

UDC 94(571.1)

IRSTI 03.23.55

J. B. Kostyakova, N. Y. Artamonova

Katanov State University of Khakassia, Abakan, Russia.

E-mail: uka29@yandex.ru; lazar1918@yandex.ru

**ILLITERACY ELIMINATION AS MOBILIZATION POLITICAL
CAMPAIGN: PECULIAR FEATURES OF THE CAMPAIGN
IN THE NATIONAL REGION IN THE 1920s
(AS EXEMPLIFIED IN KHAKASSIA)**

Abstract. The aim of the study is to analyze the deals with the illiteracy campaign of 1920s-1930s. We used methods of analysis, synthesis and comparison. Referring to the main definitions and characteristics of the social mobilization, the authors consider the illiteracy campaign as mobilization political campaign. The need to use mobilization methods for this campaign was caused by the military communism to be further fixed by the active promotion of the external military threat. Under those conditions the illiteracy campaign pursued, first of all, political aims, such as political education, support of the government and formation of the Soviet citizen identity.

The illiteracy elimination combined persuasion and active enforcement that expanded possibilities of involving the Soviet citizens into the educational process. But the mobilization and bureaucratic nature of the illiteracy campaign implementation and the results assessment did not allow to achieve the goals in the 1920s.

One of the reasons for the low rates of the illiteracy elimination in Siberia was insufficient understanding of the cultural and political peculiarities of the national regions. The regional research in Khakassia showed that in the 1920s the illiteracy elimination difficulties were associated with the gangsterism, uncertain status of the region, problematic cross-national relations, Khakass writing obstacles and insufficient material and personnel resources.

It is concluded that the solution of these issues and the mobilization methods expansion allowed to intensify the illiteracy elimination in the national regions by the end of the 1920s.

Keywords: illiteracy elimination, illiteracy elimination campaign, social mobilization, mobilization political campaign, political education, Siberia, Khakassia.

Introduction. The illiteracy elimination in Russia is still called one of the main achievements of the Soviet government. Despite quite a share of propaganda exaggeration and optimism associated with the results of likbez, the soviet educational campaign to eliminate illiteracy, it is possible to consider the effectiveness of the measures taken by the political leadership of the state to involve the citizens of the multinational country into the education activities. In this way it also involved them into the social and political life of the country.

Methods. Various aspects of the activities of the authorities and community during the illiteracy elimination campaign determines different perspectives of the research. But likbez as educational campaign is most often considered to have been a priority of the Soviet government. It is an element of the cultural or national-cultural policy, an efficient experience that combined educational, outreach and political activities as well as the cooperation of social-political organizations and the party.

The use of methods of analysis, synthesis and comparison allows to identify the specifics of the educational program as a mobilization campaign, to form a holistic view of its implementation in Khakassia, as well as to identify the features of the implementation of such a campaign in the national Siberian region.

Results. The official start of the campaign is considered to be December 26, 1919, when the RSFSR Council of People's Commissars adopted a decree "On the elimination of illiteracy in the RSFSR". It

directed all the residents aged 8 to 50 years, unable to read and write, "to learn literacy in their native or the Russian language at will" [1, 118]. A number of documents of the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks, then of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks and, then, of the Soviet Union Communist Party were devoted to the illiteracy problem, such as decrees, resolutions of congresses, etc. The fact that these documents were issued both during pre-war and post-war periods shows the long-term duration and immensity of the illiteracy elimination activities. We believe that this factor is the key one that caused a controversial designation of the likbez format (status).

The information materials and scientific literature call likbez "a state program", "state activities", "process", "work", "Soviet educational project", "Soviet campaign", etc. We suggest that the illiteracy elimination should be considered as a political mobilization campaign characterized by clearly expressed political and administrative principles, regulatory framework, clear targets, methods of coercion, the use of both government and social political resources to achieve the campaign goal. Another argument in favor of the assumption is the compliance of this campaign with the basic characteristics of the social mobilization, namely institutionality, intensity, directivity, inclusiveness, aggressiveness [2, 36].

Discussion. In the domestic research literature concept "mobilization campaign" is mainly used in the study of various wars. It is in general consistent with the traditional understanding of mobilization as the implementation of a set of measures in the army, economy, system of the public administration to ensure their functioning during the wartime or elimination of the war consequences. But, reference to the category of "social mobilization" within the scientific discourse and its study as a phenomenon of the national history have led to the situation when the term "mobilization" is used in regard to the peacetime (mobilization economy, mobilization type of development, mobilization technologies, mobilization project, etc.).

