

## **MUSTAFA SHOKAY ON COLLECTIVIZATION IN KAZAKHSTAN AND THE REPUBLICS OF MEDIUM ASIA**

### **Abstract**

The publication of the 12th volume edition of the previously unpublished works of Mustafa Shokay, in our opinion, will significantly enrich the history of economic thought in Kazakhstan. In his socio-political activity and analytical researches, he, one of the founders of Alash movement and the leader of the Kazakh opposition to the Soviet government outside the USSR, paid considerable attention to the socio-economic processes that took place in that period in the Soviet Union in general and in Kazakhstan and the republics of Central Asia in particular. The focus of Mustafa Shokay's research has always been socio-economic problems associated with socio-economic reforms to transfer the economy of the former tsarist empire in connection with the coming to power of the Bolshevik party to power, the socialist rails in the 20-30s. During the period of these transformations in the period in question, the Soviet Union had significant negative consequences, resulted in the deaths of millions of people and a significant deterioration in the welfare of the majority of the country's population. These problems were particularly acute during the period of collectivization of peasant farms, and especially in Kazakhstan and the Turkestan region. These negative socio-economic processes that served as a pretext for so close attention of the tireless fighter for justice and independence of the Kazakh people and the entire Turkic world. In the presented article numerous scientific and journalistic work of the researcher has been reviewed. In his materials, the author, on the basis of a critical analysis, assesses the process of collectivization at its various stages in the Soviet Union as a whole, in the republics of Central Asia and in Kazakhstan, in particular.

Key words: collectivization, farm household, agriculture, reform, collective farm, income, animal husbandry, rent.

Being in emigration, representing the interests of the Kazakh people and the Alash party in foreign countries, Mustafa Shokay (1889–1941, a graduate of the law faculty of St. Petersburg University, an outstanding state and public figure, scholar, essayist) demonstrated a significant interest to political, socio-economic processes in Turkestan region in the 20–30s of the twentieth century.

A special place among his scientific researches and published works on social and economic problems is taken by comprehensive studies of the process of collectivization in the agrarian sector of the Medium Asian republics and Kazakhstan in the 20–30s of the last century, its disastrously detrimental consequences for the indigenous population of these territories. He published a significant number of scientific papers and journalistic articles on these problems.

Collectivization of peasant farms in the Soviet Union, according to Mustafa Shokay's deep conviction, should have been carried out step-by-step: from lower forms to higher forms. At the same time, it must necessarily take place on the basis of voluntariness, with obligatory consideration of local peculiarities and conditions [1, p. 405–406; 2, p. 113–118].

Regarding the peculiar features of the economy management of the indigenous rural population of the Great steppe, he wrote the following: "I am by no means a defender of the inviolability of the historically established way of life in general, and if, as arguments against the Soviet methods of resolving the Kyrgyz (Kazakh – A. Dogalov) issue, referred to some historically established aspects of Kyrgyz life ...", "An uncomplicated economy, in which close to primitive cattle-breeding plays the most important role, with a relatively weak development of agriculture and the complete absence of the factory sector, eliminated the need (even if to take the point of view of the Bolsheviks) of those methods practiced by the Bolsheviks in Russia" [3, p. 155, 164].

Concerning the history of the emergence of the Soviet form of collectivization, Mustafa Shokay noted the following points: "The idea of introducing "collectivization of agricultural sector" ("collective farm") in Sov[iet] Russia belongs to Trotsky. For this, he was not yet declared an enemy of Soviet power, but only an enemy of Stalinist policy. Then, after Trotsky was removed from Sov[iet] Russia, Stalin took his "harmful idea" and began to conduct "collectivization" himself. At first, "collectivization" was supposed to be only "voluntary", that is, only those who voluntarily expressed a desire could make

up among themselves “collective farms”. There were very few such “volunteers”. Then they fell back on forced “collectivization” and began massively to drive everyone into a “collective farm”. It got to the point where here and there even home stuff – clothes bedding, and boilers were “collectivized” and even proceeded to list ... wives!” [4, p. 50–55].

Forced collectivization, according to history afterwards, not only did not produce positive results, but also caused considerable damage to the agricultural production of the Soviet state. Millions of people were victims of such a disastrous reform in the agricultural sector.

It was during the period of collectivization in the Soviet Union that Mustafa Shokay strongly opposed the used forms and methods of the conducted reform. Being in emigration, he, on the basis of materials published in the Soviet print media and official data of statistical authorities of the USSR, deeply analyzed the process of implementation of collectivization and on their basis revealed all its harmfulness. Thus, for example, he noted that “according to five-year plan, the collective farms were supposed to be voluntary associations of the peasantry, to become the stronghold of the Soviet power in the country, to enrich the people and the whole country, by flooding them with agricultural products. None of these listed conditions were met. There was a compelling push to collective farms. Under collective farms, people are starving as never before. Instead of the supposed stronghold, the collective farms became a real grave-digger of the Soviet power. Hence the struggle of the Soviet government for “cleaning the collective farms from undesirable elements” emerged [2, p. 117].

