GUMILYOV JOURNAL OF HISTORY
ISSN: 3080-129X. eISSN: 3080-6860
DOMESTIC HISTORY – ОТАН ТАРИХЫ – ОТЕЧЕСТВЕННАЯ ИСТОРИЯ

Research Article
IRSTI 03.20

CC BY NC ND

https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-129X-2026-155-2-202-219

Woman in Camp Society: Problems of Sexual Exploitation and Interpersonal Relations (Based on the Materials of Karlag and Peschanlag)

Z. Saktaganova[a], **T. Allaniyazov**[b]
[a]*E.A. Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan*
[b]*O.A. Baikonurov Zhezkazgan University, Zhezkazgan, Kazakhstan*
[a]*zauresh63@mail.ru*

Abstract. This article examines one of the most complex and taboo aspects of camp everyday life – the position of women in Kazakhstani correctional labour camps in the 1930s-1950s, focusing on survival strategies via sexual relations. This issue is the least studied in Kazakh historiography. The research is based on previously unpublished documents from the State Archive of the Russian Federation, fund R-9414 – Main Directorate of Places of Imprisonment (sometimes unofficially referred to as the "GULAG archive"), as well as the testimonies of former prisoners, which allow us to reconstruct the practice of sexual relations within the camp society. The study addresses the political and moral state of the Karlag military guard, which was notably at a low level. The article provides facts about the cohabitation of guards with female prisoners. The report on the results of the operational and service activities of the paramilitary guards of the camps and colonies of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs for 1951 to the Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs of the USSR, Colonel General I.A. Serov, was discussed. Information concerning the negative aspects of the activities of the paramilitary guards (VOKhR) is presented. The article assesses the condition of discipline within the 2nd Industrial and Karadzhar divisions and Espinsky, Prostornensky, and SKhOS (Agricultural Experimental Station) independent platoons based on the report on the operational performance of the paramilitary security units of the Karlag under the Ministry of Justice of the USSR. Primary focus is on the under-researched and ethically complex phenomenon of "sex behind barbed wire" as a survival strategy and a mechanism for physical adaptation. According to the meticulously documented case (April 1952) on cohabitation between prisoners and the officers, guards, and civilian employees of the 4th camp division of the Special Peschany Camp (MVD USSR), the authors analyse both forced and consensual forms of sexual contact. The study provides facts, detailing the circumstances. while also examining the camp administration's policies regarding the professional misconduct of officers, VOKhR sergeants, and overseers. The obtained data indicate that sexual relations under conditions of camp confinement should be considered along a continuum – from direct coercion to forced adaptive forms of behavior determined by the asymmetry of power between guards and prisoners. This study is based on archival documents and testimonies of former female inmates, enabling a reconstruction of the gender hierarchy within the camp's social structure.
Keywords: Gulag; Karlag; gender history; everyday life of prisoners; survival strategies; sexual exploitation

For citation: Saktaganova Z., Allaniyazov T. Woman in Camp Society: Problems of Sexual Exploitation and Interpersonal Relations (Based on the Materials of Karlag and Peschanlag). *Gumilyov Journal of History.* 2026. Vol.155, no.2, pp.202-219. *https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-129X-2026-155-2-202-219*

© Z. Saktaganova, T. Allaniyazov, 2026

Funding. The article was prepared as part of the IRN research project AP26104679 "Women of Kazakhstani Gulag camp inmates: survival strategies, camp everyday life" with grant funding from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Лагерлік социумдағы әйел: жыныстық тұрғыда пайдалану мен тұлғааралық қатынас мәселелері (Карлаг пен Песчанлаг материалдары негізінде)

З. Сактаганова[a], Т. Алланиязов[b]

[a]Е.А. Бөкетов ат. Қарағанды Ұлттық зерттеу университеті, Қарағанды, Қазақстан

[b]О.А. Байқоңыров атындағы Жезқазған университеті, Жезқазған, Қазақстан

Аңдатпа. Мақалада 1930-1950 жылдардағы Қазақстан аумағындағы еңбекпен түзету лагерьлеріндегі әйелдердің жағдайы лагерлік күнделікті өмірдің ең күрделі әрі жабық тақырыптарының бірі ретінде қарастырылады. Зерттеуде әйелдердің тіршілік үшін жыныстық қатынастарға бару құбылысы олардың өмір сүру стратегиялары тұрғысынан талданады. Аталған мәселе Қазақстан тарихнамасында әлі де жеткілікті деңгейде зерделенбеген бағыттардың қатарына жатады. Зерттеудің деректік негізін бұрын ғылыми айналымға енгізілмеген құжаттар құрайды. Атап айтқанда, Ресей Федерациясының Мемлекеттік архивіндегі Р-9414 қоры – Бас бостандығынан айыру орындары басқармасына тиесілі материалдар (кейбір жағдайда бейресми түрде "ГУЛАГ архиві" деп атайды), сондай-ақ бұрынғы әйел тұтқындардың естеліктері пайдаланылды. Осы деректер кешені лагерлік социум шеңберіндегі жыныстық қатынастар тәжірибесін қалпына келтіруге мүмкіндік береді. Карлагтың әскерилендірілген күзет қызметі жеке құрамының саяси-моральдық жай-күйін қарастыра отырып, оның төмен деңгейде болғаны көрсетіледі. Атқыштардың әйел тұтқындармен бірге тұру фактілері келтіріледі. КСРО ІІМ-нің лагерлері мен колонияларындағы әскерилендірілген күзеттің жедел-әрекет ету қызметінің қорытындылары туралы 1951 жылғы КСРО ІІМ министрінің орынбасары, генерал-полковник И.А. Серовқа жолданған баяндаманың мазмұны сипатталады. Сонымен қатар, әскерилендірілген күзет (ВОХР) қызметіндегі жағымсыз құбылыстар мен тәртіп бұзушылықтарға қатысты мәліметтер жүйеленеді. КСРО Әділет министрлігіне қарасты Карлаг бөлімшелерінің әскерилендірілген күзет құрылымдарының қызметтік жағдайы туралы анықтама негізінде 2-Өнеркәсіптік және Қаражар дивизиондарындағы, сондай-ақ Эспин, Просторный және СХОС бөлімшелерінің жекелеген взводтарындағы тәртіп ахуалына кешенді баға беріледі. Мақалада аз зерделенген әрі этикалық тұрғыдан күрделі мәселе – "тікенекті сымның ар жағындағы жыныстық қатынас" құбылысы бейімделу тетігі және физикалық тұрғыдан аман қалудың құралы ретінде қарастырылады. 1952 жылғы сәуір айында КСРО ІІМ-нің Ерекше Песчаный лагерьінің 4-лагерьлік бөлімшесінде офицерлік құрам, қадағалаушылар және еркін жалдамалы қызметкерлер мен тұтқындар арасындағы бірге тұру дерегі егжей-тегжейлі құжатталған материалдар негізінде талданады. Авторлар жыныстық қатынастардың мәжбүрлі және ерікті түрлерін саралап, нақты фактілер мен жағдайларды, кінәлілер мен жәбірленушілердің тегі, әскери атағы мен қызметтік лауазымдарын көрсетеді. Сонымен қатар, лагерь әкімшілігінің офицерлердің, ВОХР сержанттарының және қадағалаушылардың жарғыға сәйкес келмейтін мінез-құлқына қатысты ұстанған саясаты қарастырылады. Алынған мәліметтер тікелей мәжбүрлеуден бастап күзет пен тұтқындар арасындағы билік асимметриясымен айқындалатын мәжбүрлі-бейімделуші мінез-құлық формаларына дейін лагерьлік қамау жағдайындағы жыныстық қатынастарды бірізділік тұрғысынан қарастыру қажеттігін көрсетеді. Бұл зерттеу архивтік құжаттар мен бұрынғы әйел тұтқындардың естеліктеріне негізделіп, лагерьлік социум ішіндегі гендерлік иерархияны

