



The Influence of the Stalinist Totalitarian System on the Socioeconomic Development and Agriculture of the Semipalatinsk Region, 1946-1950

*La influencia del sistema totalitario estalinista
en el desarrollo socioeconómico de la región de Semipalatinsk, 1946-1950*

Aigul Baigapanova, Aigul Adilbayeva,
Kymbat Baissarina and Kalamkas Bolatova¹

Abstract

The aim of the article is to analyze the influence of Stalin's policy on the economy of the Semipalatinsk region in the period from 1946 to 1950, as well as to find out the consequences of the social and economic policy of the Center, which affected the further development of the region. In the course of the research, the scientific literature and materials of archival funds of that time were thoroughly studied, and the following methods were used: general philosophical method, method of collecting and analyzing, and problem-chronological methods. An in-depth study of the theoretical foundations of economic development allowed us to identify the features of the formation, structure, and level of development of the economy of the Semipalatinsk region, as well as the reasons for the shortcomings in the study period. Taking into account the new methodological principles of modern historical science, this article comprehensively analyzes the problems of socio-economic development of the Semipalatinsk region in 1946-1950 years. The main directions of economic development of this period are considered in detail. At the same time, not only the achievements of the leading manufacturers were studied, but also attention was drawn to the shortcomings that occurred in industry and agriculture.

Keywords: politics, planning, people, labor, socialist competition.

Resumen

Analizaremos la influencia de la política de Stalin en la economía de la región de Semipalatinsk durante el periodo entre 1946 a 1950, además de conocer las consecuencias de la política social y económica del Centro, que afectó un posterior desarrollo en la región. En el curso de la investigación, se estudiaron a fondo la literatura científica y los materiales

¹ Aigul Baigapanova: Alikhan Bokeikhan University, Semey, Kazakhstan, ORCID 0000-0003-3837-2400, gul.baigapanova@gmail.com; Aigul Adilbayeva: Alikhan Bokeikhan University, Semey, Kazakhstan, ORCID 0000-0001-6197-6136, adilbayevaigul3@gmail.com; Kymbat Baissarina: Shakarim State University of Semey, Semey, Kazakhstan, ORCID 0000-0002-6068-7145, kbaissarina@yahoo.com; Kalamkas Bolatova: Alikhan Bokeikhan University, Semey, Kazakhstan, ORCID 0000-0001-8235-8484, kalamkas.bo@outlook.com

de los fondos de archivo de esa época, y se utilizaron los siguientes métodos: método filosófico general, método de recopilación y análisis, y métodos cronológicos de problemas. Un estudio en profundidad de los fundamentos teóricos del desarrollo económico permitió identificar las características de la formación, estructura y nivel de desarrollo de la economía de la región de Semipalatinsk, así como las razones de las deficiencias en el periodo estudiado. Teniendo en cuenta los nuevos principios metodológicos de la ciencia histórica moderna, este artículo analiza exhaustivamente los problemas del desarrollo socioeconómico de la región de Semipalatinsk en los años 1946-1950. Son consideradas en detalle las principales direcciones del desarrollo económico de este periodo se consideran en detalle, y a su vez no solo se estudiaron los logros de los principales fabricantes, sino que también se llamó la atención sobre las deficiencias que ocurrieron en la industria y la agricultura.

Palabras clave: política, planificación, pueblo, trabajo, competencia socialista.

RECIBIDO: 14/09/2022 · APROBADO: 18/11/2022 · PUBLICADO: 02/05/2023

Introduction

Kazakhstan has undergone many transformations and trials both in the Soviet era and at the beginning of the 21st century. From the point of view of history, the period from 1946 to the 1950s seems to be the usual next stage in the development of the country, but an objective view of these five years reveals a lot of little-studied and complex problems. One of the indisputable explanations for the existence of problems is that the ideology of those years prescribed coverage primarily of the achievements of Soviet people in the field of economy, culture, and education. Sometimes these achievements were deliberately exaggerated to motivate people to further industrial victories. Shortcomings and unfortunate mistakes often did not receive proper analysis and objective assessment. For this reason, modern domestic historical science should take a new look at the socio-economic situation of Kazakhstan during this period.

