

ISSN 1814 – 6961

ОТАН ТАРИХЫ ҒЫЛЫМИ ЖУРНАЛ

**Үш айда бір рет шығатын ғылыми журнал
2019, № 2 (86)**

2/2019

Бас редакторы:
Зиябек Қабылдинов
Редакциялық алқа:

Акинер Ширин, т.ғ.д., Лондон (Ұлыбритания) университетінің профессоры
Аяған Бүркітбай Гельманович, т.ғ.д., профессор, Қазақстан Республикасы Білім және ғылым министрлігі Ғылым комитеті Мемлекет тарихы институтының директоры

Әбусейітова Меруерт Хуатовна, т.ғ.д., профессор, Қазақстан Республикасы Білім және ғылым министрлігі Ғылым комитеті Р. Сулейменов атындағы Шығыстану институты «Тарихи материалдарды зерттеу орталығының» директоры, ҰҒА корр.мүшесі.

Әбілсейіт Мұқтар, т.ғ.д., профессор, Атырау облысы мемлекеттік архивінің басшысы

Әлімбаев Нұрсан, т.ғ.к., ҚР Мемлекеттік музейдің директоры

Әжіғали Серік Ескендірұлы, т.ғ.д., профессор, Қазақстан Республикасы Білім және ғылым министрлігі Ғылым комитеті Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты Антропология және этнология бөлімінің меңгерушісі.

Байтанаев Бауыржан, т.ғ.д., профессор, Қазақстан Республикасы Білім және ғылым министрлігі Ғылым комитеті Ә. Марғұлан атындағы Археология институтының директоры, ҰҒА академигі.

Голден Питер Принстон университетінің профессоры (АҚШ)

Жұмағұлов Қалқаман Тұрсынұлы, т.ғ.д., профессор, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің профессоры, «Дүние жүзі тарихын зерттеу» орталығының директоры, Геттинген университетінің (Германия) құрметті профессоры.

Исмағұлов Оразақ, т.ғ.д., профессор, ҰҒА академигі.

Кенжебаев Ғабит Қапезұлы, т.ғ.д., профессор, ҰҒА корр.мүшесі, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университетінің оқу-методикалық істер жөніндегі проректоры

Көмеков Болат Ишмұхамедұлы, т.ғ.д., профессор, ҰҒА академигі, Халықаралық қытшақтану университетінің директоры.

Ламин Владимир Александрович, т.ғ.д., профессор, РҒА корр.мүшесі, РҒА Сібір бөлімінің Тарих институты (Россия Федерациясы)

Мансура-Хайдар, профессор, (Үндістан)

Осман Мерт, Ататүрк университетінің профессоры (Түркия Республикасы)

Сидхарт С. Саксена, Кембридж университетінің профессоры (Ұлыбритания)

Сон Ен Хун, Хангук шет тілдер университетінің профессоры (Оңтүстік Корея)

Сыдықов Ерлан Бәтмашұлы, т.ғ.д., профессор, Л. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ректоры.

Редакционная коллегия журнала

Акинер Ширин, д.и.н., профессор Лондонского университета (Великобритания)

Аяған Бүркітбай Гельманович, д.и.н., профессор, директор Института истории государства Министерства образования и науки Республики Казахстан Комитет науки

Әбусейітова Меруерт Хуатовна, д.и.н., профессор, член корр. НАН РК, директор центра «Исследование исторических материалов» института Востоковедения имени Р. Сулейменова Министерства образования и науки Республики Казахстан Комитет науки

Әбілсейіт Мұқтар, д.и.н., профессор, директор государственного архива Атырауской области

Әлімбаев Нұрсан, д.и.н., профессор, директор государственного музея, Республики Казахстан

Әжіғали Серік Ескендірович, д.и.н., профессор, зав.отделом Антропология З

и этнология Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова Министерства образования и науки Республики Казахстан Комитета науки

Байтанаев Бауыржан, д.и.н., профессор, директор института Археологии имени А. Маргулана Министерства образования и науки Республики Казахстан Комитета науки, академик НАН РК.

Голден Питер, профессор Принстонского университета (США)

Жумагулов Калқаман Турсынович, д.и.н., профессор Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби, директор «Центра по изучению Всемирной истории», Почетный профессор Геттингенского университета (Германия).

Исмагулов Оразак, т.э.д., профессор, академик НАН РК.

Кенжебаев Габит Капезович, д.и.н., профессор, член корр. НАН РК, проректор по учебно-методической работе Казахского национального университета имени Абая

Кумеков Болат Ишмухамедович, д.и.н., профессор, академик НАН РК, директор Международного кыпчакского университета.