реконструкциялауға мүмкіндік береді. Аталған зерттеу архивтік құжаттар мен бұрынғы әйел тұтқындардың куәліктеріне негізделіп, лагерьлік социум ішіндегі гендерлік иерархияны қайта құруға мүмкіндік береді.
Түйін сөздер: ГУЛАГ; Карлаг; гендерлік тарих; тұтқындардың күнделікті өмірі; өмір сүру стратегиялары; жыныстық тұрғыда пайдалану

Сілтеме жасау үшін: Сактаганова З.Г., Алланиязов Т.К. Лагерлік социумдағы әйел: жыныстық тұрғыда пайдалану мен тұлғааралық қатынас мәселелері (Карлаг пен Песчанлаг материалдары негізінде). *Gumilyov Journal of History.* 2026. Т.155, no.2, б.202-219. *https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-129X-2026-155-2-202-219*

Қаржыландыру: Мақала Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым жән жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитетінің гранттық қаржыландыру жобасы AP26104679 "Қазақстандық ГУЛАГ лагерлеріндегі әйелдер: өмір сүру стратегиялары, лагерьдегі күнделікті өмір" аясында дайындалған.

Женщина в лагерном социуме: проблемы сексуальной эксплуатации и межличностных отношений (на материалах Карлага и Песчанлага)

З. Сактаганова[a], Т. Алланиязов[b]

[a]Карагандинский национальный исследовательский университет им. Е.А. Букетова, Караганда, Казахстан

[b]Жезказганский университет имени О.А. Байконурова, Жезказган, Казахстан

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается одна из самых сложных и табуированных сторон лагерной повседневности – положение женщин в исправительно-трудовых лагерях Казахстана в 1930-1950-е гг. сквозь призму выживания через сексуальные отношения. Рассматриваемая в статье проблема является наименее изученной в казахстанской историографии. Источниковую основу исследования составили ранее неопубликованные документы из Государственного архива Российской Федерации, фонд Р-9414 – Главное управление мест заключения (неофициально называют "архивом ГУЛАГа"), а также свидетельства бывших узниц, что позволяет реконструировать практику сексуальных отношений внутри лагерного социума. Рассматривается политико-моральное состояние личного состава военизированной охраны Карлага, которое находилось на низком уровне. В исследовании приводятся факты сожительства стрелков с заключенными женщинами. Охарактеризовано содержание доклада об итогах оперативно-служебной деятельности военизированной охраны лагерей и колоний МВД СССР за 1951 г. заместителю министра МВД СССР генерал-полковнику И.А. Серову. Представлены сведения, касающиеся негативных фактов деятельности военизированной охраны (ВОХР). На основе справки о состоянии служебной деятельности подразделений военизированной охраны Карлага МЮ СССР дана оценка состояния дисциплины во 2-м Промышленном и Караджарском дивизионах, отдельных взводах Эспинского, Просторненского и СХОС отделений. Основное внимание уделяется малоизученному и этически сложному вопросу – "сексу за колючей проволокой" как инструменту адаптации и средству физического сохранения жизни. На основе детально задокументированного в апреле 1952 г. факта сожительства офицерского, надзирательского и вольнонаёмного состава 4-го лагерного отделения особого Песчаного лагеря МВД СССР с заключёнными авторы анализируют принудительные и добровольные формы сексуальных контактов, приводят конкретные факты и обстоятельства, фамилии, звания и должности виновников и пострадавших, а также политику лагерной администрации в отношении неуставного поведения офицеров, сержантов ВОХР и надзирателей. Полученные

данные свидетельствуют о том, что сексуальные отношения в условиях лагерного заключения следует рассматривать в последовательной степени – от прямого принуждения к вынужденно-адаптивным формам поведения, детерминированным асимметрией власти между охраной и заключёнными. Данное исследование базируется на архивных документах и свидетельствах бывших узниц, позволяя реконструировать гендерную иерархию внутри лагерного социума, восполняя существенный пробел в изучении гендерного измерения советской лагерной системы.
Ключевые слова: ГУЛАГ; Карлаг; гендерная история; повседневность заключенных; стратегии выживания; сексуальная эксплуатация

Introduction

In the GULAG labor camps, it is well established that one contingent – the inmates of all ages and both genders – carried out the labor, while another – military personnel and overseers – provided security. A third contingent must also be added – the civilian employees, who included medical staff, economists, accountants, and other personnel who serviced the operational needs of the camp economy. The presence of both men and women among all three groups led to the emergence of "romantic" relationships between them and, as a result, forced and consensual sexual relations, which often led to pregnancy and childbirth. Sexual relations in the Gulag camps, as already noted, ranged from consensual to violent. Love and intimacy were not uncommon even in the camp barracks, although violence against women was much more prevalent. Oral testimonies included accounts of harassment and violence by guards and prisoners, but in general, the topic was often simply hushed up. Information regarding sexual violence is almost entirely undocumented; such instances are virtually non-existent within archival sources (or, at the very least, have not been encountered in our research). Intimate relationships could serve as a survival strategy (finding patrons, obtaining better food or protection, etc.), but they always came at a moral and psychological cost.

The purpose of this article is to raise the issue of sexual violence against female prisoners that took place in correctional labour camps. This issue is rarely mentioned and is not in favour, even in research literature on the camps.

Materials and methods

The article is based on previously unpublished documents from the State Archives of the Russian Federation – Fund R-9414 – Main Directorate for Places of Imprisonment (sometimes unofficially referred to as the "GULAG archives"). Among the many reporting documents, there are a few administrative materials about cohabitation or sexual violence by paramilitary guards (officers, sergeants, convoy guards), civilian workers, and male prisoners against female prisoners. Materials relating to the Karaganda and Peschany correctional labour camps are found in inspection reports (notes, information sheets, etc.); in the correspondence between the Gulag and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Council of Ministers of the USSR, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs leadership, and other agencies concerning labour camp operations, and in special reports from operational and security departments about incidents in NKVD camps and colonies. The article also includes excerpts from memoirs by female prisoners from the Sakharov Center's archives.

The methodological basis of the study consists of the principles of historicism, objectivity, and a systematic approach. General scientific methods (analysis, synthesis, deduction, induction,

etc.) and historical methods (chronological, problem-based, interpretative, and comparative methods) were applied. The comprehensive application of these methods together made it possible to conduct a comparative analysis of sources and form a clear understanding of the nature of sexual life in the camps.

