

Тулбасиева С.К

тарых илимдеринин кандидаты, PhD

Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая

Республика Казахстан

sauletulbassieva@gmail.com

СОВЕТТИК МЫЙЗАМДАР ЖАНА ШАЙЛОО УКУКТАРЫН ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯЛОО: 1920-1930-ЖЫЛДАРДАГЫ САЯСИЙ ЧЕТТЕТҮҮ МЕХАНИЗМДЕРИ

Аннотация. Макалада совет коомунун тарыхындагы аз изилденген көйгөйлөрдүн бири-Алма-Ата аймагында 1920-1930-жылдары шайлоо укугунан ажыратуу практикасы каралат. СССРдеги эзүүчү саясатка арналган изилдөөлөрдүн Олуттуу санына карабастан, бул аспект, өзгөчө региондук өңүттө, жетиштүү ачыла элек бойдон калууда. Изилдөөнүн объектиси болуп 1920-1930-жылдары Советтик шаарлардын жана айылдардын калкынын олуттуу бөлүгү болгон шайлоо укуктарынан ажыратылган ("ажыратылгандар") жарандардын категориясы саналат. Изилдөөнүн предмети Алма-Ата районунун мисалында бул практиканын иштешинин өзгөчөлүктөрү. Макалада мыйзамдык негиздер жана статистикалык көрсөткүчтөр гана эмес, бул практиканын социалдык кесепеттери да каралат: билим алууга, жумушка орношууга, маданий жана тиричилик ресурстарына жеткиликтүүлүктү чектөө. Иш-аракеттери формалдуу түрдө "укуктук" процедураны саясий кысым көрсөтүү куралына айландырган юстиция органдарынын жана НКВДнын ролуна өзгөчө көңүл бурулат. Изилдөөнүн практикалык мааниси анын жыйынтыктарын советтик коомдун тарыхы боюнча кийинки эмгектерде, Казакстандагы социалдык трансформацияларда, ошондой эле мамлекеттин жана укуктун тарыхы боюнча курстарда колдонуу мүмкүнчүлүгү менен байланышкан. Макаланын материалдары саясий репрессиянын тарыхы боюнча лекцияларды, окуу куралдарын жана атайын курстарды даярдоодо пайдалуу болушу мүмкүн. Ошентип, иш тарыхый боштукту жоюуга жана СССРдеги шайлоо укугунан ажыратуу шайлоо тутумунун элементи гана эмес, социалдык обочолонуунун, массалык аң-сезимге таасир этүүнүн жана коомдун социалдык түзүлүшүнүн трансформациясынын маанилүү механизми болгонун көрсөтүүгө багытталган.

Негизги сөздөр: Алма-Ата, 1920-1930-жылдар, Совет бийлиги, саясий репрессиялар, шайлоо укуктарынан ажыратуу, этникалык топтор, мыйзамдар, социалдык кесепеттер, тарыхый эс тутум.

Тулбасиева С.К

кандидат исторических наук, PhD

Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая

Республика Казахстан

СОВЕТСКОЕ ЗАКОНОДАТЕЛЬСТВО И ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ ИЗБИРАТЕЛЬНЫХ ПРАВ: МЕХАНИЗМЫ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО ИСКЛЮЧЕНИЯ В 1920-1930-Е ГОДЫ

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается одна из малоизученных проблем истории советского общества-практика лишения избирательных прав в Алма-Атинском округе в 1920–1930-е годы. Несмотря на значительное количество исследований, посвящённых репрессивной политике в СССР, данный аспект остаётся недостаточно раскрытым, особенно в региональном разрезе. Объектом исследования является категория граждан, лишённых избирательных прав («лишенцы»), которые в 1920-1930-е годы представляли собой значительный сегмент населения советских городов и сёл. Предмет исследования - особенности функционирования данной практики на примере Алма-Атинского округа.

В статье рассматриваются не только законодательные основы и статистические показатели, но и социальные последствия этой практики: ограничение доступа к образованию, трудоустройству, культурным и бытовым ресурсам. Особое внимание уделяется роли органов юстиции и НКВД, чьи действия превращали формально «правовую» процедуру в инструмент политического давления.

Практическая значимость исследования связана с возможностью использования его результатов в дальнейших работах по истории советского общества, социальным трансформациям в Казахстане, а также в курсах по истории государства и права. Материалы статьи могут быть полезны для подготовки лекций, учебных пособий и спецкурсов по истории политических репрессий.

Таким образом, работа направлена на то, чтобы восполнить историографический пробел и показать, что лишение избирательных прав в СССР было не только элементом избирательной системы, но и важным механизмом социальной изоляции, воздействия на массовое сознание и трансформации социальной структуры общества.

Ключевые слова: Алма-Ата, 1920–1930-е годы, советская власть, политические репрессии, лишение избирательных прав, этнические группы, законодательство, социальные последствия, историческая память.

Tulbassiyeva S.K

candidate of historical sciences, PhD

Kazakh national pedagogical university named after Abai

Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

SOVIET LEGISLATION AND TRANSFORMATION OF ELECTORAL RIGHTS: MECHANISMS OF POLITICAL EXCLUSION IN THE 1920S-AND 1930S

Annotation. The article deals with one of the little-studied problems of the history of Soviet society-the practice of disenfranchisement in the Alma-Ata district in the 1920s-and 1930s. Despite a considerable amount of research devoted to repressive policies in the USSR, this aspect remains insufficiently disclosed, especially in the regional context. The object of the study is the category of citizens deprived of their voting rights ("disenfranchised"), which in-1930-the 1920s and 1930s represented a significant segment of the population of Soviet cities and villages. The subject of the study is the peculiarities of the functioning of this practice on the example of the Alma-Ata district.