The relevance of this work is due to the following important reasons. First, the issues of socio-economic and political development of Kazakhstan and its regions, in particular, the Semipalatinsk region, in the period from 1946 to 1950, need to be thoroughly studied with the use of new scientific research methods. Secondly, the years 1946-1950 are a complex and contradictory period in the history of not only Kazakhstan but also other republics that were part of the USSR and therefore require a strictly scientific and objective assessment, parallel consideration of both positive and negative aspects of the country's development.

Degree of scientific problem development: up to now, many research papers have appeared in the national historiography that consider the socio-economic problems of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the first post-war five-year period. In connection with the ongoing changes in the country, there is a need for a more thorough study of previously published works on the socio-economic situation of the country, and the Semipalatinsk region in particular.

The purpose of the work: a thorough study and comprehensive analysis of the features and rich experience of the development of the Semipalatinsk region during this period, allowing us to understand the causes of UPS and downs in the economy, as well as the nature of socio-economic and political processes that took place in society. It should be noted that the materials on the history of the development of production, culture, and social consciousness of certain regions of the country are multipolar in nature and therefore also need a comprehensive analysis. Detailed consideration and analysis of the socio-economic situation in the Semipalatinsk region in 1946-1950 will successfully solve the accumulated problems of the regions of modern independent Kazakhstan and prevent mistakes in the future.

It should be noted that the problems of the labor market, and the peculiarities of its formation and development in the economic literature are covered quite widely. The problem that aroused the interest of the authors of this article was addressed in different years by the French historian N. Vert (1994), whose works show a genuine interest in the history of the USSR and their understanding that the political and ideological atmosphere in the country was not favorable for publishing the true history of the Soviet period.

It must be admitted that in those years, not Soviet science, but Western Sovietology stood on more solid scientific positions and gave an objective analysis at a much higher level, considering real, and not ideologized questions for research. Thus, the term “administrative-command economy,” which more accurately reflects the essence of the Soviet economy, first appeared not in the USSR, but in the United States in 1963 and was introduced into use by American economists Grossman and Lange (1963), one of those who analyzed and criticized the economic policy of the Soviet government. At the same time, foreign Sovietists lacked real information and facts, and therefore they made their conclusions based primarily on publicly available Russian-language publications.

Works of Kazakh scientists Auanasova *et al.* (2022), and Abdulpattayev (1976) are also devoted to the analysis of the socioeconomic development of the country in the post-war period. Thus, in special studies and a number of articles by Abdulpattayev (1976), the history of animal husbandry development in the Republic is studied. In his works, the scientist considers the problems of the country’s economic development during the period of adaptation of the economy to peaceful conditions after the second world war, but, like many authors, points to the active activity of the party in these processes, focuses on achievements, leaving aside negative trends.

Literature review

The problems of consolidation, development, and strengthening of the economy in the Republic are considered in the fundamental works of Tursunbayev (1960) and Shamshatov (1974). But these studies also emphasize the role of party primary organizations in the recovery of the post-war economy. However, Tursunbayev (1960) in the monograph *Peasant Collective Farm of Kazakhstan*, spoke about the shortcomings of leadership in agriculture, which hinders work and the collective life of the peasantry. Noting the

success of post-war reconstruction, the author notes the failure of the collective state of supply, lack of necessary collective funds (seed, fodder grain, insurance), the weak profitability of the farms, small security is indivisible funds, insufficient provisions of the workdays. And as a result of the narration, Tursunbayev concludes:

The Opportunities that were hidden in the bowels of the collective farm system were not fully used. Agriculture did not meet the growing needs of the population in food, and light and food industry in raw materials. The grain problem—this Central problem of agriculture—remained unsolved. (Tursunbayev, 1960)

