

original scientific article
received: 2015-05-26

UDC 316.422(574)"1920/1936"

PROBLEMS OF MODERNIZATION OF THE KAZAKH SOCIETY IN 1920-1936 YEARS

Saltanat Tuyakbaevna RYSBEKOVA
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University,
71, Al-Farabi Avenue, Almaty, 050009, Kazakhstan
e-mail: saltanat.zysbekova@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

Reasons and consequences of the social, economic and political transformation in Kazakhstan in the first half of the 20th century are consecutively analyzed. Kazakh social modernization problems in Soviet times and its most controversial moments in the first half of the 20th century are investigated. Problems associated with the modernization of virtually all life spheres of the Kazakh society are researched. The contemporary Kazakh society is experiencing a new phase of identification, which is closely associated with the historical past.

Keywords: modernization, Kazakh society, ethnic and cultural integration

I PROBLEMI DELLA MODERNIZZAZIONE DELLA SOCIETÀ KAZAKA TRA IL 1920 E IL 1936

SINTESI

Il contributo analizza in modo consecutivo le cause e le conseguenze della trasformazione sociale, economica e politica svoltasi nel Kazakistan durante la prima metà del XX secolo.

Si indaga quindi sui problemi di modernizzazione sociale kazaka nel periodo sovietico e i suoi momenti più controversi risalenti alla prima metà del XX secolo.

Vengono esaminati i problemi associati con la modernizzazione di praticamente tutte le sfere della società kazaka.

La società contemporanea kazaka sta vivendo una nuova fase di identificazione strettamente associata con il passato storico.

Parole chiave: modernizzazione, società kazaka, integrazione etnica e culturale

INTRODUCTION

Ethnic and identification indexes of all the peoples of the USSR in the period under study were subjected to a strong qualitative transformation, primarily, due to changes in the social structure, large-scale involvement of the lower classes in the educational, political and administrative areas. At the same time, historically established ethnic and cultural mosaic dictated its features. Modern science notes that in multiethnic societies, there are two types of ethnic and cultural integration: cultural unity with titular communities and leveling cultural differences, or a political alliance that allows to preserve cultural differences between ethnic groups in multinational European societies such as Kazakhstan. According to A. Khazanov, in the USSR “modernization was carried out ... with a minimal participation of the indigenous population: industrialization, urbanization, demographic revolution, the revolution in education and labor mobility were not implemented here in full” (Khazanov, 1995). Some aspects of the issue (modernization of Kazakh society) were studied by other foreign authors (Amanzholova, 2004; Priestland, 2007; Matsuzato, 2007; Service, 2009; Tomohiko, 2012; Shane, 2013; Gorodetsky, 2014).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to the researchers, in the studied period in the Kazakh society, kinship system predetermines “communism” and “community property” of its members, “the closer is the kinship circle, the more uncontrolled the use of each other’s property by its members.” The nomadic lifestyle also led to consolidation of immutable rules of hospitality and the so-called “Konakasy” – property for guests – in traditions and mythology of the Kazakhs. The most important components of the ethnic and cultural values were also quite acceptable for the Bolshevik traditions of collective mutual assistance, especially in cases of natural disasters or epidemics, such as the so-called “Court of Conscience”, a deeply thoughtful and sensible judgment of “cleansing oath” with a sacred meaning which eliminated falsity or breach of promise (Bukinich, 1919, 39).

Along with a profound transformation of the social organization of the society and the formation of new structural elements, groups and strata of society of the past were preserved, although their social role and quantitative indicators were undergoing significant changes. However, all these structures existed concurrently, sometimes intertwined in a particular way. A distinctive feature of the social organization of the society in transition was the high degree of fragmentation of social groups, their increased mosaicism. This was due to the increasing complexity of the social structure and the existence of elements of both new and traditional structures. As a result, individual social groups were divided

