

Actual problems of social and humanitarian sciences
Актуальные проблемы социальных и гуманитарных наук

**Ijtimoiy-gumanitar
fanlarning dolzarb
muammolari**

1-maxsus
son (6-jild)

2026

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

IJTIMOIY-GUMANITAR FANLARNING DOLZARB MUAMMOLARI

Nº S/1 (6) - 2026

**АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО-
ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК**

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

TOSHKENT-2025

BOSH MUHARRIR:

Isanova Feruza Tulqinovna

TAHRIR HAY'ATI:

07.00.00- TARIX FANLARI:

Yuldashev Anvar Ergashevich – tarix fanlari doktori, siyosiy fanlar nomzodi, professor;
Mavlanov Uktam Maxmasabirovich – tarix fanlari doktori, professor;
Xazratkulov Abror – tarix fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Tursunov Ravshan Normuratovich – tarix fanlari doktori;
Xolikulov Axmadjon Boymahamatovich – tarix fanlari doktori;
Gabrielyan Sofya Ivanovna – tarix fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Saidov Sarvar Atabullo o'g'li – katta ilmiy xodim, Imom Termiziy xalqaro ilmiy-tadqiqot markazi, ilmiy tadqiqotlar bo'limi.

08.00.00- IQTISODIYOT FANLARI:

Karlibayeva Raya Xojabayevna – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;
Nasirxodjayeva Dilafruz Sabitxanovna – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;
Ostonokulov Azamat Abdukarimovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;
Arabov Nurali Uralovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor;
Xudoyqulov Sadirdin Karimovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Azizov Sherzod O'ktamovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Xojayev Azizxon Saidaloxonovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Xolov Aktam Xatamovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent;
Shadiyeva Dildora Xamidovna – iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent v.b.;;
Shakarov Qulmat Ashirovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi, dotsent.;;
Jabborova Charos Aminovna - iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD).

09.00.00- FALSAFA FANLARI:

Hakimov Nazar Hakimovich – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor;
Yaxshilikov Jo'raboy – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor;
G'aybullayev Otabek Muhammadiyevich – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor;

Saidova Kamola Uskanbayevna – falsafa fanlari doktori;

Hoshimxonov Mo'min – falsafa fanlari doktori, dotsent;

O'roqova Oysuluv Jamoliddinovna – falsafa fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Nosirxodjayeva Gulnora Abdukaxxarovna – falsafa fanlari nomzodi, dotsent;

Turdiyev Bexruz Sobirovich – falsafa fanlari doktori (DSc), Professor.

10.00.00- FILOLOGIYA FANLARI:

Axmedov Oybek Saporbayevich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;
Ko'chimov Shuxrat Norqizilovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent;
Hasanov Shavkat Ahadovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;
Baxronova Dilrabo Keldiyorovna – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;
Mirsanov G'aybullo Qulmurodovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor;
Salaxutdinova Musharrafa Isamutdinovna – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent;
Kuchkarov Raxman Urmanovich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent v/b;
Yunusov Mansur Abdullayevich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi;
Saidov Ulugbek Aripovich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent;
Qodirova Muqaddas Tog'ayevna - filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent.

12.00.00- YURIDIK FANLAR:

Axmedshayeva Mavlyuda Axatovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;
Muxitdinova Firyuza Abdurashidovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;
Esanova Zamira Normurotovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, O'zbekiston Respublikasida xizmat ko'rsatgan yurist;
Hamroqulov Bahodir Mamasharifovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor v.b.;
Zulfiqorov Sherzod Xurramovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;
Xayitov Xushvaqt Saparbayevich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;
Asadov Shavkat G'aybullayevich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent;
Ergashev Ikrom Abdurasulovich – yuridik fanlari doktori, professor;
Utemuratov Maxmut Ajimuratovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor;
Saydullayev Shaxzod Alixanovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor;
Hakimov Komil Baxtiyarovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent;
Yusupov Sardorbek Baxodirovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor;
Amirov Zafar Aktamovich – yuridik fanlar doktori (PhD);
Jo'rayev Sherzod Yuldashevich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, dotsent;
Babadjanov Atabek Davronbekovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor;
Normatov Bekzod Akrom o'g'li – yuridik fanlar bo'yicha falsafa doktori;
Rahmatov Elyor Jumaboyevich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi;

13.00.00- PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI:

Xashimova Dildarxon Urinboyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor;
Ibragimova Gulnora Xavazmatovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor;
Zakirova Feruza Maxmudovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori;
Kayumova Nasiba Ashurovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor;
Taylanova Shoxida Zayniyevna – pedagogika fanlari

doktori, dotsent;

Jumaniyozova Muhayyo Tojiyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Ibraximov Sanjar Urunbayevich – pedagogika fanlari doktori;

Javliyeva Shaxnoza Baxodirovna – pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD);

Bobomurotova Latofat Elmurodovna – pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD).

19.00.00- PSIXOLOGIYA FANLARI:

Karimova Vasilisa Mamanosirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti;

Hayitov Oybek Eshboyevich – Jismoniy tarbiya va sport bo'yicha mutaxassislarni qayta tayyorlash va malakasini oshirish instituti, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor

Umarova Navbahor Shokirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti, Amaliy psixologiyasi kafedrasi mudiri;

Atabayeva Nargis Batirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Shamshetova Anjim Karamaddinovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Qodirov Obid Safarovich – psixologiya fanlari doktori (PhD).

22.00.00- SOTSILOGIYA FANLARI:

Latipova Nodira Muxtarjanovna – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti kafedra mudiri;

Seitov Azamat Po'latovich – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti;

Sodiqova Shohida Marxaboyevna – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston xalqaro islom akademiyasi.

23.00.00- SIYOSIY FANLAR

Nazarov Nasriddin Ataqulovich – siyosiy fanlar doktori, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent arxitektura qurilish instituti;

Bo'tayev Usmonjon Xayrullayevich – siyosiy fanlar doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti kafedra mudiri.

OAK Ro'yxati

Mazkur jurnal Vazirlar Mahkamasi huzuridagi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi Rayosatining 2022-yil 30-noyabrdagi 327/5-son qarori bilan tarix, iqtisodiyot, falsafa, filologiya, yuridik va pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha ilmiy darajalar yuzasidan dissertatsiyalar asosiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan ilmiy nashrlar ro'yxatiga kiritilgan.

"Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari" elektron jurnali 2020-yil 6-avgust kuni 1368-sonli guvohnoma bilan davlat ro'yxatiga olingan.