With the acquisition of Kazakhstan's sovereignty and independence, new approaches to solving scientific problems appear in the national historiography. The period 1946-1953, and the entire history of the USSR is now viewed from a different angle. In research are introduced to such concepts as totalitarianism, Stalinism, ideologization, etc. At the same time, the range of archival sources is expanding, and the attention of scientists is focused on the hard life of the collective farm peasantry, etc. A reflection of the trends of the new era became a study, Zh.B. Abylkhozhin (1997). From the perspective of new conceptual approaches, he considers the situation in the post-war period, in particular, in rural areas. First of all, Abylkhozhin pointed out the negative trends of the post-war system, which were not usually discussed in the historiography of the previous decades. First, the author, based on real facts, shows the hard life of collective farmers, which is no longer hidden behind figures and statistics. Second, Abylkhozhin raises the problem of the repressive, punitive sanctions of the governing bodies, which gives examples from the decision of the Council of Ministers and the CPSU (b), to legitimize the government's actions. The author characterizes the period of 1946-1953 as follows:

It is impossible not to know that behind the apparently successful indicators of the post-war five-year plan were the hard labor of rural workers, imposed on all sides by repressive coercion, poverty and hunger of the population, barbaric exploitation of child and female labor, low life expectancy, the highest standards of physical wear and tear of the population, the use of slave labor of millions of Gulag prisoners. (Abylkhozhin, 1997)

K.K. Baissarina (2006), who studied this period with new approaches to the study of the realities of history, in her doctoral dissertation considered the main directions of agricultural development in the post-war years, contradictory methods and forms, the experience of implementation, as well as bitter lessons, difficulties and consequences of agricultural policy. In the course of the research, the author also studied the works devoted to the problems of reforms in agriculture, the organization of production, and the history of collective farm construction. It seems that this work also made a significant contribution to modern historiography. A lot of scientific research monographs and textbooks were published during the period of independent Kazakhstan.

Among these works, there are publications related to the topic. For example, the value of the works of K.S. Karazhanov (1991) is the fact that the authors build their conclusions on the basis of a large volume of analyzed archival materials and statistical data. In these works, the problems of material and technical equipment of enterprises and related changes in the social structure are considered in detail. For example, the doctoral dissertation of Karazhanov (1991) examines the issue of supplying the agriculture of Kazakhstan with agricultural machines produced in the factories of the RSFSR. The author of the dissertation also speaks about the assistance of the most developed industrial regions of the Union in the mechanization of Kazakhstan, and gives examples of patronage of industrial centers in the electrification of villages in Kazakhstan.

Particularly noteworthy is the thesis work of Eskendirov (2006), which presents a comprehensive analysis of the rather extensive material on the problems of economic and cultural development of the region. These works undoubtedly make a great contribution to Republican historiography. The research of Birminkulova *et al.* (2020) is devoted to the problems of agricultural development, the socioeconomic situation in the country, culture, and standard of living of villagers. The research of these authors attempts to provide comprehensive coverage of the hard work of collective farmers and state farm workers during this period. Research by Auanassova *et al.* (2018a) is also devoted to topical issues of the social sphere of agricultural workers. Their work provides an overview and analysis of social changes that reflect changes in agriculture. Currently, many works have been published on the study of the socioeconomic development of Kazakhstan, as well as the policy pursued by the Soviet government in the country.

A great interest of the authors of this article was attracted by the research of the scientist-historian Z.G. Saktaganova (2017), whose works made a significant contribution to the scientific research of this topic; her article examines the consequences of the totalitarian machine on the collective farm peasantry. It describes the policy decisions of the party and economic structures, based on the analysis of which the author concludes:

The State of collapse in which agriculture was, gave the party-state bonzes reason to believe that measures of influence on the peasants are insufficient. Therefore, in this period, the system forced the adoption of directives, seeing this as a panacea for the regeneration of the agricultural structure. (Saktaganova, 2017)

In the monograph, Saktaganova explores the extensive nature of agriculture and animal husbandry in the Republic in the post-war period. The difficult situation of the peasantry was caused, in her opinion, by the fact that the development of the economy was due to the depletion, rather than the reproduction of natural forces, as well as “the need to provide the expanding military-industrial complex with food, while preserving and strengthening the existing system of management and distribution” (Saktaganova, 2017).

