

# The Dual Character Of Soviet Agrarian Policy And Irrigation Modernization In The Fergana Valley (1920s–1950s)

Nasritdinov Qobuljon Maxamadjanovich

Candidate of historical sciences, associate professor at department of Social and Humanitarian Sciences, Pedagogy and Psychology at Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 02 December 2025; **Accepted:** 23 December 2025; **Published:** 28 January 2026

**Abstract:** This article analyzes the dual character of Soviet agrarian policy in the Fergana Valley from the 1920s to the 1950s, focusing on irrigation modernization as both an engine of socio-economic transformation and a mechanism of political control. Drawing on historical scholarship and published documentary evidence, the study examines how early Soviet land-and-water reforms, collectivization, and centrally planned procurement targets intersected with large-scale hydraulic projects. The Fergana Valley—already one of Central Asia’s most intensively irrigated regions—became a strategic space where Soviet “development” ambitions converged with the imperatives of cotton specialization, labor mobilization, and administrative consolidation. The article argues that irrigation modernization carried two simultaneous logics: a productive-modernizing logic that expanded cultivated land, stabilized water delivery, and supported new institutional capacity; and an extractive-coercive logic that narrowed agrarian diversity, intensified quota pressures, and reinforced disciplinary governance over rural society. By tracing policy shifts across the interwar years, wartime constraints, and postwar reconstruction, the article clarifies how modernization gains and social costs were co-produced within the same policy framework, leaving a legacy that shaped later ecological and governance challenges in the Syr Darya basin.

**Keywords:** Soviet Central Asia; Fergana Valley; irrigation; agrarian policy; collectivization; cotton monoculture; modernization; state planning; labor mobilization; water governance.

**Introduction:** In Soviet Central Asia, agrarian policy was never merely a question of improving yields or expanding cultivated land. It was a state-building project that sought to transform social relations, reconfigure rural authority, and integrate peripheral regions into the political economy of a highly centralized industrial state. The Fergana Valley—shared today by Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan—was a crucial site for this transformation. Long before Soviet rule, the valley’s agricultural life depended on irrigation networks and on the careful management of the Syr Darya’s tributaries. Under Soviet power, however, irrigation ceased to be only a local or regional technique and became a signature of modernity, an emblem of planning, and a material instrument for directing crops, labor, and settlement patterns toward state objectives.

The core puzzle addressed here is the “dual character”

of Soviet agrarian policy. On one side, Soviet modernization visibly expanded irrigation capacity and institutionalized water governance at scale, enabling significant growth in cultivated and irrigated lands. On the other side, the same modernization agenda narrowed agrarian choice through cotton-oriented planning, heightened coercive pressures through quotas and collectivized labor regimes, and subordinated local needs to imperial-scale extraction and strategic priorities. The Fergana case shows how these two logics—productive-modernizing and extractive-coercive—were not sequential stages but mutually reinforcing dimensions of one historical trajectory.

This study applies a historical-analytical approach typical of socio-economic and environmental history. It synthesizes peer-reviewed scholarship and academically curated sources that document Soviet

irrigation strategy, cotton-oriented development, and regional governance in Central Asia. The analysis is organized chronologically, with interpretive emphasis on policy mechanisms rather than on a purely descriptive infrastructure narrative. To capture duality, the article traces both the developmental claims of Soviet modernization and the institutional practices that translated those claims into coercive outcomes for rural society. The argument is informed by state-centered interpretations of “high modernist” development, in which large-scale technical schemes function as political technologies that simplify landscapes and populations for administrative control.

The 1920s were shaped by post-revolutionary recovery and by the Soviet consolidation of authority in Central Asia. In agrarian terms, the period combined institutional experimentation with the gradual restoration of irrigation systems damaged by war and political upheaval. Early reforms—often framed as land-and-water measures—sought to weaken pre-revolutionary hierarchies and incorporate local communities into new administrative arrangements. Yet even where reform language emphasized emancipation, the state’s strategic interest in irrigated agriculture was clear: Central Asia’s irrigated oases were the key to expanding cotton production and securing raw material inputs for the wider Soviet economy. This duality appeared early in the tension between local subsistence priorities and state production goals, a tension that would intensify with the transition to collectivization and the first Five-Year Plans.

In the Fergana Valley, irrigation was already the foundation of agricultural specialization, but Soviet policy introduced a new scale of coordination and a new politics of allocation. Water management became increasingly tied to administrative boundaries and to the planning apparatus. Even when local practices persisted, the institutional context shifted: irrigation networks began to function not merely as community-maintained lifelines but as state-governed systems expected to deliver predictable outputs aligned with procurement and industrial strategy. This shift was not only technical; it was also juridical and organizational, preparing the ground for the deeper social transformation of the 1930s.