Muassis: "SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM" mas'uliyati cheklangan jamiyati

Tahririyat manzili:

100070. Toshkent shahri, Yakkasaroy tumani, Kichik Beshyog'och ko'chasi, 70/10-uy. Elektron manzil:

scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com

Bog'lanish uchun telefon:

(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).

07.00.00 – TARIX FANLARI

Алимжанов Бахтиёр Абдиҳакимович

«НА ЭТОМ СЪЕЗДЕ ИДЕЙНОМУ РАЗБРОДУ НУЖНО ПОЛОЖИТЬ КОНЕЦ»,
ИЛИ КАК СОЮЗ АРХИТЕКТОРОВ УЗБЕКИСТАНА НАЧАЛ МЫСЛITЬ 11-17

Esanova Nilufar

O'ZBEKISTON VA JANUBIY KOREYA O'RTASIDA OG'IR SANOAT TARMOQLARINING
RIVOJLANISHIDAGI O'RNI 18-21

Muminov Azizbek Ziyoviddinovich

JIZZAX VILOYATI JOYLAGHGAN TABIIY OBYEKTLARNING TARIXIY-GEOGRAFIK
TASNIFI VA TURISTIK SALOHIYATI 22-27

Ne'matov Xumoyun To'lqin o'g'li

SHOHRUX MIRZO VA USMONIYLAR O'RTASIDAGI DIPLOMATIK ALOQALAR TARIXI 28-33

Khudoyorov Noyibjon Maripjonovich, Ruziboev Samandarbek Sobirjon o'g'li

THE POLICY OF DEKULAKIZATION AND CONFISCATION OF PEASANT
HOUSEHOLDS IN KAZAKHSTAN, 1929-1933 34-43

Шамшетдинова Дилафруза Исмайыловна

ТЕХНОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ ПРОГРЕСС И ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ КУЛИНАРНЫХ
ТРАДИЦИЙ В СЕЛЬСКОЙ МЕСТНОСТИ КАРАКАЛПАКСТАНА
(1960-1980 ГГ.) 44-48

08.00.00 – IQTISODIYOT FANLARI

Kasimova Gulyar Axmatovna, Xaydarova Durdona Shuxratjon qizi

DAVLAT TIBBIY SUG'URTASI MEXANIZMIDA DORI-DARMON XARIDLARINING
SAMARADORLIGINI OSHIRISH 49-56

Abdullayev Abdulla Fayzulla o'g'li

AXBOROT MAHSULOTLARI BIZNESINI RIVOJLANTIRISHNING KO'P OMILLI
EKONOMETRIK MODELI: OLS VA ARDL TAQQOSLASH 57-64

09.00.00 – FALSAFA FANLARI

Tashanov Abduxoliq

BUZG'UNCHI G'OYALARING IJTIMOIY-SIYOSIY VA AXLOQIY MUAMMOLARI 65-71

Jo'rayev Ahmad Muhammadiyevich

TASAVVUF TA'LIMOTIDA DINIY BAG'RIKENGLIK VA MILLATLARARO TOTUVLIK
MASALALARI 72-78

Tursunkulova Shaxnoza Tuychiyevna

TASAVVUFNING FALSAFIY JIHATLARI XUSUSIDA 79-84

Ibraximova Dilorom Saloydinovna

RAQAMLI MUHITDA ESTETIK IDROKNING XUSUSIYATLARI 85-88

Muxammadiyeva Oliya Narzullayevna

OILA INSTITUTINI MUSTAHKAMLASH KONSEPSIYASI - OILA VA JAMIYAT
IJTIMOIY BARQARORLIGINING MEZONI 89-92

<i>Matchanova Barno</i>	
MAFKURA VA MILLIY MAFKURA TUSHUNCHALARI:	
MAZMUN-MOHİYATI VA İJTİMOİY FUNKSIYALARİ 93-98	
<i>Uraqov Nodirbek Boboqulovich</i>	
BAG'RIKENGLIK G'ÖYASINING TASAVVUFİY-FALSAFIY TAHLİLİ	
(Maxdumi A'zamning "Risolai tanbeh ul-ulamo" asari asosida) 99-104	
<i>Raxmatov Alisher Obidovich</i>	
İJTİMOİY FALSAFADA INTEGRATİSYANING RIVOJLANISH BOSQİCHLARI 105-108	
<i>O'sarkulov Oybek Murodilovich</i>	
MILLIY IDENTIKLIKNING TRANSFORMATİSYASI VA İJTİMOİY INTEGRATİSYA:	
O'ZBEKİSTONDAGI KOREYS DIASPORASI TAJRİBASI 109-115	
<i>Fayziyev Xurshid Jumayevich</i>	
VOLTERNING "BAG'RIKENGLIK HAQIDA" ASARIDA JAN KALASNING QATL	
ETİLİSHİ VA UNİNG OQIBATLARINI AKS ETTİRİLİŞİ 116-121	
<i>Shadmonova Zebiniso Amrulloyevna</i>	
OILA SHAXS KAMOLOTINING ASOSIY İJTİMOİY MUHİTİ VA JAMIYAT	
BARQARORLIGINİNG OMİLİ SİFATIDA 122-126	
<i>Idiboyev Abror Jamolovich</i>	
JAMIYAT İJTİMOİY-MA'NAVİY BARQARORLIKNI TA'MINLASHDA - YOSHLAR	
HUQUQİY TARBIYASINING O'RNI 127-130	
<i>Ahmadjonov To'lqinbek Akramjon o'g'li</i>	
RAQAMLI OLAMNING YOSHLAR ONGİGA TA'SIRI 131-136	
<i>Sodiqov Islombok Otabek o'g'li</i>	
RAQAMLI MADANIYAT TUSHUNCHASI VA UNİNG RIVOJLANISH BOSQİCHLARI 137-141	
<i>Abdurahimov Ravshanbek O'ktam o'g'li</i>	
HUQUQİY DEMOKRATİK JAMIYAT QURİSH SHAROİTİDA YOSHLAR HUQUQİY	
ONGİNİNG SHAKLLANISH OMILLARI 142-146	
10.00.00 – FILOLOGİYA FANLARI	
<i>Duvlaeva Nozigul Xolmuxammat qizi</i>	
İNGLİZ VA O'ZBEK MATNLARIDA STİLİSTİK TASVİR VOSİTALARI 147-151	
<i>Зикруллаева Хусния Бахтияровна</i>	
СТРУКТУРА, ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИЕ И НОРМАТИВНЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ	
ЗАИМСТВОВАННЫХ ТЕРМИНОВ В УЗБЕКСКОМ	
НАУЧНО-ТЕХНИЧЕСКОМ ТЕКСТЕ 152-156	
<i>Turdiyeva Dilorom Soliyevna</i>	
PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES FOR INCLUSIVE LEARNING 157-162	
<i>Eshmuratov Umidjon Temurovich</i>	
İNGLİZ VA O'ZBEK TİLLARIDAGI AFORİZMLARNING SEMANTİK XUSUSİYATLARI 163-167	
<i>Avlayeva Saida Bozorovna</i>	
İNGLİZ VA O'ZBEK TİLLARIDA COVID-19 PANDEMIYASI SHAROİTİDA	
SHAKLLANGAN KİSHİLAR JAMOALARINI İFODALOVCHI NEOLOGİZMLAR 168-172	
<i>Ubaydullaeva Dilfuza Akmal qizi</i>	
JURNALİSTLARNI TAYYORLASHDA NUTQ MADANIYATI KOMPETENSIYALARINING	
STRUKTURASI 173-181	