Scientific research and articles by Anisimov and Butler (1968), Elagin and Basin (1984), and Gnoevykh and Backman (1985), devoted to the history and socioeconomic situation of cities and villages in Eastern Kazakhstan, were published gradually. In the scientific research of modern domestic scientists-economists Zharekeshev (2007), Kadysova and

Azerbayeva (2011), and others, the problems of increasing labor productivity in the economy, stimulating labor, forming the labor market, as well as issues of unemployment in the city and village in the conditions of market relations are deeply studied. Despite the emerging new works, one can not deny the existence of many little-studied problems related to the socioeconomic development of the Semipalatinsk region.

Materials and methods

In this paper, the general philosophical method, which allowed to consider the problem from a dialectical position based on the principles of historicism, objectivity, and consistency was used. The method of collecting and analyzing archival documents that provide information about achievements and successes, as well as mistakes and abuses in the economy of the region in the post-war years was used as well. In addition, comparative and problem-chronological methods were used, which allowed us to consider the socioeconomic situation of the region in the context of the development of historical science as a whole, and in close connection with specific historical experiences. The use of these methods made it possible to identify the general and special socioeconomic development of the Semipalatinsk region in the 1946-1950 years.

In the course of familiarization with the materials of reports, adopted resolutions, decisions, orders, and other archival information reflecting the specifics of agricultural development, the study attempted to analyze the reasons for the non-fulfillment of obligations and mistakes made. Decisions, resolutions and resolutions of congresses, plenums and conferences of the CPSU and the Central Committee of the Communist party of Kazakhstan, documents of state Executive bodies related to the country's economy were also analyzed. At the same time, these documents received a one-sided assessment, were not subjected to critical analysis, and the necessary conclusions were not made. The same can be said about statistical collections. Therefore, when analyzing historical processes, patterns, and structures of social development, archival data and statistical materials were used for comparison.

Results and discussion

The post-war years were difficult for the economy of Kazakhstan. There was a decline in the production of many types of industrial products, especially consumer goods. The problem of labor resources turned out to be very acute. There were not enough jobs in factories, factories, and agriculture, which was due to a number of reasons. First, many Kazakhstanis went to the front and did not return from the war. Secondly, most of the specialists who were evacuated to Kazakhstan during the war returned to their homeland. Third, many factory workers, recent school graduates, did not have proper professional qualifications.

In the 40 and early 50 years the ideology of socialism of the Stalinist model, according to most researchers and historians, reached its peak. After the end of the war, the efficiency of the economy, subordinated to the hard center, still maintained a stable ideological

character. The chosen model of development brought into the public consciousness the inviolability of the Stalinist party-state and propaganda-administrative system. According to the plan adopted on March 18, 1946, in the fourth five-year plan (1946-1950), it was planned to restore the areas destroyed by the war, bring industry and agriculture to the level of pre-war indicators, and even exceed them. At the same time, special attention was paid to the development of the economy of Kazakhstan. It should be noted that the Semipalatinsk region did not lose its significant status in the economy of the Republic even in the post-war years (Auanassova *et al.*, 2018b).

The post-war period was a period of restoration of agriculture and further development of natural resources for the Semipalatinsk region. The main goal of the economic policy of the Soviet Union was to maximize the use of natural mineral resources of the Semipalatinsk region, as well as the development of the light industry. Among other regions of the country, Semipalatinsk became considered an economically significant region that had a favorable economic value for the extraction of raw materials. The post-war period of development of Semipalatinsk was characterized by the fact that the government's plans were primarily aimed at the growth of the light industry. It should be noted that the Semipalatinsk region was one of the regions of Kazakhstan, where agriculture and animal husbandry have always been developed, and it provided agricultural products to other regions of the Republic. In addition, the region is rich in fish and fruit products. The region has also created all conditions for the development of the agricultural sector. In the plans of the fifth five-year plan, the task was set to bring the gross agricultural output of the Semipalatinsk region to 348.935 thousand rubles (Shipunova, 1990).