In this regard, the authors have tried to develop an ethically sound methodology for studying traumatic experiences. Such a methodology requires a combination of historical objectivity and a trauma-informed approach. Future researchers must work not only with facts, but with the "voices" of victims that have been filtered through shame, censorship, and decades of silence.

The key principles of this methodology are outlined below:

– The principle of subjectivity. In archival documents, women are portrayed as "objects of decomposition" or just "records". The methodology should give her a voice. It is necessary to show the gap between how the administration "saw" the system and how the woman "experienced" it. We are not studying "cohabitation," but rather the experience of living with violence.

– Deconstruction of "consent" under conditions of total dependence. The methodology is based on the postulate that in a closed system with an absolute imbalance of power, free consent does not exist. Analyzing "situational coercion," the researcher must assess the context of the choice. If the alternative to sex was death or injury during forced labor, any "consent" is methodologically classified as a form of coercion.

– An ethical interpretation of silence and euphemisms. The methodology must take into account that "figures of omission" in memoirs are indicators of extreme trauma. A researcher has no right to accuse a memoirist of being insincere if she omits certain details. On the contrary, the methodology should interpret the gaps in the text as evidence of the depth of the humiliation suffered.

– A rejection of moralizing and victim-blaming. Scientific analysis must exclude value judgments such as "she agreed for personal gain". Sexual contact is viewed as a necessary strategy for survival (whether biological or psychological).

– The researcher's self-reflection. The methodology involves understanding the author's own perspective. Researching sexual violence in camps involves working with "toxic" material.

Thus, the proposed methodology is based on reconstructing traumatic experiences through the lens of gender sociology and microhistory. What is important here is to move away from the legal formalism of camp reports in favour of analysing the "grey area" of choice, where sexuality serves as the final frontier in the struggle for survival. This approach allows us to view "voluntary-coercive sex" not as an isolated incident, but as a form of systemic dehumanization that requires a sensitive analytical framework.

Literature review

Although this issue has not been considerably examined, it is reflected in various scientific studies and memoirs. Sex and sexual violence in Soviet labour camps have rarely been the subject of specific research. However, they have been indirectly addressed by foreign scholars in the context of studying female prisoners and their survival strategies in the camps, as well as camp life based on the women's memoirs. They have been studied by M. Stark (Stark 2003), Wilson T. Bell (Bell Wilson 2010), K. Frierson (Frierson 2015), E. MacKinnon (MacKinnon 2019), and Gregory P.R. (Gregory 2013). In the 2020s, works by O. Kis and L. Wolanskyj (Kis 2020) and E. Applebaum (Applebaum 2023) on the lives of women in the Gulag. V. Shapovalova raises the issue of violence in women's camp memoirs in a collective monograph (Domestic 2012). At the

same time, a certain emphasis in research and memoirs is placed on identifying strategies for survival, when the female contingent of the camps was forced to enter "romantic" relationships with guards in order to maintain basic material and economic conditions for a tolerable life in prison.

In foreign scholars' research, we often encounter materials about sexual violence/sexual contact in relation to female prisoners. After all, guards and prisoners were not completely separated, nor were male and female prisoners. Many of the guards cohabited with female prisoners (Applebaum 2023: 270). For example, the GARF (State Archive of the Russian Federation) has a list of Belomorkanal administration officials who were expelled from the Party: one of the reasons for their expulsion was cohabitation with female prisoners (Applebaum 2023: 610). Local camp commanders, officers, and enlisted personnel of the VOKhR (militarised guards), and civilian workers (often former prisoners) had low social status (minimal education, extremely low intelligence, etc.). Therefore, some of them often behaved inhumanely towards prisoners (but not all).

Sex, like everything else in camp life, was often public; the nature of sexual relations, whether consenting or coercive, homosexual or heterosexual, was influenced by the harsh camp environment (Applebaum 2023: 323). In the chapter "Women and Children" by American researcher A. Applebaum, women's stories of sexual violence against women and girls by prisoners (usually criminals) as objects of their lust are presented. There are stories of "camp love". Love, sex, sexual violence, and prostitution were part of camp life (Applebaum 2023: 317-341). A. Solzhenitsyn writes: "Everything was done with natural ease... Only obvious old age or obvious ugliness protected a woman – and nothing more" (Solzhenitsyn 1991: 150).

Researcher O. Kis, examining the GULAG experiences of Ukrainian women through their memoirs, contends that the themes of the female body and sexuality are among the most heavily taboo subjects within their personal narratives (often not only Ukrainian–authored).). "Although nearly every female prisoner in a camp was at risk of being raped, there is not a single mention in the available memoirs of Ukrainian women that something like that might have happened to them: the memoirists limit their descriptions to incidents that they witnessed or to unsuccessful attempts to violate their bodies. It is safe to assume that quite a few Ukrainian women were, in fact, raped or subjected to sexualized violence and abuse, but this area remains a gap in their recollections of the Gulag - either because such incidents were simply repressed in their memories or because they deliberately suppressed them due to the traumatic nature of the experience" (Kis 2020: 88).

Results

Prior to our research, let us examine the semantics of such key concepts and terms as "cohabitation," "intimate relationships," "relationships," and "voluntary-coercive sex". Due to the specific nature of the camp context, it is necessary to distinguish between these concepts, since the semantic confusion in the sources (especially in NKVD orders) was often intentional – it served to conceal a criminal offense under the guise of a moral transgression. In the context of the Gulag, the euphemism "sexual cohabitation" was used to refer to any sexual relationship between a staff member and a female prisoner. This term strips the act of its physiological and volitional connotations. In official documents, it was used to record instances of "violations of the regime" without specifying the degree of coercion, and served as a tool for bureaucrats to cover up actual violence.

"Intimate relationships" referred to the presence of interpersonal attachment and emotional involvement. They implied a relative symmetry of feelings between two prisoners (to the extent possible in a camp). In memoirs, this is often described as "camp love" or "camp marriage". Such instances of voluntary attachment between two prisoners should be distinguished from "vertical" coercion by the guards.

"Illegal connections" is a technical term referring to a breach of the boundary between "the authorities" and "the enemy". The emphasis here is not on sex, but on the exchange of resources. "Connection" implies corruption: sex in exchange for passing notes, for food, or for easing the regime's restrictions. In the camp's "exchange economy", sexuality served as currency in a transaction.

The term "voluntary-coercive sex" in the context of women's camp experiences (particularly within the Gulag system) describes a situation in which physical violence is replaced by socioeconomic pressure. From a legal standpoint, this is rape, but in the subjective experience of survival, it is a "deal" made under conditions of no choice. The element of "free will" here is illusory and constrained by a strategy of survival. A captive woman may technically say "no," but the price of that refusal is death, exhaustion, or unbearable conditions. In this case, free will manifests itself as a conscious choice between two evils – the woman "agrees" to the relationship in order to save herself or her children (if they are in the camp), to obtain medicine, or to be transferred to lighter work ("menial" jobs). Coercion, however, stems from the administration's absolute power (or that of privileged inmates –"blatnye"). It does not always take the form of a direct order, but rather involves creating conditions in which life without a patron is impossible.