Ламин Владимир Александрович, д.и.н., профессор, член корр. РАН, директор Института истории Сибирского отделения Российской академии наук (РФ)

Мансура-Хайдар, профессор, (Индия)

Осман Мерт, профессор Атамюркского университета (Турция)

Сидхарт С. Саксена, профессор Кембриджского университета (Великобритания)

Сон Ен Хун, профессор университета иностранных языков Хангук (Южная Корея)

Сыдыков Ерлан Батташевич, д.и.н., профессор, ректор Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Гумилева.

Editorial Board of the Journal

Akiner Shirin, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor of London University (Great Britain)

Ayagan Burkitbai Gelmanovich, Doctor of History, Professor, Director of the Institute of State History of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan Science Committee

Abuseitova Meruert Huatovna, Doctor of History, Professor, Corresponding Member NAS RK, director of the Center for the Study of Historical Materials at the Institute of Oriental Studies named after R. Suleimenov of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan Science Committee

Abilseit Mukhtar, Doctor of History, Professor, Director of the State Archive of Atyrau Oblast

Alimbai Nursan, Doctor of History, Professor, Director of the State Museum, Republic of Kazakhstan

Azhigali Serik Eskendirovich, Doctor of History, Professor, Head of Department Anthropology and Ethnology of the Institute of History and Ethnology named after. C.C. Valikhanova Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan Science Committee

Bayтанаев Бауыржан, Doctor of History, Professor, Director of the A. Margulan Institute of Archeology of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan Science Committee, Academician of NAS of RK.

Golden Peter, a professor at Princeton University (USA)

Zhumagulov Kalmaman Tursynovich, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Academician, Professor of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Director of the Research Center on World History Studies, Emeritus Professor of Gottingen University (Germany).

Ismagulov Orazak, Doctor of Historical Sciences, professor, Academician of NAS of RK.

Kenzhebaev Gabit Kapuzovich, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member NAS of RK, vice-rector for teaching and methodical work of the Abay Kazakh National University

Kumekov Bolat Ishmukhamedovich, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of NAS of RK, Director of International Kypchak University.4

Lamin Vladimir Alexandrovich, Doctor of History, Professor, Corresponding Member. RAS, director of the Institute of History of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (RF)

Mansura-Haydar, Professor, (India)

Osman Mert, professor of the Atatürk University (Turkey)

Sidhart S. Saxena, Professor at Cambridge University (Great Britain)

Son Yong Hong, a professor of the Hanguk University of Foreign Languages (South Korea)

Sydykov Erlan Battashevich, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Rector of the

L. Gumilev Eurasian National University.

Жауапты редактор:

Айжамал Құдайбергенова

Редактор:

Бота Жүнісова

Компьютерде өңдеуші және дизайнер

Венера Зікірбаева

Редакцияның мекен-жайы:

050100, Қазақстан Республикасы,

Алматы қ., Шевченко көшесі, 28,

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты,

Отан тарихы журналының редакциясы

Телефон: +7 (727) 232-46-54

E-mail: Otanhistory@gmail.com

Электрондық мекен-жай:

¹**Begalieva A.**

¹Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, senior lecturer of the faculty Pre-College Education
Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty city. E-mail: aysha.1958@mail.ru

²**Khairullayeva V.**

²Associate professor of the University Narhoz
Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty city.

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY IN 40-YEARS OF XX CENTURY and at the beginning of XXI c.

Abstract

The paper examines stages of studying new economic policy by a historical science. Researchers' views on this problem are often defined by a political state of affairs. Recent works give an objective estimation of the purposes of new economic policy.

The periods of studying the New Economic Policy in the historical literature coincide in many respects with basic changes in the history of the country. But interest to this problem doesn't weaken. New Economic Policy experience is claimed in the period of economic reforms and during transitional economy development.

Keywords: historiography, Soviet power, region, new economic policy, agrarian policy, reform.

¹**Бегалиева А.К.**

¹Әл-Фараби атындағы ҚазҰУ, ЖОО-ға дейінгі дайындық кафедрасының аға оқытушы.
E-mail: Aysha.1958@mail.ru

²**Хайруллаева В.**

Халық шаруашылығы университетінің қауымдастырылған профессоры, Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ.

XX ғ. 40-жж.- XXI ғ. басындағы Жаңа экономикалық саясаттың тарихнамасы

Мақалада тарих ғылымында жаңа экономикалық саясатты зерттеудің кезеңдері көрсетілген. Ос мәселеге деген зерттеушілердің көзқарасы саяси конъюнктурамен анықталды. Тек соңғы жылдары ғана жаңа экономикалық саясаттың міндеттері ме мақсаттарына объективті баға берген жұмыстар жарыққа шықты.