The article examines not only the legislative framework and statistical indicators, but also the social consequences of this practice: restriction of access to education, employment, cultural and household resources. Special attention is paid to the role of the judicial authorities and the NKVD, whose actions turned the formal "legal" procedure into an instrument of political pressure.

The practical significance of the research is related to the possibility of using its results in further works on the history of Soviet society, social transformations in Kazakhstan, as well as in courses on the history of state and law. The materials of this article can be useful for preparing lectures, textbooks, and special courses on the history of political repression.

Thus, the work aims to fill in the historiographical gap and show that disenfranchisement in the USSR was not only an element of the electoral system, but also an important mechanism for social isolation, influencing mass consciousness and transforming the social structure of society.

Keywords: Alma-Ata, 1920s-1930s, Soviet power, political repressions, disenfranchisement, ethnic groups, legislation, social consequences, historical memory.

Introduction. The issue of preserving and understanding historical memory, as well as the formation of national identity, is becoming particularly relevant in modern Kazakhstan. The country, being a multi-ethnic and multi-confessional state, has experienced a difficult path of formation-from the colonial period as part of the Russian Empire to decades of Soviet modernization, accompanied by radical social, cultural and political changes. In this regard, it is particularly important to refer to the experience of the 1920s-and 1930s, since it was during this period that the key mechanisms of Soviet policy that determined the further development of society were formed.

One of these mechanisms is the disenfranchisement of citizens -, a process that has affected large swaths of the population and has had a long-term impact on public relations. Despite the fact that Soviet historiography dealt with this problem very sparsely, and in the post-Soviet period it was mainly addressed in the context of the study of repression, it deserves a separate and comprehensive analysis.

To understand the essence of the phenomenon of disenfranchisement, it is important to take into account the context of the era. The Soviet government, which emerged as a result of the October Revolution of 1917, sought not only to retain power in the face of civil war and foreign intervention, but also to radically restructure the social structure of society. The emphasis was placed on the formation of a "new person"-a citizen devoted to the ideas of socialism and communism, ready to abandon the previous traditional guidelines in favor of collectivist values. At the same time, the class approach became the main criterion for assessing the loyalty of the population.

In this context, disenfranchisement was a social «filter» tool. Entire groups of the population were recognized as "alien" to the Soviet regime-: the nobility, clergy, former officials, merchants, well-to-do peasants, and intellectuals who did not support the revolution. Formally, it was only a restriction on political rights, but in practice this status meant a wide range of restrictions, including the inability to get an education, get a prestigious job, or take advantage of social benefits.

Kazakhstan held a special place in this regard. First, the region was multiethnic: Kazakhs, Russians, Ukrainians, Uyghurs, Tatars, Germans and representatives of other ethnic groups lived here. Second, the traditional social structure based on tribal ties and the nomadic economy was in conflict with the model of Soviet modernization. Third, Alma-Ata, as an administrative and cultural center, became a space where the processes of political and social transformation were most clearly manifested. It is here that one can observe a combination of general Soviet trends with regional specifics.

The study of disenfranchisement in Alma-Ata allows us to understand not only the mechanisms of operation of Soviet legislation, but also how these mechanisms were transformed in a multinational society. It also allows us to trace how the policy of the Soviet government affected different social and ethnic groups, creating a special system of social control.

It is also important to note that the authorities considered disenfranchisement as a temporary measure aimed at purging «society of «class-alien elements». However, in practice, this policy has acquired a long-term character and has become a stable institution that has existed for several decades. Moreover, its effects were felt even after the formal restrictions were lifted, as social memory retained the stigma of being "deprived" and passed it on to subsequent generations.

The study of this topic is particularly relevant today, when Kazakhstan is looking for ways to understand its historical past. The country's memory policy is aimed at restoring justice to victims of political repression, perpetuating their memory and preserving their historical heritage. In this context, studying the practice of disenfranchisement provides a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of functioning of the Soviet system and its impact on society.

The aim of the study is to comprehensively analyze the practice of disenfranchisement in the Alma-Ata district in-the 1920s and 1930s, identify its legal basis, social consequences, and role in the transformation of society.

To achieve this goal, you need to solve the following tasks:

- To consider the legislative basis for disenfranchisement in the USSR and its evolution in the 1920s-and 1930s.

- Analyze how these norms were implemented in the Alma-Ata district and which categories of the population were subjected to the greatest restrictions.

- Investigate the social and cultural consequences of disenfranchisement for various ethnic and social groups.

- Determine the role of the judicial authorities and the NKVD in the implementation of this policy.

- To identify the significance of this practice for the formation of public relations in Soviet Kazakhstan.

Thus, the introduction to the study not only indicates its purpose and objectives, but also emphasizes the relevance of the topic for modern science. Disenfranchisement in the USSR was not just an element of the electoral system, but also an essential tool of political control and social exclusion. Considering this problem on the example of Alma-Ata allows us to fill in existing historiographical gaps and expand our understanding of the mechanisms of functioning of Soviet society.

Materials and methods. The study uses a wide range of scientific approaches and methods that allow us to comprehensively consider the phenomenon of disenfranchisement in Alma-Ata in the 1920s and 1930s. The methodological basis of the work is based on the principles of historicism, objectivity, consistency and scientific reliability, which provides a comprehensive and unbiased study of the problem.

The principle of historicism presupposes the consideration of phenomena in their development and interrelation. In the context of this topic, this means studying disenfranchisement as a dynamic process that changed depending on the political situation and strategic objectives of the Soviet government. The study traces how the policy laid down in the 1918 Constitution of the RSFSR evolved during the 1920s and 1930s and how the criteria for recognizing citizens as «unreliable» changed.