“The Bolsheviks are somehow not getting along with the collective farms. One day “Stalin’s collective farm charter”, referred to as the “iron law” is violated, another day “Golden Fund” of the collective farm economy is squandered. It is impossible to even enumerate how many times it was necessary to make “amendments” to the “Stalinist charter” or even completely modify it, and it’s hard to figure out “who exactly violates the collective farm charter: whether the collective farmers or the Soviet government itself” [4, p. 50].

Analyzing the results of the failure of the collectivization process in the initial period of its implementation, insightful Mustafa Shokay makes the following conclusions: “The Bolsheviks achieved their aim. In some places all 100% of the peasant economy was collectivized: neither a shred of their land nor own livestock. However, the results turned out to be just the opposite of what the Bolsheviks expected: the “collectivized” cattle were destroyed mercilessly, the “collectivized” land ceased to yield. ... People died in the thousands and millions. We see the results of this famine now according to the data of the last Soviet census (see “Yash Turkestan”, № 115) [4, p. 51].

After the catastrophic failure of conducted socio-economic reforms aimed at the collectivization of peasant farms, the Soviet government took a number of urgent administrative and policy measures to eradicate the mistakes committed in the agricultural sector. In this regard, Mustafa Shokay critically noted in the article “On the collective farm front” that “It was necessary to change the “iron law” – “the Stalin collective farm charter” in the direction of some relief. “100% collectivization” of sowing of grain and vegetables was prohibited. Permission was given to the so-called farmstead, that is, the peasants had the right to private property on a plat (a maximum of half a hectare) near their homes and on some, the most insignificant amount of livestock. And this indisputable evidence of the collapse of the reckless “collective farm system”, the Bolsheviks and their hired agents began to misrepresent as its success” [4, p. 51–52].

Further, in this article it is stated that “The real struggle began between even though tiny, but with its own economy, which the peasants had to work with their own hands and the powerful “collective farm”, equipped with the most advanced agricultural machines [4, p. 52].

According to his conviction in this economic battle “the victory will remain with their small farm, the income from which remained entirely in the hands of the peasant himself, one could not doubt” [4, p. 52]. Historical facts clearly confirm the absolute correctness of this statement, i.e. so it happened.

In connection with these negative circumstances, the government of the Soviet Union, as the author of the article notes, urgently “resorted to measures to combat the small private peasant economy and imposed a special tax on the horse. The peasants were forced to transfer the “extra horses” they had to the collective farms and proceeded to manually work out their piece of land. This led to a decrease in the number of workdays in collective farms, and the Soviet government issues a decree on the mandatory minimum of workdays. Obviously, this measure adopted in May of this year

is considered insufficient for the victory of the collective farm system over the tiny private farm household and the Bolsheviks have resorted to reducing, firstly, the size of the already small backyard area and secondly, to prohibiting the lease of the collective farm land to the peasants” [4, p. 52].

Noting the features that were taking place in the process of collectivization in the Turkestan region, he objectively and bitterly pointed out that “The Bolshevik bunglers were especially zealous in Turkestan and Kazakhstan, and Stalin was forced to write his famous “Dizzy with success” [4, p. 51].

After the release of this article, party conferences were urgently held in the Medium Asian republics and Kazakhstan, where many negative facts were revealed during the discussion of the collectivization process and a number of frightening measures were taken to eliminate them. On the matter Mustafa Shokay notes the following in his articles: “Goloshekin in Alma-Ata and Aronshtam in Ashkhabad also spoke about mistakes. Meanwhile, eight months ago, all of these characters at one time excluded mistakes and did not allow anyone to mention them. In particular, we quoted on the pages of “YashTürkistan” how that “Moscow Turkmen” Aronshtam threatened to accuse counter-revolutionary communists from real Turkestan Turkmen for their statement about the inapplicability of Moscow directives to “jump over the lowest forms of collectivization directly to the highest” and the need to consider local peculiarities” [1, p. 405].

Further, in his works, he repeatedly noted that all responsibility for the mistakes and excesses committed in the process of collectivization in the Turkestan region and Kazakhstan was assigned on local party and executive bodies. Consequently, on the part of the Stalinist dictatorial regime, repressive measures were taken against the workers of these institutions – “...the Moscow Bolsheviks began arresting strictly and blindly small fry secretaries of district committees, who were fulfilling their own directives ...” [2, p. 118].