The pressure exerted on the woman was not the result of a single act of aggression, but rather a systematic process of pushing her to the breaking point. The methods used to exert this pressure were as follows:

– Food blackmail: food in the camp was the primary tool of control; extra rations or access to the kitchen in exchange for sexual favors turned sex into a biological necessity.

– "Privileges" granted by the camp administration: the promise of a transfer from general hard labor (logging, quarries) to the infirmary, the office, or the sewing workshop. Mortality rates were extremely high during general labor, so such a "deal" was literally a matter of life and death.

– The threat of "transfer": Women were intimidated by the prospect of being sent to harsher camps or separated from their loved ones if they refused to show "loyalty" to a supervisor or guard.

– Gender hierarchy: In the camp, women found themselves in a position of double subjugation – both to the camp authorities and to criminal leaders. The administration often deliberately handed women over to be "torn apart" by the barracks of repeat offenders in order to break their will and force them to seek protection from a specific officer (the institution of "camp husbands").

Theoretically, this phenomenon is classified as "compulsion by circumstances". There is no consent here, as there is an insurmountable power imbalance between the parties. In this context, sex is not an act of passion or exchange, but rather a form of currency that the camp system extracts from the human body when there is nothing else left to give. Ultimately, the overall atmosphere of camp life, such as hunger, grueling labor, and the guards' arbitrary abuse of power, directly created the conditions for sexual violence.

To contextualize "voluntary-compulsory sex" within the broader system of the Gulag, it must be viewed not as a random social vice but as a logical extension of the state's policy of dehumanization.

Within the Gulag system, this phenomenon was embedded in three fundamental contexts.

1. Functional context: sex as an element of the "camp economy". In a system where everything from rations to life itself is distributed centrally, sexuality has become an informal currency. Two aspects are evident here. The first reason is pragmatic. Since the Gulag was a production machine, the administration used sex as a means of providing unscheduled incentives to loyal staff (the VOKHR) and useful prisoners ("fools"). The second factor is a shortage of resources. In conditions of a total shortage of calories and heat, the female body became the last convertible resource. Thus, "voluntary-compulsory sex" is an extreme form of exploitation of the surplus value of the human body, in which not only labor but also physiological resources are extracted from it.

2. Political and legal context: the abolition of legal status. The Gulag created a space of "exception" where all-Union laws (protecting honor and dignity) did not apply. Two points stand out here. The first is civil death. Since most women (especially those charged under Article 58) were classified as "enemies of the people", their physical safety was not protected by the state. The second is legitimization through "re-education". The idea that "socially dangerous elements" were subject to rigorous re-education provided security forces with a moral justification for violence as a means of "subduing" or "subjugating" the enemy. On the scale of the Gulag, this turned sexual abuse into a tool for the complete breaking of political will.

3. Institutional Context: Systemic Latency and Collective Responsibility. The Gulag is a closed corporation with its own specific code of ethics centered on "the honor of the uniform". There was a hierarchy of secrecy: as investigations in Karlag and Peschanlag have shown, the Gulag's top leadership was aware of the scale of the problem but only took action when it interfered with production (epidemics, mass pregnancies). Furthermore, there was a utilitarian approach to morality: the system allowed violence as long as it contributed to "stability" within the camp. In this context, this means that the Gulag deliberately sacrificed women's sexual integrity in order to maintain an informal hierarchy and the loyalty of lower-level enforcers (guards).

Thus, within the context of the entire Gulag system, "voluntary-compulsory sex" was a symptom of "systemic cannibalism." By stripping individuals of their rights, the state created a vacuum that was filled by the most primitive forms of domination. This was not a "personal weakness" on the part of individual guards, but a structural necessity of a system that depended on the complete powerlessness of one group and the total lack of oversight over another. Contextualization leads to the conclusion that sexual exploitation in the Gulag was not a "shadow" of the system, but an integral part of it, as standardized and functional as logging or gold mining.

A comprehensive examination of the subject under study requires consideration of such important aspects as: a) the role of the camp hierarchy: how a prisoner's status (political, criminal, "blatnaya") influenced her vulnerability; b) gender stereotypes of the time: how notions of "a woman's fate", morality, and sexuality legitimized violence or forced victims to remain silent; c) the issue of interethnic relations, particularly relevant to Karlag and other camps where women of different nationalities were held.

A deep theoretical understanding of these aspects requires their integration into the social context of the 1930s–1950s. This yields the following picture.

1. Hierarchy of vulnerability: status and risk. A woman's status in the camp's "rankings" determined not only the extent of her physical labor but also her "market value" within the system of sexual exploitation. "Political" prisoners (Article 58): the most vulnerable category. Deprived of their civil rights and subjected to ideological stigmatization ("enemies of the

people"), they were "fair game". Sex often became their only way to secure indoor work (in a library or accounting office), which memoirists (such as E. Ginzburg) refer to as "a deal with the devil". Women who committed petty crimes and those who committed serious ones demonstrated greater adaptability. In their subculture, having a connection with a "blatar" or a prison guard could be seen as a status achievement. The criminal world often used its women as "currency" to bribe guards. CHSIR (Family Members of Traitors to the Motherland): a group category (e.g., in ALZHIR) where women were consolidated. Their vulnerability was collective: the administration used the threat of separation from their children as the primary means of coercing loyalty, including sexual loyalty.

2. Gender stereotypes and the legitimization of violence. The Soviet discourse of that time combined slogans about "emancipation" with a harsh patriarchal undertone and the doctrine of "re-education". The following aspects are clearly evident here. First: the concept of the "fallen woman". The criminal environment and security personnel perpetuated a stereotype: a woman in the camp was already "tainted." This removed moral barriers to violence: "She's public property here anyway." Second: silence as a strategy. The stereotype of "female shame" and "honor" forced educated women to conceal the facts of coercion. Admitting to a relationship meant social death within the circle of "her own kind" (fellow intellectual prisoners), who were often merciless in their judgments. The third: the biological framing of guilt. The administration used the stereotype of female "seductiveness" to justify the guards' actions. In official reports, the violence was often described as "the woman provoked the officer," which placed the blame on the victim for "corrupting" the guard.

3. The Interethnic dimension (using Karlag as an example). Karlag served as a melting pot for deportations, which created specific points of tension, among which the following stand out.

A) "National contingents": Women from traditional societies (German women from the Povolzhie region, Chechen women, Ingush women, and women from the Baltic states) faced a double burden. For them, sexual contact with a representative of the "authorities" or another ethnic group often meant a permanent break with their own community and the impossibility of returning to it after their term of service.

B) The language barrier as a factor in coercion: The administration exploited the fact that foreign women or special resettlers did not speak Russian to falsify documents or mislead them regarding their rights, which facilitated coercion into cohabitation.

C) Ethnic solidarity: In some cases (for example, among Latvian or Ukrainian groups), ethnic cohesion served as a protective mechanism: collective resistance or the protection of "one's own" reduced the risk of individual violence.