The term "political mobilization campaign" is still rare in the scientific literature. In our opinion, it is due to the fact that using this term, the researchers cannot always clearly explain the difference in a mobilization campaign and a political campaign proper as well as differences in their varieties, such as agitation-mass campaigns and ideological-propaganda campaigns. A. S. Kimerling offered to differentiate political campaigns of Stalin era according to their goals as "those mobilizing the population to build the socialism and the repressive ones supporting the totalitarian regime" [3, 109–118]. The researcher also described the implementation mechanism of those mobilization campaigns. The scientist characterized in detail all the campaign stages by the example of the elections for the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in 1946. According to this author, there were four stages of the mobilization campaign. They were an ideological message through the central and, then, local press, an organization stage, mass mobilization and implementation of the campaign goals and objectives together with a success report [4, 104–114].

However, we believe this technology is not universal, being characteristic of the period when the country had already established an extensive media network. Along with other means of agitation and propaganda it provided an ideological impact on almost every citizen of the USSR. The illiteracy elimination campaign was held under the prevalence of oral agitation and propaganda over the mass propaganda, especially in the 1920s. Moreover, the fact that the campaign had been implemented for several decades does not allow to conclude about a strict sequence of the stages pointed out by A. S. Kimerling, as the active periods of the campaign were replaced by its "decay". In this regard, we find it necessary to reconsider the essence and results of likbez as educational campaign from the perspective of social mobilization. We believe it will allow to step away from the fixed trends studying likbez and provide a fresh look at this educational project as political mobilization campaign.

The researchers studying social mobilization in relation to the Soviet society rely on the definitions of this historical category presented in the works of A. A. Galkin, A. G. Fonotov and other authors; the researchers offer their own generalizing definitions as well. So, S. A. Krasilnikov reveals social mobilization as "purposeful guidance impact of authorities on the people. It was based on the suppression or distortion of free and rational preferences, motivations and actions of individuals and groups to bring the society to an active state to support and implement the goals and objectives declared a priority, being recognized by the public majority." According to the researcher, this perspective shows the social mobilization as a "deformed, distorted and falsified version of the social contract / consent model of the Western type in the Soviet-Stalin modification" [5, 40–46].

When analyzing the illiteracy elimination campaign, we also see a contradiction between the declared goals and the desired results and a distortion of understanding the public good. Making efforts and involving considerable resources, the Soviet power promoted the idea of undoubted usefulness of the illiteracy elimination campaign for citizens, for reading and writing skills would help them escape from the "darkness of ignorance", get rid of the "fetters of the damned past", be a freeman, master professions and make career. But the politicization of *likbez* to form a new Soviet personality led to the persuasion measures as well as to the enforcement to participate in the illiteracy elimination process.

One of the major factors contributing to the possibility of social mobilization of the Soviet society is considered to be the external, first of all, military threat. In the political propaganda, especially in the press it was a personified "image" of the external enemy that generalized the Entente, fascist Germany, militaristic Japan or some other representatives of the hostile capitalist world. The illiteracy elimination campaign began during the Civil war to be later held under the constant external (real and imaginary) threat to the new Soviet state that turned to be in the "hostile capitalist environment". In this context, we believe that literacy was treated as a form to support the government and its activities and as contribution to the strengthening of the country's defensive potential. This explained the need to apply mobilization methods to wage the campaign and, above all, to take measures to compel citizens to study, including overall censure and warnings about criminal liability and fines.

However, political mobilization campaigns as a universal basis and a tool for the implementation of mobilization technologies were not only of a conflict (confrontational), but also of positive character. They were both based on the imperative nature of "struggle" as the main way to achieve a goal. Referring to this idea, S. N. Ushakova identified three types of political campaigns. They are those 1) based on the external threat factor; 2) directed against internal "enemies"; 3) pursuing the goals of positive mobilization [6, 22]. According to this typology, the illiteracy elimination can be classified as a political campaign of a positive type, since the result was to be the entire literacy of the population, their involvement into the social and political life, enculturation and more opportunities for self-realization.

