Urazbayeva A.M.

candidate of historical sciences, associate professor,
al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty,
e-mail: akzhamal.m@gmail.com

THE MAIN PRINCIPLES OF DOCUMENTS CLASSIFICATION
(on the basis of the examples of Kyrobkom (1920-1925)

In the new conditions of the formed independence, the theoretical and methodological approaches to the study and analysis of our past have not only expanded, but also enriched. The significance of the theoretical foundations and methodological approaches in understanding and interpreting historical processes has increased. In other words, the importance of developing the theoretical foundations of historical knowledge and using new methods has increased.

The collapse of the communist party, which had an ideological influence on historical science, failed to overcome the challenge of time and the independent development of the republic opened up the possibility of a comprehensive study of the consequences of totalitarian rule in Kazakhstan. Formulating problems in a new way requires a search for a wide range of sources and their introduction into scientific circulation.

As clearly stated in the article «Seven Facets of the Great Steppe» by Elbasy, it is necessary to conduct fundamental research of all domestic and foreign archives, covering information from ancient times to modern times. Based on this, the principles of working with documents, their classification and the problem of analyzing information as a source become relevant.

In this regard, the author in the article analyzes the documents of the Kirghiz Regional Party Committee, based on the principles of scientific classification and types of archival documents. The features and the source value of party documents are considered on the basis of specific, group and other classifications.

Key words: classification, party documents, source study, totalitarianism, archive.

Уразбаева А.М.

тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент,
әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.,
e-mail: akzhamal.m@gmail.com

Құжаттарды сыныптаудың басты принциптері
(Қыробком құжаттары мысалында 1920-1925 жж.)

Жаңа қалыптасқан тәуелсіздік жағдайында өткенімізді зерттеуге, саралауға деген теориялық және методологиялық әдістер кеңейіп қана қоймай байи түсті. Әсіресе, тарихи процестерді түсіндіру мен түсінуде теориялық қор мен методологиялық құралдың мәні бірден күшейді. Басқаша айтқанда, тарихи танымның теориялық негіздері мен жаңа әдіс-тәсілдерді игерудің маңызы артты. Тарих ғылымына идеологиялық ықпал жасап келген коммунистік партияның уақыт сынына төтеп бере алмай тарауы және республикамыздың тәуелсіз дамуы бір кездегі Қазақстандағы тоталитарлық билік зардаптарын жан-жақты зерттеп, зерделеуге жол ашты. Мәселенің жаңаша қойылуы сан алуан тың деректерді кең көлемде тауып, ғылыми айналымға енгізуді қажет етеді.

Елбасының «Ұлы даланың жеті қыры» атты мақаласында айқын көрсетілгендей ежелгі дәуірден қазіргі заманға дейінгі кезеңді қамтитын барлық отандық және шетелдік мұрағаттар дүниесіне елеулі іргелі зерттеулер жүргізу қажеттігі өзекті болып отыр. Осы негізде құжаттармен жұмыс істеудің принциптері, оларды сыныптау, дерек көзі ретінде талдау мәселелерінің де өзектілігі артып отыр.

Осыған орай, автор мақалада архив құжаттарын сыныптаудың ғылымда қалыптасқан принциптері мен түрлерін Қырғыз облыстық партия комитеті құжаттары негізінде талдауға талпыныс білдіреді. Түрлік, топтық және т.б. сыныптаулар негізінде партия құжаттарының ерекшелігі, деректік маңызы қарастырылған.

Түйін сөздер: сыныптау, партия құжаттары, деректану, тоталитаризм, мұрағат.

Уразбаева А.М.

кандидат исторических наук, доцент,
Казахский национальный университет, Казахстан, г. Алматы,
e-mail: akzhamal.m@gmail.com

**Основные принципы классификаций документов
(на примере документов Киробкома (1920-1925 гг.))**

В новых условиях сформировавшейся независимости теоретические и методологические подходы исследования и анализа нашего прошлого не только расширились, но и обогатились. Особенно повысилось значение теоретических основ и методологических подходов в понимании и трактовке исторических процессов. Иначе говоря, возросла важность разработки теоретических основ исторического знания и использования новых методов. Распад коммунистической партии, оказывавшей идеологическое влияние на историческую науку, не сумевшей преодолеть вызов времени и независимое развитие республики, дал возможность для всестороннего изучения последствий тоталитарного правления в Казахстане. Постановка проблем по-новому требует поиска широкого спектра источников и введения их в научный оборот.