In 1946, when all the suffering of the war was over, the city began to gradually meet the needs of the population in products. The workers, participating in the socialist competition, sought to become the leaders of production and offered new conditions for competition. The movement of innovators of production was widely developed, and the industry experienced a period of updating equipment, and improving working conditions and methods. In 1946, the city consisted of Oktyabrsky, Kalininsky, and Leninsky administrative districts.¹ In the minutes of meetings of party activists in Semey, the success of the Semipalatinsk meat-canning plant, which produced tens of millions of canned foods every year, was systematically noted. According to the five-year plan, the investment Fund was mainly owned by the Ministry of local production. The Fund allocated funds for the construction and reconstruction of enterprises. After the repair, the Semipalatinsk mechanical plant began to operate, producing its products for local enterprises. In 1946, the country's agriculture was experiencing a severe decline, both as a result of the war on the one hand, and as a result of a severe drought on the other, so on June 27, 1946, the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the CPSU(b) adopted a Resolution on the protection of bread "About measures on maintenance of safety of bread, to prevent its wastage, theft and spoilage", and on November 25, 1946, a Decree "On the preservation state of bread." In order to develop animal husbandry, the Union-Republican Ministry of Animal Husbandry of the USSR and the Ministry of Animal Husbandry of the Kazakh SSR was formed. In 1947, the Ministry of Agriculture of the

1 Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan. F. 1109, d. 5, d. 398, d. 103.

Kazakh SSR was formed, which was responsible for the development and implementation of state policy in the fields of agriculture, animal husbandry, and veterinary medicine (Bakina and Zhanakova, 2010).

It should be noted that the consequences of the totalitarian regime have had an extremely negative impact on the socioeconomic life of the people, leading to a deadlock in agriculture. The state of economic and social development of the Republic began to depend on the level of development of the main branch of the national economy—agriculture, in which there was a significant decrease in crop yields and livestock indicators. The state, despite the difficult situation, did not leave any extra grain in public warehouses. Many heads of collective farms were declared “weak-willed” and condemned for failure to fulfill the state order for grain procurement. There were cases when a person could go to prison for a handful of grain brought to a hungry child. Despite the stagnation in agriculture, the state did not stop receiving most of the collective farm products. This policy has not bypassed Kazakhstan. For example, the Semipalatinsk region in the fourth five-year plan had to hand over 127 million tons of grain to the state, with each hundredweight—12 kg. It was necessary to get production, which compared with pre-war indicators increased by 7 percent. If the agricultural cooperatives of the Semipalatinsk region were located on an area of 6.162.960 ha, then of them were: 372.672 ha—haymaking land, 241.872 ha—fallow lands, 384.408 ha—haymaking lands, 426.801 ha—pasture lands, but many pasture lands were not fully used, and the haymaking land could not provide a sufficient supply of feed. At the end of the fifth five-year plan, there were 593 state farms in the Republic, including 369—grain farms, including 98 state farms in East Kazakhstan, 26 of which are grain farms. Thus, according to Baissarina, “the collective was economically more powerful and diversified” (Baissarina, 2006).

From December 16, 1947, the card system was abolished, and state and cooperative trade was introduced instead of the normalized distribution of food and industrial goods. The monetary reform was carried out, which significantly improved the economic situation of the residents of the Semipalatinsk region. Reports and references on the General economic state of the region in 1946-1947 indicate the intensive growth of various industries in Semipalatinsk. After the war, there were four major industrial centers in the city: the meat-packing plant (was subordinate to the Ministry of Meat and Dairy Industry), mill flour (in the flour subordination of the Federal trust), factory primary wool processing (subordinate to the Ministry of Textile and Cloth Industry of the Kazakh SSR), leather-tanning factory and two garment factories, subordinated to the Ministry of light industry of the Kazakh SSR.

In 1947, the output according to the plan of the national economy of the USSR and the plan of industrial enterprises of the Semipalatinsk region was 96.7%. According to Kyrykbaeva (2000), six out of eight enterprises completed the production program and achieved the following indicators (Table 1).