Жаңа экономикалық саясатты тарихи әдебиетте зерттеу кезеңдері Ресей Федерациясындағы түбегейлі өзгерістерге байланысты. Бұл тақырыпқа қызығушылық жоғары. ЖЭС тәжірибесі экономикалық реформалар жүргізгенде, өтпелі дәуірдегі экономиканың дамуына өте қажет.

Кілт сөздер: тарихнама, кеңестік билік, аймақ, жаңа экономикалық саясат, аграрлы саясат, реформа.

¹**Бегалиева А.К.**

¹КазНУ имени аль-Фараби, ст.преподаватель факультета довузовского образования

²**Хайруллаева В.**

²Ассоциированный профессор университета Нархоз
Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы.

Историография 40-гг. XX- начале XXI века новой экономической политики

Аннотация

В статье рассматриваются этапы изучения новой экономической политики исторической наукой. Взгляды исследователей по данной проблеме часто определялись политической конъюнктурой. Лишь в последние годы появились работы, которые смогли дать объективную оценку задачам и целям новой экономической политики.

Периоды изучения нэпа в исторической литературе во многом совпадают с коренными изменениями в истории страны. Но интерес к данной проблеме не ослабевает. Опыт нэпа востребован в период экономических реформ, развития экономики переходного периода.

Ключевые слова: историография, советская власть, регион, новая экономическая политика, аграрная политика, реформа.

Introduction

The new economic policy adopted in 1921 by the 10th RKP (b) Congress became a new stage in the formation and development of the Soviet economy. NEP had a significant impact on the subsequent course of Russian history.

The main components of the initiated reforms were: replacement surplus on food tax; the use of market mechanisms and various forms of ownership; attraction of foreign capital; holding monetary reform (1922-1924 yy.), etc. Creating the economic basis of socialism through high rates of industrialization through agriculture became the basis of the internal economic policy of the Bolshevik Party. With the liberal reforms in the economy, the strengthening of the party-state bureaucracy continued.

Under these conditions, the Russian intelligentsia was excluded from solving the country's economic problems. The opposition that existed within the party could not be a source of alternative in the search for ways of reforms, economic transformations. The main political goal of NEP was to relieve social tension, strengthen the social base of Soviet power, which is based on an alliance of workers and peasants. In the economic sphere, it was necessary to prevent a further deepening of the economic crisis. It is these issues that have been the subject of study in most research scientists, both in our country and abroad.

The historiography of the new economic policy, the forms and methods of its implementation, social protests and many other things were interpreted differently in different periods. In the early twenties, the young Soviet government had no other alternative than by trial and error to realize that for which the socialist

revolution was accomplished. The question is, were certain methods and forms justified in domestic policy? The possibility of alternative existed, it was manifested in the course of internal party discussions. But what was the guarantee that an alternative course would not lead to the same results. An objective assessment without an ideological stamp should be the basis for understanding the reforms of the 20s and the possibility of using their experience at the present stage of the country's development.

NEP in the understanding of V.I. Lenin meant the possibility of using in the interests of socialism commodity production, commodity-money relations, cost accounting and material incentives. He believed that trade is the only possible form of the connection of socialist industry with the petty-bourgeois peasant economy (Maslov S.S. M., 2007: 302).

Party functionaries understood the reforms as a temporary retreat, due to special internal conditions and the international situation. One of their active researchers of the new economic policy was L. Kamenev, who recognized that the upcoming road of building socialism would take a lot of time and, first of all, because of the underdeveloped economy of the country. In his opinion, the task of NEP was to give impetus to the development of industry based on peasant economy (Kamenev L., 1923: 7). L. Kamenev claimed that NEP was for a long time, since the task was not only of restoring, but also of further developing the country's economy.

Common, unified theoretical foundations among researchers of that period was not. They associated NEP with the political crisis and the events of March 1921 in Kronstadt and considered it a modified continuation of the policy of "war communism". NEP was a necessity of a transitional period with a temporary admission to the economy of capitalist elements, which should be eliminated in the future (Kaktyn A., 1924: 130).

In 1929, a discussion on NEP was held at the Communist Academy. According to the researchers, NEP solved economic problems by this period, and this meant that further use of these principles was inappropriate. It was believed that this policy was dictated solely by the peculiarities of the structure of the economy of a country dominated by small-scale peasant farming. AT

1938 in the publication of the History of the CPSU (b). Short Course "the results of the first stage of studying the causes and consequences of the implementation of the new economic policy were summed up.