The regulatory framework of the educational program was based on the program of the Russian Communist Party adopted at the VIII Congress of the Party in March 1919. During "the buildup raising the possibility of the full implementation of communism" the public education was considered to be a tool of "the up-brining of the generation able to finally establish communism". The document declared "comprehensive national assistance" to various forms of citizens' self-education and their training in the context of the "most extensive propaganda" of the Communist ideas [7, 419–420]. The decree "On the elimination of illiteracy in the RSFSR" logically continued this policy. It forced the illiterate population of the country to study by order, which was peculiar to the military communism period. At the same time, the decree did not indicate any sources of funding, personnel and other resources which would allow to implement this project when involved.

The mobilization status of *likbez* as a political campaign was bolstered with the establishment of All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for the illiteracy elimination in 1920 to give it broad powers to implement the adopted resolutions. Further, forms, scale, subjects and quantity indicators of the campaign were defined in the resolutions of congresses, party conferences, the I All-Russian Congress on literacy elimination (1922) and in Sovnarkom decree (1923). The analysis of these documents and some other documents allowed to conclude that in the first half of the 1920s the campaign emphasis was made on administrative pressure and enforcement. The campaign was supposed to be provided with teachers due to their civilian duty to organize reading seminaries and schools. It was also supposed to mobilize communists and class-conscious workers to read aloud the party documents and newspapers. The second resource for the educational campaign was an enthusiastic public initiative, which was embodied in the mass voluntary society "Down with Illiteracy" established in 1923. This tendency was on in the late 1920s in the way of voluntary-compulsory cultural outings.

The ideological essence of *likbez* as educational campaign was promoted by way of combining illiteracy elimination and political propaganda. This allowed to reach the goal of educating younger generation, developing new intellectuals and promoting "political re-education" of citizens. Moreover, an integral part of that education was education of citizens "in the aspect of Marxist worldview and communism" [8, 315–316]. The centralized and regulated administration determined the general direction,

methods and planned targets of the political campaign. But the real situation, progress rate and extent of the literacy campaign were different in different regions and depended on the local conditions.

The apparent lag of Siberia from the European part of the country in the illiteracy elimination rate was caused by a number of reasons, including wide geography and ethnic "diversity" of the population comprising indigenous Siberian peoples, complex landscape, the Civil war consequences, active migration, steady increase in the number of illiterates, etc. [9, 195]. As a result, the number of literates per thousand people in Siberia was one and a half times less than this number in the European part of the country (218 and 330). The educational campaign rate in the first six years also showed an evident lag of the Siberian region from the average rate taken for the RSFSR (9.1% and 12.6%) [10, 145–146].

But we believe this situation was determined by the ways of implementing the campaign as well. By the beginning of 1928/1929 the campaign had been predominantly organized with "apparatus methods of the national education authorities through the system of the commercial literacy offices and schools". The involvement of the community to educate adults was "limited" and mainly used in towns. This, at best, allowed to "keep the rate of illiteracy", but did not lead to the fundamental solution of the problem [10, 145–146].

The campaign in some Siberian regions took place in accordance with the all-Russian events, but it had its own peculiarities. When considering the illiteracy elimination for the "non-Russian ethnic minorities" in the early 1920s, the resolutions of XI All-Russian Congress were fundamental. The Congress designated the educational campaign in the row of minor ethnic goals as one of the "main tasks in improving the cultural and political level of the masses" and marked the end of the campaign, being the day of the October revolution decade [11, 120–121]. At the same time, the indigenous ethnic groups and national diasporas of Siberia were equalized in the rights to education, while the number of their representatives were of the first importance in the reporting documentation on the educational campaign. But their peculiar way of life, their writing language (or its absence), the possibility to train teachers and other factors were not taken into account. The change in this situation had become evident only by the end of the 1920s, which led to an increase in funding for the education system of the national regions.

However, the lack of knowledge about some Siberian ethnic groups and their "economic, household and linguistic characteristics" did not allow to use "differentiated approach" [12, F. 47. Op. 1. D. 740. L. 32-32 turn.] for these groups, which hampered literacy among the indigenous Siberian communities. This can be seen in Khakassia, one of the South Siberian national regions. In the 1920s, half of the local population were Khakass, people of the indigenous ethnic group. The educational campaign in the "non-Slavic" (Khakass) district of Minusinsk uyezd of the Yenisei province was held under difficult conditions of relieving the Civil war consequences. Moreover, the situation was complicated by the fight against political and criminal banditism which officially ended in 1921. But, in fact, the criminal situation in the region remained complex and influenced the activities of the Soviet authorities and the development of the education system.