The fear of the Stalinist repressive regime at that time did not allow the great bulk of the leading officials of the party and Soviet bodies in Kazakhstan to express their disagreement with the socio-economic reforms in the countryside in that period in the republic. Analyzing this circumstance, Mustafa Shokay noted the following. Firstly, “In “Enbekshi Kazakh”, now, after the party conference, they write that many of the Kazakh communists were afraid at one time to point out the harm from the rigid application of the Moscow “general line” to Kazakh conditions. And the editorial board of this newspaper itself, it turns out, was afraid to print on its pages the reports from places about the disastrous consequences of forced collectivization” [1, p. 405].

Secondly, “They started talking about mistakes afterwards, when threatening symptoms of an open uprising began to manifest themselves in different parts of Turkestan” [1, p. 405].

Thirdly, “What are the real results of the now-realized “political mistakes” of the party leadership?” [1, p. 405].

Thus, for example, he points out that “In Kazakhstan, the number of livestock has decreased by one third. ...Isa-ogly (Isayev – A. Dogalov) Oraz spoke about this in Alma-Ata [1, p. 405].

Fourthly, “Isa-ogly, of course, cannot express any doubt that “real development of animal husbandry is possible only on the basis of mass collectivization”. But, having become convinced in the “negative results” of this Leninist theory, he expressed a sensible idea, which we should fix on the pages of our journal.

Isa-Ogly says: “There are no yet prerequisites for mass collectivization in our livestock areas” [1, p. 405].

Fifthly, “As you can see, Isa-ogly, the most faithful agent of the red Moscow dictatorship, himself switched to the position of Ismail Sadvakas-ogly (Smagul Saduakasov – A. Dogalov). After all, Ismail also accepts the theoretical positions of Leninism, but believes that there are no “prerequisites” for the application of Leninism in Kazakh conditions. Ismail is ranked among the agents of the bourgeoisie for this. This means that Oraz also has one foot in the position of the “steppe bourgeoisie”...” [1, p. 406].

For the development of collective farm production in Kazakhstan, in opinion of the leaders of the republic’s party organs, an issued decree of the Soviet government “On measures for the development of public animal husbandry in collective farms”, adopted on 8th of July, 1939, had to play a role.

Mustafa Shokay had a different opinion on this issue. “Has the “public animal husbandry in the collective farms” not been brought to the extreme limits by the already existing laws and special measures of the Soviet government? According to digital data, in terms of the number of livestock

available in collective farms, he wrote, it would seem, “public animal husbandry in collective farms” no longer needs any special incentive measures” [4, p. 13].

In support of his thoughts, he cites the following data from official press organs: “After all, here in Turkestan, where, compared with other parts of the Soviet Union, there is a greater number of individual farmers, the number of livestock they have, for example, in the Kazakh part, is equal to only 0,8% (that is, less than one percent) of the total number of livestock in the country ... . Almost all cattle are in state farms, collective farms and only a very small amount is in “personal possession of collective farmers”. So what’s going on?” [4, p. 14].

On this occasion, based on specific facts from the USSR mass media, the decision of the party organs, the decree of the government and other executive bodies, and statistical agencies, Mustafa Shokay gives the following explanation: “The fact is that the same thing happens with “public animal husbandry in collective farms” as with “public farming”. In other words, with a huge amount of their own, state-owned and rural cattle do not provide the benefits that are required for the Soviet state: rural cows do not produce enough milk, and sufficient quantity of butter is not obtained from rural milk; rural sheep do not give the necessary amount of wool, etc., etc. ... ” [4, p. 14].

On the basis of such analysis, he reveals that many collective farms in the Turkestan region, including Kazakhstan, do not have livestock farms. For example, he points out that “collective farms without livestock farms exist in Aktobe region – 13%, in Kyrgyzstan – 45%, and in Tajikistan even 62% (that is, almost two thirds) of all collective farms. In a number of collective farms there are certain types of livestock farms and there are no other types” [4, p. 14].

All of the above is about the attitude of Mustafa Shokay, an outstanding son of the Kazakh people, to the process of collectivization in the USSR as a whole, and in the republics of Medium Asia and Kazakhstan – in particular, in our opinion, can be summed up with his following words: “By and large disastrous for Turkestan policy of collectivization through the efforts of Goloshekin and his comrades turned in Kazakhstan into a true cemetery of the people’s wealth. The death of livestock and the death of the nomadic and semi-nomadic Kazakh population, forcibly and without proper preliminary measures, translated into settlement and driven to collective farms” [5, p. 189].