Methodology

The article is based on general scientific principles of historicism and objectivity. When writing an article, the authors relied on the principle of historicism, which considers any event in the prism of the past and the future. The comparative method made it possible to investigate the historiography of the problem in close connection with the socio-political and historical situation, as a result of which it arose and acted.

The following methods were used: idiographic, describing the individual characteristics of individual historical facts and events, problem-chronological, reflecting facts and events in a logical sequence.

Main part

A radical change in the Soviet historiography on the problems of NEP occurred in the period from the 1930s. in the first half of the 1950s, when the complete dominance of the official communist ideology and economic practice was established in the USSR.

Radical changes in the countries of Western Europe in the second half of the twentieth century revived interest in the problems of new economic policy. Works have been published on the economic recovery of the twenties (Genkina E.B., 1954: 503).

Y. Larin, S.G. Strumilin, E.B. Genkina, Yu.A. Polyakov, I.B. Berkhin and other researchers considered NEP not only as the leading one, as a matter of fact, but also the only tendency in the development of the country's economic policy in the twenties. This led, perhaps, to a reassessment of NEP and its significance in terms of the degree of influence on the social and political processes in society. Objectivity in assessing the activities of the country's leaders, evaluating contradictions in the NEP and its crises, and the narrowness of economic reforms did not always suffice.

In the late 60s - early 70s, work appeared on the implementation of NEP at the regional level. This made it possible to include in the scientific circulation a large number of new documents of a regional nature (Problemy agrarnoi...1969: 367).

In the second half of the eightieth years of the 20th century, significant changes were noted in historiography related to the changes that took place in the USSR. During this period, there are first attempts to deviate from ideological dependence in the interpretation of how to build socialism, and the possibilities of using the market mechanism in this process. Economists, historians have sought in NEP the sources of perestroika and arguments to analyze the causes of the deformation of socialism.

The transition to a market economy in the Russian Federation since the 90s. Twentieth century. attracted researchers to the history of the twenties of the twentieth century (NEP i hozraschet, 1991: 364). The problems of economic, social nature and features of development of the agricultural sector of the economy were studied (Mentalitet i agrarnoe, 1994: 440). This was an attempt to analyze the causes, mechanism and consequences of NEP for the Soviet economy and the prospects for socialist industrialization. The historiography of the nineties of the nineties, in contrast to the perestroika, was the rejection of overly optimistic assessments and the transition to a more objective coverage of its parties. Researchers paid great attention to the dynamics, crises, contradictions, the emerging system, the prospects of NEP. The experience and perspectives of Russian émigré economists of the 1920s and 1930s were studied (NEP. Vzgljad so storony, 1991: 304).

Of particular interest is the collective work "The Tragedy of the Soviet Village. Collectivization and dispossession. Documents and materials in 5 volumes 1927-1939." Edited by V. Danilov, R. Manning, L. Viola (Tragediia sovetskoi derevni, 1996). The publication on the basis of new documents demonstrates objectively, without ideological clichés, the beginning of reforms and counterreforms, the curtailment of new economic policies and the beginning of forced collectivization. The authors believe that the period from 1925 to 1927 was precisely the period of NEP without compulsory grain procurements. "Nevertheless, in such a short period, the ability of NEP through the expansion of market relations to intensify all available productive forces of the country, to provide a general economic recovery as the basis of the movement towards socialism, was revealed with sufficient conviction." (Tragediia sovetskoi derevni, 1996: 16).

During this period, the problem of the relationship between government and society, which remained outside the field of view of historians, developed. Most researchers believe that in the study of economic policy it is necessary to consider in connection with it both economic aspects, and political and ideological. By the mid-nineties, there were several approaches to studying the political system of the twenties. The first was to deny the difference between the political systems of the 20s and 30s, recognizing that at that time a totalitarian system had developed in the country. The second approach is based on the statement of significant differences between authoritarian NEP and totalitarianism 30s.

The reforms of the 20s and 80-90s have in common that they began and were regulated "from above", without taking into account the laws of economic development. In Soviet historiography there is no tradition of specifically linking political doctrines with socio-political and economic factors. This is explained by the dominant view of the role of ideology in the political struggle in the "upper ranks" (Tsakýnov S.V., 1994: 11).