Как четко указано в статье Елбасы «Семь граней Великой степи», необходимо провести фундаментальные исследования всех отечественных и зарубежных архивов, охватывающих период с древних времен до современности. Исходя из этого, становятся актуальными принципы работы с документами, их классификация и проблема анализа информации как источника.

В связи с этим автор в статье анализирует документы Киргизского обкома партии, основываясь на принципах научной классификации и видах архивных документов. Рассмотрены особенности и источниковое значение партийных документов на основе видовой, групповой и др. классификациях.

Ключевые слова: классификация, документы партий, источниковедение, тоталитаризм, архив.

Introduction

During the years of independence, a lot of work has been done to study the past of our people on the basis of archival documents. The «Cultural heritage» program was successfully implemented, which made it possible to restore the forgotten fragments of the historical chronicle. Despite this, many documentary evidence about the life of ancestors has not yet been put into scientific circulation and are waiting in the wings in numerous archives around the world.

In this regard, the article by the Head of State «Seven Facets of the Great Steppe» is very important, where a special place is devoted to the need for serious fundamental research of all domestic and foreign archives, starting with antiquity and ending with modernity.

And in the qualitative studies of archival documents, the role of classifications is very important.

The possibility of systematic analysis of the information in the documents comes from the classification. In source studies science table of classification analysis has cognitive function which researches types and classes of sources and their specification of historical fact. Therefore, one of the most complicated and efficient methods to use documents of Kyrobkom, which combines complex group of written sources, as tool of research of the historical problems of Kazakhstan in first quarter of XX century is classification of documents. Classification dividing many objects into clear logical groups (Bernheim, 1908: 81), research objects for science – classifying sources, defining their specifications and features, and grouping according to their specifications.

Historiography of the issue and methodology

Nowadays in source studies science classification issue is researched in several scientific works (Danilevski, Kabanov, Rumyantseva, Medushevskaya, 2004: 701). One of the authors who dedicated his works for source classification issue is N.N. Maslov and V.V. Stepanov (Maslov, Stepanov, 1974: 304). The problem of categorize

source by type, the stages of working with them is unfolded in the works of V.P. Danilov (Danilov, Yakubovskaya, 1961: 3-24), V.V. Farsobin (Farsobin, 1987: 438), V.I. Buganov (Buganov, Turkan, 1977: 3-16), L.N. Pushkarev (Pushkarev, 1975). For example, V.V. Farsobin considered in his works the classification problem in connection with the concept of «historical source». Along with Russian scientist, Kazakhstani scientists contributed to research of source classification as well. Namely, K.M. Atabayev's classification of sources (classification –author), his research of methods of source studies analysis could be base for source study analysis of the documents of Kyrobkom (Atabayev, 2002:172). However, no established one system for classifying sources by type and group is formed. Therefore, in case of its formation, it is necessary to consider, firstly, purposes, secondly, the amount and the types of source available.

The methodological basis of the study will be the principle of historicism, which involves the consideration of the classification of documents in accordance with specific historical conditions.

Types and special aspects of classification

During the research, widely used and with objective signs strictly considered various types of classification can be used. They are: dividing sources into historical traditions and historical remains, classification according to their content, normative and executive aspects. Mentioned classification types have specific advantages along with disadvantages. We can see them while individual analysis of each of them.

Firstly, while considering Kyrobkom documents as source, dividing sources into historical traditions and historical remains, German historian E.Bernheim who lived between the end of the XIX century and beginning of XX century considered conditions of source classification «according to their closeness level with facts», dividing respective sources into historical traditions and historical remains (Bernheim, 1908: 81), Communist Party source study scientist M.A.Varshavchik analyzing other classification types, divided sources into two types, according to relations to the event: historical traditions and historical remains (Varshavchik, 1984: 198). This tradition is described in the work of German methodologist and historian I.G. Droysen. The author takes the principle of correspondence of source with facts. Above-mentioned V.V. Farsobin using M.N. Tihomirov's presumption, states that there are two types of sources, which were formed

historically: one is historical remain, second is historical tradition (Farsobin, 1987: 204). The author describes historical tradition as one fact to be shown in source, which means that historical tradition is taken as a result of that fact influence to witness or others, while historical remain is remain of people's service, direct witnesses of historical facts.