The uncertainty of the "non-Slavic" district statute significantly hampered the educational campaign. The absence of the local authorities hampered the administrative management and financing of the region and the solution of the personnel issue. Many factors were taken into account to define the form of the national government structure in Khakassia, including the low literacy level of the population and almost total lack of the local ethnic labour. Therefore, on November 14, 1923, the Presidium of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee adopted a decree on establishing Khakass uyezd with eight districts departed from Minusinsk uyezd and Achinsk uyezd of the Yenisei province and Kuznetsk uyezd of the Tomsk province.

The establishment of the national uyezd was to expand the possibilities of the illiteracy elimination for adults. In fact, the ineffective organization and personnel management led to the situation that established in January 1924 the uyezd department of public education consisted of one person. The head of the department came to Khakassia only in August and was forced to make numerous reports and plans. Despite the demands to increase the number of students, the budget for the most pressing needs of the uyezd educational system was reduced from 76 thousand to 19 thousand rubles [13, . F. 14. Op. 1. D. 48. L. 21a–21b.].

The illiteracy elimination campaign in Khakassia was also complicated by the semi-nomadic way of life of the major part of the indigenous population engaged in cattle breeding, by the small number of schools in the settlements and the lack of the teaching staff. They tried to solve the problem by way of the extensive propaganda and organizational activities with the population, which determined the active use of mobilization methods. But the main difficulties and peculiarities of the political mobilization campaign were largely determined by the low literacy level of the indigenous population and the lack of native language writing.

Before the revolution of 1917 the "non-Slavic" district had accounted for 160 literate Khakass men and 40 Khakass women [13, F. R-16. Op. 1. D. 35. L. 66] per thousand people. According to the census of 1920, the total literacy of the male population of the "non-Slavic" district was 13.1%, female literacy rate being 4.6%, in small settlements such indicators were respectively 8.9% and 1.6% [14, 260]. In the context of the undeveloped Khakass writing, the task was to educate indigenous ethnic community in the Russian schools to eliminate their illiteracy. But we suppose that the mobilization approach to the educational campaign for the Khakass could not give the required effect, as Khakass people did not sufficiently comprehend the Russian language. According to the data of 1910, 31% of the Khakass population knew Russian. In the districts neighboring the Russian districts, this indicator was up to 100%, while in some districts it fell to 9%. Women who lived more isolated almost did not speak Russian [15, 508] and had no opportunity to learn even elementary literacy.

Therefore, despite the mobilization measures to take Khakass to the Russian schools, the illiteracy elimination campaign in the "non-Slavic" district had slow progress in 1921. The recording of the illiterate was made improperly, there were no textbooks, literature, curricula and guidance papers. But the most acute problem to solve to reach the educational goals was the teaching staff for the schools to teach illiterate people. The situation even worsened due to the fact that the "old" Russian teachers of the "non-Slavic" district did not completely take the Soviet ideology. "New system" training of teachers from the Khakass people was slow despite the teacher courses held in Krasnoyarsk, Minusinsk and some villages of Khakassia since 1921. Even in the academic year of 1923/1924, there were only 18 Khakass teachers of 81 teachers who worked in the uyezd schools [16, 75]. Except in rare circumstances, they had an extremely low educational level and lacked methodological skills as well as training educational experience. It affected the effectiveness of likbez where the main burden was on the teachers. To solve the personnel problem Minusinsk department of public education recorded all the literate Khakass people to force them to work in literacy schools. But these mobilization measures did not have an effect, because dealing with illiterate adult students required special teaching and aspiration to educate such students.

Women, especially the Khakass women, were even more difficult to get involved into the educational project. They made up a significant part of the illiterate population of the "non-Slavic" district, and to train them had some specifics. Khakass women needed some courage to overcome the patriarchal prejudices, fear and uncertainty, to cross the psychological barrier associated with age and national traditions. While the Russian women trained to read and write became more liberated and independent to get engaged in conducting the literacy classes, the Khakass women often remained inactive and full of complexes. According to the data of 1928, there were almost three times as many Khakass boys in schools as there were girls. This gap was even more evident with adult learners [12, F. 47. Op. 1. D. 740. L. 32 turn.]. The women's literacy was an essential requirement for achieving women's real equality with men in the social, political and cultural spheres. But teaching methods that did not take into account the peculiarities of women's psychology for this indigenous ethnic group as well as such unified methods of involvement into the literacy school as coercion and political agitation made it difficult to achieve this goal.