A major contribution to the historiography of NEP was made by the collective work "NEP. Acquisitions and losses" (Devis R.Э, Dmitrenko V.P., 1994: 217), which examined the experience of conducting reforms in the USSR. During this period, peasant themes, traditional for Russian historiography, were developed, issues of cooperative construction, etc. (Shmelev G.I., 2000: 225). According to a number of authors, thanks to the efforts of the Bolsheviks, the "fists" were knocked out of the state of economic stability, lost most of their land holdings and ceased to be the basis for the stable development of agriculture. The artels that replaced them, the collective farms, for the most part, were characterized by mismanagement and lack of organization.

Recently, generalizing works have been published in which the contradictions of the establishment of a market economy in the 1920s and its results have been investigated (Hodiakov M.V., 2001: 300). A number of foreign historians have shown interest in this issue in connection with changes in the modern history of Russia. But they are all united in the understanding of NEP as a result of a sharp political confrontation in the Bolshevik party in the struggle for power (Sokolov J., 2006: 560).

Changes in the socio-political system, economic policy contributed to a new understanding of the problems of the new economic policy. Was it possible to use the NEP methodology in the conditions of economic reforms of the transitional period of the end of the 20th - beginning of the 21st centuries? How will society respond to these changes? Was it possible to take into account the experience and mistakes of the twenties in order to carry out cardinal reforms with minimal losses for society? The success and possibilities of NEP and the fact that, largely due to the premature, unreasonable actions of the authorities, these reforms were interrupted, were evaluated in a new way. On the other hand, government regulation in the economy of such a country as Russia was, and the previous period, characterized by the incompleteness of the reforms initiated, justified such a degree of state intervention.

A somewhat different interpretation of NEP was formulated in the Soviet historical encyclopedia of 1967.10, where, in particular, it was stated that the main task of NEP was to strengthen the alliance of the working class with the peasantry on an economic basis. This point of view was confirmed and in the Great Soviet Encyclopedia 1974. The authors of such a respectable publication as the multivolume History of the USSR 1967 left no further in their submissions. In its VIII volume in the section "New Economic Policy - the Road to Socialism" it was stated that this policy required reconstruction projects across the entire economic front to determine ways of strengthening the economic union of the working class and peasants, ways of building socialism in the transition period

A number of works continue to show the perception of NEP as a policy of temporary reforms, concessions to the problems of transition and the recognition by the young Russian government of the need to move away from the direct construction of socialism (Mənchaev Sh.M., Əstinov V.M., 2008).

A new trend in the historiography of NEP began in the second half of the 1980s. From interpretation as a transitional period to industrialization and collectivization, they proceeded to isolating it more as an independent period of Soviet history. The great interest of researchers was aroused by discussions within the ruling party, the features and nature of the opposition's activities. The works of L. Trotsky, G. Zinoviev, L. Kamenev, N. Bukharin and other party leaders of that period became available. The attention of scientists to a greater extent than before, began to attract the activities of various sectors of the economy, and above all the cooperative and private. The multistructure nature of the economy, interaction in the conditions of the Soviet market, its various participants are considered in the works of V.I. Kasyanenko, L.N. Liu-tova, A.P. Kilina, Yu.P. Bokareva, S.M. Petrova, S.F. Grebenichenko, D.V. Kovalev.

Different points of view on NEP were also presented in the textbook "The Newest History of the Fatherland of the Twentieth Century", edited by A.F. Kiselev and E.M. Shchagin (1998). The authors concluded that there are two views on the issue of the New Economic Policy. On the one hand, NEP was a narrow anti-crisis platform, on the other hand, a broad program of building a socialist society based on commodity-money relations. In essence, it is only these

ideas that limit the diversity in understanding the essence of the policy of the Soviet state of the 1920s.

At the beginning of the 21st century, works appeared whose authors try to objectively evaluate the experience of NEP. Both errors and positive results of the activities of the government and the Bolshevik Party are taken into account. Various issues of reform of the twenties of the twentieth century are considered through the general problems of restoration and further reconstruction of the economy and social relations in Russian society (Telitsyn V.L., 2002; Plehanov A.M., 2006; Danilino S.N., 2007).

NEP in terms of the sum of its economic and political events was one of the classic phenomena of the transition period for a country with an underdeveloped industry, with a predominantly rural population. The monopolization of industry and its leading industries contributed only to short-term success, and in the social and political sphere this led to dictatorship. Without denying the effectiveness of measures taken in the field of economics in the twenties and thirties of the twentieth century, they carried in new, more serious issues that required resolution. Indeed, in the future, the government has repeatedly tried to reform both the economy and social relations within the framework of socialist social relations.

