

On the Resettlement of The Population in The First Years of The Development of Virgin Lands (Using the Example of The Nuratau Oasis)

Jurabek Jumayev

Independent researcher of Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Received: 24 January 2026; **Accepted:** 20 February 2026; **Published:** 12 March 2026

Abstract: This article discusses the resettlement policy of the Soviet government in the first years of the development of virgin lands. It highlights the problems that arose during the resettlement of the population of the Nuratau oasis based on information stored in archival funds.

Keywords: Development of virgin lands, Nuratau, oasis, cotton, resettlement, Mirzachul, state farm.

Introduction: Historically, Uzbekistan, with its geographical location, climate, and conditions, has been one of the regions with a highly developed agricultural culture since ancient times. In turn, the history of artificial irrigation in the region goes back to the distant past. During the years of independence, the history of the Soviet period - the experience of the country's development, the influence of the administrative-command system characteristic of totalitarianism on the socio-economic and cultural life of the multinational population of Uzbekistan - is being consistently studied [1:9,10]. The introduction into scientific circulation of many historical documents stored in the archival funds of our republic plays an invaluable role in the implementation of such positive work. Along with this, there is a need to study the policy of the Soviet government on the development of virgin and fallow lands, including the resettlement policy in the Uzbek SSR, as a separate topic.

As is known, the resettlement of the population for the development of new lands became especially active in the period after the Second World War. This process was more characteristic of 1947-1948, when the main developed territories were the districts of the Tashkent region of the Mirzachul. Resolutions of the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR No. 2092 of October 27, 1948, and No. 163 of February 3, 1949, were aimed at relocating 10,000 farms from the republic's territories

to the Mirzachul, Syrdarya, Bekabad, and Buka districts of the Tashkent region [2:4,5,6]. Based on these decisions, on March 15, 1949, 8,336 families were resettled to the Tashkent region, and the plan was fulfilled by 83%. As a result, the total number of evacuees amounted to 23,420 people, of whom 14,847 or 63% were able-bodied people [2:5].

If we pay attention to the archival documents of 1949, it records the number of people resettled from the regions of the republic. It is noted that the largest number of resettled population (1250 households) falls on the share of the Samarkand region. However, only 1,077 of the listed farms were relocated. 173 farms did not arrive at the destination [2:6]. A total of 89 families were relocated from the Kushrabat district of the Nuratau oasis to the Pskent district of the Tashkent region by 1950 [3:16-20]. Such information indicates that since this period, relocations have been carried out at an accelerated pace.

Resolution No. 449 of the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR and the Central Committee of the CP (b) of Uzbekistan dated March 25, 1950, outlined a plan for the resettlement of the population from the villages of the Nuratau oasis to cotton-growing state farms and their distribution in these territories [4:79]. This resolution envisaged the relocation of 1,000 farms from the Samarkand region to the "Dalvarzin - No. 2," "Boyovut - No. 1," "Boyovut - No. 3," and "Boyovut -

No.4" state farms of the Tashkent region [4:80]. As a result, by June 1 of this year, a total of 118 farms (330 people, of which 220 are able-bodied) from the villages of Osmonsoy, Yangi Qishloq, Chaqir-Chuqur, and Narkurt of Forish district were relocated to the "Boyovut-No1" state farm in Tashkent region [4:284-286]

Furthermore, according to information provided by our informants, by this time, the population of many villages in the oasis had been forcibly relocated without leaving a single household. Examples of such cases include the villages of Mojurum, Andagen, Kochak, and Savrak in the Nurata oasis. Our interlocutors also noted that the residents of the aforementioned villages were completely evacuated overnight, and not a single person was left in the villages.

At the meeting of the Samarkand Regional Executive Committee on November 13, 1950, it was decided to transfer 2000 farms to the Tashkent region. The decision of the meeting provided for the relocation of 400 households from the Farish district to the Syrdarya district, 400 families from the Koshrabad district to the Bekabad district, and 400 households from the Gallyaarl district to the Bekabad district [5:2-3]. Thus, the above-mentioned facts show that the largest resettlement of the population from the Nuratau oasis occurred in the 1950s.

In the data of the Tashkent Regional Executive Council of Workers for February-September 1950, the conditions created for the resettled population were noted. This information mentions the unsatisfactory state of housing provision and construction work for the relocated population, confusion in the performance of tasks by the departments responsible for relocation, frequent red tape and misunderstandings between managers, unauthorized departures of employees, and untimely execution of orders [6:220-222]. It should be noted that the government provided benefits only to collective farms created from resettled farms. One of the benefits being created is that such collective farms are exempt from submitting agricultural products to the state for three years.

According to the decision of the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR dated March 21, 1951, a total of 2,400 farms were to be relocated from the Samarkand region according to the interregional relocation plan. The government resolution, developed on June 27 of this year, additionally provides for the relocation of 500 farms between regions, and the plan for internal inter-district relocation provides for 120 farms. However, it is noticeable that the number of farms indicated in the resettlement plan of the Samarkand region for 1951

periodically changes. It should be noted that a significant part of the territory of these districts belonged to the Nurata oasis.

A total of 353 farms from the "Molotov" and "Engels" collective farms of the Koshrabad district submitted applications to the government for relocation by 1951, resulting in the eviction of 180 families from the "Molotov" collective farm and 173 families from the "Engels" collective farm [7:7]. Such information also clarifies that at that time the resettlement was carried out mainly in a mandatory form, and as a result of propaganda and agitation efforts, the residents of Nurata voluntarily applied for resettlement.

