawal of all land suitable for farming from the Kirghiz” [17, p.4].

The need for land among immigrants grew and as the number of cattle increased. If in 1906 peasant farms had 157,140 heads of cattle, in 1916 their number reached 986,360 heads [18, p.58]. In addition, cattle-breeding plots began to be created, for which land was now selected in Irgiz and Turgai districts.

In response to the Kazakhs' complaints, the Turgai military governor gave the following telegram: “Favor to inform them that all their resistance to the work of the resettlement parties will be suppressed by force” [19, p.59].

Landlessness of the Kazakhs became a mass phenomenon, in connection with this, the authorities had to deal with the issue of the organization of the Kazakhs on the ground. To this they were forced by the aggravated relations of the Kazakh villages with resettlement villages, mutual conflicts and armed clashes, and theft of cattle. At the same time, the resistance of the Kazakhs to the resettlement policy began to take on an organized character.

The colonial administration did not want to land the Kazakhs, especially in the black earth Aktyubinsk and Kustanai districts. They were needed by Russian settlers.

Even the partial allotment of land at the settled rate, the Kazakhs who wished to engage in agriculture, the regional government, was considered to be also accompanied by many "insurmountable difficulties". By that time, the number of Kazakhs who became impoverished, owning insignificant livestock and, accordingly, limited land was already weighty. Statistical surveys of Aktobe district showed that Kazakhs, who owned 10 livestock heads, including 5 horses, accounted for 76 percent of the total county population. It was more profitable for them to get a certain plot, at least according to the agricultural norm. But the regional administration, under the pretext of their inability to independently conduct agricultural work, refused to allocate land to such Kazakhs.

This decision of the regional government, which is distinguished by extreme cynicism and hypocrisy, both in its essence and arguments, reflected the reluctance of the colonial administration in the land system of the Kazakhs, who were trying to save at least 10-15 acres. The Kazakhs, deprived of livestock and pastures, appealed to the regional administration with a request to allocate them with land for the transition to agriculture. According to the data of the Migration Administration, the number of such requests for 1906-1907 amounted to 6400 applications in Aktobe district, Kustanaisk– 4700 [20, p.66].

Acceleration of the process of landlessness and transition to settled life took place in those areas that have undergone intensive colonization. So, another expedition Shcherbina found out that in Kustanai district more than 77 percent of Kazakh farms were engaged in farming with 4 acres sown per tent, in Aktobe - 94 percent on average 5-6 acres per farm. This meant that the land plots of the Kazakhs who had settled down to life were tiny compared to the land plots of immigrants. When setting up Russian settlements, several norms of per capita holdings were made: 10, 12, and 14 acres. With 3 men's souls, the land allotment was from 30 to 45 acres per family, of which convenient land in Kustanai district per capita accounted for 13.8 acres, and in Aktyubinsk - 12.3 acres. In 1914, among the Kazakhs, who led a nomadic and semi-nomadic way of life, from 70 to 150 acres, mostly of desert and semi-desert land, were used per tent [41, p.7]. However, this average indicator of the land plot of this category of the population, indicated in official documents, does not always give a correct idea, because as a result of repeated studies, cuts and unauthorized seizures, the land area at the disposal of one tent was reduced in Aktobe district to 27-168 acres, Kustanai district - 27-40 acres, Turgai - 130 acres [22, p.102].

The fate of the indigenous population did not concern the tsarist government and its colonial satraps, officials, and migrant organizations. The latter openly declared "it is enough for the Kazakhs

to leave, like gnawed bones on saline lands - there let them do what they want. If they want - let them live, if they do not want - let everything die out" [23, p.150].

The process of settling the Kazakhs and their transition to sedentary has been studied in sufficient detail in Russian historiography, however, unreasonably focusing on the "progressive" aspects of the problem, they do not pay attention to the issue of farming culture among immigrants. Extensive farming practices that prevailed among the immigrants did not promote respect for the economic object; as a result, they needed more and more virgin lands suitable for arable farming. Military governors have repeatedly reported to St. Petersburg: "Unfortunately, not all immigrants settled in the area. Some of them, having failed from their first sowing, abandoned the land the next year and many in two or three years" [24, p.38 ob].