With Stalinist collectivization and the acceleration of central planning, agrarian policy entered a new phase. The Soviet state sought to restructure rural property relations, suppress independent producers, and integrate peasant households into collective and state farms operating under compulsory procurement targets. In this context, irrigation modernization became both a productive necessity and a disciplinary

mechanism. Irrigation expansion could increase total output and stabilize yields, but it also enabled tighter crop specialization and strengthened the administrative capacity to impose quotas, redirect labor, and enforce compliance through collective institutions.

The quantitative expansion of irrigation in the valley illustrates the modernization dimension. Published data indicate that irrigated land in Fergana reached approximately 530,000 hectares by 1930 and increased to around 650,000 hectares by 1950, reflecting sustained growth in the cultivated-irrigated base across the period that bridges late interwar and early postwar decades.

The most emblematic hydrotechnical achievement of the late 1930s was the Great Fergana Canal. Built in 1939, the canal became a Soviet showcase of socialist labor and engineering, constructed at remarkable speed through mass mobilization. Accounts note that more than 160,000 collective farm workers were mobilized and that the main canal was completed in approximately 45 days, channeling Syr Darya waters to expand irrigation for cotton and related agriculture.

The canal’s symbolism reveals the dual character of the policy environment. As modernization, it promised water security for fields and an expanded agricultural base. As governance, it served as a platform for mobilizing labor, performing political loyalty, and broadcasting the state’s capacity to “make the desert bloom.” The language of heroic construction did not merely celebrate economic development; it normalized coercive mobilization and reinforced a model in which the state’s developmental goals justified extraordinary demands on rural communities.

The Second World War did not halt the logic of cotton-centered irrigation development, although it constrained resources, redirected priorities, and increased pressures on labor and provisioning. In Central Asia, the war years also involved demographic and industrial shifts, including evacuations and the reconfiguration of production priorities. Within such conditions, irrigation systems remained critical infrastructure: food and raw-material supplies depended on the stability of irrigated output, and planning institutions continued to treat irrigated agriculture as the backbone of regional economic contribution. The wartime period therefore reinforced the Soviet pattern of treating water systems as strategic assets, with maintenance and selective expansion justified by national-scale imperatives rather than by local agrarian balance.

At the same time, wartime continuity accentuated the coercive side of agrarian governance. Where

machinery and inputs were limited, meeting production targets relied even more heavily on intensified labor extraction, administrative pressure, and the disciplinary routines of collective farming. Irrigation modernization thus remained embedded in a political economy of compulsory delivery: water infrastructure supported production, but the distribution of its benefits was mediated by state procurement priorities and by the uneven power relations between planning bodies and rural households.

In the 1950s, Soviet policy in Uzbekistan and the wider region emphasized reconstruction and renewed growth through Five-Year Plans. In the Fergana Valley, this meant continued attention to irrigation capacity, canal maintenance, and the institutionalization of water delivery as part of broader agricultural and industrial planning. Although some of the largest later expansions occurred after the 1950s, the decade was decisive in stabilizing the “irrigation–cotton–planning” nexus that defined Soviet Central Asian agrarian development. The Fergana irrigation system increasingly functioned as a historically accumulated network shaped by earlier imperial plans and Soviet upscaling, embedding the valley in a path-dependent infrastructure logic: once canals and allocation patterns were built for cotton-oriented state orders, shifting objectives became institutionally and technically difficult without redesign.

In parallel, the social costs of this model became more visible. Cotton specialization constrained crop diversity and often displaced food-oriented priorities, increasing dependence on interregional redistribution. Moreover, long-standing problems of drainage, seepage losses, and soil salinization became structural risks in many irrigated settings, signaling that modernization through expansion alone could produce diminishing returns unless paired with investment in efficiency, maintenance, and ecological safeguards. Studies of Soviet water management later emphasized that extensive irrigation development, while economically central, was also characterized by systemic inefficiencies and mounting ecological consequences across the Aral Sea basin.

The Fergana Valley case shows that Soviet agrarian policy’s “dual character” was not an accidental contradiction but a functional arrangement. Modernization was real: irrigation expansion increased the irrigated area, supported higher and more stable output, and created large-scale administrative capacity for water delivery. Yet modernization also advanced a specific political economy, in which agricultural landscapes were reorganized to serve cotton-centered state objectives and to demonstrate the legitimacy of

Soviet rule through visible transformation projects. The same canal that delivered water also delivered governance, enabling the state to standardize cropping patterns, mobilize labor, and enforce compliance through collective institutions.

This duality can be conceptualized through the lens of state simplification and “high modernist” development: complex local ecologies and social arrangements are rendered legible through standardized infrastructure and planning categories, making them easier to administer but also more vulnerable to mismanagement and coercion. In Fergana, water became a political medium. Allocation decisions, maintenance priorities, and the very design of canals expressed and reinforced state priorities. The Great Fergana Canal, in particular, illustrates how hydraulic modernity served as propaganda and as a disciplinary practice at the same time—celebrated as progress while normalized as mass mobilization under party direction.