It should be noted that the indigenous population of the "non-Slavic" district gave a positive response to the illiteracy elimination idea. Particularly, it is evidenced by the meetings of the inhabitants of Sira, Big Monok and other Khakass villages in 1921, where they supported the opening of the literacy schools [17, F. 120. Op. 1. D. 257. L. 69, 76, 84.]. Though the analysis of the archival data shows that in the first years of the Soviet power the educational campaign was not very successful and widespread with the adults. The situation got even worse in 1921, when almost all the educational and cultural institutions were transferred to the local budget of the province executive committees which could not provide for them due to the lack of finance. The attempts to expand the school network without the appropriate material support

did not improve facilities of educational institutions. So, on July 21, 1922, the III Khakass non-party conference decided to reduce the number of schools in the "non-Slavic" district, "to keep those schools that were better equipped and provided sufficiently with textbooks and teachers" [16, 43]. Thus, a number of literacy schools were closed.

The situation began changing only in 1923-1924, when Khakassia started to construct buildings for schools again. However, by 1924 the literacy schools for adults had been established only in some villages and Khakass uluses (small settlements). But the lack of the permanent network of educational centers made them get closed. The adult education was also the duty of reading rooms where the illiteracy elimination was to be organized "locally", with the local literate people. When there were no such people, the reading rooms had to be at least responsible for "lists of the illiterate with their gender and age indicated" [18, 2]. The illiteracy elimination was organized more steadily in day schools, where adults were taught by professional teachers. But financial difficulties and an acute shortage of people able to teach reading and writing did not allow to open independent elementary literacy schools. Therefore, the literacy level in the national uyezd had increased insignificantly for the period from 1920 to 1924, while in many settlements it remained unchanged. The all-Union census of 1926 showed that the literate in Khakassia made up 31.5% of the population of the age from 15 to 50, the indigenous population literacy being 16%. There were totally 20% of literate women, with only 6.5% of Khakass literate women [19, 66].

In the second half of the 1920s, the literacy situation changed significantly, mainly due to the active mass propaganda in rural areas. The rural population awareness of the need for literacy was a notable result of the campaign. However, the archival documents on the campaign coverage (see table) show that only the Khakass population demonstrated positive dynamics. First of all, it is associated with the approval of the Khakass alphabet and edition of the educational and fiction literature in the native language since 1925. These events made it possible to organize teaching in schools and educational centers with Khakass textbooks in the academic year of 1927/1928.

Dynamics of the number of literacy students in Khakassia. Comp. according to State institution "National Archives" of the Republic of Khakassia. F. R-16. Op. 1. D. 35. L. 32-32 turn.

Number of illiterate persons trained		
Academic year	Total	Including Khakass people
1924/1925	1168	400
1925/1926	2047	1030
1926/1927	3380	1463
1927/1928	2609	1545
1928/1929	4364	2645
Total	13568	7083

To a certain extent, the society "Down with Illiteracy" contributed to the revival of the likbez campaign, with the first group of the society being formed in Khakassia in 1924. In 1926 mobile schools and nomadic "khyzyl ib" ("red yurts") also began organizational activities and propaganda for the educational campaign. Their teaching did not give high results because of the short period of their stay in the uluses and villages, but we believe it aroused the interest of adults in literacy as useful thing in everyday life and professional activities. Nevertheless, according to the contemporaries, despite the propaganda of the idea that the one who "does not gain knowledge now will lose the right to a decent human life in the future", adult schools were attended only by a small part of the illiterate. They preferred "wandering about the streets, hooliganism and drunkenness" [20, 1].

In the second half of the 1920s the cultural construction funding began to increase due to the "strengthening" of the local budget. This resulted in the significant increase in the number of the literacy schools in Khakassia: from 47 in 1924/1925 to 162 in 1928/1929 [16, 38]. To add, the financing of the literacy training of one Khakass student was almost three times more than that of the Russian student (25

and 9 rubles accordingly) [21, 52]. This proves that the educational campaign began taking into account the peculiarities of the indigenous ethnic groups of Siberia.