A separate issue in the historiography of NEP is the peasant question and protest actions at the initial stage of the peaceful formation of Soviet power (Krestianskie istorii, 2001; Istoriia Sovetskogo krestianstva, 1986). This period can be considered a continuation of the civil war in the special conditions of the formation of a new socio-political system. For Russia, this question is eternal, like the land issue. In their frank letters, the peasants expressed an objective state of affairs in the village, in the peasant household. "Like everyone else, the Soviet government also knows that the peasants of Soviet Russia are in a critical situation and eke out a miserable existence" (Litvin A.L., 2004; Krestianskie istorii, 2001). The peasantry took the position that was determined by the agrarian policy of the government, which meant the solution of land and food issues. This was the cause of the conflict between the state and the peasantry. "Often a person turned out to be on one side or the other of the front for purely everyday reasons, having nothing in common with the ideology of the opposing camps. The peasant war of 1917-1921. - a consequence of the policy of the Bolsheviks, who by their regulation tried to turn the peasantry "into state farm laborers" (Telitsyn V.L., 2002).

The problem of collectivization in the historical literature to this day is of keen interest and discussion. But most authors agree that this story of the Russian village was tragic and erroneous, was the beginning of a radical change of the peasant economy. The studies analyze the problems of vital activity, the position and role of the peasantry in socio-economic transformations, the policy of the party and the interaction of various economic structures in the perestroika village (Telitsyn V.L., 2002).

The new economic policy and its consequences for the Kuban-Black Sea region, and the subsequent collectivization and industrialization, are represented by a wide range of studies (Bondarev V.A., 2006; Fitspatrik Sh., 2001; Oskolkov E.N., 1991. Kabanov V.V., 1988. Kondrashin V.V., 2008.). The region had a

number of features that determined the course, methodology, mechanism and results of the reforms. The border southern outskirts of Russia with the dominant rural, Cossack population, class contradictions, difficult land management, poorly developed industry, focused on the processing of agricultural products - these facts formed the centers of contradictions in the transition period and served as objects of research. The protest actions of the Cossacks against the Bolsheviks were expressed in the fighting of the “white-green” detachments in the most active phase in 1921-1922 [26]. But later on, the “white-green” formations for two years created problems for the Soviet government, being reborn from a political into a criminal element. Cossacks actively opposed reforms, and the Bolsheviks sought to destroy the economic foundations of individual peasant farming.

Conclusion

In the course of revolutionary transformations, we try to find idols for ourselves, and often to comprehend and substantiate contradictory phenomena in our history. The story goes in such cases to the service of politicians and authorities. Power can not be independent, as well as society. If we violate these principles, the temptation of a biased interpretation of historical events appears. When considering the problems of NEP, one should proceed from the fact that they have experienced the process of nucleation, development and extinction. We should not idealize the new economic policy, it has fulfilled its tasks within the framework of the existing political system. No one had any practical experience in building a socialist society, so it would be wrong to assert that NEP was a temporary phenomenon. The implementation of NEP had the most serious influence on the economic and political conditions for the development of the country, the culture of the masses, and the basis for the formation of the structures of the new government.

In world practice, certain trends can be traced during the transitional period of the state's development. The more complex and problematic the conditions, the more the formation characteristics are lost, resulting in problems defense, international security, social problems are growing. Under these conditions, contradictions between the political superstructure and the ongoing economic reforms are manifested, and there is a temptation to move to authoritarian methods of leadership and “aggressive” state intervention in the economy and its full regulation. Russia in its historical development passed precisely this way.

References:

Bondarev V.A. 2006. Krestianstvo i kollektivizatsiia: mnogoakladnost sotsialno-ekonomicheskikh otnosheniı derevni v raionah Dona, Kəbanı i Stavropolia v kontse 20-h-30-h godah XX veka. Rostov n/D: Izd-vo SKNTsVSh, - 520 s.

Istoriia Sovetskogo krestianstva: v 5 t. T. 1. 23.

Valentinov N. 1991. Novaja ekonomičeskaja politika i krizis partii posle smerti Lenina: gody raboty v VSNH vo vremja NEPa. Vospominanija sovremennika. M. 367 s.

Galın V.V. 2006. Zapretnaja politekonomija. Krasnoe i beloe. M.: Algoritm, 608 s.

Genkina E.B. 1954. Perehod Sovetskogo gosýdarstva k novoi ekonomičeskoj politike (1921-1922 gg.). M.: Gospolitizdat, 503 s.

Goldentýl I. 1924. Zemelnye otnoshenija na Kəbanı. Kratkıı ocherk. Krasnodar: Bərevestnik, S. 96.

Golod 1932-1933 godov: sb. st. 1996. / otv. red., vstýp. st. Iý.N. Afanaseva. M.: Ros. gos. gəmanıt. ən-t. 96 s.