<i>Alimova Shaxnoza Yaxshiboyevna</i>	
ASSOTSIATIV TAJRIBA PSIXOLINGVISTIKA USULI SIFATIDA	182-187
<i>Xudayberganov Nizomaddin Uktambay o'g'li, Mansurova Shaxinabonu Najmaddin qizi</i>	
O'ZBEK TILIDA SON VA SIFAT SO'Z TURKUMLARINI POS TEGLASH ASOSIDA	
O'QITISH METODIKASINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH TAMOYILLARI	188-193
12.00.00 – YURIDIK FANLAR	
<i>Abdullaeva Dildora Elmurodovna</i>	
ПРАВОВОЕ РЕГУЛИРОВАНИЕ ИНВЕСТИЦИОННОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ В СТАРТАП	
ПРОЕКТЫ В РЕСПУБЛИКЕ УЗБЕКИСТАН НА ПРИМЕРЕ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ	
АКСЕЛЕРАТОРОВ И ИНКУБАТОРОВ	194-198
<i>Fayzullayeva Shaxlo Jumaniyoz qizi</i>	
THEORETICAL AND LEGAL ASPECTS OF INCLUSION OF COPYRIGHT OBJECTS IN	
INTERNATIONAL TRADE.....	199-204
<i>Qalandarov Aminjon Amondullayevich</i>	
KORPORATSIYALARDA AFFILLANGAN SHAXSLAR INSTITUTINING HUQUQIY	
TABIATI VA TARTIBGA SOLINISHI	205-212
<i>Uralov Sarbon Sardorovich</i>	
JINOYAT-PROTSESSUAL QONUNCHILIKDA VIDEOKONFERENSALOQA ORQALI	
TERGOV HARAKATLARINI TARTIBGA SOLISHNING UMUMIY SHARTLARI	213-218
<i>Xolmirzayev Muhsin Shavqiddin o'g'li</i>	
KRIMINOLOGIK PROGNOZLASHDA ANIQ FANLAR VA AXBOROT-KOMMUNIKATSIYA	
TEXNOLOGIYALARI YUTUQLARIDAN FOYDALANISH IMKONIYATLARI	219-225
<i>Dilbovoyev Nozimbek</i>	
XORIJIY (CHET EL) VA MAHALLIY (MILLIY) INVESTITSIYA TUSHUNCHALARINING	
ILMIY-NAZARIY TAVSIFI, ULARNING BOZOR IQTISODIYOTIDAGI	
O'RNI VA AHAMIYATI.....	226-232
<i>Nishonov Abdulloh Ubaydulloh o'g'li</i>	
ATOM ENERGIYASINING XAVFSIZLIGINI TA'MINLASHNING	
XALQARO-HUQUQIY ASOSLARI	233-240
<i>Asadov Shahriddin Faxriddin o'g'li</i>	
FUQAROLIK HUQUQIDA XIZMATLARNING HUQUQIY TABIATI:	
KONSALTING XIZMATLARI MISOLIDA.....	241-243
<i>Abdusapparov Sha'buz Muzaffar yugli</i>	
НЕСАНКЦИОНИРОВАННЫЙ ДОСТУП И ХИЩЕНИЕ ДЕНЕЖНЫХ СРЕДСТВ С	
ПЛАСТИКОВЫХ КАРТ: УГРОЗЫ, МОДЕЛИ ПРЕСТУПЛЕНИЙ И КОМПЛЕКСНЫЕ	
МЕРЫ ПРОТИВОДЕЙСТВИЯ.....	244-253
<i>Xasanov Tursonnulat Shavkatjon ugli</i>	
МЕЖДУ АЛГОРИТМОМ И ЗАКОНОМ: ПРОБЛЕМА ПРАВОВОЙ	
ИДЕНТИФИКАЦИИ СМАРТ-КОНТРАКТОВ В ЦИФРОВУЮ ЭПОХУ	254-259
<i>Kadirova Moxigul Xamitovna</i>	
ZAMONAVIY DAVLAT BOSHQARUVI VA ADOLATLI SUD-HUQUQ TIZIMI	260-262
<i>Muxitdinova Firyuza Abdurashidovna</i>	
UCHINCHI RENESSANS SHAROITIDA VATANPARVARLIK	
G'YASINING MA'NAVIY-HUQUQIY MOHIYATI	
(O'zbekiston tajribasi va xorijiy yondashuvlar qiyosida).....	263-269