But by 1927 the literacy plans had not been fulfilled in the Republic of Khakassia as well as in the entire country. Nevertheless, the reporting documents recorded a significant increase in the number of literacy students. For example, there were 486 literate men and 162 literate women for one thousand Khakass people at the age from 14 to 36 in Askiz district which was the most culturally backward. The Russian population of the district showed higher results: 613 literate men and 251 literate women [13, F. R-16. Op.1. D. 35. L. 66.].

The literacy rate in the Republic of Khakassia significantly reduced the transfer of the ethnic writing into the new Turkic latinized alphabet (NTA) in the second half of 1928. The introduction of this alphabet made all the Khakass who learned to read and write and the literacy teachers be retrained. There were many teachers in the NTA committees. They were involved in the complex and time-consuming process of forming a new spelling of the native language. Moreover, they also had to introduce it in schools. This increased their workload and reduced the effectiveness of their participation in the likbez campaign. We believe that mass recurrence of illiteracy became one of the most compelling reasons to transfer the Khakass writing back the Cyrillic alphabet in 1939.

Thus, by the end of the 1920s the illiteracy elimination campaign in Khakassia had achieved some success; in particular, the adult education system was founded, which gave people the opportunity not only to learn literacy, but to apply their knowledge in practice. But, despite the many-sided activities of the national and public organizations, the illiteracy had not been completely eliminated in Khakassia by the end of the 1920s. We believe that to a large extent it was due to the mobilization character of the considered political campaign.

Its institutional character consisted in the public, political and regulatory support of the likbez. But, the insufficient funding of the campaign was accompanied by the top-down approach, when the organizational and methodological guidance of the campaign was replaced by the delivery of numerous orders and instructions; the assessment of the campaign results was mainly focused on the numerical values fixed in the notes and reports. The large scale of likbez as educational campaign and aspiration for the entire inclusiveness of illiterate people determined the aggressive propaganda with the main focus on the government demand for the mass political education of the population. The intensity of the campaign forced to ignore the psychological, ethnic, social, cultural, gender characteristics of the illiterate as well as the specifics of the regions, especially the ethnic ones.

The relative stabilization of the foreign policy and country economy by the end of the 1920s caused a change in the tools and methods of the educational campaign. The likbez mobilization character was preserved, but at the same time the educational system, training of teaching staff, edition of periodicals and educational literature and promotion of the national culture values got new financing possibilities. The main factor for improving the effectiveness of the literacy campaign was a differentiated approach that took into account the specifics of the regions and the ethnic characteristics of their population.

Ю. Б. Костякова, Н. Я. Артамонова

Н. Ф. Катанов атындағы Хакас мемлекеттік университеті, Абакан, Ресей

**ЛИББЕЗ МОБИЛИЗАЦИЯЛЫҚ САЯСИ БАҒДАРЛАМАЛЫҚ ҚАМТАМАСЫЗ ЕТУ:
1920 СОҢДАҒЫ ҰЛТТЫҚ ОБЛЫСТАРДА ӨТКІЗУДІҢ НЕГІЗДЕРІ
(ХАКАСИЯ МЫСАЛЫНДА)**

Аннотация. Зерттеудің мақсаты - белсенді фазасы 1920-1930 жж. Болған сауатсыздықты жою жөніндегі науқанға талдау жасау. Талдау, синтездеу және салыстыру әдістерін қолдану, әлеуметтік мобилизацияның негізгі анықтамалары мен сипаттамаларына сүйене отырып, білім беру бағдарламасы жұмылдыру саяси науқан ретінде қаралды. Оны жүргізудің жұмылдыру әдістерін қолдану қажеттілігі әскери коммунизм саясатына негізделген және одан кейін сыртқы әскери қауіпті белсенді насихаттау арқылы күшейтілді. Мұндай жағдайда білім беру бағдарламасы, ең бастысы, саяси мақсаттар: саяси білім, билікті қолдау, кеңестік азаматтың жеке басын қалыптастыру.

Сауатсыздықты жоюдың сенімді әдістерін жою және белсенді мәжбүрлеу, бұл азаматтарды оқу үдерісіне тарту мүмкіндігін кеңейтеді. Бірақ білім беру бағдарламасын жүзеге асырудың мобилизациялық-бюрократиялық сипаты және оның нәтижелерін бағалау 1920-шы жылдарда қойылған мақсаттарға қол жеткізуге мүмкіндік бермеді.