Among the reasons for the instability of the resettlement farm, the governor M. Eversman called them a weak economic situation, huge debts, reaching up to 400 rubles or more per yard, and extremely difficult conditions of local agriculture. The welfare of the resettlement villages depended mainly on the presence of large areas of virgin lands, from which they plowed up only the best plots, changing them in three or four years to new ones. Constant needs of this kind led to the capture of not only summer camps by migrants, but also the place of winter camps of the Kazakhs. In addition, the specific nature of the climatic conditions of the region required special techniques for processing the fields, but they were completely unfamiliar, admits Eversman, to most of the people from the internal provinces of Russia, who are used to other conditions of the field economy.

In accordance with the "Instruction on the procedure for determining the land fund in the regions of Akmola, Semirechensk, Turgai, Ural for resettlement, as well as for state needs" approved by the Council of Ministers on June 9, 1909, land plots were assigned, on the same grounds as immigrants, with a calculation of no more than 15 acres per capita, to all those Kazakhs who wished to receive a settled land plot [25, 134 p.].

The Kazakhs tried to have at least a piece of land at their disposal. The "Observation of the Turgai Region for 1914" stated: "The motives for the Kyrgyz going to a settled position in the reporting year (1914 - Wed.) were ... mainly the desire to have land with more permanent rights and within more defined boundaries" [26, 132 p.]. In 1914, 6,623 kibiteowners of the Arakaragai, Ayat, and Chubar parishes of Kustanai district and Karahobdin parish of Aktobe district allocated 23 sites with a total area of 176396 acres. This means that for each family there were 26.6 acres of land. But virtually every tomb owner got 13-14 acres, since half of the allotted area was unsuitable for farming. In other words, the Kazakhs, transitioning to sedentary, were put in the worst economic conditions. The lands provided to the Kazakhs were mainly far from rivers and lakes, and settlers were forced to settled there for a long time.

However, not one Kazakh was sure that he could live permanently and keep farming in this designated area. He and his family could be resettled to another locality: a) if necessary, provide access to water for the formed resettlement villages and, in general, to ensure the settlements in water terms ” b) in order to eliminate through the lanes between the resettlement areas and lands in the use of the Kazakhs [27, 132 p.].

In the development of the Instruction of June 9, 1909 in the Turgai regional administration, a new “Instruction on land management of the Kyrgyz” was developed. At the meeting of the general presence of the regional government of April 24, 1912, it was noted that the above-mentioned document of the Council of Ministers, “indicating in general terms the basis for the transition of the Kirghiz to a settled position and the order of their social and administrative structure, does not determine the order of their establishment and land use time from the formation of the site to the formation of a rural society ” [28, p.1].

The instruction was approved in 1913 by the Chief Superintendent of Land Survey-OGW and agriculture.

According to the new instruction, the process of transition of the Kazakhs to settled life was considerably complicated, the former conditions for the withdrawal of the land plot were preserved (“through the strip”, etc.), and the dependence of the Kazakhs on the peasant chief increased. In paragraph 17 of the Resolution of the General Presence of the Regional Phenomenon it was stated: “The administration of lands limited to Kirgiz plots and the assignment of Kirgiz to them is assigned to the peasant chief” [29, p.1].

The instruction was approved in 1913 by the Chief Superintendent of Land Survey-OGW and agriculture.

In the conditions of impoverishment and hunger, the Kazakhs deprived of livestock and land were faced with the problem of survival, and inter-ethnic tension intensified. Therefore, the judgments of individual researchers about the “progressiveness” of the colonization of Kazakhstan by the Slavic population of Russia are hardly reasonable. The question of land constituted the main content of the national liberation movement of the Kazakhs of the Turgai region. This is how the question was posed by the leaders of the liberation struggle of the Kazakh people A. Bukeikhanov, A. Baitursynov, M. Dulatov and others.

References

1. Kazaktyn Atazandary: kuzhattar, derekterzhanezerteuler. 10 volume. 4-volume = Ancient world of Kazakh law: materials, documents and research. - Almaty: ZhetiZhargy, 2005. - 552 b., p. 460