Fıtspatrik Sh. 2001. Stalinskije krestiane: sotsialnaja istorija Sovetskoi Rossii v 30-e gody. M.: ROSSPEN. 336 s.

Danilin A.B. 2001. Nepovskaja Rossija: «sotsialističeskaja ratsionalizatsija» rynka trəda // Novyj istoričeskij vestnik. № 3. URL: [http:// www.niveb1nik.ru](http://www.niveb1nik.ru).

Danihno S.N. 2007. Rabochie Iəgo-Vostoka Rossii v gody nepa: istorija, generatsija i mnogomernost povsednevnoi jizni sotsialnoi grəppy. Rostov n/D: Izd-vo SKNTsVSh. 343 s.

Devıs R.Ə, Dmitrenko V.P., Maə V.A. 1994. NEP: priobretenija i poterı. M.: Naýka. 217 s.

Dmitrenko V.P. 1992. M.: Naýka, 234 s.

Erbının S.A. 2006. Stanovlenie bolshevistskoj vlasti na Donə i Kəbano - Chernomorie i eə obestvennoe vospriiatie. Slaviansk - na - Kəbanı: Izd. tsentr SGPI, 164 s.

Kabanov V.V. 1988. Krestianskoe hoziaistvo v əslovııah «voennogo kommúnizma». M.: Naəka. 302 s.

Kamenev L. 1923. Polojenie v strane i v partii. M.: Krasnaja nov, S. 7.

Kaktyn A. 1924. Novaja ekonomičeskaja politika i «nojnitsy» (očerrednye zadachi ekonomičeskoj politiki). M.: Krasnaja nov, 130 s.

Kon S. Opyt Sovetskoi natsionalizatsii // NEP. Vzgliady so storony: sbornik / sost. V.V. Kədrıavtsev. 1992. M.: Moskovskij rabochij, S. 29.

Kollektivizatsija selskogo hoziaistva na Severnom Kavkaze 1927-1937 gg. 1972. / pod red. P.V. Semernika, E.N. Oskolkova. Krasnodar, 832 s.

Kýbanskogo okrýga. 1930. Krasnodar, Vyp. 2. S. 63.

Konıəkov I.A. 1928. O rassloenii krestianskih hoziaistv Kəbanı. Krasnodar, S. 56.

Klassovaja borba i kəlachestvo na Kəbanı. 1931. Rostov n/D, S. 78.

Kondrashın V.V. 2008. Golod 1932-1933 godov: tragedija rossijskoj derevni. M.: ROSSPEN. 519 s.

Krestianskie istorii: Rossijskaja derevnija 20-h godov v pısmah i dokəmentah 2001./ sost. S.S. Krıəkova. M.: ROSSPEN. 232 s.

Krınko E.F., Hlynina T.P. 2009. Istoriija Severnogo Kavkaza v 1920-1940-e gg.: sovremennaja rossijskaja istoriografija. Rostov n/D: Izd-vo IýNTs RAN. 304.

Krestianstvo v pervoe desiatiletie Sovetskoi vlasti 1917-1927. 1986. / otv. red. V.P. Danılov. M.: Naəka. 455 s.