According to conclusion of E. Bernheim, «remains» as a part of the event, gives deformed information as a result of subjective influence on event and direct result. Moreover, the author says the following on diversity of remain types: «…one of them is documents. Documents give many things without any change» (Bernheim, 1908: 87). In its narrow meaning, remain can be result of actions of subjects who did not consider inheriting for the next generation, which is relic used in daily routine.

Source study scientist M.A. Varshavchik describes «historical remain» as relic formed during the development of event being described (Varshavchik, 1984: 69). In written source concept of remain is corresponding with the concept of document. Namely, they are guidance, decrees and decisions, protocols of meetings and negotiations, stenographs, and other documents and relics related to the event, and describing it, giving opportunity to evaluate it. Historical tradition contains documents formed as a result of analysis of the subject taken as a result of impression from the event. They are memoirs, diaries, etc. Even though such relics were formed by influence of society, it was formed by special necessity. The importance dividing sources into historical traditions and historical remains for researcher is as following: remain (documents – according to our estimation – author) has subjectivism amount is less than usual, here viewpoint of individuals, their feelings are not taken into consideration. Therefore, compared to historical traditions, remains (documents) have more importance. However, as documents are formed as a result of acts of people, thus, it is impossible not to consider the influence of viewpoint of individuals-subjects. Such documents are reports, protocol prepaired before stenographs of the meetings, etc. Here debates, disagreements can take place. Therefore, we highlight the necessity of paying attention to issue of determining the level of truthiness while using documents as source.

Along with that, one source can be remain and tradition at the same time. For example, even though some documents describe particular event, they cannot provide with information on event course. For example, let's take reports of party organizations as an example, they serve as historical remain during

conference or meeting, while reporter can be related to the event, that is historical tradition. In other words, consideration of the report in the meeting, is a fact (if it's recorded – author), the report itself and reporter are traditions. Furthermore, we can see that one source can be tradition and remain at the same time, in particular, publication documents. Party or Soviet periodicals are not only registers of past events, but also it was a tool in the hands of party to influence the society. Periodical publications which served as informer for readers on various events in the society, after some time, have become one of the precious sources (Zhdanovskaya, 1965: 381). Periodical publication as unique source describing the event becomes historical tradition, thus it serves as story teller, while as a connection between fact and its result, it becomes historical remain. In this term, E. Bernheim says the following «we can consider tradition as remain, if we consider them as result of time» (Bernheim, 1908: 87). In conclusion, even though sources can be conditionally divided into traditions and remain, it can be efficient method used in classifying documents.

For any historical research inner content of source takes important place. Therefore, it is logical condition to sort sources by their content. However, while sorting sources by their content some difficulties will raise. For example, related to Kyrobkom documents, first of all, Kyrobkom documents consider many issues in terms of content, purpose, description. Respectively, documents prepared during meetings, conferences includes documents which describe Kyrobkom service widely, therefore, the more issues are considered, the more information absorbed by sources.

Political life, ideological work, people's economy, culture, internal or foreign policy, party, soviet structure issues can be included in one document or published in many documents prepared during the meeting. Therefore, while sorting sources according to their content, one source can include various information can be repeated in many cases. Moreover, sources related to each other according to their content could require diverse methods of research. This correspondingly complicates the source study analysis. Therefore, being one of the important conditions of sorting according to content, it can raise complications while using source in scientific way, as a result, it cannot be main type of classification.

As far as classifying as «normative» and «executive is considered, normative society served during normative source formation, thus in includes documents which aimed at to the future rather than

to the past in terms of its content and course, and it aimed at information related to future acts rather than past action. Normative sources are diverse according to their formation, content, form, and importance. Normative documents are important because they give an opportunity to research relations appeared before the formation of such documents. They include programs and charter of party with «up to down course», decrees of conferences and meeting where obligations and policy of party is decided, decrees of the Central Committee, directive documents of local party organizations, order of leading party, etc. Executive documents describe progress and results of party and Soviet State policy. One of the disadvantages of historical research based on normative documents is that they cannot determine daily organizational, service, Soviet structure economic, political, «educational» role of Communist party. As it is impossible to know how much planned work and political directives were implemented, sometimes results and conclusions of completed work shown at the end of the directive documents cannot compensate such defect. It is only guidance to work to be done. Moreover, number of issued decrees cannot evaluate to service of the party organizations. Because, issuance of decrees several rimes proves that they weren't implemented on time.