Table 1. The output according to the plan of the national economy of the USSR and the plan of industrial enterprises of the Semipalatinsk region (1947)

Table 1. La producción según el plan de la economía nacional de la URSS y el plan de empresas industriales de la región de Semipalatinsk (1947)

1	Meat canning plant	100.8%
2	Flour and feed mill	101.6%
3	Paper and packaging plant	117.2%
4	Meat and dairy products combine	204.0%
5	Silicate plant	130.0%
6	Transport and repair plant of Ayaguz	133.5%

Source/fuente: Kyrykbaeva, 2000.

The post-war five-year plan is also characterized by the fact that industrial enterprises have made new commitments to improve the quality of products. At the enterprises of the Semipalatinsk region, socialist competitions among teams for the production of high-quality products began. By with the set goals, female workers of the factory Bolshevi-chka Ukraina began to exceed the daily norm of the day by two or three times. But, despite the high performance of employees of production enterprises, archival documents of those years have the character of dry reporting. Nevertheless, the people's desire for selfless work and love for the Motherland were the realities of the ideology of that period. At the same time, several industrial enterprises in the region failed to achieve the accepted indicators. Among them: mill—81.2%, factory of primary processing of wool—91.2%. The implementation of production plans in the industry of the Semipalatinsk region provided for many requirements: improving the quality of manufactured goods for the specified range, reducing the cost of manufactured products, and saving raw materials, energy, and equipment. However, individual enterprises did not fully cope with the tasks assigned to them. For example, the production plan of 1945 in the USSR was fulfilled by 73.7%, for industrial cooperation—by 66.4%. In the report on the results of the food industry enterprises in the region for the first half of 1946, a number of references were given. One of these references refers to the Semipalatinsk meat-canning plant named after him Kalinin. Already at that time, it was listed in the ranks of enterprises of Union significance.

After the war, the plant, like other enterprises, switches to peaceful working conditions. The range of quickly produced products is expanding. For example, employees of the cannery were engaged in the production of canned delicacies. Along with the main products, the meat processing plant produced up to 14 types of mass-consumption products.² Nevertheless, during these years, the Semipalatinsk meat-canning plant processed 7.646 tons of meat instead of the planned 9.650 tons, which was 79.4% of the plan. Under the plan of 1.640 tons of sausage products, 1.284 tons were produced, which was 78.3% of the plan. Canned food—according to the plan 6.400, but it produced 1.575 PCs. or 24.6% of the planned. The main reason for the non-fulfillment of the nine-month production program for the production of basic products is due to the fact that

2 Center for Documentation of the Modern History of the East Kazakhstan Region 591, p. 2, d. 61, p. 96. In <http://cdni-arhiv.vko.gov.kz/ru/> (accessed 18/04/2023).

the meat processing plant was not provided with raw materials in full volume for seven months.

In 1946, the annual plans of the Union industrial enterprises of the city of Semipalatinsk were fulfilled by only 31.9%, the Republican industrial enterprises—by 84.9%, and local industrial enterprises—by 88.7%. In 1946, the meat processing plant fulfilled the annual plan by 82.2% and could not bring the volume of production to 9372.1 rubles. Of the 14 enterprises under the Republic's jurisdiction, only one of the local industrial enterprises fulfilled the annual plan. The reasons for not fulfilling the plans were the lack of raw materials, weak electricity, and outdated equipment. The reports of that time indicate the inefficient organization of labor of workers, weak living conditions of employees, and morally and technically outdated equipment.

As for the quality of products produced in the local and cooperative industries, without taking into account individual products, it was often unsatisfactory. Most managers wanted to increase the number of products produced, and the quality of goods was in the background. The shoes were heavy, and flimsy, and there were cases when the colors of the two pairs of shoes were different. The furniture was made of rough and flimsy materials. Often the quality and price of a particular product did not correspond to each other. For example, if at the level of the Union 1000 pieces of brick cost 1000 rubles, then at a brick factory subordinate to the Ministry of Industry and building materials, it cost only 123 rubles. If a ton of limestone was estimated at 4000 rubles, then at the same plant this ton cost only 59 rubles.³