The principle of objectivity implies the use of reliable sources and the rejection of ideological bias. To implement this approach, various types of sources were used: official legislative acts, archival materials, statistical data, documents of election commissions, as well as memoirs of contemporaries. Comparing these sources allows us to reconstruct the historical picture more accurately.

A systematic approach is necessary to understand disenfranchisement not only as an isolated institution, but also as part of a broader system of political control. The deprivation of rights was considered in conjunction with other forms of repressive policies-administrative exile, confiscation of property, restriction of educational and labor opportunities. This approach makes it possible to identify the place of the phenomenon under study in the overall structure of the Soviet political system.

The main research methods used were historical-problematic, comparative-historical, chronological, statistical, and descriptive-analytical. **The historical-problematic method** allowed us to focus on a specific problem-the mechanisms of disenfranchisement, to identify its causes, specifics and consequences. **The comparative-historical method** was used to compare the practice in Alma-Ata with all-Union trends. This made it possible to identify both general patterns and regional features. **The chronological method** provided a consistent presentation of events and tracking the dynamics of the development of legislation and the practice of its application. **The statistical method** was used to process quantitative data obtained from archival sources, such as lists of disenfranchised persons and reports of election commissions.

The descriptive-analytical method allowed us to reconstruct specific cases preserved in the documents and consider the fate of individual citizens in the context of a general policy.

A special place is occupied by the source base of the study. The paper uses documents from the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, and the City Archive of Almaty.

The Central State Archive attracted the following funds:

Fund No. 44-People's Commissariat of Workers 'and Peasants' Inspection of the Kaz ASSR (1929), which preserved materials on the verification of election campaigns and the work of local bodies; Fund No. 74- People's Commissariat of Agriculture of the Kyrgyz SSR, containing information on deprivation of rights for using hired labor in agriculture; Fund No. 83-People's Commissariat of Labor of the Kyrgyz SSR, reflecting restriction of labor activity of "deprived" persons; Fund No. 135-Central Commission for Confiscation of Property and eviction of semi-feudal bais, which includes complaints and petitions from citizens. Fund No. 251 Isa secret department containing cases of the Visiting Supreme Court and minutes of sessions in the 1920s.

Of particular importance are the materials of the Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, in particular Fund No. 141, which includes documents on the confiscation of farmsteads in the territory of the Alma-Ata district. These sources allow us to trace the relationship between socio-economic campaigns and restrictions on political rights.

The City Archive of Almaty presents unique materials, including- Fund No. 174 (minutes of the executive Committee of the Alma-Ata City Council of Workers' Deputies) and Fund №. 1714 (lists of kulak families resettled in Alma-Ata). These documents contain information on the number of voters, categories of «disenfranchised» persons, grounds for disenfranchisement, as well as on appeals and complaints submitted to election commissions.

The involvement of a wide range of sources allowed us to consider the problem in its multi-aspect nature. Legislative acts record the legal basis of the phenomenon, archival documents give an idea of its practical implementation, and statistical materials allow us to identify the scale and structure of «deprived persons».

Thus, the materials and methods of research provide a comprehensive nature of the work, allowing us to consider the deprivation of electoral rights simultaneously as a legal, political and social phenomenon.

Historiography. The social policy of the Soviet state for a long time was based on the task of forming a «correct» class structure. This process was carried out in two ways: on the one hand, privileges were created for categories of the population that were recognized as «progressive» from the point of view of ideology (workers, poor people, Red Army soldiers), and on the other-, measures of social and political exclusion were applied to those groups that were considered «alien» or «reactionary» (the nobility, merchant's clergy, intellectuals, and well-to-do peasants).

Inequality was evident not only in political and cultural rights, but also in access to social benefits, material resources, and life opportunities. Thus, the class principle determined not only the political position, but also the level of well-being. The Bolshevik Party, positioning its policies as the embodiment of social justice, actually elevated some strata of society and marginalized others. One of the most revealing tools of this approach was the introduction of the category of citizens "deprived of political rights", which appeared in parallel with the formation of Soviet statehood.

In post-Soviet historiography, the problem of «lishentsy» was mainly studied in the context of political repression. For example, in the works of V. N. Zemskov, the category of special settlers is considered as one of the forms of administrative pressure [1]. In turn, V. P. Popov analyzed the use

of the mechanism of removing citizens from political life as part of the state repressive policy [2, 20-32].

S. A. Krasilnikov offered an interesting perspective, classifying the «deprived» as marginal located on the border of social groups: they remained part of society, but were cut off from its political and legal institutions [3, 5-8].

Foreign historiography, especially Anglo-American historiography, has focused on the everyday practices and social structure of Soviet society. Thus, Sh. Fitzpatrick investigated the phenomenon of social stratification and noted that the category of "deprived" people found themselves in a constant struggle for survival in the new system [4]. V. Brovkin linked the problem of deprivation of rights with the Bolsheviks' attempt to adapt society to the new economic policy and form a sense of political and social identity among the population [5].

In Russian historiography, the issue of disenfranchisement was often considered as part of the state's discriminatory policy, but the scope of research remained limited: attention was mainly paid to the dynamics of the number of «disenfranchised» people and formal procedures for their exclusion, while regional aspects remained poorly studied. In Kazakhstan, researchers focused more often on the class approach than on the legal assessment of political disenfranchisement practices.

Major Kazakh works include the research of A. N. Nusupbekov devoted to the formation of the working class, the three-volume «History of the working Class of Soviet Kazakhstan» [6], as well as the fundamental works of Zh.B. Abylkhozhin, S. T. Rysbekov and other scientists who analyzed the transformation of the traditional social structure and the consequences of collectivization [6].