Historical materials of the period under review, published after independence of Kazakhstan, testify the correctness of the socio-economic views of Mustafa Shokay on the conduct of the process of collectivization in the Soviet Union, and especially in Kazakhstan and the Turkestan region.

#### LIST OF LITERATURE

- 1 Мұстафа Шоқай. На партийных съездах Туркестана. Шығармаларының толық жинағы. Он екі томдық. Том 4. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2012.
- 2 Мұстафа Шоқай. Туркестан перед второй пятилеткой. Шығармаларының толық жинағы. Он екі томдық. Том 7. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2013.
- 3 Мұстафа Шоқай. Советская власть и киргизы. Шығармаларының толық жинағы. Он екі томдық. Том 2. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2012.
- 4 Мұстафа Шоқай. На колхозном фронте. Шығармаларының толық жинағы. Он екі томдық. Том 11. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2014.

#### Аңдатпа

Бұдан бұрын Мұстафа Шоқайдың елінде жарияланбаған 12 томдық басылымның жариялануы біздің ойымызша, Қазақстандағы экономикалық ойдың тарихын едәуір байытады. Алаш қозғалысының негізін қалаушылардың бірі және КСРО-дан тыс кеңестік билігіне қарсы қазақ оппозициясының көшбасшысы болып табылатын қоғамдық-саяси қызметі мен аналитикалық зерттеулері сол уақытта Кеңес Одағында және Қазақстандағы әлеуметтік-экономикалық процестерге үлкен көңіл бөлді, әсіресе Орталық Азия республикалары. Мұстафа Шоқайдың зерттеулері әрқашан большевиктер партиясының билікке келгеніне, 20–30-шы жж. социалистік рельстерге байланысты бұрынғы патша империясының экономикасын трансферттеу үшін әлеуметтік-экономикалық реформалармен байланысты әлеуметтік-экономикалық мәселелер болды. Осы кезеңде деректерді қайта құру кезеңінде Кеңес Одағы миллиондаған адамның өлімінен және ел халқының көпшілігінің әл-ауқатының айтарлықтай нашарлауынан көрінетін елеулі теріс салдары болды. Ерекше өткір болып көрсетілген мәселелер шаруа қожалықтарын және де, әсіресе, Қазақстан мен Түркістан аймағындағы

ұжымдастыру кезеңінде пайда болған. Бұл теріс әлеуметтік-экономикалық үдерістер қазақ халқының және бүкіл түркі әлемінің әділдігі мен тәуелсіздігі үшін тынымсыз қарсыластың мұқият назарын өзіне қалдырды. Ұсынылған мақалада зерттеушінің көптеген ғылыми және журналистік жұмыстары қарастырылды. Автор өз шығармаларында Кеңес Одағының түрлі кезеңдерінде, Орта Азия республикаларында және Қазақстандағы сыни талдау негізінде ұжымдастыру үдерісін бағалайды.

Тірек сөздер: ұжымдастыру, шаруа қожалығы, ауыл шаруашылығы, реформа, ұжымшар, кіріс, мал шаруашылығы, жалға алу.

#### **Аннотация**

Публикация 12-томного издания ранее не опубликованных на родине трудов Мустафы Шокая, на наш взгляд, позволит значительно обогатить историю экономической мысли Казахстана. В своей общественно-политической деятельности и аналитических изысканиях он, один из основателей движения Алаш и лидер казахской оппозиции к советской власти за пределами СССР, уделял значительное внимание социально-экономическим процессам, происходившим в тот период в Советском Союзе в целом и в Казахстане и республиках Средней Азии в частности. В центре внимания исследований Мустафы Шокая всегда были социально-экономические проблемы, связанные с социально-экономическими реформами по переводу экономики бывшей царской империи в связи с приходом к власти партии большевиков в 20–30-е гг. В период проведения данных преобразований в указанный период в Советском Союзе имели место значительные негативные последствия, выразившиеся в гибели миллионов людей и существенном ухудшении благосостояния основной части населения страны. Особенно остро указанные проблемы проявились в период коллективизации крестьянских хозяйств, и особенно в Казахстане и Туркестанском крае. Именно эти негативные социально-экономические процессы служили поводом столь пристального внимания неутомимого борца за справедливость и независимость казахского народа и всего тюркского мира. В представленной статье рассмотрены многочисленные научные и публицистические работы исследователя. Автор в своих трудах на основе критического анализа оценивает процесс коллективизации на ее различных этапах в Советском Союзе в целом и в республиках Средней Азии и в Казахстане в частности.

Ключевые слова: коллективизация, крестьянское хозяйство, сельское хозяйство, реформа, колхоз, доход, животноводство, аренда.