<i>Shagilov Pulatbek Koptleuovich</i>	
JAMOAT XAVFSIZLIGIGA TAJOVUZ QILUVCHI HUQUQBUZARLIK LARGA QARSHI KURASHISH BO'YICHA ILG'OR XORIJIY MAMLAQATLARINING TAJRIBASI TAXLILI	270-276
<i>Kubaeva Ismigul Farkhod qizi</i>	
PARTY AUTONOMY VS CONSUMER PROTECTION IN INTERNATIONAL E-COMMERCE: THE CASE OF UZBEKISTAN IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE	277-283
<i>Нормуродова Азиза Азимжон кизи</i>	
ПОНУЖДЕНИЕ ЛИЦА К ВСТУПЛЕНИЮ В ПОЛОВУЮ СВЯЗЬ: ПРАВОВАЯ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКА ОБЪЕКТИВНОЙ СТОРОНЫ ПРЕСТУПЛЕНИЯ.....	284-295
<i>Toshpo'latov Islom Otavulla o'g'li</i>	
O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASIDA KADRLAR BILAN ISHLASH SIYOSATIDA MA'NAVIY- MA'RIFIY ISHLAR VA UNI ICHKI ISHLAR ORGANLARI TIZIMIGA TA'SIRI	296-301
<i>Аллашова Ширина Турсынбаевна, Каримова Мадина Мирзаджоновна</i>	
ВИКТИМНОЕ ПОВЕДЕНИЕ ЖЕРТВ БЫТОВОЙ ПРЕСТУПНОСТИ И ЕГО ПРОФИЛАКТИЧЕСКОЕ ЗНАЧЕНИЕ	302-307
<i>Lutfullayeva Feruza Boboqulovna</i>	
HUQUQIY DAVLAT KONSEPSIYASINING ZAMONAVIY NAZARIY YONDASHUVLARI	308-312
<i>Abdugaffarov Davronbek Dilshod o'g'li</i>	
SHARTNOMALARNI AMALGA OSHIRISH USTIDAN SAMARALI PARLAMENT NAZORATI: O'ZBEKISTONDA XALQARO TIJORAT SHARTNOMALARIDA TARAFLARNING ERK MUXTORIYATINI KUCHAYTIRISH	313-317
<i>Jalilov Ravshanjon Abdukayumovich</i>	
INSON A'ZOLARI VA TO'QIMALARINING NOQONUNIY AYLANMASI: JINOIY-HUQUQIY VA QIYOSIY TAHLIL	318-329
<i>Muxtorov Muhammad Amin Mirkomil o'g'li</i>	
MULK HUQUQINI MUHOFAZA QILISH ICHKI ISHLAR ORGANLARINING FAOLIYATI....	330-337
<i>Karimov Ulugbek Xakimjonovich</i>	
LEGAL FOUNDATIONS OF PROSECUTORIAL SUPERVISION IN ENSURING THE ALLOCATION, USE, AND PROTECTION OF LAND PLOTS IN THE AGRARIAN SECTOR OF UZBEKISTAN	338-343
<i>Mirabdullayev Maqsudjon Mahmudjon o'g'li</i>	
MASHINALI O'QITISH USULLARI ASOSIDA XOSTNING XAVFSIZLIGINI BAHOLASH, MODEL VA ALGORITMLARINI ISHLAB CHIQISH.....	344-349
<i>Utebaev Salamat Maqsetbay o'g'li, Dauletbaeva Aynur Baxramovna</i>	
OILAGA QARSHI JINOYATLARNING O'ZIGA XOS XUSUSIYATLARI VA ULARNING OLDINI OLİSH.....	350-354
<i>Tillayev Ikrom Rustamjonovich</i>	
HUQUQBUZARLIK LAR PROFILAKTIKASINI BELGILAB BERUVCHI UMUMIY VA SOHAVIY-HUQUQIY HUJJATLAR TAHLILI	355-362
<i>Xoshimova Nilufar Zafarjon qizi</i>	
O'ZBEKISTONDA MEHNAT MUNOSABATLARIDA MIGRATSIYA MUNOSABATLARI.....	363-366

13.00.00 – PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI

<i>Rahmonova Nilufar Najmuddin qizi</i> BO'LAJAK O'QITUVCHILARNI FORSAYT TADQIQOT METODLARI ASOSIDA KREATIV KOMPETENSIYALARI TA'LIM TRAYEKTORIYASINI TASHKIL ETISH.....	367-371
<i>Abdurasulova Dilrabo Tolkunjon qizi</i> KOMPARATIVISTIKISTIK YONDASHUV TALABALARNING MADANIYATLARARO KOMPETENSIYASINI SHAKLLANTIRISHNING METODOLOGIK ASOSI SIFATIDA.....	372-380
<i>Таджиходжаева Эльвира Рашидовна</i> ЦИФРОВАЯ ГРАМОТНОСТЬ КАК ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКАЯ КАТЕГОРИЯ В СИСТЕМЕ ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ НЕПРОФИЛЬНЫХ СПЕЦИАЛЬНОСТЕЙ.....	381-387
<i>Ravshanova Gulnoza Burxonovna</i> 5-SINF O'QUVCHILARINING ANTROPOMETRIK TOTAL KO'RSATKICHLARINI O'RGANISH BO'YICHA TADQIQOT BOSHIDA OLINGAN NATIJALAR TAHLILI.....	388-393
<i>Mirzaakhmedova Makhliyo Yuldashevna</i> THE IMPACT OF AUTHENTIC MATERIALS ON TEACHING BUSINESS WRITING SKILLS TO ESP STUDENTS	394-400

Received: 03 January 2026

Accepted: 17 January 2026

Published: 30 January 2026

Article / Original Paper

THE POLICY OF DEKULAKIZATION AND CONFISCATION OF PEASANT HOUSEHOLDS IN KAZAKHSTAN, 1929-1933

Khudoyorov Noyibjon Maripjonovich

Senior Lecturer of the Department of History of Uzbekistan

Andijan State University, Andijan Region, Republic of Uzbekistan

E-mail: noyibxudoyorov1970@gmail.com

<http://www.orcid.org/0009-0007-6337-9862>

Ruziboev Samandarbek Sobirjon o'g'li

1st-year Master's student of the educational program

"Cultural Heritage of the Near and Middle East and Africa"

Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

E-mail: roziboyevsamandar00@gmail.com

City: Rome, Italian Republic

<http://www.orcid.org/0009-0003-7833-5759>

Abstract. This article analyzes the policy of dekulakization and confiscation of peasant households implemented in Kazakhstan between 1929 and 1933. Based on archival documents and regulatory legal acts, the study examines the legal foundations of this policy, its mechanisms of implementation, and its socio-economic consequences. The authors argue that dekulakization served as a preparatory stage for forced collectivization and played a significant role in the formation of the material and technical base of collective farms.

Keywords: dekulakization, forced collectivization, confiscation, peasant households, Kazakhstan, Soviet agrarian policy, repression.