Thus, interethnic hierarchies in the camp overlapped with gender and status hierarchies. A woman's vulnerability in Karlag was cumulative: a political charge + belonging to a deported ethnic group + gender-based prejudices created a situation where her body became "no man's land," over which the administration exercised absolute power.

We did not find any materials about cohabitation or sexual relations with female prisoners, or about sexual violence towards them, in the archival documents of the 1930s. However, this does not mean such facts did not exist; it is likely that they were deliberately concealed. In documents from the 1940s and 1950s, such facts are rarely mentioned, though they are nevertheless recorded. In particular, in a special report to the NKVD USSR Gulag administration from the deputy head of the operational department of the Karaganda camp, State Security Captain Kogenman, on 22 October 1941, contained that "the political and moral state of the personnel of the Karaganda military guard was at a low level. Discipline among the staff was

undermined. There were situations with duty drunk riflemen, as well as cases of their cohabiting with female prisoners". Thus, it was noted: "The riflemen of the Sareptsky platoon, K-v, O-v, Z-v, D-v, and G-sh, systematically cohabited with female prisoners. The commander of the unit, Sh-ku, was aware of this, but no measures were taken.

In the 4th platoon, riflemen R-v, G-k, and G-v cohabited with female prisoners. Rifleman N-v from this platoon cohabited with prisoners T-na, A-va, K-va, and V-va. When this became known in the platoon, N-v committed suicide.

Sh-n, a rifleman in the Burminsky platoon, cohabited with one of the prisoners and provided her with financial assistance. This prisoner passed letters to rifleman Sh-n through the platoon commander's assistant E-nko"[1].

The fact that N-v committed suicide after the circumstances came to light indicates that the guard feared the consequences of cohabitation (understanding that these actions would result in fairly severe punishment, and since several female prisoners were involved, it can be assumed that this was a case of sexual coercion); so it is unlikely that feelings of remorse led to such a sad end to the life of the rifleman N-v.

In the report on the results of the operational and service activities of the paramilitary guards of the camps and colonies of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs for 1951 (l. 54), information concerning negative aspects of the activities of the paramilitary guards (VOKhR) was sent to the Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs of the USSR, Colonel General I.A. Serov[2]. Such information about "immoral phenomena" is often found in reports and records, but the nature of these "relationships" is not always specified. According to the report, "officers do not yet demand enough from their subordinates in terms of compliance with the regulations. As a result, the number of immoral acts and gross disciplinary offences, such as violations of Soviet law – unauthorised absences, sleeping on duty, abandonment of post, fraternization with prisoners, and theft of socialist property – is decreasing very slowly"[2]. In the first half of 1951, security personnel committed 410 violations of service regulations, including 13 cases of communication with prisoners.[3] Subsequently, upon examination of such materials, it becomes clear that sexual relations are also involved.

Five brigades were created whose responsibilities included checking the state of the regime, eliminating identified shortcomings, working with personnel, investigating cases of relationships between civil workers and prisoners, and taking "active measures to combat this evil"[4].

A report on the performance of the Karlag military security units of the Ministry of Justice of the USSR noted that "the following units are considered to be in poor disciplinary condition: the 2nd Industrial Division, the Karadzhar Division, and certain platoons of the Espinsky, Prostornensky, and SKhOS divisions. In the aforementioned units, the proportion of personnel who committed military offenses and service violations ranged from 7% to 30% of the total headcount. In the Prostornensky camp division B-v, who was convicted under Article 58-10, Part II of the Criminal Code, sentenced to ten years and then employed as the head of the food supply depot, systematically violates camp regulations, engages in heavy drinking, cohabitates with women, and embezzles food supplies, among other infractions"[5].

Among the criminal acts and violations of camp regulations in 1953, there were 569 cases of cohabitation with female prisoners in 19 divisions of Karlag as of 29th October 1953.5 We assume these represent officially identified facts, but it is highly probable that the actual number was significantly higher and was simply kept undisclosed. As a rule, it is impossible to find specific details regarding such information. The number "569" does not mean anything

on its own. Verification of its context reveals the following picture. If there were an average of about 60,000 prisoners and about 2,000-3,000 security and administrative staff in Karlag, then 569 identified cases over a given period (usually a year in Gulag reports) is a staggering number. This means that nearly one in four or five staff members was involved in "sexual relations." In the Karlag documents, these 569 cases are typically linked to drunkenness and embezzlement. By correlating this figure with other violations, it can be argued that the sexual exploitation of female prisoners in Karlag was not an isolated vice, but part of a general pattern of lawlessness. This proves that sexual violence was a consequence of the general breakdown in discipline. These figures typically peaked in 1945-1948 (postwar disorganization) and in 1951-1953 (the crisis of the system prior to Stalin's death). This confirms the theory that sexual abuse is an indicator of the regime's agony.

After analyzing hundreds of archival files on the history of Kazakhstani labour camps, no documents were found on sexual violence against female prisoners. We believe that such incidents did occur (evidenced by the annual rise in the number of pregnant women in GULAG camps (Saktaganova 2025) but they were characterized as disciplinary infractions or extraordinary occurrences. The only evidence was found concerned sexual violence against a civilian employee. In a memorandum addressed to V.I. Shirvinsky, Deputy Minister of Justice of the USSR, regarding gross violations of inmate detention protocols, noted that on 9 July 1953, inmates K-v and P-e raped a free-hire worker Ch-va at the camp-point livestock station Borodinovka. We contend that this crime was documented solely because the act of violence was committed by prisoners against a member of the free-hire staff.[6]

Discussion

The detailed documented instance of sexual relations between camp personnel and prisoners in the 4th camp division of the special Peschany camp (MVD USSR) (the only detailed archival source we have found) was recorded only because this information passed through the closed GULAG information space. Such occurrences were by no means extraordinary within the daily lives of the camp contingents; rather, these realities were an established norm. However, during the period under consideration, they were, as a rule, not publicized; although in most cases, official internal service investigations were mandatory. This was because any relations between officers, guards, and civilian employees and prisoners convicted of so-called counter-revolutionary crimes – as defined by Article 58 of the RSFSR Criminal Code – fell under specific articles of the criminal code. Consequently, the "perpetrators" were frequently tried either by Military Tribunal or a Court of Honour, or were simply dismissed from the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Gulag system. For ethical reasons, we will omit the surnames and initials of the primary figures involved.

The editorial office of the newspaper Pravda received an anonymous letter detailing instances of intimate relations between officers, overseers, civilian employees in the 4th camp division of the MVD USSR Peschany Camp in the spring of 1952, and prisoners convicted of counter-revolutionary crimes. The letter stated that intimate relations had occurred between the head of the 3rd camp-point of the 4th camp division, Major S-tin, and prisoners L-va and Yu-va; as well as between his former deputy, Lieutenant Colonel M-dze, and prisoner Ya-va. A former operational officer of the same camp-point, Lieutenant Zh-v, had sexual relations with prisoner P-na, while the former head of the guard service, Sergeant Major R-ko, had been involved with other female prisoners. The letter further indicated that female civilian employees of the 4th

camp division were in intimate relations with prisoners A-v and T-l; a former statistician of the planning and production unit (PPCh) of the 1st camp-point, L-kikh, was involved with prisoner L-chuk; a worker of the camp division's PPCh, G-ko, was involved with prisoner V-l; and a nurse from the camp division's medical unit, K-na, was involved with prisoner T-v.