It examines in detail the formation of the working class during the NEP period. The fundamental research of Kazakhstani scientists on the problems of socio-economic development of the working class in the republic can be attributed to the three-volume work «History of the working class of Soviet Kazakhstan: The Working class of Kazakhstan during the consolidation and development of socialism (1938-1960)» [7]. I would also like to mention the scientific work of Zh. B. Abylkhozhin "Traditional structure of Kazakhstan. Socio-economic aspects of functioning and transformation (1920-1930)" [8]. One of the most significant scientific works on social modernization is S. T. Rysbekov's doctoral dissertation «The Soviet experience of social modernization of traditional society: lessons and historical meanings (1920-1936)» [9]. Based on historical research, the author introduced new sources on the history of social modernization of Soviet Kazakhstan in the period 1920-1936. Zh.B. Abylkhozhin, M. Tatimov, M. K. Kozybayev, and Kh. Aldazhumanov devoted their works "Collectivization in Kazakhstan: the tragedy of the peasantry" to the issue of punitive measures against peasants during the years of Soviet totalitarianism [10]. And also, M. K. Kozybayev and Kh. S. Aldazhumanov «Totalitarian socialism: reality and consequences» [11]. I would like to note that almost all scientific works on the socio-economic development of Kazakhstan in 1920-1930 were considered comprehensively.

Thus, the problem of deprivation of political rights in the Soviet period is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, covering legal, social, economic, ideological and ethno-cultural aspects. Consideration of the legislative framework allows us to identify the mechanisms of institutionalization of this practice and trace its impact on society in the context of political and social modernization.

Analyzes. The phenomenon of disenfranchisement in the 1920s and 1930s cannot be understood without analyzing the broader social policy of the Soviet state. From the first years of its existence, the Soviet government positioned itself as the power of the working people - the workers and the poorest peasants, who were considered the main support of the revolution. Accordingly, all other

categories of the population were perceived through the prism of class struggle: either as potentially loyal or as hostile.

Already the Constitution of the RSFSR of 1918 established the principle of differentiation of political rights depending on social origin and type of activity. According to this document, the right to vote and be elected was granted to workers, peasants, Red Army soldiers and labor intelligentsia. At the same time, former exploiters, clergy, people who lived on unearned incomes, as well as representatives of «counter-revolutionary elements» were deprived of these rights. Later, similar provisions were enshrined in the republican constitutions, including the declaration of the Kazakh ASSR of 1926.

Thus, disenfranchisement was not an accidental or temporary measure, but a systemic element of the Soviet political model. It reflected the idea of creating a "dictatorship of the proletariat", in which the state had to protect the interests of the working people and at the same time suppress class-alien elements.

In actual practice, the category of "deprived persons" turned out to be very broad and covered many groups of the population. First of all, these are:

Persons who used hired labor. Under the Soviet ideology, the exploitation of man by man was considered the main feature of bourgeois society. Therefore, even small farms that hired workers seasonally fell under suspicion.

Citizens who lived on unearned incomes. This definition included not only former entrepreneurs, but also, for example, persons who rented out housing or received interest on deposits.

Merchants and intermediaries. Despite the temporary admission of private entrepreneurship during the NEP years, this category of the population was considered as a temporary evil. As the NEP collapsed, it was the merchants who made up one of the most numerous groups of «deprived» people.

Clergy and religious leaders. The Soviet government viewed religion as an ideological threat. Therefore, clergymen of all faiths- Orthodox priests, Muslim mullahs, Catholic and Protestant pastors-were deprived of their voting rights along with their families.

Former employees of the tsarist administration and representatives of the "old order". This category included former police officers, gendarmes, officials, officers, as well as people who were seen in "counter-revolutionary" activities during the Civil War.

Convicted and administratively exiled persons. A criminal record or expulsion automatically resulted in the loss of political rights.

Family members of persons deprived of their liberty who have reached the age of majority. This paragraph is particularly illustrative of the collective nature of repression: responsibility extended not only to the person himself, but also to his relatives.

If we consider the situation in Alma-Ata, then, as archival data show, by the end of the 1920s, the share of disenfranchised people was about 10-15% of the city's population [12, p. 19].

At the same time, the largest group consisted of merchants and representatives of small businesses. This reflected the specifics of Alma-Ata as a center of regional trade and handicraft production.

The political logic behind disenfranchisement was simple: the exclusion of potentially unreliable citizens from political representation. However, in practice, the consequences were much broader. Disenfranchisement automatically led to a reduction in social status and limited opportunities for the whole family.

The social policy of the Soviet government was based on the idea of "re-education" of class-alien elements. But in reality, the "deprived" often found themselves in the position of marginalized groups,

forced to adapt to new conditions. Children of "lishentsev" faced refusals when entering schools and universities, adults-with restrictions when applying for a job.

Thus, «inequality» became a kind of «stigma» that determined the life path of entire generations.

It should be noted that the practice of disenfranchisement was closely intertwined with other forms of social policy. During the period of collectivization and industrialization, it was used as an additional tool of pressure on the population. For example, the threat of disenfranchisement was often applied to those who resisted joining collective farms or refused to hand over grain for state procurement.

In addition, the "deprived" were deprived not only of political, but also of legal equality. Their appeals were rarely granted, and the procedure for appealing decisions of election commissions was formal in nature. In practice, the possibility of restoring rights existed only in exceptional cases and most often depended on personal connections or the intervention of higher authorities.