1929-1933-YILLARDA QOZOG'ISTONDA QULOQLASHTIRISH VA DEHQON XO'JALIKLARINI MUSODARA QILISH SIYOSATI

Xudoyorov Noyibjon Maripjonovich

O'zbekiston tarixi kafedrasi katta o'qituvchisi

Andijon davlat universiteti, Andijon viloyati, O'zbekiston Respublikasi

Ro'ziboyev Samandarbek Sobirjon o'g'li

"Yaqin va O'rta Sharq hamda Afrika madaniy merosi" ta'lim dasturining

1-kurs magistranti

Rim, Sapienza universiteti, Rim, Italiya

Annotation. Mazkur maqolada 1929-1933-yillarda Qozog'istonda amalga oshirilgan quloqlashtirish va dehqon xo'jaliklarini musodara qilish siyosati tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot arxiv hujatlari va normativ-huquqiy qarorlar asosida ushbu siyosatning huquqiy asoslari, amalga oshirish mexanizmlari hamda ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy oqibatlarini yoritigan. Mualliflar quloqlashtirish jarayoni majburiy kollektivlashtirishga tayyorgarlik bosqichi bo'lganini va kolxozlarning moddiy-texnik bazasini shakllantirishda muhim rol o'ynaganini asoslaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: quloqlashtirish, majburiy kollektivlashtirish, musodara, dehqon xo'jaliklari, Qozog'iston, sovet agrar siyosati, repressiyalar.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47390/SPR1342V6SI1Y2026N05>

Introduction. At the turn of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, the inclusion of archival documents previously marked as “secret” and “top secret” into scholarly circulation made it possible to reassess Soviet agrarian policy. In particular, forced collectivization carried out in the 1920s–1930s and the closely related policy of dekulakization remain among the most significant and controversial topics in historiography. Although the policy of dekulakization in Kazakhstan was implemented on the basis of all-Union decisions, the region’s socio-economic and ethnic characteristics gave this process specific features. As a result of the vague and overly broad interpretation of the concept of the “kulak,” repressive measures were applied not only to wealthy peasant households but also to middle peasants and, in some cases, even poor households. This article examines the legal foundations, mechanisms of implementation, and socio-economic consequences of the dekulakization policy carried out in Kazakhstan between 1929 and 1933, based on an analysis of archival documents and regulatory decisions.

Literature Review and Methodology. In the historiography of the 1920s–1930s, Soviet agrarian policy—particularly the processes of forced collectivization and dekulakization—has been extensively examined. Early scholarly studies of this issue emerged during the Soviet period and were conducted primarily within the framework of Marxist-Leninist methodology and the concept of class struggle. In particular, the materials of the Eighth All-Kazakhstan Regional Conference of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), as well as party documents, reveal the ideological foundations of this policy [1; 10]. In the speeches and writings of F. I. Goloshchyokin, the process of socialist transformation in Kazakhstan is justified from a class-based perspective, with the liquidation of kulak and bai households interpreted as a necessary measure [2]. Among Soviet-era scholars, N. A. Ivnitsky regarded dekulakization as an important stage of class struggle in the countryside and analyzed it in close connection with the state’s repressive mechanisms [4]. Documentary collections devoted to rural life on the eve of and during collectivization constitute an important source base for the present study [6; 11]. At the same time, Soviet historiography often portrayed confiscation and resettlement measures in a justificatory manner, without adequately addressing their social consequences.

In the post-Soviet period, a critical reassessment of this problem has intensified. Researchers such as A. P. Kozlov and V. M. Samosudov reconsidered collectivization and dekulakization from the perspective of socio-economic processes and the evolution of historiography [3; 7]. The works of R. A. Medvedev emphasize the role of individual actors and political decision-making in Stalin-era agrarian policy [8]. Regional studies have also highlighted the local specificities of dekulakization and forced resettlement, including the mechanisms of their implementation in Kazakhstan [5].

Methodologically, the study is based on the principles of historicism, systemic analysis, and the comparative-historical method. The main sources include regulatory legal acts, party resolutions, statistical materials, and archival documents. In particular, materials from the Archive of the Administration of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan and the Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History are of key importance for understanding the practical implementation of the dekulakization policy [9; 12]. In addition, periodical publications and contemporary journalistic works were used in the analysis [13; 14].

Discussion. The mass introduction into scholarly circulation of archival materials previously marked as “Secret” and “Top Secret” led to the emergence of new concepts and research directions in historiography. This development made it possible to achieve a more accurate and comprehensive understanding of historical realities. Following the October Revolution, Soviet authorities divided the rural population into three main socio-economic groups—poor peasants, middle peasants, and kulak-bai households. The Bolsheviks adopted a specific approach to defining the criteria for classifying peasants into these categories. In particular, it was argued that “...it would be more appropriate to distinguish the rich, middle, and poor peasants according to the number of horses they possessed. If a peasant owned many horses, he was almost always considered well-off; if he had a large number of draught animals, this meant that he also had extensive arable land, additional plots beyond his own land, and financial reserves” [1]. At the same time, it was emphasized that “the situation of one-horse peasants was difficult,” and that “if we consider the entire stratum of one-horse peasants, there is no doubt that the majority of them belonged to the poor and needy population” [2]. By the 1920s, key criteria for identifying social groups included the size of landholdings, arable land, draught animals, and the presence of industrial (production) enterprises.

The forced and comprehensive collectivization of agriculture became one of the most violent and painful chapters in the history of Soviet peasantry. The policy of dekulakization implemented in Kazakhstan did not differ significantly from all-Union directives. However, given the region’s complex ethnic composition, certain specific features emerged in the course of this process. In particular, within the framework of social stratification of landowners, not only traditional Russian kulaks but also local Kazakh elites and other representatives of the landowning class were included among the so-called “exploitative elements.”

In Soviet historiography, measures of property deprivation—an integral component of the state’s repressive policy—were presented in a fragmented manner and predominantly within an ideological framework that sought to justify their “legitimacy.” Serious scholarly interest in this issue emerged primarily in the late 1980s and early 1990s, when numerous academic works were produced and significant research was conducted. Nevertheless, many aspects of forced confiscation of property and the resettlement of peasants, especially at the regional level, still require further and more in-depth study.

In contemporary national historiography, the chronological framework of the dekulakization policy—particularly the question of when it began—remains a subject of scholarly debate. A group of researchers associates the initial stage of this policy with the resolution adopted by the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR on 21 May 1929. Since this document provided a detailed description of the specific characteristics of kulak households, it is interpreted as the prologue, or preparatory stage, of the dekulakization policy.

The vague criteria and broad interpretation of the concept of the “kulak household” during the period of mass collectivization made it possible to classify virtually any peasant household under this category. An analysis of historical sources [3; 4; 5] indicates that this practice lacked an objective basis. In fact, the resolution of the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR dated 21 May 1929 was aimed, within the framework of the New Economic Policy (NEP), at restricting the economic growth of kulak households, and its objectives were clearly defined.