into numerous, sometimes loosely connected subgroups representing different and sometimes conflicting social and economic interests. Traditional communities had a question about their place in the social hierarchy, the level of cohesion and the value system. The main features defining marginality were, firstly, the intermediate state associated with the period of transition, and, secondly, the uncertainty of the social situation, the fact that they didn’t join or partially joined social structures or groups. Meanwhile, the state of general culture and social development, and hence the opportunity to realize the potential of modernization, still required huge efforts. In Dzhetysuyskii region, for example, as of September 1924, up to 90.7% of the population was illiterate; half were illiterate among communists and 57% of the believers. In Akmola district of the same province, the executive committee “on the national tradition associated with the bais (the rich) hungry to feed” proclaimed that 25 thousand people were among the exploited ones. The civil initiative was politically oriented and testified to the growing initiative and activity of “the common people”. In Aktobe province, for example, on the initiative of the inhabitants of 25 villages of Chelkarskiy District, where “party cells” were formed, in a number of townships and villages they decided to close mosques and to transform them into schools and to open new schools. Workers felt their opportunities and actively participated in production meetings, demanding that their decisions are implemented and the discipline is strengthened. At the same time, cooperatives caused mistrust and even animosity due to the facts of theft by their activists. Moreover, these workers demonstrated “krestyanofilstvo” (“strive to lead rural life”) keeping the economy in rural areas and suggesting to impose even lower taxes on the kulaks and shopkeepers. By April 1926, the network of schools and groups of party education in Kazakhstan covered 40.4% of the communists (9154 out of 22674 people.), 27.6% of the total number of communists graduated from high school, and the rate for peasants was 4.9% (Russian State Archives of Socio-Political History (RGASPI)).

The resolution of the 5th Conference on continuous land management (5th All-Kazakh Conference of the RCP (b), 1925, 33) has led to significant shifts in the social structure of the Kazakh aul (village). The former scheme of communal land tenure was destroyed, and the poor people were given a piece of land and became less dependent on the traditional hierarchy of social relations. At the same time, it caused the aggravation of interethnic relations. The implementation of the Kazakhs’ priority right to land resulted in suffering of not only the representatives of the European Nationalities – Russians, Ukrainians, Belarusians, Germans – but also of Uzbeks, Uighurs, Taranchi, who sent numerous complaints to Moscow (Chebotareva, 2006, 101).

Along with the economic, social and cultural problems were being solved. But this sphere remained very

problematic throughout the USSR. In Kazakhstan, in the middle of 1920s the illiteracy reached 90%, and in Karakalpakstan Autonomous Region the rate was 100%. Primary schools covered only 10% of school-age children of the indigenous population. According to Akmola Provincial Party Committee, in 1925, "despite the sixth year of Soviet power in the province, so far no medical centers or hospitals for Kyrgyz population have been founded. Of course, the obstacle to a certain extent is the lack of health workers from the Kazakhs and relevant space. If we consider a large incidence of diseases in Kazakh population, especially venereal diseases, scabies, smallpox, etc., it becomes clear how little has been done yet in this field" (Milestones of Consolidation 1990, 105).

As was noted in April 1926 by N. Nurmakov, "... 90% of the indigenous population have never used and do not use any medical help.

... Medical and school network in Kazakhstan exists only in large sedentary settlements, i.e. where the population is most cultural, European. There is no medical care in 90% of Kazakh villages. The same can be said with regard to the school network. ... If one says that there is a school system, in the most cases it is just an imitation. In the old days in Kazakh villages, tsarist government did not build any schools, and now under the Soviet regime it is the same – no funds for construction of schools precludes that, and this year is not an exclusion. ... The same is the situation in almost all of the autonomous republics and regions" (State Archives of the Russian Federation (GA RF, 7-9).

On February 16, 1927, All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks adopted a special resolution "On Health Care of Kazakh Population" which provided for allocation of state and local budget funds for capital construction of hospital buildings, for medical assistance district accelerated mobile units for medical institutions and ambulatories, and further, of medical-hospital sites, while maintaining medical search teams. In 1926, the republic had 8 mobile medical units, and only 13.5% of all Kazakh townships were covered by constant medical aid (Russian districts: 44%). The time of their work was increasing, and the radius of their action was reducing. But still, qualified medical aid was possible to provide "only to a very limited extent, mainly the eye, obstetric and venereal medical care." District doctors, as their number increased, also had to be engaged in the survey of water supply and housing, school sanitary inspection, the struggle for a healthy life. The funding was increased from all types of budgets for fighting against syphilis, tuberculosis, trachoma, gynecological diseases which became "very alarmingly" spread. It was forbidden to violate the principle of free medical care. At the same time, the following was scheduled to open in 1927/28 financial year: three Kazakh midwifery college in Kyzyl-Orda, Semipalatinsk and Uralsk, as well as one-year course of training nurses social assistance from Kazakh girls in Kyzyl-Orda at the expense of the state budget;

it was planned that the following would be done from the funds of local budget: Kazakh schools' support at all provincial hospitals, attracting Kazakh doctors to work without graduating or graduating in other republics (Milestones of Consolidation 1990, 127-129, 139, 163).