Thus, the category of «deprived persons» performed several functions at once: first, it served as a tool for political isolation of "unreliable" elements; second, it provided control over social processes; third, it contributed to the destruction of the traditional social structure; and fourth, it created an atmosphere of fear and submission in society.

An analysis of Soviet social policy shows that disenfranchisement was not a random practice, but was a deliberate and purposeful mechanism built into the system of public administration. Its application in Alma-Ata demonstrates how the general political attitudes of the center were combined with regional specifics and how this affected the fate of specific people.

The phenomenon of disenfranchisement in the USSR in the 1920s and 1930s cannot be understood without analyzing the legal framework that consolidated and legitimized this practice. Soviet statehood was formed in conditions of acute political struggle, which predetermined the class orientation of its legislation. The right to vote was considered not as universal and equal for all citizens, but as a privilege of the working masses - first of all, workers and peasants, who, according to the Bolsheviks' plan, were to form the basis of the «dictatorship of the proletariat».

The first Soviet Constitution-, the 1918 Constitution of the RSFSR-, played a key role in institutionalizing the practice of disenfranchisement. In its text, the principle of differentiating electoral rights by class was explicitly enshrined.

Article 65 listed the categories of citizens deprived of the opportunity to vote and be elected. These included: people who use hired labor for profit; people who live on unearned incomes (for example, interest holders, landlords who receive rent); private merchants and intermediaries; monks and ministers of religious cults; former officials of the tsarist police, gendarmerie and security departments; persons recognized as insane or convicted of serious crimes.

Thus, in the legal sphere, the right to vote was not initially universal. It was made dependent on social affiliation and political loyalty, which fixed the exclusion of entire segments of the population from the number of «full-fledged citizens».

On the territory of Kazakhstan, this practice is reflected in the Constitution of the Kazakh ASSR of 1926. Although this document largely repeated the provisions of the all-Union legislation, it also took into account regional specifics. In particular, in the conditions of Kazakhstan, much attention was paid to the category of "households"-well-off farms that used hired labor and owned significant resources. Constitutional and by-laws explicitly stated that representatives of this group are subject to disenfranchisement.

Thus, in national republics, the legal grounds for deprivation of rights were often extended and focused on combating local forms of «exploitation».

During the NEP period (1921-1928), the existence of a private sector in the economy was formally allowed, but legal restrictions on "alien elements" remained. Moreover, in the context of economic difficulties and social tensions, the practice of disenfranchisement has become even more widespread. Election commissions had special instructions detailing the grounds for excluding citizens from the electoral lists.

Thus, «unearned income» was often understood as not only entrepreneurial activity, but also any form of "excess" management. For example, renting livestock or land could be interpreted as exploitation and result in disenfranchisement.

Of particular interest is the USSR Constitution of 1936, which was called "Stalinist". Formally, it proclaimed universal, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot. Thus, the status of «deprived persons» was officially canceled. However, in practice, the real mechanisms of repressive control have not disappeared.

The NKVD and justice agencies continued to keep records of «unreliable» citizens, and election commissions retained the ability to exclude them from the lists under various pretexts (for example, charges of «anti-Soviet agitation»). Thus, the proclaimed universal suffrage was often declarative in nature.

Archival documents show that the practice of disenfranchisement was widespread in Alma-Ata and the Alma-Ata district during the entire period under review. For example, in the protocols of election commissions of the early 1930s, a significant number of those excluded for reasons of "social origin" or "anti-Soviet activity" are recorded.

A typical example is the case from the protocol of 1931, where several dozen citizens were deprived of their rights on the grounds that «they are former merchants and are suspected of profiteering» [13]. Other documents contain phrases like "son of a former mullah" or «wife of a repressed kulak», which indicates the hereditary and collective nature of the repressions.

It is important to note that the Soviet legislation left a wide scope for arbitrary interpretations. The concepts of «exploitation» «unearned income», and «anti-Soviet activities» were extremely vague, which allowed election commissions and state security agencies to act at their discretion.

Thus, the evolution of legislation showed not so much a softening as an institutionalization of repressive practices. Even where democratic principles were formally proclaimed, they were combined with a real policy of exclusion and discrimination.

Historical and legal analysis suggests that the practice of disenfranchisement was not a temporary anomaly, but an organic part of the Soviet legal system. It demonstrated the priority of political expediency over the principles of equality and legality. In Alma-Ata, as in other regions, this led to the mass marginalization of entire segments of the population and the consolidation of an atmosphere of fear and control.

Archival documents of the city of Almaty allow us to clearly trace how the norms of Soviet legislation were applied at the local level.

After the national-territorial division of 1924 and the administrative reform of 1926, Alma-Ata became the center of the Semirechensky district, and then the Alma-Ata district. During this period, agricultural communes, artels and collective farms were actively created in the city, which was accompanied by changes in the administrative and territorial structure and the formation of new village councils.

During the election campaigns of the 1920s, special instructions were applied that regulated in detail the procedure for compiling lists of citizens. The election cards included data on the age, gender, nationality, social status and education of candidates. Special attention was paid to belonging

to the working class and party organizations. Persons deemed «deprived of political rights» were registered in separate registers.

According to archival data, the elections in Alma-Ata in 1926 covered about 50 thousand residents, of whom 22,249 had the right to vote. However, 2,378 people (approximately 11%) were excluded from the list of voters. Among them:

- persons who used hired labor for profit - 26 people;
- citizens who lived on unearned incomes-95;
- merchants and intermediaries - 1605;
- representatives of religious circles-148;
- former policemen and gendarmes - 207;
- convicted and administratively expelled persons - 188;
- mentally ill and under guardianship - 40;
- members of families of deprived persons who have reached – 69 the age of 18-69 [14. 1. 19].