The discussion also clarifies why “success” and “cost” are inseparable in this history. Cotton specialization generated economic outputs that Soviet planners valued, but it also created systemic dependencies. Infrastructure designed to maximize irrigated cotton output locked the region into allocation patterns that privileged a single commodity, often at the expense of diversified agriculture and long-term ecological resilience. Later analyses of the Aral Sea basin showed how irrigation withdrawals and the expansionist logic of Soviet water management contributed to large-scale environmental degradation, reminding us that early and mid-century modernization trajectories carried delayed costs that surfaced dramatically in subsequent decades. While the Aral Sea crisis peaked later, its structural roots lay in the earlier confidence that large-scale irrigation could expand indefinitely and that nature could be reorganized to meet planned production objectives.

Finally, the Fergana experience highlights the importance of regional specificity. The valley was not a blank space; it was a historically irrigated and densely settled landscape. Soviet policy therefore did not invent irrigation but re-scaled it and re-politicized it. The dual character of policy emerged precisely because Soviet modernization had to work through existing social and ecological systems while simultaneously subordinating them to the imperatives of centralized planning. This produced a distinctive Soviet “hydraulic governance” in which development and coercion were not opposing outcomes but co-produced effects of the same institutions and strategies.

Between the 1920s and the 1950s, Soviet agrarian

policy in the Fergana Valley pursued irrigation modernization as a pathway to economic growth, political legitimacy, and administrative consolidation. The results were inherently dual. Modernization expanded irrigated agriculture and strengthened institutional capacity for water management, contributing to measurable growth in the irrigated land base and to the consolidation of a region-wide irrigation network. At the same time, modernization intensified coercive governance through collectivization, quota enforcement, and mass labor mobilization, and it narrowed agrarian options through cotton specialization. The Great Fergana Canal stands as a historical emblem of this duality: a genuine hydrotechnical achievement and a political technology of mobilization and control.

Understanding this dual character is essential for interpreting later developments in Central Asian water politics and ecological stress. The infrastructure and allocation patterns created in the mid-century were not neutral; they embodied state priorities and produced long-lasting path dependencies. The Fergana Valley thus demonstrates a broader historical lesson: in large-scale state-led development, modernization gains can be inseparable from coercive institutional forms, and the long-term sustainability of technical achievements depends on whether governance systems can balance productivity with social legitimacy and ecological limits.

#### REFERENCES

1. Kreuzmann H. From Upscaling to Rescaling: Transforming the Fergana Basin from Tsarist Irrigation to Water Management for an Independent Uzbekistan // *Society – Water – Technology: A Critical Appraisal of Major Water Engineering Projects* / eds. R.F. Hüttl, O. Bens, C. Bismuth, S. Hoehstetter. Cham: Springer, 2016. P. 113–127. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-18971-0\_9.
2. *Society – Water – Technology: A Critical Appraisal of Major Water Engineering Projects* / eds. R.F. Hüttl, O. Bens, C. Bismuth, S. Hoehstetter. Cham: Springer, 2016. 295 p. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-18971-0.
3. Peterson M.K. *Pipe Dreams: Water and Empire in Central Asia's Aral Sea Basin*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. 416 p. DOI: 10.1017/9781108673075.
4. Khalid A. *Making Uzbekistan: Nation, Empire, and Revolution in the Early USSR*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015. 434 p.
5. *Ferghana Valley: The Heart of Central Asia* / ed. S. Frederick Starr; with B. Beshimov, I.I. Bobokulov, P. Shozimov. London; New York: Routledge, 2011.
6. Abdullaev K., Nazarov R. *The Ferghana Valley Under Stalin, 1929–1953* // *Ferghana Valley: The Heart of Central Asia* / ed. S.F. Starr. London; New York: Routledge, 2011.
7. Micklin P.P. *The Water Management Crisis in Soviet Central Asia*. The Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies. No. 905. Pittsburgh: Center for Russian and East European Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 1991.
8. Micklin P.P. *Desiccation of the Aral Sea: A Water Management Disaster in the Soviet Union* // *Science*. 1988. Vol. 241. P. 1170–1176.
9. Scott J.C. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1998.
10. Bichsel C. *Conflict Transformation in Central Asia: Irrigation Disputes in the Ferghana Valley*. London; New York: Routledge, 2009.
11. *Great Fergana Canal (1939)* [Electronic resource]. *Seventeen Moments in Soviet History*. Michigan State University. Accessed: 18.01.2026.
12. *Moving the Waters in Soviet Uzbekistan* [Electronic resource]. Harvard University, Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies, 2023. Accessed: 18.01.2026.
13. *Start of the Construction of Great Fergana Canal* [Electronic resource]. *Environment & Society Portal*. Accessed: 18.01.2026.
14. Hodnett G. *Technology and Social Change in Soviet Central Asia: The Politics of Cotton Growing* // *Soviet Politics and Society in the 1970s* / eds. H.W. Morton, R.L. Tökés. New York: Free Press, 1974. P. 60–177.
15. Starr S.F. (ed.). *Introducing the Ferghana Valley // Ferghana Valley: The Heart of Central Asia*. London; New York: Routledge, 2011.