However, the drastic changes introduced into tax legislation in the autumn of 1929 indicated a completely different direction. These changes made it possible to excessively broaden the concept of the “kulak household,” as a result of which middle peasants and even some poor peasants were included in this category. At the same time, they created a legal basis that, in practice, generated favorable conditions for the launch of forced collectivization [3].

Scholars who have examined the policy of dekulakization have largely relied on the interpretation of the Russian term *kulak* found in V. I. Dal's *Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language*, published between 1863 and 1866. In this dictionary, the lexical meaning of the word *kulak* is interpreted, first, as the act of clenching the hand into a fist, symbolizing density and compression. Second, the term *kulak* is applied to a specific social stratum of the rural population in Russia, characterized as miserly, self-interested, harsh, and strong-willed individuals [6].

The first three characteristics in this description correspond in Uzbek to such negative meanings as “stingy,” “greedy,” and “calculating,” whereas the latter two may be interpreted as “determined,” “reliable,” and “independent.” Depending on the context, these qualities may carry either negative or positive connotations. It should also be taken into account that V. I. Dal described the *kulak* stratum as a social phenomenon characteristic of the first half of the nineteenth century.

Russian linguists also interpret the word *kulak* as meaning “buyer,” “seller,” “collector,” and “intermediary,” emphasizing that representatives of this group were active participants in market relations rather than mere producers. Importantly, in pre-revolutionary Russia the term *kulak* did not always carry a negative connotation [6].

The abolition of serfdom in Russia in 1861 led to the emergence of new economic relations that significantly affected various social strata, including the social psychology of the peasantry. Rural entrepreneurs who understood the demands of the time began to achieve success not only in agriculture but also in industry. From the 1890s onward, the term *kulak* came to be used in Russia to denote the rural bourgeoisie [1].

In terms of cultural level and living conditions, kulaks did not differ sharply from ordinary peasants. Like other peasants, they directly participated in the labor process. What primarily distinguished kulaks from other rural social groups was their entrepreneurial spirit and business skills. Kulaks expanded their landholdings by leasing land from peasants, landowners, and the state. They owned agricultural machinery and implements, working and breeding livestock, as well as commercial and industrial facilities such as mills and sugar-processing enterprises. Kulaks rented draught animals and equipment to poorer peasants and employed hired labor on their own lands. They played a significant role in agricultural production in Russia, providing nearly 50 percent of grain output, and also controlled systems of trade and product distribution in rural areas.

When speaking about a “broad network of state and collective farms,” Stalin undoubtedly idealized the existing situation, presenting a desired state of affairs as reality. At the same time, he expressed confidence that after the defeat of the Right Opposition, the idea of property confiscation would be supported by the majority of the party apparatus.

Stalin was well aware that dissatisfaction with the New Economic Policy (NEP) was widespread within the party, as this policy essentially restored economic arrangements against which the communists had previously fought. In his speech at the Fourteenth Congress of the

All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), he rightly stated: “If communists are asked what the party is more prepared for—dekulakization or abandoning it in favor of an alliance with the middle peasant—I believe that 99 out of 100 communists are ready to support the party’s slogan. They will immediately deprive the kulaks of their property” [7]. In his speech at the Marxist Agrarian Congress, Stalin also determined the future fate of dekulakized peasant households and completely blocked their admission to collective farms. Posing the rhetorical question, “Is it possible to admit a kulak into a collective farm?” Stalin answered it categorically himself: “Of course, a kulak cannot be admitted to a collective farm. This is impossible, because he is a bitter enemy of the collective farm movement” [8].

In December 1929, a commission of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was established to develop measures for implementing mass collectivization. Its membership included secretaries of regional and local party organizations, among them the representative of Kazakhstan, F. I. Goloshchyokin. Under the leadership of Ya. A. Yakovlev, the commission discussed, among other issues, the liquidation of kulak households. The commission’s conclusions formed the basis of the resolution adopted on 1 February 1930 by the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) entitled “On Measures to Strengthen the Socialist Reconstruction of Agriculture in the Areas of Mass Collectivization and the Struggle against the Kulaks” [9].

In accordance with this resolution, laws permitting land leasing and the use of hired labor in individual peasant households were abolished in areas of mass collectivization. Alongside these measures—which had served as a social basis for the persistence of capitalist relations in the countryside—local Soviet authorities were granted the right to take all necessary actions in collectivization zones, including the complete confiscation of property and its removal beyond the boundaries of districts and regions [9].

In order to implement the resolution of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of 1 February 1930, the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People’s Commissars of the Kazakh ASSR adopted, on 19 February 1930, the decree “On Measures to Strengthen the Socialist Reconstruction of Agriculture” [10].

Peasant households of the “kulak-bai” type were divided into three categories. The first category (“counterrevolutionary activists”) included kulaks and wealthy households subject to deportation beyond the borders of the republic; the second category (“kulak properties, the wealthiest semi-landowners, semi-feudal bais”) was to be resettled outside the district; and the third category (“the remaining kulak and wealthy households”) was also subject to removal beyond district boundaries [9].

In Kazakhstan, the processes of confiscating the property of “kulaks” and “bais” and deporting them began in the second half of February 1930. Initially, grain-producing regions included in the mass collectivization plan were subjected to these measures [11]. Overall, it was planned to liquidate and resettle 7,667 peasant households in the zones of mass collectivization in Kazakhstan [9]. According to a decision of the Kazkraikom commission, by the summer of 1930 it was envisaged to liquidate a total of 3,221 households, of which 1,065 belonged to the first category, 1,250 to the second, and 906 to the third category [9].

From 1 May 1929 onward, households that had “declared themselves kulaks,” as well as “kulaks who had arrived from other districts and regions, even in cases where no kulak characteristics were observed in their households,” began to be included in the kulak category

[12]. As a result, virtually any peasant household could be classified as a kulak household depending on the will of the individuals or institutions responsible for registration. In practice, this is precisely what occurred. An analysis of archival documents shows that in several districts and regions of Kazakhstan, the lists of households subject to confiscation were revised multiple times. In these lists, households were alternately designated as “kulak” or “middle peasant” [9].

Although preparation for the campaign to “eliminate kulaks and bais as a class” was carried out differently across regions of Kazakhstan, everywhere it was organized with particular caution and in a manner resembling a military operation. For example, the Petropavlovsk district party committee adopted a decision to form armed detachments in the region in order to assist the OGPU bodies. It was stipulated to “establish groups and detachments composed of communists in each district, arm them, and conduct a struggle against all ‘counterrevolutionary attempts’ by kulaks, bais, and other hostile forces directed against party and Soviet measures,” with these activities to be carried out in cooperation with the district military commissariat [12].