From these data, it can be seen that the main group of "deprived" people consisted of merchants (more than two-thirds). This fact is particularly significant, since it was during this period that a new economic policy was in effect, allowing for private entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, the Soviet authorities continued to consistently restrict the political rights of citizens engaged in trade.

A significant place among the "deprived" was also occupied by clergy. Their share was about 6% of the total number of excluded persons. The Soviet leadership perceived the clergy as an ideological threat that could compete with the Marxist system of values.

The lists given in the archive materials allow us to reconstruct the fate of specific people. For example, in 1928, dozens of former merchants and entrepreneurs of Alma-Ata were included in the list of "-deprived" people. The columns indicated the reasons for the deprivation of rights: «engaged in the trade of haberdashery», «maintained a teahouse», «sold leather goods», «had a workshop with apprentices», etc. Similarly, representatives of religious communities-mullahs, imams, and religious officials-were excluded from political life on the basis of their profession.

**Table 1 . Withpiocs of disenfranchised former merchants in the city
Alma-Ata from 1925 to 1928**

№	Last name first name and patronymic	gender	nationality	what was employedлся before 1917	ADDRESS	Reason for suspension
1.	Artyunyants Ivan Gergievich	Husband.	an Armenian	sold dry	goods Tatarskaya 60	as a merchant
2.	Abdusattarov Iskandyr	Husband.	taranchinets	sold old iron	Tianshan 22	merchant
3.	Antropova Darya Sergeevna	Wives	Russian	merchant, sold ready-made clothes and shoes koshmami	Kopalskaya tract No. 46	merchant
4	Asyrbekov Akhatai	Husband	Kazakh	merchant, sold ready-made clothes and	Trading 10	merchant

				shoes koshmami		
5.	Avazbaev Bagautdin	Husband	taranchinets	traded bakaleynaya	Lepsinskaya 35 / Soldatskaya 97	merchant
6.	Abdullaev Khapiskhan	Husband	taranchinets	Fontannaya No. 4	teahouse	merchant
7.	Alexandrova Kapitolina Markovna	zhen	Russian	Naryn No. 139	school of ceramics and sewing	merchant, as an employee.
8.	Bektemirov Gainulla	husband	Kazakh	Cavalry 10	haberdashery	merchant
9.	Alexey Dinisovich	Husband	Breusov Russian husband	Jetysuiskaya	old iron	merchant
10.	Bagsutdinov Abdusalyam	husband	taranchinets	Lepsinskaya 31	koshmy	merchant
11.	Pavel Ivanovich Bragin	husband	Russian husband	K. Marx 27	merchant, bath	merchant
12.	Bikineev Ibragim	husband	taranchinets	Tokmak 29	leather	goods merchant
13.	Baimbekov Gali	husband	Kazakh	Cossack 31	leather	goods merchant
14.	Butyev Chan	husband	taranchinets	Issykulskaya 44	shoe	merchant
15.	Bukhmina Matryona Vasilyevna	wives	Russkaya	Kaskelenskaya 8	sold tar	merchant

[15. l. 28-31].

Former employees of the tsarist punitive organs were also an important category. The archive lists contain the names of dozens of former police officers, bailiffs and officers who lived in Alma-Ata and its environs. They were automatically classified as "unreliable" and excluded from the list of voters along with their families.

Thus, the mechanism for compiling and publishing lists of disenfranchised persons has become part of the daily practice of local authorities. Disenfranchisement was not limited to the citizen himself: the consequences also extended to his relatives, which significantly increased the proportion of the population actually excluded from political life.

The process of excluding significant categories of the population from political life had long-term consequences for the social and cultural development of society. Disenfranchisement meant not only the inability to participate in elections, but also the actual restriction of access to a number of basic opportunities.

First of all, the «deprived» people lost their right to hold elected positions and positions in government bodies, which automatically excluded them from the number of active participants in public-and political life. In addition, this status restricted the possibility of employment: persons

deemed "unreliable" were rarely allowed to work in state institutions and industrial enterprises, and could not be members of cooperatives.

Social consequences were also expressed in the restriction of educational opportunities. Children of the «deprived» often did not have access to secondary and higher education, especially when it came to prestigious educational institutions or professions related to management and public service. Thus, the status of "deprived" was passed from parents to children, creating the effect of "hereditary responsibility".

The judiciary and the NKVD played an important role in implementing this policy. Election commissions received instructions from the center and worked in close coordination with local police departments and State security agencies. The latter provided «verification» of citizens for their social origin, political trustworthiness, and participation in activities that were "alien" to the Soviet government.

Practice shows that the interference of the NKVD significantly increased the repressive nature of the electoral system. In the protocols of election commissions of the late 1920s – начала 1930 and early 1930s, direct references to NKVD information are often found as grounds for excluding citizens from the number of voters.

For example, according to archival data from 1930 in Alma-Ata, out of 25 thousand citizens who reached the age of majority, about 3.5 thousand were recognized as "deprived". A significant part of them are former merchants, religious figures and former employees of the tsarist administration. In many cases, the decisions of election commissions indicated: «according to the NKVD, he was engaged in anti-Soviet agitation», «participated in the White Guard movement», «suspected of links with the kulaks», etc. [16].

For example, in Protocol No. 13, legal consultants from the People's Commissariat of Justice were present when considering citizens' petitions for the restoration of political rights such as: a). Valkova Anna, 106 Lenin Street. trade under a patent as a percentage of turnover. Resolved: as not having a five-year work experience established by law, after the termination of trade, refuse the application b). Polyakov Fyodor Alekseevich, Fontannaya St. 80. a member of the lishentsya family. We decided: to reject the application in case of disagreement with the opinion of the legal consultant. c) Listened to: petitions of the list of citizens who have their own enterprises with hired labor (Regional Cash Register). They decided to include in the list of deprived persons as having hired force in their production. [17, 31].