Сібірдегі сауатсыздықты бәсеңдетудің себептерінің бірі ұлттық аймақтардың мәдени-саяси дамуына жеткіліксіз қарау болды. Хакасия мысалында 1920-шы жылдары көрсеткен болатын. білім беру бағдарламаларын іске асыруға байланысты қиындықтар: бандитизмге қарсы күрес, аймақтың мәртебесі туралы белгісіздік, ұлтаралық қарым-қатынас мәселесі, Хакас сценарийін әзірлеу және енгізу қиындықтары, материалдық-техникалық базаның жеткіліксіздігі. Осы мәселелерді шешу және 1920-ші жылдардың аяғына қарай рұқсат етілген жұмылдыру әдістерінің ауқымын кеңейту туралы қорытынды жасалды. ұлттық аймақта сауатсыздықты жоюды күшейту.

Түйін сөздер: сауатсыздықты жою, білім беру бағдарламасы, әлеуметтік мобилизация, саяси науқандарды мобилизациялау, саяси білім, Сібір, Хакасия.

Ю. Б. Костякова, Н. Я. Артамонова

Хакасский государственный университет им. Н. Ф. Катанова, Абакан, Россия

**ЛИКБЕЗ КАК МОБИЛИЗАЦИОННАЯ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ КАМПАНИЯ:
ОСОБЕННОСТИ ПРОВЕДЕНИЯ В НАЦИОНАЛЬНОМ РЕГИОНЕ В 1920-е гг.
(НА ПРИМЕРЕ ХАКАСИИ)**

Аннотация. Целью исследования является анализ кампании по ликвидации неграмотности, активная фаза которой пришлась на 1920-1930-е гг. Применяв методы анализа, синтеза и сравнения, и опираясь на основные определения и характеристики социальной мобилизации, ликбез был рассмотрен как мобилизационная политическая кампания. Необходимость использования для его проведения мобилизационных методов была обусловлена политикой военного коммунизма и в дальнейшем закреплена с помощью активной пропаганды внешней военной угрозы. В этих условиях ликбез преследовал, прежде всего, политические цели: политическое просвещение, поддержка власти, формирование личности советского гражданина.

Ликвидация неграмотности совмещала методы убеждения и активного принуждения, что расширяло возможности вовлечения граждан в образовательный процесс. Но мобилизационно-бюрократический характер реализации ликбеза и оценки его результатов не позволил добиться поставленных целей в 1920-е гг.

Одной из причин низких темпов ликвидации неграмотности в Сибири являлся недостаточный учет особенностей культурного и политического развития национальных регионов. На примере Хакасии было показано, что в 1920-е гг. трудности с реализацией ликбеза обусловили: борьба с бандитизмом, неопределенность статуса региона, проблема межнациональных отношений, сложности с разработкой и внедрением хакасской письменности, недостаточная материальная и кадровая база. Был сделан вывод о том, что решение этих вопросов и расширение спектра мобилизационных методов позволили к концу 1920-х гг. активизировать ликвидацию неграмотности в национальном регионе.

Ключевые слова: ликвидация неграмотности, ликбез, социальная мобилизация, мобилизационная политическая кампания, политическое просвещение, Сибирь, Хакасия.

Information about authors:

Kostyakova J. B., Cand. Hist. Sci., Associate Professor, Department of stylistics of Russian and journalism, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Katanov State University of Khakassia, Russia; uka29@yandex.ru; <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4103-2944>

Artamonova N. Y., Doc. Hist. Sci., Professor, Department of of Russian History, Institute of History and Law, Katanov State University of Khakassia, Russia; lazar1918@yandex.ru; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5965-6798>

REFERENCES

- [1] O likvidatsii bezgramotnosti sredi naseleniya RSFSR. Dekret SNK RSFSR ot 26 dekabrya 1919 g. (1947). In Direktivy VKP(b) i postanovleniya Sovetskogo pravitelstva za 1917–1947 gg. 2, Moscow- Leningrad (In Rus.).
- [2] Krasil'nikov S.A. (2013). Stalinskaya model' sotsial'noy mobilizatsii v sovremennoy istoricheskoy literature. In Sotsial'naya mobilizatsiya v stalinskom obshchestve (konets 1920-kh –1930-e gg.). Novosibirsk: 34–41. ISBN 978-5-4437-0207-0 (In Rus.).