- Ljotova L.N. 2000. Promyshlennost Rossii v gody NEPa (1921-1929 gg.). Zhil'novsk. 260 s.
- Litvin A.L. Krasnyi terror v Rossii. 1918-1922 gg. 2004. M.: Eksmo. 285 s.
- Maslov S.S. Kolhoznaja Rossija 2007. M.: Nauka. 302 s.
- Mentalitet i agrarnoe razvitiie Rossii (XIX-XX vv.): materialy mejdnar. konf., g. Moskva, 14-15 ijunia 1994 g. / pod red. V.P. Danilova, L.V. Milova. M. 440 s.
- Menchaev Sh.M., Estinov V.M. 2008. Istorija Sovetskogo gosudarstva. M.: Norma. 720 s.
- Nikanorov G. L. 2007. Nadryv: pravda i loj otechestvennoj istorii XX veka. - M.: KomKniga.
- NEP i hozraschet. Ekonomika. 1991. M. 364 s.
- NEP. Vzgliad so storony: sbornik / sost. V.V. Kadriavtsev. M.: Moskovskii rabochii, 1991. S. 304; Formirovanie administrativno-komandnoj sistemy (20-30-e gody): sb. st. / pod red.
- Oskolkov E.N. 1991. Golod 1932-1933 gg. Rostov n/D, 91 s.
- Plehanov A.M. VChK-OGPZ: otechestvennye organy gosudarstvennoj bezopasnosti v period novoj ekonomicheskoj politiki 1921-1928 gg. 2006. M.: Kichkovo pole. 704 s.
- Shmelev G.I. Agrarnaja politika i agrarnye otnoshenija v Rossii v HH veke. - 2000. M.: Nauka, 225 s.
- Shtein B.E. Torgovaja politika i torgovye dogovora Sovetskoi Rossii 1917-1922 gg. M.; P.: Gos. izd-vo, 1923. 247 s.
- Shapinov V.V. 2007. Imperializm ot Lenina do Putina. M.: Algoritm, 256 s.
- Smirnskii V.I. Dinamika kollektivnogo zemledelija i sotsialnaja struktura Problemy agrarnoj istorii sovetskogo obestva: materialy naech. konf., 9-12 ijunia 1969 g. / otv. red. M.P. Kim. M.: Nauka, 1971. S. 367.
- Sokoloff J. Bednaja derjava. Istorija Rossii s 1815 goda do nashih dnei. M.: Izd. dom GAVShE, 2008. S. 888; Vert N. Istorija Sovetskogo gosudarstva. 2006. M.: Ves Mir. 560 s.
- Telitsyn V.L. «Bessmyslennyi i bespodnyj»?... Fenomen krestianskogo benta 1917-1921 gg. 2002. M.: Ros. gos. gumanit. zn-t. 338 s.
- Tragedija sovetskoi derevni. Kollektivizatsija i raskolachivanie. 1927-1939 // Dokumenty i materialy: v 5 t. 1999. T.1. Mai 1927-noiabr 1929 / pod red. V. Danilova, R. Manninga, L. Voly. M.: ROSSPEN, 880 s.
- Tsakonov S.V. V labirinte doktriny. Iz opyta razrabotki ekonomicheskogo kysra strany v 1920-e gody. 1994. M. 191 s.
- Hodiakov M.V. Detsentralizm v promyshlennoj politike regionov Rossii: 1917-1920 gg. 2001. SPb.: Izd-vo SPbGy. 300 s.

**Мазмұны
Содержание
Contents**

**ДЕРЕКТАНУ ЖӘНЕ ТАРИХНАМА
ИСТОЧНИКОВЕДЕНИЕ И ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ
SOURCE STUDING AND HISTORIOGRAPHY**

- Садвокасова З.Т.
ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-ОСВОБОДИТЕЛЬНОГО
ДВИЖЕНИЯ СОВРЕМЕННЫМИ ИСТОРИКАМИ.....8
- Kubeyev R.D., Murzakhodzhayev K.M.
ON SOME PECULIARITIES OF INTERACTION BETWEEN TRADITION
AND MODERNIZATION IN THE CONTEXT OF BUILDING MODERN
KAZAKHSTANI SOCIETY (HISTORIOGRAPHIC REVIEW)..... 15
- BEGALIEVA A., KHAIRULLAYEVA V.
HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY IN
40-YEARS OF XX CENTURY and at the beginning of XXI c.....21
- Шашаев А.К., Зикирбаева В.С.
ФОТОМАТЕРИАЛДАРДЫҢ ЭТНОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ
ДЕРЕККӨЗ РЕТІНДЕГІ МАҢЫЗЫ.....37

**ТАРИХ ҒЫЛЫМДАРЫНЫҢ МЕТОДОЛОГИЯСЫ
МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЙ НАУКИ
METHODOLOGY OF HISTORICAL SCIENCE**

- Мұхатова О.
ҚАЗАҚ ДАЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ҰЛТ-АЗАТТЫҚ ҚОЗҒАЛЫС ТАРИХЫН
КЕЗЕҢДЕУ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ.....42

**ТАРИХ ЖӘНЕ ТҰЛҒА
ИСТОРИЯ И ЛИЧНОСТЬ
HISTORY AND PERSONALITY**

- Кабульдинов З.Е., Қуанбай О.Б., Тылахметова А.С.
ОТСТАИВАНИЕ ИНТЕРЕСОВ КАЗАХСКИХ РОДОВ СУЛТАНМАМЕТ
СУЛТАНОМ ОТ ПРИТЯЗАНИЙ РОССИЙСКИХ ВОЕННЫХ В СРЕДНЕМ
ПРИИРТЫШЬЕ (II половина XVIII века).....57
- Сайфулмаликова С.С., Баянбай А.С.
ЖӘҢГІР ХАННЫҢ КҮНДЕЛІКТІ ӨМІР ТАРИХЫНАН
(1823-1845 жж.).....63