There was a high social mobility, people moved vertically from one class, social group, strata to another, a higher one, or vice versa, to a lower one, different horizontal displacements (professional, territorial, etc.), due to economic instability, political changes, structural adjustment and other factors of the period of transformation. There were changes of ideological orientations, values and norms, political and economic priorities. As a result, new social groups and strata of society tended to occupy their respective place of power and influence in the social hierarchy. There were changes in the political and economic elite of society.

In fact, one of the leading national thinkers of the first third of the 20th century, J. Aymaulyty (1889-1931) recorded and clearly defined the fundamental contradictions and consequences of rapid modernization for the social and moral status and the significance of introduction of a new governance and cultural elite of the Kazakh society. Meanwhile, Alash Orda intellectuals, the elite of the Kazakh society, were seeking to preserve their influence and participate in the cultural modernization undertaken by the state. The meeting in June 1924 of the Congress of Kazakh Scientists was attended by 19 people, of which 7 were communists. Among the participants were the leaders of Alash: A. Bukeikhanov, Kh. Dosmukhamedov and others. They discussed the problems of phonetics and Kazakh alphabet, language. The majority of 11 people accepted the proposal by A. Baitursynov to keep Arabic script (Turykulov advocated the introduction of the Latin alphabet). Having indorsed in their resolution the activities of Soviet government, the delegates at the same time condemned the "nationalist movement Alash Orda" (Russian State Archives of Socio-Political History (RGASPI), 6-9).

In 1927, 23% Kazakhs in Kazakhstan were central trade union members and 32% were members of the regional organization (a similar situation was in Uzbekistan and Tatarstan). Trade union officials sent from the center didn't stay in the country for more than two years, and that undermined the stability and the consistency of their work. In the county offices, the part of Kazakhs was 15%, and 9% in the lower authorities. In cooperative organizations, the Kazakh population showed little activity at re-elections and meetings; attendance at meetings of 6 Union of the Republic was 43.4%, and that was attributed mainly to the credit cooperatives, which could provide real support to people. Thus, the real union democracy for the mass was formal, but the reporting, which mainly drew attention to the case presented, rated it as quite satisfactory.

The politicization of ethnicity as a condition of the people's life in the Bolshevik doctrine provided a pow-

erful attractive force to ethnic nationalism, buoyed by national elites striving to improve access to power and resources, to official cultural institutions. That, in turn, determined the contradictory actions of the government and its relations with intellectuals, whom it never trusted, and who were the main source of recruiting people to the Soviet bureaucracy in national regions.

Constructed in the Soviet times, the national bureaucracy, preferring the values of stability and compromise with the government while maintaining the formal rule of Union center, and budget allocations in favor of the Republic, successfully occupied a dominant position in politics and culture at the regional level. Official secular ideology, Marxism-Leninism, was mainly assimilated only to the extent to which its postulates were consistent with the traditional ideas of justice. That in its own way confirmed the high importance of the values of collectivism and obedience and, conversely, introduced additional obstacles to formation of an independent, independently thinking individual. The mind-set to restore peace and human rights and to use violence for the sake of the natural course of life in fact prepared the ground for the nationalist ideology and ethnocentric policy (Panarin, 1994).

The political practice acted along the same lines, especially in the first 10 years of Soviet ruling. However, strict political censorship, excessive personalization of power, a high degree of ritualization of political actions, closed decision-making process, etc., in fact reinforced rather than undermined the Kazakhs' own traditions of political culture which smoothly combined the features of Nomadism, Tengrism and Islamic zhuzh-clan (kinship) identity, and the complex hierarchy of social ties with the Soviet collectivism, the new patriotism and citizenship.

Taking into account the specifics to the legal culture is of great importance for understanding the ethnic and cultural evolution of Kazakh society. Zh. Akpayev (1876-1934), in particular, paid attention to the combination of legal and sociological sense, as the "hidden value" in the conceptual framework of the traditional law of the Kazakhs. They were crystallized and "unconsciously reasonably" evolved from generation to generation, creating the psychological and semantic context of relations. In particular, there were no articulated notions of rights in the studied period in the Kazakh society, therefore, the speech practice, for example, expressed the notion 'right', was very flexible, saturating it with rich cultural symbols (Akpan, 2002, 318-319).