In addition, a statement was delivered to the Alma-Ata cityоудскому police stating that the Presidium of the Ashgabat City Council deprived Kulikov Ivan Nikanorovich of the right to vote, as a major businessman. According to the named presidium, Kulikov currently lives in the city of Alma-Ata, where he is hiding from paying taxes. The secretariat of the Ashgabat City Council asks to take measures to search for this person and report on the results. On this issue, the Almaty City Council proposes to take measures to search for Kulikov I. N. and report the results of the response to the Secretary (Korenev), tex. secretary (Lipnitskaya) [17. 21,51].

Thus, the formal legal procedure for disenfranchisement was reinforced by repressive practices that turned this mechanism into an instrument of political control.

It is impossible not to note the psychological consequences. The status of "deprived" became a stigma that actually removed a person from the circle of "full-fledged citizens". Such restrictions increased social isolation and created an atmosphere of fear and suspicion in society.

Together, all these measures contributed to the consolidation of Soviet power by weakening possible centers of opposition and resistance. At the same time, they undermined social trust, destroyed traditional ties and deepened contradictions between the State and society.

Conclusion and conclusions. The study of the practice of disenfranchisement in Alma-Ata in the 1920s and 1930s provides a deeper understanding of the essence of the Soviet political system, as well as the mechanisms by which the authorities regulated social processes. Based on the analysis of the legislative framework, archival documents, and social context, several fundamentally important conclusions can be drawn.

First of all, disenfranchisement should not be considered as a temporary or accidental measure limited only to the first years of Soviet power. On the contrary, it was a stable institution built into the very structure of the state. The Constitution of the RSFSR of 1918, and then the Constitution of the Kazakh ASSR of 1926, established the class principle of access to political rights, based on the idea of the «dictatorship of the proletariat». This meant that the right to vote was not granted to all citizens, but only to those who belonged to the «working classes».

Thus, initially the electoral system of the USSR was discriminatory. Unlike bourgeois democracies, where the right to vote was regarded as a universal civil right, in the Soviet Union it was perceived as an instrument of class struggle.

The study revealed that the category of «deprived persons» was extremely diverse and covered a significant mass of the population. It included merchants, entrepreneurs, wage earners, members of the clergy, former officials and officers, and their families. In the context of Alma-Ata, special attention was paid to the fight against «piracy» and small-scale trade, which reflected the specifics of the region as a center of agricultural production and trade.

Thus, disenfranchisement served the function of «cleansing» the social space of groups that the authorities considered potentially dangerous.

Disenfranchisement had far-reaching consequences. It meant not only exclusion from political life, but also restricted access to education, employment, and social benefits. Children of the "deprived" faced refusals to enter schools and universities, adults-with the inability to take up positions in state institutions or cooperatives.

In addition, the status of «deprived» imposed a stigma on the entire family. As a result, there was a situation of «hereditary responsibility», when restrictions were passed from parents to children. This contributed to the marginalization of significant groups of the population and perpetuated social inequality.

The most important role in the implementation of this policy was played by the judicial authorities and the NKVD. They provided control over the implementation of legislative norms and gave election commissions grounds for excluding citizens from the lists. Archival materials show that in many cases, decisions to revoke rights were based on certificates of the NKVD bodies, which indicated facts of «anti-Soviet agitation» or «links with the kulaks».

Thus, the formal legal procedure of disenfranchisement has actually turned into an instrument of repression supported by law enforcement agencies.

The adoption of the USSR Constitution of 1936 formally abolished the status of «disenfranchised persons» and established the principle of universal and equal suffrage. However, practice has shown that this innovation was largely declarative in nature. The authorities still retained the ability to exclude citizens from the electoral lists under various pretexts, and in the context of mass repressions in the late 1930s, the election procedure itself became a formality.

This confirms that Soviet legislation often existed in isolation from real practice, where political expediency prevailed over the norms of law.

One of the most significant consequences of the policy of disenfranchisement was the formation of an atmosphere of distrust and fear in society. The status of «deprived» was perceived as a stigma that isolated a person and his family from full participation in public life.

Even after the formal restrictions were lifted, the memory of «deprivation» persisted, and many citizens continued to feel discriminated against. Thus, this practice has had a long-term impact on the formation of social structure and historical memory in Kazakhstan.

The study of disenfranchisement is important not only for understanding the Soviet era, but also for modern Kazakh historical science. This topic allows us to take a fresh look at the mechanisms of functioning of the totalitarian state, at the interaction of the center and regions, as well as at the fate of individual social groups.

In addition, the study of this problem contributes to the formation of historical memory necessary for understanding the scale of political repression and restoring justice to its victims.

The disenfranchisement of Alma-Ata in the 1920s and 1930s was not a temporary campaign, but a stable institution deeply rooted in the Soviet system of government. It performed several functions at once: first, political (isolation of unreliable elements); second, social (marginalization of entire groups of the population); third, fourth, ideological (confirmation of the principle of "dictatorship of the proletariat"); fifth, psychological (formation of an atmosphere of fear and control).

The study of this phenomenon provides a deeper understanding of the nature of Soviet society and reveals the mechanisms by which the state managed social transformation. Based on the material of Almaty, it becomes obvious that disenfranchisement was not only a tool of political struggle, but also an important factor that determined the social dynamics of the region.