Upon receiving the letter, the GULAG leadership responded immediately, forwarding the document to the Head of the Peschany Camp Administration, along with corresponding severe resolutions. The investigation was assigned to Major Z-v, the head of a section within the Peschany Camp Administration's Department of Regime and Operational Work. By 7 April 1952, having examined the investigative materials regarding the cohabitation of the 4th camp division's personnel with prisoners, Z-v confirmed the facts as detailed in the archival record.

"The investigation found that Major S-n, head of the 3rd camp-point of the 4th camp division, did not have any intimate relationship with prisoners L-va and Yu-va. No affirmative testimony regarding such a connection between S-n and these prisoners was provided by either the inmates or the camp department staff; furthermore, the prisoners with whom he was allegedly involved failed to confirm the reports. However, it was established with certainty that prisoner Yu-va had been pregnant and had undergone an abortion, for which she was hospitalised in the camp-point's medical unit from 11 to 14 January 1952. She categorically refused to name the individual responsible for the pregnancy, stating: 'I was pregnant by a civilian employee of the camp-point, but I will never say who he is' ".[7]

Rumours were prevalent among the camp-point inmates that senior overseer, senior Sergeant N-v (born 1920), had allegedly cohabited with Yu-va; however, there is no evidence confirming their liaison was obtained during the course of the investigation. N-v himself entirely denied that he had been in an intimate relationship with Yu-va.

"The former deputy head of the 3rd camp-point, Lieutenant Colonel M-dze – who, during the investigation, was head of the agricultural sector of the Prostornensky camp division of Karlag – was noted by Z-v for his undignified and excessively familiar relations with female prisoners, which generated various rumours amongst the inmates, including allegations of cohabitation with Ya-va, K-ko, and O-va. However, the investigative materials failed to confirm that M-dze had cohabited with any of the aforementioned prisoners.

Prisoner O-va, while denying any cohabitation with M-dze, testified during the investigation that she had engaged in sexual relations with the former senior overseer of the 3rd camp-point, Sergeant Major D-v. Prisoner F-va confirmed O-va's testimony regarding D-v, stating that she too had engaged in sexual relations with him, as well as with the former head of the camp department's supervisory service, Sergeant Major R-ko.

Under interrogation, F-va testified: '...In February 1952, I performed an abortion on myself without any assistance; consequently, I was hospitalised there (in the 2nd camp-point of the 2nd camp division). I was pregnant by the former head of the supervisory service, Sergeant Major R-ko... I also have sexual relations with the senior overseer, D-v'. F-va declared: 'I can add nothing more as I consider myself entirely to blame; I am ashamed to speak of them, and by my confessions, I am causing them great trouble'.

Prisoner P-na also provided testimony regarding cohabitation with D-v, stating during her interrogation the following: 'Even before Zh-v, I had a sexual act with Senior Overseer D-v… It occurred under the following circumstances: D-v was on duty in the camp, and I was being held in the punishment cell (kartser). He came to me and proposed a sexual act. I agreed, and the act was committed. He was under the influence of alcohol at the time'.

Former operative officer of the 3rd camp point, Lieutenant Zh-v was in an intimate relationship with prisoner P-na, which was confirmed by the testimony of overseers G-va and P-ka, a written

report by R-ko, a written statement by the head of the medical unit, Lieutenant E-va, and P-na's personal confession. When questioned regarding what Zh-v had told her about himself, she stated: "He mentioned to me that he had been severely reprimanded at a meeting because of his involvement with me. He begged me not to speak of our cohabitation".[7]

The investigative materials reveal that Lieutenant Zh-v, in his capacity as an operational officer, was aware of the liaisons between the personnel and female prisoners; however, he took no measures to expose or suppress these criminal manifestations, nor did he inform the leadership of the Administration's Department of Regime and Operational Work.

During the inquiry, Z-v also established instances of violations of Soviet legality by certain senior officials of the 4th camp division. For example, prisoner K-va wrote an anonymous letter addressed to the Head of the Camp Administration and the Prosecutor concerning facts of cohabitation between the 3rd camp-point personnel and female inmates, alongside other irregularities occurring at the site. Z-v's investigation further disclosed that the Head of the 4th camp division, Senior Lieutenant U-v, and the Head of the 3rd camp-point, Major S-n, were aware of the instances of cohabitation by their subordinates. Nevertheless, they failed to take decisive measures to eliminate these practices or punish those responsible; on the contrary, they concealed these gross manifestations from the Camp Administration leadership.

What disciplinary measures were determined by Major Z-v following the investigation? S-n was removed from his post for the violation of discipline among the personnel and a loss of political vigilance, which had resulted in instances of cohabitation and other criminal connections between employees and female prisoners. Zh-v was dismissed from his duties and referred to a Court of Honour for his criminal involvement with female inmates and his irresponsible attitude toward his official obligations. The former head of the guard service of the 3rd camp-point was removed from his post and dismissed from the MVD for his relations with female prisoners. Sergeant Major R-ko, the former senior overseer of the 3rd camp-point, Sergeant Major D-v was likewise dismissed from the service for cohabitation with female inmates.[7]

The investigation materials show that only some of the facts in the letter to Pravda were confirmed. The findings reveal that several female prisoners were victimized by "voluntary-compulsory sex" involving the named military personnel. As for the "heroes" of the sexual front, the system treated their transgressions with relative leniency – they were merely dismissed from the service.

An analysis of why the system was limited to "soft" measures (dismissal) reveals a profound contradiction between the letter of the law and camp pragmatics. To support this argument, we will identify three levels of causes. First, the legal framework versus law enforcement. Formally, the legislation of the USSR at that time (the 1926 Criminal Code of the RSFSR) contained provisions allowing for punishment for sexual violence and abuse of power: Article 109, "Abuse of Power or Official Position" (up to 5 years); Article 151 "Coercion of a woman into sexual intercourse by a person on whom the woman was materially or professionally dependent" (up to 5 years); Article 153 "Rape" (up to 5 or 8 years). However, this did not work in the Gulag, as female prisoners were denied legal standing. To initiate a case, a statement from the victim and evidence were required. Within the camp hierarchy, a prisoner's complaint against a guard was viewed as "slander against a representative of authority" or "an attempt to discredit the socialist system." The system automatically trusted the person in uniform, not the "enemy of the people".

Second, the question is: why did the leadership cover up these crimes? Concealing the acts of violence was not an act of mercy toward the guilty party, but rather a means of protecting the honor of the uniform and maintaining performance metrics. Mass criminal cases against

Gulag staff for violence would have meant a breakdown of discipline in the unit. It was more advantageous for the camp commander to quietly dismiss a "corrupted" employee than to initiate a tribunal that would make him look like a poor leader in the eyes of Moscow. The economic factor must also be taken into account. The camp was, first and foremost, a production facility. Legal proceedings diverted resources. A woman's pregnancy or illness following an assault was considered a "detriment to the workforce," and the perpetrator was punished primarily for this damage to production rather than for the moral harm inflicted on the woman.