The importance of executive documents increase due to their ability to show the process of political, organizational, economic, soviet structural work of party, execution or failure of instructions of supreme bodies. There are many number and types of executive sources. They are administrative – organizational, inspecting documents, concluding documents, and relating documents of local organizations, informative materials from lower bodies to upper bodies, correspondences, preparation documents. In general, executive documents can be divided as urgent and final documents. In historical research considering connection between normative and executive documents, it is advisable to use both of them equally. This connection in objective term, serves as political and organizational union.

In conclusion, the main disadvantage of research based on normative documents is lack of inspection of daily organizational, ideological, political service of party. Nevertheless, the importance of using normative and executive sources in historical research is their connections. When completing each other, they can give us an opportunity to unfold the process of historical event. In comparison, we can see the importance of sorting according to

«normative» and «executive» condition in historical research.

Another simple type of classification is type classification, which is grouping according to type and form. For example, memoirs, newspapers, act and statistical materials, articles, etc. Many scientists as L.N. Pushkarev (Pushkarev, 1963: 81-96), M.K. Makarov (Makarov, 1963: 195) paid attention to the formation of the concept of «Types of sources». M. Medushevskaya says: «type is a group of record which was formed in society, with similar features and certain service (Medushevskaya, 1977: 69). This is not specification of type, yet it is condition of formation of type of source. Later the author states that «source content cannot be limited by its type», and everything is formed from the connection of their forms (samples – author) and content. V.O. Kluchevski (Kluchevski, 1991:) is one of the scientists who formed the course of source study research such as complex analysis of major group of compositions related to one type. According to the author, research by types helps to determine social information specifications in sources and its credibility.

One thing to be note while sorting documents by type is that one type of source can be divided into several classes. Diverse type sources can be similar in terms of their content (protocol of meeting, memoirs, statistical tables etc.).

In conclusion, while sorting by type it is necessary to note that type of source cannot describe its content, and similarly while determining the content of the source, dividing by type cannot be the main condition. Because, there are many types of the source and their content are diverse. However, L.N. Pushkarev who classified sources by their type divided main types of sources into two groups: documental and declarative, and invented circular and liner systems of classification of recorded sources (Pushkarev, 1963: 264-268). Nevertheless, the author's viewpoint on difference between documental and declarative sources: «if the source describes more about past events took place before the formation of the source, it will be declarative source, and if in the source past event is registered, but not described fully, it will be documental source» can be disputable (Pushkarev, 1963: 212).

Historian T. Omarbekov on classification problem states the following: «documents from Soviet Union period history can be divided into three groups: individual people documents; political party and social organizations documents; state institutions and enterprises documents» highlighting its advantage as following: «in sorting documents

the most important thing is necessity not to use hierarchy stages, considering some of them (for example, compositions of classics of Marxism-Leninism, Communist Party bodies' documents, etc.) apart from historical sources» (Omarbekov, 1997: 20). Certainly, as Soviet documents with common outer features and stable forms, are considered as a whole, special party documents were not classified. However, while classifying Kyrobkom documents we cannot ignore the above-mention principle. Moreover, it is worth to note that during the domination of Communist ideology, sources of Soviet period were divided into three groups according to their formation principles. Historian-scientist T. Omarbekov who research it, shows the following groups of documents: «sources which were formed as a result of social and economic relations, sources which formed as a result of social and political fights, intellectual and culture of the society, and sources which were formed as a result of family basis» (Omarbekov, 1997: 21). Certainly, there is a disadvantage of grouping of the documents in this way, because, many documents according to their formation can be related to all three groups at the same time. This complicates the analysis of diverse sources with unique features.