Thus, the study of this topic contributes to a more complete and objective understanding of the history of Kazakhstan during the Soviet period and helps to comprehend the lessons of the past for modern society.

Modern Kazakhstan is going through an important stage of understanding its own historical past. The period of Soviet modernization, including the 1920s and 1930s, left a contradictory legacy: on the one hand, industrialization, urbanization and the formation of a new cultural environment, and on the other—mass repression, famine, forced collectivization and discrimination of entire social and ethnic groups. In this context, the study of the practice of disenfranchisement takes on not only academic, but also socio-political significance.

At the state level, Kazakhstan pays great attention to preserving the memory of victims of political repression. Memorial complexes, museums, and research centers have been created. On May 31, the Day of Remembrance of Victims of Political Repression and Famine is celebrated annually. This date has become a symbol of recognition of the scale of the tragedy and respect for the memory of millions of people affected by the totalitarian system.

In this process, it is particularly important to study those forms of repression that previously remained in the shadows. While deportations, mass arrests, and the GULAG are reflected in the public consciousness, the practice of disenfranchisement is still not recognized as an element of repression. Meanwhile, in the 1920s and 1930s, it was one of the most widespread forms of political discrimination, affecting hundreds of thousands of citizens.

The inclusion of the history of the "deprived" in the broad context of the memory policy allows us to restore justice to these people and show that the repression was not only punitive, but also preventive, aimed at systematically restricting the rights of entire social groups.

In recent decades, Kazakhstan has been implementing major state projects aimed at studying and preserving the historical heritage. Among them are the programs "Madeni Mura", "Halyk Tarikh Tolkyninda", as well as modern initiatives related to the digitalization of archives and support for scientific research.

However, the analysis shows that the topic of disenfranchisement is still presented fragmentally in historiography. Most of the research is devoted to deportations, GULAG activities, and mass political processes. Meanwhile, it was the «dispossessed» who were the category that the overwhelming majority of Soviet citizens encountered in everyday life.

The expansion of the research field at the expense of this topic will allow us to present a more comprehensive picture of repressive politics and show that it was not only violent, but also legal in nature- it was fixed in official documents and regulations.

For modern Kazakhstan, it is important not only to record the facts of the past, but also to learn from them the lessons necessary for the further development of the state. The experience of disenfranchisement shows how dangerous a state that divides its citizens into «loyal» and «hostile» on social or ethnic grounds can be.

The memory of the «deprived» reminds us of the value of equality and civil rights, which are now enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The principle of universal suffrage, respect for individual rights and protection from discrimination are fundamental foundations of modern society. In this sense, drawing on the experience of the past becomes an important tool for strengthening national identity based on the values of justice, human rights and equality before the law.

Thus, the practice of disenfranchisement in Alma-Ata in the 1920s and 1930s is not only historical, but also relevant. It recalls the extent of political discrimination during the Soviet period, shows the mechanisms of repressive policies, and helps modern society realize the value of equal civil rights.

The study of this phenomenon and its consequences contributes to the formation of a mature historical memory necessary for strengthening national unity and democratic values. This is especially important for Kazakhstan, as the appeal to the past becomes the basis for building a future free from discrimination and injustice.

References:

1. Zemskov V. N. Special settlers in the USSR, 1930-1960. Moscow:Nauka Publ., 2003, – 306 p. (in Russian)
2. Popov V. P. State terror in Soviet Russia. 1923-1953: sources and their interpretation. // Domestic archives. 1992 No. 2. – pp. 20-32.
3. Krasilnikov S. A. Marginal in post-revolutionary Russian society in the 1920s-30s // RGNF Bulletin. 2003. No. 4. – pp. 5-8.
4. Fitzpatrick, Sh. "Class assignment" as a social identification system // Russia and the Modern World, 2003, No. 2, – pp. 133-151.
5. Danilov V. P., Ilyin A., Teptsov N. Collectivization: as it was / / History gives a lesson, Moscow: Politizdat, 1989, – pp. 128-141.
6. Nusupbekov A. N. Formation and development of the Soviet working class in Kazakhstan (1917-1940) Alma-Ata: Nauka Publishing House of the Kazakh SSR, 1966.
7. Nusupbekov A. N. History of the working class of Soviet Kazakhstan. Alma-Ata: Nauka Publ., 1988.

8. Abylkhozhin Zh. B. Traditional structure of Kazakhstan: Socio-economic aspects of functioning and transformation: 1920-1930. Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR, Institute of History, Archeology and Ethnography named after Ch.Ch.Valikhanov. -Алма-Ата: ГЫЛЫМ, 1991.
1. 9 Rysbekova S. T. Soviet experience of social modernization of traditional society: lessons and historical significance (1920-1936) 2010, Uralsk.
9. Abylkhozhin Zh. B., Tatimov M., Kozybaev M. K., Aldazhumanov Kh. "Collectivization in Kazakhstan: the tragedy of the peasantry" Almaty, 1992.
10. Kozybaev M. K., Aldazhumanov Kh. S. "Totalitarian socialism: reality and consequences" of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan. Ualikhanov Institute of History and EthnologyУалиханова, Kazakhstan. AdiletIsland (Justice) - Almaty: XXI Century, 1997.
11. АСА. F-174, In., 6, С. 12, p 19.
12. АСА F. 174, In., 9, С. 37, p 204
13. АСА. F-174, In., 6, С 12, p 19.
14. АСА. F. 174, In.,15, С. 23 p. 28-31.
15. АСА. OTS F-174, In., 26, С. 111, p. 11
16. АСА. F. 174. Op. 16. D.6. p..51.

Рецензент: философия илимдеринин кандидаты, доцент Бекбоева А.К.