In order to prevent peasant households slated for liquidation from leaving the district, the district committee issued an order prohibiting the sale of railway tickets at all stations within the district to peasants who lacked the appropriate authorization; permission could be granted only by regional executive committees.

In practice, the “planned targets” for the liquidation of kulak households—often established on a subjective basis—were frequently exceeded. Alongside kulak households, wealthy, middle, and in some cases even poor peasant households were also confiscated [9]. According to existing instructions, the confiscation of dwellings belonging to “kulaks” and “bais” of the second and third categories was to be carried out on the basis of decisions adopted at meetings of poor peasants, middle peasants, and collective farms. At these meetings, lists identifying the “kulaks” and “bais” designated for resettlement were compiled and discussed, after which they were submitted to the district executive committee for approval and, once endorsed, forwarded to the village council for final confirmation [12].

In practice, however, such a strict procedure was often violated. For example, in the village of Bogolyubovskoye in the Petropavlovsk district of the Voroshilov okrug, a representative of the district executive committee, Kirillov, convened a meeting of party and Soviet activists and immediately identified candidates for confiscation, issuing an order the same day to “liquidate kulaks as a class.” The order was carried out without delay: all households deemed more or less well-off were confiscated indiscriminately—“even underwear was taken away, and those deprived of property were driven out into the street.” The “landless” attempted to find shelter among fellow villagers, but rumors spread that anyone who assisted the “liquidated” peasant households would “meet the same fate.” As a result, the meeting concluded with the registration of all collective farms [9].

In accordance with directives issued by the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People’s Commissars of the Kazakh ASSR, all means of production and all property were to be confiscated from dekulakized peasant households of the first category, leaving them only the most essential household items, a two-month food supply, and 500 rubles for household needs. From households of the second and third categories, nearly all property and the main means of production were confiscated, with the exception of minimal tools and equipment required for agricultural work [12].

In practice, however, even these minimal measures intended to ensure the basic subsistence of dekulakized households were not observed. Complaints were received by the Kazkraikom of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) from various regions indicating that dispossessed households were not provided with even the minimum necessary supplies for production and food, and that personal belongings were also being confiscated [9]. In districts where confiscations were carried out, cases of looting became widespread. For instance, in the village of Stanovoye in the Trudovoy district of the Petropavlovsk okrug, it was reported that “during confiscation everything was taken away, no inventories were drawn up... the secretary of the VKP(b) candidate group, Vasilyev, personally confiscated the gold earrings of citizen Sinyu” [5].

By the end of 1930, the liquidation and resettlement of kulak-bai households of the first and second categories in the zones of mass collectivization in Kazakhstan had largely been completed, and by May 1932 the process of liquidation and “economic and everyday equalization” of third-category kulaks and bais was also brought to an end. Thus, by the summer of 1932, the last “exploitative classes” in the villages and auls of Kazakhstan had been eliminated.

However, the process of dekulakization did not end there: in subsequent years, repeated confiscation measures were also carried out. At this stage, however, the content of dekulakization changed. Once the majority of the rural and aul population had been collectivized, the wave of repression continued within the collective farms themselves, that is, within their internal social environment.

In all grain-producing regions, special inspection commissions were established to identify and purge “kulak-bai elements” who had covertly entered collective farms. These elements were to be expelled from the collective farms and resettled with confiscation of their property. From 1933 onward, leadership of confiscation measures was transferred to the political departments of the Machine and Tractor Stations (MTS), established in accordance with the decision of the joint January plenum of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and the Central Control Commission [13]. The political departments operated with considerable intensity. In the first half of 1933 alone, MTS political departments identified 2,487 “kulaks, bais, and their accomplices” who had secretly infiltrated collective farms in areas of mass collectivization [11].

From the perspective of the repressive apparatus of Stalinism, Kazakhstan’s harsh climatic conditions, low population density, and availability of vast unoccupied lands made it one of the principal regions for resettling confiscated households. According to the resolution of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) dated 30 January 1930, “On Measures for the Liquidation of Kulak Households in Areas of Mass Collectivization,” it was planned to resettle between 20,000 and 25,000 kulak families to Kazakhstan [9].

The placement of “special settlers” was carried out in accordance with strict regulations. These rules were established by the decree of the People’s Commissariat of Internal Affairs of the RSFSR, “On the Places of Residence of Kulak Households Resettled from Areas of Mass Collectivization,” which regulated even the width of streets in settlements and the list of “cultural and public buildings” [9].

Living conditions in these settlements were extremely harsh. Agriculture remained the primary occupation of the “special settlers.” To organize production, “standard agricultural artels” were established in the settlements. According to special instructions, wages in the settlements were paid at only 50 percent of the established norm, while bread and other foodstuffs were issued at half rations. Failure to meet planned targets entailed various punishments for the “special settlers” [9]. Exhausting physical labor combined with inadequate nutrition led to mass mortality. For example, in Labor Camp No. 54 in the Shortandy district of the Karaganda region, 575 people died over an eight-month period from May to December 1933 [9].

Results. Thus, it becomes evident that the policy of “eliminating kulaks and peasants as a class” was determined not so much by a desire to “abolish exploitation out of hatred,” but by other factors. Foremost among these was the urgent need of newly established collective farms for material means of production. Simply uniting poor peasant households into collective farms could not produce significant economic results, since the primary participants were poor peasants and economically weak middle peasants. Consequently, the principal source for forming the material and technical base of collective farms became the means of production and property confiscated from peasant households deprived of their assets in villages and auls.

Machine and Tractor Stations (MTSs) were also unable to supply many collective farms with tractors and other agricultural machinery. By the spring of 1932, the total number of tractors available in the republic amounted to only 1,626, which was clearly insufficient; the main agricultural work continued to be carried out using horses and oxen [13].

Moreover, although MTSs contributed to some extent to increasing labor productivity in agriculture (in particular, cultivated areas expanded in regions where they operated), they simultaneously generated another problem—namely, the alienation of direct producers from the means of production. Work performed on collective farms with the assistance of MTSs was often inefficient. As a rule, MTSs were engaged only in seasonal work, which they frequently carried out in a formalistic manner. For example, in the spring of 1931, the sowing campaign in several MTSs of the Petropavlovsk district lasted for as long as two months. As a result, seeds sown in late May and early June often failed to germinate [13].