Furthermore, some source study works relates documents to clerical correspondence, and divide them into eight types. First of them is organizational documents. Main of them are regulations, decrees, agreements. Organizational documents help to determine execution steps, structure, advantages, types, execution of case. Second group called instruction documentation includes document such as decision, orders, circulars. These documents, as a continuation of organizational documents, show the execution of administrative works. Protocols and stenograms as a special type of organizational-instructional documents, compounds the third group. Fourth group is regular correspondence of institutions, letters, telegrams, etc. Planned documents – fifth, registration documents – sixth, control documents – seventh, reports – eighth group. Sorting documents this way makes sense. Every document is analyzed separately. However, if to note that these documents could be grouped by common features, this type of classification can be considered as main condition as well.

A.A. Kulshanova who used documents Central state archive and archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan as source for localization policy divides document complex into four groups: «normative, organizational-instructional, report-informative, and documents with personal

features» (Kulshanova, 1999: 43). The author relates decrees, orders, rules, meeting materials to normative documents, while protocols, orders, circulars, instructions has instructional information, they relate to organizational-instructional documents. Third group – report-informative group includes reports, summaries, materials which were basis for documents, statements, explanations, correspondence. They include some conclusions related to one specific time. Personal documents compound from letters, requests to head of organizations. «Personal documents have information not registered in special documents. They describe personality, civil principles, and political viewpoint of the author».

Formed on scientific base these classifications have significant importance in research of the documents of Kyrobkom. None of them can be ignored and we cannot limit with them only. However, we can see there is no table for classification of sources in science sources, especially documents.

Conclusion

Nevertheless, taking above-mentioned conditions, principles as a basis, we can group documents of Kyrobkom as follows: documents of party institutions and organizations, and compositions of employees of party. First of all, the amount of documents of party organizations and institutions is huge in the history of party, therefore, the materials of these documents are full of information which give us an opportunity to research widely and completely history of Kazakhstan. Controlling and managing ideological, political, organizational, etc. works, party service can be seen in these documents group. Because, mentioned documents group includes starting from documents of conference of Kyrobkom to documents formed during the process of beginning of party organizations service.

In conclusion, as any other types of sources, we can see that it is required to classify documents by their type, content, description. This, consequently, will help to identify specifications of the documents. Classification, firstly, helps researcher to work with types of documents as source, and secondly, gives an opportunity to use respective methods. For this purpose, party documents related to history of formation of totalitarism in Kazakhstan in 1920-1925 divided into many groups such as: conference materials of party, documents of administrative organizations of party, documents of local party institution and beginner party organizations, compositions and memoirs of party employees.

Литература

Бернгейм Э. (1908) Введение в историческую науку. Санкт- Петербург. 81 с.

Данилевский И.Н., Кабанов В.В., Румянцева М.Ф., Медушевская О.М. (2004) Источниковедение: Теория. История. Метод. Источники Россииской историй. Москва. 701 с.

Маслов Н.Н., Степанов З.В. (1974) Очерки источниковедения и историографии истории КПСС. Москва. 182 с.

Данилов В.П., Якубовская С.И. (1961) Источниковедение и изучение источников советского общества // Вопросы истории. №5. С. 3-24.

Фарсобин В.В. (1987) Источниковедение и метод. Москва: Наука. 438 с.

Буганов В.И., Туркан Г.А. (1977) Актуальные проблемы источниковедения истории СССР //Вопросы истории. №3. С. 3-16.

Пушкарев Л.Н. (1963) Вопросы классификации источников в русской исторической науке // История СССР. №5. С. 81-96.

Атабаев Қ.М. (2002) Қазақстан тарихының деректанулық негіздері. Алматы. 172 б.

Варшавчик М. А. (1984) Историко-партийное источниковедение. Теория, методология, методика. Киев. 198 с.

Ждановская З.В. (1965) Большевистская периодическая печать как источник при изучении истории КПСС (1900-1917). Москва. 381 s.

Спирин Л.М. (1982) Теория, методология и методика исследований по историй КПСС. Москва: Наука. 57 с.

Пушкарев Л.Н. (1963) Вопросы классификации источников в русской исторической науке // История СССР. №5. С. 81-96

Макаров М.К. (1963) К вопросу о терминологии в источниковедении истории СССР. – Тр. Москов.гос. ист.-архив. института. Москва. Т. 17. 195 с.