Third, "relative leniency" as an element of the system. Dismissal without trial (sometimes accompanied by transfer to another camp) was a form of institutional solidarity among security forces. Two important points should be noted here: 1) The ideological barrier: officially, in the USSR, "socialist legality" precluded such atrocities. To acknowledge them at the systemic level would have meant admitting the failure of the camps' rehabilitative function. 2) The specific nature of the inmate population: since many women were "political prisoners" (Article 58), any violence against them by guards was viewed by the administration as a "routine overstep" or "excess," rather than a crime against the individual, since the prisoner's personhood had been nullified by the sentence.

Thus, dismissing uniformed rapists from service instead of sending them to prison was not an act of "leniency," but rather a tool for the system's self-preservation. The Gulag could not judge its own personnel under laws designed for civilians, as this would have undermined the very hierarchy of coercion upon which the camp system was based.

The case at Peschanlag is a striking example of how sexual exploitation undermined the very concept of a "special regime." An investigation at Peschanlag revealed that sexual relationships were not "incidental" but rather a tool of informal control. When the administration couldn't control prisoners by force, it entered into "deals" through women. Violence/cohabitation here is a symptom of the "decomposition of the vertical". The guard's power over a woman's body was converted into her loyalty or the extraction of information. The Peschany camp proves that the harsher the regime, the more sophisticated and widespread the forms of sexual pressure became as the only available "channel of communication" between the authorities and the enslaved. The Peschany camp case, combined with the Karlag statistics (569 cases), demonstrates that the sexual exploitation of women in the Gulag system was not the aberration of individual employees. This was a structural feature: in the Karlag camp, it took the form of a mass everyday norm (quantitative aspect), while in the Peschany camp, it became a political-administrative resource (qualitative aspect). Thus, the Karlag statistics confirm the typicality of the phenomenon, and the investigation in the Peschany camp reveals its mechanics.

The study and analysis of the memoirs of female prisoners from the electronic archives of the Sakharov Centre has made it possible to identify isolated, small fragments in women's memoirs related to sexual harassment. The memoirs of I.I.. Kalina describe being coerced into sexual relations by the Steplag authorities; as a prisoner designated by the number SKh-365, she was brought to the camp commandant during the night. "The following morning, I was summoned by several MVD officials, ordered to lie in a gynaecological chair, and after an examination, they delivered their verdict: 'You may go; you are a virgin'. This was the GULAG style of caring for the 'flowers of the future'." For refusing to become the commandant's concubine, she was cast into a punishment brigade under a certain Yulia Radchenko, a woman of renowned cruelty and malice. ("Child" prison term 2005: 121-125).

Irina Ivanovna Kalina's story is a vivid and well-documented example of sexual violence and abuse of power by the administration. However, the question of its "typicality" requires two aspects:

- Was her experience typical? In terms of the pervasiveness of the phenomenon, yes, her experience was typical. The sexual exploitation of female prisoners ("camp wives", coercion in exchange for food or light work, and outright violence by guards and authorities) was a systemic flaw in the Soviet camp system.

- Was this case exceptional? In terms of documentary evidence and open resistance, Kalina's case is rather exceptional.

Most such stories remained "invisible" due to the victims' shame, fear of reprisals, or lack of access to paper and the ability to file a complaint. Kalina, however, spoke out openly because she was a strong-willed political prisoner by virtue of her status. Not every woman in those conditions had the strength to confront the camp commander and subsequently make this fact public. The situation of coercion itself was widespread and everyday practice, but the victim's willingness to document it as a crime and preserve her story for history made I.I. Kalina's case a unique testimony to a systemic tragedy.

And a brief mention of this appears in the memoirs of L.E. Kundesh (Zelenova): "...I gave birth to a boy in the camp in 1941. I know nothing about the child's father. (We had only met two times). The child grew up in a nursery. In 1947, I was released after serving my sentence. The memories are harrowing – was it truly not a dream? – ditches, barracks, sleeping platforms, and the constant harassment and humiliation at the hands of the camp authorities" (From letters to Memorial 1991: 34-35).

Analysing the language of trauma used by female prisoners, one can't help but agree with researcher O. Kis that such camp experiences involving sexual violence were painful, filled with humiliation, shame, and guilt (Kis 2020: 67). Perhaps this is the main reason why women often avoided talking about their sexual lives in the camps.

Conclusion

The stories we have told are only a small fragment of the rather dramatic sexual everyday life "behind barbed wire". They are indicative of their content and demonstrate the moral character of some of those called upon to guard the prisoners. There were officers, senior officers, and ordinary members of the paramilitary guard who were far from understanding such concepts as honour, conscience, respect for women, and other moral and ethical values. However, in our opinion, this cannot be said to characterize the entire VOKhR. The available documents show the central Gulag administration was forced to respond to such incidents when they "came to light" and became a subject of discussion by party or state bodies.

To sum up, we note the following.

1. "voluntary-coercive sex" in the Gulag was not a deviation. It was an informal management institution that allowed the administration to economize on physical coercion, replacing it with the mechanism of a "sexual contract". A woman's body became a bargaining chip in maintaining the camp economy.

2. The punishment system, such as dismissal instead of court martial, proves that the authorities deliberately maintained a "gray zone" of lawlessness. This maintained the guards' loyalty: the right to have uncontrolled control over a prisoner's body was a kind of "non-material bonus" for service under difficult conditions.

3. As specific directions for further research, the following can be proposed: a) a comparative analysis of the investigative files of the VOKhR and memoirs will make it possible to compare how the same event is described in the protocol (as "cohabitation") and in the diary (as

"rape/blackmail"), this will allow us to reveal the mechanisms of bureaucratic falsification of meanings; b) the study of "children's cases" in the camps archives will allow for an analysis of the judicial and medical documents of the "Infant Homes" at the camps, and the resulting statistics on the birth and death rates of children born as a result of such relationships will be an objective indicator of the scale of violence, which cannot be hidden behind euphemisms; c) ethno-sociological cross-section: study of disciplinary practices in relation to women of different ethnic groups (for example, comparison of German special settlers and Slavic female criminals) to identify national vulnerability coefficients.

Thus, the phenomenon of "voluntary-coercive sex" in the Gulag requires deconstruction not as a moral issue, but as a technology of power. Further research could focus on the intersection of criminal statistics and the anthropology of survival, drawing not only on NKVD reports but also on the "physiology" of camp life – from labor assignment mechanisms to an analysis of departmental medicine.

Acknowledgments

The authors of the article express their gratitude to the editorial team and the reviewers.