Regarding the conditions created for the population, it should be noted that the completion of housing construction and its transfer to the resettled was carried out in 1951-1952, i.e., after the expiration of the specified benefit. In particular, due to the fact that these benefits were not provided to those resettled to the "Leninism" collective farm in the Buka district of the Tashkent region, the overdue debt in the amount of 489 thousand soums was transferred to the account of the Agricultural Bank.

At that time, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR, S. Kamolov, having studied the above circumstances, on the basis of the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers No. 258 of February 11, 1954, requested permission to write off the debt of the "Leninism" collective farm to the bank in the amount of 305 thousand rubles (35% of the cost of housing) at the expense of funds allocated from the republican budget in 1957 to repay the non-refundable share of loans for the construction of housing for the resettled residents to the Agricultural Bank [8:24].

It should be noted that propaganda and explanatory work had a great influence on the progress of resettlement measures. As a result of the adoption of special decisions, in particular in Uzbekistan, public awareness campaigns were organized with the participation of a representative of the regional resettlement department and 13 (non-staffed) organizers [9:48]. Public explanatory work by representatives of the party body of the indicated regional executive committee is entrusted to district, state, and collective farm officials. Five people from the workers' department and its subordinate inspectors, as well as the executive committee, were involved in this work. Displacement issues were covered twice in regional publications and once in district publications [10:286]. Radio broadcasts were also broadcast four times, and more than 200 propaganda posters were used. However, there are often cases when the

regional resettlement commission is unable to ensure the participation of the person directly responsible (a representative of the regional resettlement department) in the meetings.

According to the 1951 report of the resettlement department under the Samarkand Regional Executive Committee, 444 farms were planned to be relocated from the Gallyaaraal district, but in reality, 403 farms were relocated. Also, 362 out of 390 households from the Farish district and 353 out of 373 households from Koshrabad were officially relocated [7:10]. In the period from March to April 29, 1951, the relocation plan was fulfilled by 101.7%, resulting in a total of 2,443 households being relocated. As noted in the documents, from the above-mentioned farms of the studied Nuratau oasis, 923 were transferred to the Bekabad district, 514 to the Syrdarya, 956 to the Mirzachul, and 50 to the Yangiyul district [11:128-129].

The highest percentage of emigration occurred in 1967, however, in 2 years, 1043 out of 3590 families, or 29%, returned to their homeland. The main reasons for the resettlement of families in 1967 were the lack of necessary production, housing, living, and cultural conditions, and the failure to distribute work by specialty. Another important reason for relocation is that some regional departments do not take family selection and relocation seriously. Among the resettled families were undisciplined, low-skilled, and even unfamiliar workers who did not understand agricultural production, without families, and who returned to their places after the end of the season.

Head of the Department of Resettlement and Resettlement Construction of the State Committee. It is necessary to dwell on the testimony given by U. Mavlyanov. It is noted that in order to further improve the work on assigning relocated families to their places, a number of tasks have been assigned to the departments of the regional executive committees and district representatives on the use of labor resources. Officials had to organize and qualitatively select relocated families, primarily agricultural specialists, communists, and Komsomol members, take specific measures to provide housing for those relocated, create the necessary cultural and living conditions, and provide employment for all able-bodied people in their specialties.

Employees of regional departments, especially representatives of districts for the use of labor resources, were required to maintain constant contact with the relocated families, timely provide them with the established benefits, and know the needs and demands of each newcomer. It is also indicated that in the event of the departure of settled families, local

party bodies should be notified and this issue should be discussed in the appropriate manner with the participation of farm managers [12:68-69].

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the government agencies responsible for the resettlement had to eliminate a number of problems in the resettlement of the population to new lands. Archival documents provide us with a lot of information about the unsatisfactory state of housing provision for the resettled population, the unsatisfactory state of construction work, the irresponsibility of the departments responsible for resettlement, and the untimely execution of orders. The Nurata people also faced such difficulties that arose during the initial years of resettlement.

REFERENCES

1. Бобожонова Х. Ўзбекистонда ижтимоий-иқтисодий муносабатлар (70-80- йиллар мисолида). – Тошкент: Шарқ, 1999.
2. State Archive of Tashkent Region, fund 652, inventory 1, file 876, sheets 4, 5, 6.
3. Koshrabad District State Archive, Fund 24, Inventory 1, File 18, Pages 16-20.
4. State Archive of the Gallyaaraal District, fund 152, inventory 1, file 54, sheets 79-80, 284-286.
5. Samarkand Regional State Archive, fund 1013, inventory 1, file 28, sheets 2, 3.
6. State Archive of Tashkent Region. Fund 652, inventory 1, file 1426, sheets 220-222.
7. Samarkand Regional State Archive, fund 1013, inventory 1, file 29, sheets 7, 10.
8. NA Uz, fund 837, inventory 38, file 7876, sheet 24.
9. Samarkand Regional State Archive. Fund 74, inventory 1, file 952, sheet 48.
10. NA RUz, fund 2347. Inventory 1, file 40, sheet 286.
11. Samarkand Regional State Archive, fund 1013, inventory 1, file 32, sheets 128-129.
12. NA RUz, fund-2765, inventory-1, file-55, sheets 68-69.