Dynamics of Kazakh identity, where intertwined geographically zhuz (kinship) localization of ethnic groups, migratory habits, pagan and Islamic guidance, as well as emerging civil self-definition, reflected the desire and unique ways of embedding slowly reformed archaic structures and practices into a rapidly modernizing reality.

Modernization was accompanied by changes in the social structure of the society, by the destruction of tradi-

tional ties and formation of new ones. The main conditions for that were overcoming collectivism, community, extended family and transition to individualism, improving literacy. Nevertheless, this indicator cannot be the only one of modernization. According to Sh. Eisenstadt, "The presence of initial social and demographic and structural features of modernization – such as modern education, the growth of literacy, urbanization, mass media, etc. – is a necessary condition, but not a guarantee of the success of modernization process" (Nikitin, 1998, 69).

Moreover, "rooted traditions play a major role in maintaining the stability of the society undergoing painful changes" (Smelser, 1994, 626).

Formation of new population segments (intellectuals, civil servants and managers, etc.) and the increase of their proportion in the structure of the society inevitably lead to interest in political activity, striving to express their own specific needs in political form. Modernization should be supported by mainstream society, not just by the leading groups. To solve this problem, the Communist party's monopoly power resorted to the "conductors" of its political line to the multitudes – all sorts of social organizations, including those related to education (the Union Extraordinary Committee, the Society for Assistance to Defense, Aviation and Chemical Construction, the "Down with Illiteracy!" society, the Voluntary Association for Assistance to Army, Air Force and Navy, the Union of Atheists, etc.) – the participants of which were the most active members of the community, to raise their cultural level and to realize their potential in the fields set by the civil authorities. Systematic activities to transform the society led to a stable instability, when the place and the role of a particular individual, not to mention the appurtenance to a stable group, were extremely vague and variable. At the same time, party leaders themselves, at least in the period of the New Economical Party, admitted the actual inconsistency, low efficiency and the bureaucratic nature of public relations created in different social environments. Modernization means the formation of a new social structure, which, at a certain long enough stage, combined with the former grouping. For example, by the end of 1927 in Kazakhstan, 42% of workers were Kazakhs, and 17% of the rural population was united in cooperatives. In 1927-28, of the 11,226 industrial workers 3,316 were Kazakhs. The average monthly salary which increased in 1926-27 was 53.4 to 58.7 rubles. More than 47 thousands workers were engaged in fine arts and crafts (Dosov, 1928, 4-8).

This led not only to the complexity of the social structure of the society, but also to the need to form a new system of relations between different social groups. The struggle between the traditional and the new groups did not always mean that the internal unity was deteriorated and the development was discontinued.

If the society is able to resolve the problem of the relationships between the new and old groups and be-

tween groups within them, it will generate new instruments and change the old mechanisms of social relations. As it was said above, formation of population's new segments (civil servants, managers, engineers, etc.) and the increase of their proportion in the structure of the society inevitably lead to interest in political activity, striving to express their own specific needs in political form. Modernization should be supported by mainstream society, not just by the leading groups. But if there are no conditions for meeting their requirements and coordinating positions with other population groups, there may be political instability. With the abandonment of the New Economical Party and the strengthening of Stalin's personal power, all public organizations were put under strict control of public authorities. Spontaneous actions and self-action were strictly regulated by numerous regulations and directives, and the elected body made of the most active functionaries became the governor of the giant bureaucratic machine horizontally permeating the entire society. Thus, in June 1929, the World Communist Party of Bolsheviks Central Committee Organizational Bureau entrusted the issues of coordination and approvals, convening congresses and meetings of all mass organizations (cooperatives, International Organization Assistance Revolution, Society of Assistance Defence Aviation and Chemical Construction, Automobile Road Organization, Organization on Struggle Against Alcoholism, Anti-religious Organization, Union Society of Cultural Relations, rescue waters, esperantist, philatelists and so on.) to the National Commissariat for Inspection of Working Rural Dwellers. The National Committee for Internal Affairs supervised the convocation of congresses and meetings of voluntary public organizations (in 1929, 120 organizations had the registration), the coordination of their decisions with the Peoples Commissariat in relevant fields of work (education, health, etc.). The National Committee for Internal Affairs itself had to report to the Central Committee of the World Communist Party of Bolsheviks on the political and social significance of the activities of public institutions, and gave permissions for conducting thereof in consultation with the State Political Administration Body. In the voluntary organizations themselves, control functions were performed by party factions (the Russian State Archives of Socio-Political History (RGASPI), 1-12, 30-34).