2. Motivated Temporary instructions to district chiefs of the Turgaregion. - Orenburg, 1878, p. 80
3. CGA RK. f.25, Op. 1, d.2835, p.17
4. CGA RK. f.25, Op. 1, d. 2214, pp. 122-123
5. Ibid. p.138
6. Ibid. p. 142
7. Ibid. p. 143
8. Ibid. pp. 147-148
9. CGA RK. f.25, Op. 1, d. 2682, p. 133
10. CGA RK. f.25, Op. 1, d. 2536, p. 59
11. Kazaktyн Atazandary: kuzhattar, derekterzhanezertteuler. 10 volume. 4-volume = Ancient world of Kazakh law: materials, documents and research. - Almaty: ZhetiZhargy, 2005. - 552 b., p. 460
12. Collection of Legislation on Kyrgyz Steppe Regions / comp. I.I. Kraft, Orenburg, 1898, p. 103
13. CGA RK. Ф. 25, оп. 1, d. 1494, p.8
14. Overview of the Turgay region in 1896, Orenburg, 1897, p.2
15. CGA RK, f. 25, op. 1, d.375, p. 42
16. Orenburgleaflet, 1880, № 2
17. CGA RK, f. 25, op. 1, d. 1441, p. 4
18. Materials on the land issue in Asian Russia, Vol. 1, Steppe region, Petrograd, 1917, p.58
19. Tursunbaev A. Socioeconomic posleds Twi I resettlement policy, p.59
20. CGA RK, f. 29, op. 1, d. 58, l. 66
21. The reference book and the address of the calendar of the Turgay region for 1914.Part II, Orenburg, 1914, p. 7
22. Kazakh economic management of its natural-historical and living conditions, M., 1926, p. 102
23. Atishev A.A. The political thought of Kazakhstan in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Alma-Ata, 1979,
24. CGARK, f. 25, op. 1, d. 375, p. 38 об.
25. The reference book and the address of the calendar of the Turgay region for 1911 year. Orenburg, 1911, p. 134
26. Overview of Turgay district for 1914 year, Orenburg, 1915, p. 13 2
27. Reference book ... for 1914, p. 132

28. CGARK. ф. 29, оп. 1, д. 165, р. 1

29. Kazakh. 1913, 23 november; 1914, 23 january; 1915, 15 february; CSARK, ф. 25, оп. 1, д. 360, р.1

МРНТИ 03.20

ИДЕАЛ СОВЕТСКОГО ПАТРИОТИЗМА В ПОДВИГЕ ПАНФИЛОВЦЕВ

Д.А. МАЦЮК

Актюбинский региональный государственный университет им. К.Жубанова,

г.Актөбе, Казахстан

Аннотация. В данной статье исследуется явление войны как результат слабости дипломатических методов и как вид международных отношений с помощью военных приемов. Рассмотрен феномен интернационально-советского патриотизма сквозь анализ выдающегося подвига 28 героев-панфиловцев, нарушивших планы немецкой армии под Москвой 1941 г. Показан антинаучный подход к громким сенсациям, пытающимся усомниться в подлинности существования героев Великой Отечественной войны. Вместе с тем, приведены разные подходы к осознанию преступной направленности политики и идеологии фашизма. Показано бережное отношение казахстанцев к памяти земляков-панфиловцев.

Ключевые слова: война, дипломатия, интернациональный патриотизм, казахстанцы, идеология фашизма, победа.

Түйіндеме. Осы мақалада соғыстың құбылысы әлсіздік дипломатиялық әдістер мен түрі және халықаралық қарым-қатынастар нәтижесі ретінде әскери тәсілдер арқылы зерттеледі. 1941 ж. Мәскеу үшін шайқаста неміс әскерлерінің жолын бөгеген 28 батыр-панфиловшылар интернационалдық патриоттық феномені басым ерлік призмасы арқылы талдап қаралды. Ұлы Отан соғысы батырларының шынай өмірде бар жоқтығына күмән туғызатын өткен тарихты бұрмалауды әшкерелеу әрекеті жүзеге асырылады. Сонымен қатар, фашизмнің идеологиясы мен қылмыстық бағыттағы саясатын ұғынудың түрлі амалдары келтірілген. Жерлестеріміз-панфиловшылар рухы қазақстандықтардың жадында екені көрсетілген.

Түйінді сөздер: соғыс, дипломатия, халықаралық патриотизм, қазақстандықтар, фашизм идеологиясы, жеңіс.

Annotation. his article explores the phenomenon of war as a result of the weakness of diplomatic methods and as a form of international relations through military techniques. The phenomenon of international patriotism is considered through the prism of the analysis of the immortal feat of 28 Panfilov heroes who blocked the way for parts of the German army in the battle for Moscow in 1941. An attempt is made to expose the falsification of the historical past as an unreasonable attempt to doubt the existence of real heroes of the Great Patriotic War. At the same time, different approaches are given to the realization of the criminal orientation of the policy and ideology of fascism. Showing the careful attitude of Kazakhstan to the memory of fellow Panfilov.

Key words: war, diplomacy, international patriotism, citizens of Kazakhstan, the ideology of fascism, victory.