Notes

1. Correspondence with the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Council of Ministers of the USSR, the leadership of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR, and other organisations on issues related to the work of correctional labour camps and colonies, vol. 1. 1952. State Archive of the Russian Federation (hereinafter GARF), f. R-9414, reg. 1, c. 117, l. 245-246.
2. Special reports from the operational department and security administration of the Gulag on incidents in NKVD camps and colonies. 1941-1942. GARF, f. R-9414, reg. 1, c. 39, l. 54, 68-69. Inspection reports, memos, and correspondence on the work of the Karaganda CLC. 1953. GARF, f. R-9414, reg. 1, c. 719, l. 2-3, 21-24.
3. Inspection reports, memos, and correspondence on the work of the Karaganda CLC. 1953. GARF, f. R-9414, reg. 1, c. 719, l. 107.
4. Inspection reports, memos, references, reviews, action plans, and correspondence on the state of the Karaganda CLC, vol. 1. 1951-52. GARF, f. R-9414, reg. 1,c. 451, l.97. (in Russian)
5. Inspection reports, memos, and correspondence on the work of the Karaganda CLC. 1953. GARF, f. R-9414, reg. 1, c. 719. l. 13.
6. Inspection reports, memos, references, reviews, action plans, and correspondence on the state of the Peschany CLC, vol. 2. 1951-1962. GARF, f. R-9414, reg. 1, c. 465. l. 130-146.
7. Inspection reports, memos, references, reviews, action plans, and correspondence on the state of the Peschany CLC, vol. 2. 1951-1962. GARF, f. R-9414, reg. 1, c. 465. l. 130-146

References

Applebaum E. *Gulag.* Moscow: AST Publishing House: CORPUS. 2023. 699 p.

Bell Wilson T. *Sex and Soviet Power in the Gulag of Western Siberia.* Oxford. 2010. 27 p.

"Child" prison term: literary record by S. Melnik [memoirs of Kalina I.I.]. Political repression in Stavropol-on-Volga in the 1920s-1950s: For remembrance... Tolyatti: Centre for Information Technology. 2005. Pp.121-125. https://vgulage.name/books/quot-quot-39/

Frierson C. *Silence Was Salvation: Child Survivors of Stalin's Terror and World War II in the Soviet Union.* New Haven: Yale University Press. 2015. 288 p.

From letters to Memorial [memoirs of Kundesh (Zelenova) L.]. *Zvenya: Historical Almanac. Is.1*. Moscow: Progress: Phoenix: Atheneum. 1991. Pp.34–35. https://vgulage.name/books/kundesh-zelenova-l-je-iz-pisem-v-memorial/

Gregory P. *Women of the Gulag: Portraits of Five Remarkable Lives*. Stanford California: Hoover Institution Press. 2013. 246 p.

Kis O. *Survival as Victory: Ukrainian Women in the Gulag*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press. 2020. 640 p.

MacKinnon E. Motherhood and Survival in the Stalinist Gulag. *Aspasia*. 2019. No.13, pp.65-94.

Saktaganova Z., Gladysheva A., Ventsel A. Child Mortality and Disease in Karlag, 1941: A Comparison of Prisoners' and Free Workers' Children. *The yearbook of Balkan and Baltic studies.* 2025. Vol.8.2, pp.192-217. https://doi.org/10.7592/YBBS8.2.09

Domestic Violence in the History of Russian Everyday Life (11th–21st Centuries). Collective monograph, ed. and comp. by Shapovalova V., Muravyova M., Pushkareva N. St. Petersburg: EU SPb. 2012. 200 p.

Solzhenitsyn A. *The Gulag Archipelago (1918-1956).* Part Three. Chapter 8. Translated from the Russian by Thomas P. Whitney. Moscow. 1991. Pp.227-251.

Stark M. *Frauen in Gulag: Alltag und Uberleben,* 1936 bis 1956. München. 2003. 553 p.

The 1926 edition of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR. Moscow: Legal Publishing House of the NKYU of the RSFSR. 1927. Article 151. Pp.54-55.

Information about the authors

Zauresh G. Saktaganova – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Director of the Center for Ethnocultural and Historical-Anthropological Research, E.A. Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Gogol st., 38, 100012, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5881-482X, zauresh63@mail.ru
Turganbek K. Allaniyazov – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Zhezkazgan Baikonurov University, 100600, Zhezkazgan, Kazakhstan, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6761-1525, klio56@mail.ru

Авторлар туралы мәлімет

Зәуреш Ғалимжанқызы Сақтағанова – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Этномәдени және тарихи-антропологиялық зерттеулер орталығының директоры, академик Е.А. Бөкетов атындағы Қарағанды Ұлттық зерттеу университеті, Гоголь көшесі, 38, 100012, Қарағанды, Қазақстан, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5881-482X, zauresh63@mail.ru
Турганбек Кайпназарович Алланиязов – тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, Ө. Байқоңыров атындағы Жезказған университеті, 100600, Жезказған, Қазақстан, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6761- 1525, klio56@mail.ru

Сведения об авторах

Зауреш Галимжановна Сактаганова – доктор исторических наук, профессор, директор Центра этнокультурных и историко-антропологических исследований, Карагандинский национальный исследовательский университет имени академика Е.А. Букетова, ул. Гоголя, 38, 100012, Караганда, Қазақстан, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5881-482X, zauresh63@mail.ru
Турганбек Кайпназарович Алланиязов – кандидат исторических наук, Жезказганский университет имени О. Байконурова, 100600, Жезказган, Казахстан, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6761-1525, klio56@mail.ru

Contributions of the authors

Saktaganova Z.G. – proposed the idea and general concept of the article. She collected, systematized, and analyzed archival materials, formulated the structure, and wrote the sections of the article: "Methods and Materials", "Literature Review", "Results", and "Discussion".
Allaniyazov T.K. – collected, systematized, and analyzed archival materials, reviewed historiography and wrote the sections: "Introduction", "Discussion" and "Conclusion"».

Авторлардың үлесі

Сақтағанова З.Ғ. – мақаланың идеясы мен жалпы тұжырымдамасын ұсынды. Мұрағаттық дереккөздерді жинақтауды, жүйелеуді және талдауды жүзеге асырды, мақаланың құрылымын айқындап, "Әдістер мен материалдар", "Әдебиеттерге шолу", "Нәтижелер", "Талқылау" бөлімдерін жазды.
Алланиязов Т.К. – мұрағаттық дереккөздерді жинақтауды, жүйелеуді және талдауды, историографиялық шолуды жүзеге асырды, "Кіріспе", "Талқылау" және "Қорытынды" бөлімдерін жазды.

Вклад авторов

Сактаганова З.Г. – предложила идею и общую концепцию статьи, осуществила сбор, систематизацию и анализ архивных источников, сформулировала структуру статьи, написала разделы: "Методы и материалы", "Обзор литературы", "Результаты", "Обсуждение".
Алланиязов Т.К. – осуществил сбор, систематизацию и анализ архивных источников, обзор историографии, написание разделов: "Введение", "Обсуждение" и "Заключение".

Disclosure of conflict-of-interest information. The author claims no conflict of interest / ***Мүдделер қақтығысы туралы ақпаратты ашу.*** Авторлар мүдделер қақтығысының жоқтығын мәлімдейді. / ***Раскрытие информации о конфликте интересов***. Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Information about the article / Мақала туралы ақпарат / Информация о статье

Entered the editorial office / Редакцияға түсті / Поступила в редакцию: 11.03.2026.
Approved by reviewers / Рецензенттер мақұлдаған / Одобрена рецензентами: 26.04.2026.
Accepted for publication / Жариялауға қабылданды / Принята к публикации: 07.06.2026.