All the necessary parameters of the Kazakhs as a nation, writes S. Akiner, were established only in the Soviet era. The tragic events of 1930, related to the transfer of the Kazakhs to a sedentary lifestyle, did not occupy "... a central place in the consciousness of Kazakhs, like the Armenian genocide and burning Jews in the furnaces of concentration camps respectively had a central place in Armenian and Jewish identity ... Maybe because entire populations died and only few survived families remained to keep the memory of the dead ... and the rest of the population was exposed to intense propagan-

da... the misfortune of such a magnitude was doomed to oblivion ..." (Akiner, 1995).

Class priorities prevailed over all other considerations and motives. According to the head of the Kazakh government Y. Isayev, for example, the creation of the first five republics required 615.8 thousand people. 24.5 th. professionals, including highly qualified, were needed, whereas the number of people trained in the universities of the country in 1930/31 was 2,537 and the number trained in colleges was 8 thousand people. At the same time, Goloschekin again and again warned that settling nomadic nation was the matter of class struggle, and rich people and *atkaminery* (officials) educated in Russian schools, would not had "laid down their pens in the pants" (Report of the Regional Committee of the 6-th All-Kazakh Party Conference 1928, 31-33, 34, 56, 69, 104).

In Kazakhstan, the number of intellectuals years increased 8-fold – from 22.5 thousand to 177.9 thousand people – in 1926-1939. However, in 1933, in 70 districts of the country where the indigenous population was over 90%, one doctor had to serve 38 thousand residents. Meanwhile, 52.8% of the population lived here, and that was 83% of the Kazakh Republic. And in 1939, 75% of the collective farms specialists had no professional education (The Economy of Kazakhstan 1930; Abzhanov, 1988; The Party Life of Kazakhstan 1990).

Characteristically, the transformation of the Kazakh Autonomy into a Federal Republic took place in 1936, when a full-blooded national intelligentsia who advocated national development and democratic content of the Soviet federalism was politically and largely physically eliminated. The real life of ethnic groups had virtually no connection with the discussions and decisions of the chairpersons, while remaining extremely difficult and sometimes even tragic (Amanzholova, 2005, 350-351).

In cases where the person sought to make a political career, linguistic and cultural assimilation were of crucial importance and significance. Moreover, the federal structure of the state granted privileges to "natsmen" (ethnic men) only in "their" republics, which led to low migration of the indigenous population of the region during the Soviet period and fixation of priorities in the aggregate of behavioral norms. It is possible to agree with R. Suni that no full assimilation of the Kazakhs took place; in fact, ethnic differences – both emerged and primordial – strengthened in the Soviet era (Suni, 2001).

Toynbee proposed a slightly different view: "The introduction of an alien culture is a painful and difficult process; while the instinctive resistance of the victim to innovations that threaten to destroy the traditional way of life makes it even more painful for the resisting nation, the first injection of another cultural paradigm results in its victim's splitting into individual elements, and then reluctantly adoption of smaller, seemingly insignificant and therefore not as destructive (of all of its poisonous), elements of foreign culture in the hope that it will be able to stop further invasion. Yet, as one inevitably leads

to another, the victim soon discovers that it is necessary to adopt in parts all other elements of the invading culture, too. Therefore, it is not surprising that the natural attitude of the victim to the invading alien culture is a self-destructive sense of hostility and aggression.” But “Neither mastery of foreign high technology nor zealous preservation of the traditional way of life can be a complete and final answer to the challenge of invading alien civilization” (Toynbee, 2003, 436-437).

According to T. Omarbekova, in 1929-1931 in Kazakhstan, there were 372 anti-Soviet actions (Omarbekov, 1994).