Within the framework of the command and administrative system, the industrial development strategy was also built. At the same time, as in previous years, the basis of industrialization was ideology. Stalin, assessing the potential danger from the outside as excessive, set the task to maximize the development of priority (group A) defense complexes and heavy industry. And the production of consumer goods (group B) “freeze”, because, in his words, “there is no revolution without losses”, and the flourishing of the social structure—a matter of a bright future. Kazakhstan's industry can also be considered a reflection of this policy. Already in the post-war years in the Semipalatinsk region, work began on launching a cable plant in Semey. In Ust-Kamenogorsk, the first lead-zinc plant was launched. Also was built a factory for the production of machines for food processing. Production of steel, equipment for the production of cement, ferrous, and non-ferrous metals was also established, and coal and mining enterprises were developed. And since the main attention was paid to the development of heavy industry in Kazakhstan, efforts were directed to this sphere. Among the enterprises that produced products in Semey in the late 40 and early 50 years, the largest was still considered to be a meat-canning plant and a Shoe factory belonging to group B. The economic development of the Semipalatinsk region during the study period increased due to the development of the industry of group B: food and light. In Semey, a tanning and extraction plant began to issue its products. In 1949, further development of enterprises belonging to group B was planned in East Kazakhstan: the construction of a Shoe factory with a capacity of 600 thousand pairs of shoes began.

3 Center for Documentation of the Modern History of the East Kazakhstan Region
1391, d. 1-t, d. 20, p. 13. In <http://cdni-arhiv.vko.gov.kz/ru/> (accessed 18/04/2023).

Scientists recognize that the economic development of that time was not stable and was characterized by distortions. The socialist competition, which covers all areas of production in the regional economy to achieve quantitative indicators, in the subsequent period affected the production of low-quality products. Thus, the Semipalatinsk region developed an economy that was characterized by fraud, which contributed to its deep decline in the following years. Despite this, Soviet economic science continued to talk about the Golden five-year plan “and show the possibilities of intensifying the country’s production sectors thanks to the wisdom of the party and state leadership.” It was suggested that the Soviet economy could not experience a crisis, as it constantly does with the economies of capitalist countries. This was the opinion of the country’s leaders, who in the post-war years actively assured everyone that they had found mechanisms for rapid development of production.

At the same time, the country was working to improve its defense capability. Stalin became the head of the largest military-industrial complex of the Soviet Union. In Kazakhstan, a large-scale infrastructure of military production was deployed, the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site and other military facilities were built, and soon Kazakhstan became the largest link in the military-industrial complex of the USSR. The Semipalatinsk nuclear test site became one of the most severe Kazakh tragedies. On August 29, 1949, the first test of a nuclear charge was made at the Semipalatinsk test Site. The test Site had a huge negative impact not only on the health and life of people but also on the economy as a whole. People began to gradually leave their places of residence. Many people have experienced radiation exposure, which has affected the appearance of malignancies, changes in blood pressure, and the birth of children with various physical and mental disabilities. The Soviet Union conducted these nuclear tests without taking into account the health consequences of 200.000 residents of the Semipalatinsk region who were not evacuated or warned during the actual explosions.

As can be seen, the post-war plans for the development of Soviet society reflected Stalin’s anti-democratic, totalitarian model of socialism. However, the people who survived the war years became different. Gradually, there was a reassessment of values, people became more aware of the need to turn to social programs and democracy.

Conclusions

Modern Kazakh historiography today actively fills in the white spots of the history of the Soviet state, revealing the anti-human policy of totalitarianism in relation to the people. Only during the period of Glasnost could the Soviet people realize what the phenomenon of Stalinism meant in the history of mankind. The command and administrative system that emerged in the USSR by the mid-20s reached its apogee in the 30-40s and early 50s, including in Kazakhstan. This system had such negative phenomena as the suppression of human freedom, ignoring its rights, alienation of people from the means of production, the formation of a policy of influence on the government governing the state, and the dominance of the cult of personality of I. Stalin.

These factors had a negative impact on socio-political development and led to serious consequences. Violations of the law were committed and abuses of power continued. The political system showed an inability to develop itself. It did not take into account many aspects of the life and activities of the people, the natural and climatic conditions of the development of certain regions. Thus, the main economic policy in the post-war period was the further expansion of the agricultural sector and the use of natural mineral resources in East Kazakhstan.