Медушевская О.М. (1977) Теоретические проблемы источниковедения: Уч.пособие. Москва: Издательство Московского архивного института. 230 с.

Ключевский В.О. (1991) Сказания иностранцев о Московском государстве. Москва

Омарбеков Т. (1999) 20-30 жылдардағы Қазақстан қасіреті. Алматы. 215 б.

Кульшанова А.А. (1999) Документы Центрального Государственного архива и Архива Президента Республики Казахстан по политике коренизаций в Казахстане (1920-1936 гг.) как исторический источник: дисс. канд. ист. наук. Алматы. 132 с.

References

Berngeim Э. (1908) Vvedenie v istoritheskuju nauku [Introduction to Historical Science]. Sankt Peterburg, 81 s.

Danilevskii I.N., Kabanov V.V., Rumjantseva M.F., Medushevskaja O.M. (2004) Istothnikovedenie: Teorija. Istorija. Metod. Istothniki Rossiiskoi istorii [Source Study: Theory. Story. Method. Sources of Russian history]. Moskva, 701 s.

Maslov N.N., Stepanov Z.V. (1974) Otherki istothnikovedenija i istoriografii istorii KPSS [Essays on Source Studies and Historiography of CPSU Histories]. Moskva, Izdatelstvo Leningradskogo universiteta. 304 s.

Danilov V.P., Jakubovskaja S.I. (1961) Istothnikovedenie i izuthenie istothnikov sovetskogo obshestva [Source studies and the study of sources of Soviet society] // Voprosy istorii. №5. S. 3-24.

Farsobin V.V. (1987) Istothnikovedenie i metod [Source Study and Method]. Moskva, Nauka. 438 s.

Buganov V.I., Turkan G.A.(1977) Aktualnye problemy istothnikovedenija istorii SSSR [Sources Actual problems of the source study of the history of the USSR]//Voprosy istorii. №3. S.3-16.

Pushkarev L.N. (1975) Klassifikatsija russkih pismennyh istothnikov po Otethestvennoi istorii [Classification of Russian written sources on national history]. Moskva.

Atabaev Q.M. (2002) Qazaqstan tarihynyn derektanulyq negizderi [Source study basics of the history of Kazakhstan]. Almaty, 172 b.

Varshavthik M. A. (1984) Istoriko-partiinoe istothnikovedenie. Teorija, metodologija, metodika [Historical and party source study. Theory, methodology]. Kiev. 198 s.

Zhdanovskaja Z.V. (1965) Bolshevistskaja perioditheskaja pethat kak istotchnik pri izutchenii istorii KPSS (1900-1917) [Bolshevik periodicals as a source in studying the history of the CPSU (1900-1917)]. Moskva. 381 s.

Spirin L.M. (1982) Teorija, metodologija i metodika issledovanii po istorii KPSS [Theory, methodology and methodology of research on the history of the CPSU]. Moskva, Nauka. 57 s.

Pushkarev L.N. (1963) Voprosy klassifikatsii istothnikov v russkoi istoritheskoi nauke [Classification of sources in Russian historical science] // Istorija SSSR. №5. S. 81-96

Makarov M.K. (1963) K voprosu o terminalogii v istothnikovedenii istorii SSSR [On the question of terminology in the source study of the history of the USSR]. Moskva. T. 17. – 195 s

Medushevskaja O.M. (1977) Teoretitcheskie problemy istothnikovedenija [Theoretical problems of source study] / Utch. posobie. Moskva, Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo arhivnogo instituta, 230 s.

Kljutchevskii V.O.(1991) Skazanija inostrantsev o Moskovskom gosudarstve Legends of foreigners about Moscow State]. Moskva

Omarbekov T. (1997) 20-30 zhyldardagy Qazaqstan qasireti [The tragic pages of Kazakhstan 20-30 years]. Almaty. 215 b.

Kulshanova A.A. (1999) Dokumenty Tsentralnogo Gosudarstvennogo arhiva i Arhiva Prezidenta Respubliki Kazahstan po politike korenizatsii v Kazahstane (1920-1936gg.) kak istoritheskii istothnik [Documents of the Central State Archive and the Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan on the policy of root-finding in Kazakhstan (1920–1936) as a historical source]: diss. kand. ist. nauk. Almaty. 132 s.