- [3] Kimerling A.S. (2017). Bor'ba za urozhay: mobilizatsionnye kampanii v derevne v 1946–1953 godakh (na primere Molotovskoy oblasti). In Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Istoriya. 4 (39): 109–118. doi 10.17072/2219-3111-2017-4-109-118 (In Rus.).
- [4] Kimerling A.S. (2016). Vybory v Verkhovnyy Sovet SSSR 1946 goda v Molotovskoy oblasti kak primer mobilizatsionnoy politicheskoy kampanii. In Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Istoriya. 4 (35): 104–114. doi: 10.17072/2219-3111-2016-4-104-114 (In Rus.).
- [5] Krasil'nikov S.A. (2011). Stalinskaya model' sotsial'noy mobilizatsii: nekotorye problemy izucheniya. In Vestnik Novosibirskogo universiteta, Seriya: Istoriya, filologiya, 10 (10): 40–46. Novosibirsk (In Rus.).
- [6] Ushakova S.N. (2013). Ideologo-propagandistskie kampanii v praktike funktsionirovaniya stalinskogo rezhima: novye podkhody i istochniki. Moscow. ISBN 978-5-8243-1822-7 (In Rus.).
- [7] KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh i resheniyakh sezdov, konferentsiy i plenumov TsK. 1998-1953 (1953). Izd. 7-e. Moscow. (In Rus.).
- [8] Ponomarev B.N., Wolin M.S., Zaitsev V.S. (1982). Istoriya Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza. Moscow. (In Rus.).
- [9] Sagalakov E.A. (2019). Socio-political development of the Altai-Sayan region. In Bulletin of National academy of sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan. V. 1. 377: 195–198. ISSN 1991-3494. <https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2518-1467.22> (In Eng.).
- [10] Mikhaylov A. (1932). Likvidatsiya negramotnosti i malogramotnosti. In Sibirskaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya. Novosibirsk. 3 (L–N): 145–146. (In Rus.).
- [11] Direktivy VKP(b) i postanovleniya Sovetskogo pravitelstva o narodnom obrazovanii za 1917-1947 gg. (1947). Moscow-Leningrad. 24: 120–121 (In Rus.).
- [12] State Public Institution of Novosibirsk Region "State Archives of Novosibirsk region.
- [13] State institution "National Archives" of the Republic of Khakassia.
- [14] Kyshpanakov V.A. (1995). Naselenie Khakasii: 1917–1990 gg. / edited by N.Ya. Gushchin. Abakan. ISBN 5-7479-0112-5 (In Rus.).
- [15] Butanaev V.Ya. (2008). Ocherki istorii Khakasii (s drevneyshikh vremen do sovremennosti). Abakan. ISBN 978-5-7810-0542-0 (In Rus.).
- [16] Asochakov V.A. (1983). Kul'turnoe stroitel'stvo v Khakasii (1917–1937). Abakan (In Rus.).
- [17] Municipal State Institution "Archives of Minusinsk".
- [18] T. (1924). Rabota izby-chitalni. In Vlast truda. 18 December (In Rus.).
- [19] Cheremnykh M.Ya. (1938). Ekonomicheskyy i kul'turnyy rost Khakasskoy avtonomnoy oblasti. In Sovetskaya etnografiya. Moscow- Leningrad. 1: 60–72 (In Rus.).
- [20] Dobrozhelatel (1926). Chto daet likbez. In Zhizn i rabota nashey shkoly. The newspaper was published in December 1926 in a mobile school in the village of Abaza (Khakassia). State institution "National Archives" of the Republic of Khakassia. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 119. L. 3 (In Rus.).
- [21] Kazarin V.N. (1998). Obrazovanie, nauka i intelligentsiya v Vostochnoy Sibiri. Irkutsk. ISBN 5-7430-0699-7 (In Rus.).
- [22] Sklyarov Valery, Skliarova Iouliia, Utepbergenov Irbulat, Akhmediyarova A.T., et al. (2019) // International journal of innovative computing information and control. Vol. 15. Issue 1. P. 321-335.
- [23] Pertiwi D., Sudrajat A., Kumalasari D., Retnawati H., Waspada S.P., Dossayeva S.K., Kassymova G.K. (2019). Gender equality in feminism // Bulletin of National academy of sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan. ISSN 1991-3494. Vol. 5(381). P. 112-121. <https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2518-1467.130>