However, the planned economy did not take into account the specifics of the country's region, since the natural and climatic conditions of East Kazakhstan were more suitable for the development of animal husbandry than agriculture. Today, based on effective research methods, it is possible to assess its damage. The tragic past should be a lesson for building a worldwide tolerant political and economic space.

References

- Abdulpattayev, S.I. (1976). *The Communist Party of Kazakhstan in the Struggle for the Development of Animal Husbandry (1946-1965)*. Alma-Ata, Kainar.
- Abylkhozhin, Z.B. (1997). *Essays of the Socio-Economic History of Kazakhstan in the XX Century*. Almaty, Turan.
- Anisimov, S. and Butler, G. (1968). *Semipalatinsk 250 Years*. Alma-Ata, Kazakhstan.
- Auanassova, A.; Auanassova, K.; Zhumagulov, B., and Karasayev, G. (2018a). "The Alash Party on the Kazakh Statehood." *Astra Salvensis* 6(1): 129-136.
- Auanassova, A.M.; Nurpeisov, E.K.; Auanassova, K.M.; Karasayev, G.M.; Zhumagulov, B.S. (2018b). "Soviet Power and Hidden Policy of Neocolonialism and Totalitarianism." *Astra Salvensis* 6(1): 223-237.
- Auanasova, A.; Nurpeisov, E.; Auanassova, K.; Kushenova, G., and Mukhlisov, N. (2022). "The History of the Alash Party in the Context of the Impact on the Processes of Constitutional Acts." *Ancient Asia* 12(14): 1-8.
- Baissarina, K.K. (2006). *The Development of Agriculture in Kazakhstan: History and Lessons (1946-1965)*. Almaty, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University.
- Bakina, N.S. and Zhanakova, N.T. (2010). *History of Medieval Kazakhstan*. Almaty, Atamura.
- Birimkulova, G.; Ibrayeva, A.; Duisenkozha, Y., and Baydarov, E. (2020). "Kazakhstan in the System of Geopolitical and Regional Relations of the EU and the PRC." *Central Asia and the Caucasus* 21(3): 15-31.
- Elagin, A. and Basin, V. (1984). *A History of Cities in Kazakhstan. Semipalatinsk*. Alma-Ata, Nauka.

- Eskendirov, M.G. (2006). *Social and Economic Development of East Kazakhstan (the Second Half of the XIX – Beginning of the XXI Century)*. Almaty, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University.
- Gnoevykh, V.P. and Backman, E.L. (1985). *Semipalatinsk Meat-Packing*. Almaty, Kazakhstan.
- Grossman, G. and Lange, O. (1963). “Notes for a Theory of the Command Economy.” *Soviet Studies* 15(2): 101-123.
- Kadysova, R.Z. and Azerbayeva, A.D. (2011). *Historiography of Agriculture in Kazakhstan in the Post-War Period (1946-1985): Educational and Methodological Guide*. Pavlodar, Kereku.
- Karazhanov, K.S. (1991). *Cooperation of the Union Republics in the Development of Agriculture in Kazakhstan in 1946-1980 (Historical and Party Aspect)*. Alma-Ata, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University.
- Kyrykbaeva, E.O. (2000). *History of the City of Semey: Socio-Economic and Cultural Aspect (1946-1990)*. Almaty, Nauka.
- Saktaganova, Z.G. (2017). *Economic Modernization of Kazakhstan (1946-1970)*. Karaganda, Karsu Publishing House.
- Shamshatov, I.S. (1974). *Collective Farm Construction in Kazakhstan (1946-1970)*. Alma-Ata, Nauka.
- Shipunova, N.I. (1990). “Ten-Month Plan.” *Vesti Semey* 254: 3-12.
- Tursunbayev, A.B. (1960). *Peasant Collective Farm of Kazakhstan*. Alma-Ata, Kainar.
- Vert, N. (1994). *History of the Soviet State*. Moscow, Progress.
- Zharekeshev, K.B. (2007). *Socio-Economic and Cultural Development of Kazakhstan*. Almaty, Nauka.