Thus, dekulakization was not the result of mass collectivization but, on the contrary, served as its preparatory stage. Without dekulakization, the implementation of forced mass collectivization would have been virtually impossible. The most important source for the formation of collective farm property consisted of the means of production and assets confiscated from dispossessed peasants. The standardized phrase frequently encountered in documents—“with confiscation and resettlement”—was not accidental; it appeared in all directives and decisions related to the policy of expropriation. This measure was mandatory for all categories of peasant households subjected to dispossession [13].

In Kazakhstan, cases of confiscation of large peasant households had also been observed earlier, particularly during the liquidation of large “semi-feudal” households in 1928–1929 [14]. However, whereas at that time the property of “bais” was mainly redistributed in favor of certain poor households, the means of production, assets, and agricultural product reserves confiscated from “kulaks” and “bais” were now transferred to the indivisible funds of collective farms as the share of poor peasants and farm laborers. Confiscated residential buildings were used “for state needs of village councils and collective farms (clubs, educational facilities,

schools, and others)" or converted into dormitories for peasants who joined collective farms. Responsibility for safeguarding confiscated property was assigned to local Soviet authorities [10]. According to official data, only in the mid-1930s did collective farms in Kazakhstan receive means of production worth 5,489.1 thousand rubles as a result of confiscations. Official statistics indicate that their share in the indivisible funds of collective farms exceeded 25 percent of the total value of collective farm property [11].

In addition, the strict repressive policy applied to peasants who did not wish to join collective farms and attempted to "maintain an independent existence" within their own households served as a specific incentive to instill collectivist thinking in their consciousness. Such peasants could at any moment be classified as "assistants of kulaks" (*podkulachniki*).

In our view, it would be incorrect to assign responsibility for the policy of dekulakization solely to Stalin and his closest associates. Stalin himself was, to some extent, a captive of Marxist doctrine or, at the very least, was able to employ it as an effective instrument for addressing urgent socio-economic tasks. It was precisely the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of classes and class struggle that provided the ideological foundation for social division and was used by Stalin to justify the need for a "new, decisive offensive against capitalist elements in the city and the countryside" [7].

Conclusion. The policy of dekulakization implemented in Kazakhstan between 1929 and 1933 served as an integral and preparatory stage of forced mass collectivization. The study demonstrates that due to the vague and broad interpretation of the concept of the "kulak," repressive measures were applied not only to wealthy households but also to middle peasants and, in some cases, poor peasant households. An analysis of archival documents and normative decisions shows that the primary objective of dekulakization was not so much to intensify class hostility as to form the material and technical base of newly established collective farms. Confiscated means of production and property became an important source of collective farm assets. At the same time, this policy dealt a severe blow to the social structure of the rural population, leading to mass resettlements, economic decline, and demographic losses. Overall, the process of dekulakization in Kazakhstan clearly demonstrates the repressive nature of Soviet agrarian policy and its regional specificities, indicating the need for further in-depth research in historiography.

References/Adabiyotlar/Литература:

1. VIII Всеказахстанская краевая конференция ВКП(б). 8–16 января 1934 г. : стенографический отчет. – Алма-Ата : Казкрайком ВКП(б), 1935. – 404 с.
2. Голощекин Ф. И. Казахстан в социалистической стройке // Партийное строительство в Казахстане : сборник речей и статей (1925–1930 гг.). – М. ; Алма-Ата : Государственное издательство РСФСР, 1930. – 344 с.
3. Козлов А. П. Социально-экономические преобразования в казахском доколхозном ауле второй половины 1920-х гг. // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. – Тамбов : Грамота, 2012. – № 12 (26). – Ч. I. – С. 118–122.
4. Ивницкий Н. А. Классовая борьба в деревне и ликвидация кулачества как класса (1929–1932 гг.). – М. : Наука, 1972. – 360 с.
5. Семено А. В. Осуществление политики раскулачивания и выселения кулацких семей на территории Кировской области в 1929–1934 гг. : автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. – Киров, 2003. – 21 с.

6. Документы свидетельствуют : из истории деревни накануне и в ходе коллективизации. 1927–1932 гг. / под ред. В. П. Данилова, Н. А. Ивницкого. – М. : Политиздат, 1989. – 526 с.
7. Самосудов В. М. Современная отечественная историография коллективизации (1980-е – середина 1990-х гг.). – Омск : Изд-во ОмГПУ, 1998. – 141 с.
8. Медведев Р. А. Свита и семья Сталина. – М. ; Пермь : Изд-во политической литературы ; Изд-во «Звезда», 1991. – С. 170.
9. Архив Администрации Президента Республики Узбекистан. Ф. 58. Д. 1. Л. 72–75; Д. 3297. Л. 23, 28; Д. 3521. Л. 91; Д. 5043. Л. 5–87; Д. 8119. Л. 12.
10. Коммунистическая партия Советского Союза в резолюциях, решениях съездов, конференций и пленумов ЦК. – М. : Политиздат, 1984. – Т. 5. – 446 с. – С. 279–280.
11. Коллективизация сельского хозяйства Казахстана (1926 – июнь 1941 гг.) : документы и материалы / под ред. А. Б. Турсунбаева. – Алма-Ата : Казахстан, 1967. – Ч. 1. – 576 с.
12. Российский государственный архив социально-политической истории (РГАСПИ). Ф. 17. Оп. 25. Д. 207. Л. 2–3.
13. Починковский Л. М. МТС в Казахстане // Народное хозяйство Казахстана. – 1932. – № 5. – С. 18–26.
14. Кабульдинов З. Триумф и трагедия казахских баев // Казахстанская правда. – 31 мая 2024 г. – URL: <https://kazpravda.kz/n/triumf-i-tragediya-kazahskih-baev/> (дата обращения: 20.12.2025).

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

IJTIMOIY-GUMANITAR FANLARNING DOLZARB MUAMMOLARI

Nº S/1 (6) – 2026

**АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО-
ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК**

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

**“Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb
muammolari”** elektron jurnali 2020-yil
6-avgust kuni 1368-sonli guvohnoma bilan
davlat ro‘yxatiga olingan.

Muassis: “SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM”
mas’uliyati cheklangan jamiyati

Tahririyat manzili:

100070. Toshkent shahri, Yakkasaroy
tumani, Kichik Beshyog’och ko‘chasi,
70/10-uy. Elektron manzil:

scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com

Bog’lanish uchun telefon:

(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).