CONCLUSION

One cannot deny the objectively progressive inclusion of the ethnic aspects into mass active social forms of public life, to provide for improvement of civic responsibility and of people's political and legal culture. But more often, the mass participation in new forms of social organization has not meant qualitative changes in the culture and mentality of recent nomads. There was a habit to obey authority and command and externally imposed rules, while remaining in a closed world of traditional stereotypes and customs. Many political, economic, educational, cultural and other projects which had been developed and approved in the Soviet era in Moscow, did not have a special colonial nature, but in the context of Central Asia, diverse social actors could be used or considered as instruments of repression and control on behalf of the “mother country.” Much of the Soviet nation structure existed mainly on a public level, whereas at the level of a household, the family remained a strong parallel source of loyalty and solidarity

(tribal and traditional aspects). At the same time, the researchers emphasize that much of the “invention” was an internalized population. So, language dialects had stopped functioning and people used to speak a codified language created by the Soviet state. In some parts of the society, they believed that the Soviet era created “national” history. Nevertheless, despite the strong influence of the Stalinist national policy, pre-modern identities were tenacious and preserved enough – for example, the genealogical kinship system – to transform the Soviet era nomenclature system into clan ties. The preservation of traditionalist solidarity and demographic policy of the USSR led to emergence of enclaves of modernization, industrialization through the migration of Russian-speaking to large cities and construction sites in the region. The contemporary Kazakh society is experiencing a new phase of identification which is closely connected with the historical past. Michael Fink, for example, reconstructs in this regard the continuity of Kazakh identity on the basis of Braudel's historicism and identifies three levels of the structure thereof. The first – the history of human interaction with the environment (ecohistory), the most prolonged and repeated; social history as a temporal one, characterized by changes in rhythms, acting groups, etc.; Traditional History Facts – a temporal history (history of major events, movements, “... the most exciting and richest ...”) (Fink, 1999, 11).

In this very third historical “layer” lies the genesis of the Kazakhs, while the second layer reflects the interaction between the society and the official ideology, as a link between the history of long duration and the situational history. Finally, the reference to the first “layer” helps to revive the clan, tribe, zhuz ties, the functioning of language and religion.

TEŽAVE Z MODERNIZACIJO KAZAŠKE DRUŽBE MED LETOMA 1920 IN 1936

Saltanat Tuyakbaevna RYSBEKOVA
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University,
71, Al-Farabi Avenue, Almaty, 050009, Kazakhstan
e-mail: saltanat.zysbekova@mail.ru

POVZETEK

V članku se v zaporedju analizirajo vzroki in posledice družbene, gospodarske in politične preobrazbe, ki se je v Kazahstanu odvijala v prvi polovici 20. stoletja.

Avtorica raziskuje težave z modernizacijo kazaške družbe v sovjetskih časih, zlasti njene najbolj kontroverzne trenutke v prvi polovici prejšnjega stoletja, in obravnava težave z modernizacijo v tako rekoč vseh življenjskih sferah kazaške družbe.

Po izsledkih raziskovalcev iz obravnavanega obdobja je kazaški družbeni sorodstveni sistem vnaprej določal ,življenje v skupnosti' in ,skupnostno lastnino' njenih članov; čim tesnejši je bil krog sorodstveno povezanih ljudi, tem bolj vzajemno so njegovi člani uporabljali lastnino drug drugega.

Značilno je, da se je preoblikovanje kazaške avtonomije znotraj federativne republike zgodilo leta 1936, ko je bilo v sovjetskem federalizmu onemogočeno že razvejano kazaško nacionalno gibanje, demokratična substanca narodnega izobraženstva pa tudi fizično odstranjena.

Kljub močnemu vplivu stalinistične državne politike so bile predsodobne identitete vztrajne in so, denimo, ohranile sistem genealoškega sorodstva, da bi preoblikovale nomenklturni klanski sistem iz sovjetskega obdobja.

Sodobna kazahstanska družba doživlja novo fazo identifikacije, tesno povezano z zgodovinsko preteklostjo.

Ključne besede: modernizacija, kazaška družba, etnična in kulturna integracija

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abzhanov, Kh. (1988):** Rural Intellectuals of Kazakhstan in the Conditions of Improvement of Socialism. Alma-Ata, 39.
- Akiner, Sh. (1995):** The Formation of Kazakh Identity. From Tribe to Nation State. London; Washington, D.C.
- Akpan, J. (2002):** Sketches on Kyrgyz Common, in Particular, Marriage, Law. The Anthology of Kazakhstan's Socio-Political Thought from Ancient Times Until Present (in two volumes). Almaty: Institute for Development of Kazakhstan, 556.
- Amanzholova, D. (2004):** Kazakh Autonomy: From the Conception of Nations to Self-Determination by Soviet. Acta Slavica Japonica. The Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University. Vol. 21.
- Amanzholova, D.A. (2005):** Russia and Central Asia. 1905-1925. Collection of Documents. Karaganda: KarGU.
- Bukinich, D. (1919):** Communism and the Kyrgyzs. The Life of Ethnicities, 31 (39).
- Chebotaeva, V.G. (2006):** Problems of the Russian Colonization: Was Russia the "Prison of Peoples?". Russia and Kazakhstan: Problems of History (20th – the Beginning of the 21st Centuries). Iranian Academy of Sciences, 420.
- Dosov, A. (1928):** Nationalities Policy on the Verge of the 12th Anniversary of Proletarian Dictatorship. Soviet Power, 44-45, 4-8.
- Fink, M.T. (1999):** Reconstructing Kazakhstan: Creating Boundaries and National Identities. A Braudelian Analysis. Ph.D. Dissertation; American University.
- Gorodetsky, G.(Ed.) (2014):** Soviet Foreign Policy, 1917-1991: A Retrospective. Changes in the Social Structure of the Soviet Society 1921 - mid 1930s. (1979), 295.
- Khazanov, A.M. (1995):** After the USSR. Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Politics in the Commonwealth of Independent States. Madison, WI, 155.
- Matsuzato, K.(Ed.) (2007):** Imperiology: From Empirical Knowledge to Discussing the Russian Empire. Sapporo.
- Milestones of Consolidation (1990).** From the Experience of the Party Organizations of Kazakhstan in the Solution of the Nationalities Question in the 1917-1927 Decade. (to the 70th Anniversary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan). Collection of documents. Alma-Ata: Kazakhstan, 232.
- Nikitin, M.D. (1998):** Colonialism v tropicheskoi Afrike (Colonialism in the Tropical Africa). Vostok, 1.
- Omarbekov, T. "Zobalan": (1994):** Kushtep uzhyndastyruqa karsylyk. 1929-31 zhyldary bolgan Khalyk narazylygy. Almaty: Sanat, 267.
- Panarin, C. (1994):** Nationalism in the CIS: the Philosophical Origins. Free Thought, 5, 30-37.
- The Party's Life in Kazakhstan. (1990).** 10, 77.
- Priestland, D. (2007):** Bolshevism, Stalinism, and Class Struggle: Ideas and Politics in the Soviet Union 1917-1939. Oxford and New-York.
- Report of the Regional Committee of the 6th All-Kazakh Party Conference. (1928).** Report and seal. According to T. Goloshekin (15-23 November 1927). Kzyl Orda.
- Russian State Archives of Socio-Political History (RGASPI). F. 17. Op. 69. D. 561.**
- Russian State Archives of Socio-Political History (RGASPI). F. 17. Op. 60. D. 769. L. 215, 232; 234, 252, 279; D. 795. L. 18.**
- Russian State Archives of Socio-Political History (RGASPI). F. 17. Op. 60. D. 777.**
- Service, R. (2009):** History of Modern Russia: From Tsarism to the Twenty-First Century. Penguin Books Ltd. ISBN 0-14-103797-0, 378.
- Shane, S. (2013):** 73 Years of State Atheism in the Soviet Union, Ended Amid Collapse in 1990.
- Smelser, N. (1994):** Sociology. Phoenix, 626.
- State Archives of the Russian Federation (GA RF). F. 3316, Op. 3, D 131.**
- Suny, R.G. (2001):** Constructing Primordialism: Old Histories for New Nations. The Journal of Modern History, 73, 862-896.
- The Economy of Kazakhstan. (1930).** No. 3-4, 17, 19; No. 5-6, 41.
- Tomohiko, U.(Ed.) (2012):** "The Alash Orda's Relations with Siberia, Ural, and Turkestan: The Kazakh National Movement and the Russian Imperial Legacy." In *Asiatic Russia: Imperial Power in Regional and International Contexts*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 271-87.
- Toynbee, A.J. (2003):** The Civilization on the Stand of History. Collection. Iris Press.
- 5th All-Kazakh Conference of the RCP (6) (1925).** Transcript and Resolution. Kyzyl-Orda.