

**THE SOCIAL-ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE POPULATION  
RELOCATED TO THE LAND TO BE DEVELOPED AT THE INITIAL TIME**

J.B. Jumayev  
Teacher of the Faculty of History  
of Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

ABSTRACT	KEYWORDS
This article talks about the initial socio-economic situation of the population relocated to the reserves and gray lands being developed in our republic, as well as the problems that arose in providing them with housing.	Protection campaign, field, Uzbek SSR, Samarkand region, Nurota oasis, General Resettlement Department, Resettlement Department, collective farm, state farm, social assistance.

**Introduction**

In the scientific literature and archival documents on the process of development of protected lands, construction organizations have allowed laziness in the process of development, financial and monetary resources are dispersed among different organizations, and a number of other problems have arisen, such as lack of personnel. passed. It is clearly felt that since the start of the security campaign, the problem of personnel and labor has not lost its importance [1:31].

At this point, in the process of moving people to new lands, we can conditionally divide the inner mental experiences of a person into three stages: 1. Awakening of the desire to move in a person and making a decisive decision; 2. Adaptation of the resettled population; 3. The stage of formation of new sterotype, value and ustanovka in pastoralists [2:18].

Socio-economic provision of relocated farms and creating an opportunity for them to get back on their feet was one of the important tasks facing the government of the republic at that time. It should be noted. However, in the post-war period, great difficulties were encountered in the issue of resettlement of collective farmers displaced by the Uzbek SSR, and the tasks in this field were not fulfilled. For example, on April 30, 1951, the reference of Hasanov, the head of the relocation department, on the state of relocation in Samarkand region stated that instead of 2,400 houses in the total planned for the region, 2,443 houses were built. moved. It is mentioned in the reference that 500 farms are planned to be relocated from Koshrabot district, 257 farms from Molotov collective farm, 211 farms from Engels collective farm, 468 farms in total, and 93.6% of the plan was fulfilled. However, this reference does not specify where exactly they were moved.

As of July 1, 1951, the head of the relocation department, Hasanov, stated that 3,020 planned apartments were relocated in the region, 2,900 of which were relocated to other regions. It is noted that 120 of them were transferred to the interior of the region. 2,196 people from 468 families from

Koshrobot region, which we are studying, and 918 of them are able to work, and "Khlopkor", "Stalin-2", "K. Marx" and "Bolshevik" collective farms [3].

It is worth mentioning that, when moving to a new place, the displaced population faced several other social problems, in addition to problems such as housing allowance and getting a plot.

It should be noted that the five-year plan (1954-1958) of population resettlement was approved by the decision of 1954, and a total of 40,000 farms were set to be resettled. Of these, 6,000 farms were relocated in 1954, 7,000 in 1955, 8,000 in 1956, 9,000 in 1957, and 10,000 in 1958. In 1956, the government of the republic approved the next five-year (1956-1960) perspective plan for population relocation to new lands. According to it, a total of 49,500 farms are planned to be relocated, of which 40,000 farms will be transferred to collective farms, and 9,500 farms will be transferred to state farms [4:79]. It is worth mentioning that only collective farms created from displaced farms were given benefits by the government. One of these benefits was that they were exempted from handing over agricultural products to the state for three years.

Organizations responsible for this issue managed to relocate farms, albeit with great difficulties. The next problems were their placement, organization of economic life, allocation of privileges and provision of housing. At that time, the success of the resettlement policy was evaluated by the fact that the people who were moved to a new land remained there. The relocation of people living in one area, that is, relatives, neighbors, and neighborhoods, was explained by the guarantee of their permanent residence in the new lands. This practice was tested in other regions of the republic and gave positive results [5:107]. However, although this practice has been tested, in practice it is often done differently. In this case, 3 to 10 farms from each village were selected for relocation [6]. In many cases, such events caused the evicted residents to return to their villages.

The process related to the problem of social assistance to the displaced population was characterized as follows: 86.2% of the displaced farms were not provided with cows and calves, not a single farm that migrated in 1953 was did not receive social assistance [7]. In Fergana region, 31.3% of families were provided with cows and calves, and this result was also evaluated as a negative fact by the leadership of the republic [8:48].

In a word, it was difficult for displaced households to live permanently on the newly appropriated lands. Because, as promised by the Soviet organizations, the problems of providing them with housing or repairing the built houses, providing money and credit to new farms and livestock, first of all, cows, had to be solved. However, the problem of providing housing has not been solved, which is the reason for people to go back to their old places [8:48,49].

The archival documents indicate that the first reason for the failure to implement housing construction plans was the non-arrival of construction workers from collective farms. They show a number of kolkhozes coldly looking at work. The most important of them is that vehicles were not provided for the delivery of building materials and use in construction works [9]. In the report of the Main Resettlement Department under the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR about the resettlement departments of Samarkand and Surkhandarya in 1958, statistics are given about the advance paid to the resettled population [9]. It is mentioned that internally displaced people in Samarkand region: 58 families, 300 people, displaced people in Mirzachol: 396 families, 700 people, 1000 people in total. On average, 500 soums were distributed to them, a total of 579,000 soums.

We know that in the 50s of the 20th century, decisions made at the Center reached the regional executive committee within one or two weeks at most. In spite of the fact that resettlement activities in

the Central Asian republics are much slower than in the central regions of the USSR, extremely short deadlines have been set for the execution of decisions. When the relocation plan and the plan for the construction of houses for mobile households are compared, the disparity in this regard is clearly visible. For example, the resettlement plan was adopted on January 28, 1950, and the housing construction plan was adopted on August 26 of this year. In the archive documents, the report of Osipov, the chairman of the "Uzpereselenstroy" organization, to the Samarkand regional executive committee Usmanov and Kambarov, on the implementation of the decision of the Council of Ministers of the UZSSR No. 1760 of September 2, 1951 on the condition of building residential houses information is given [10]. According to him, this decision was discussed twice, measures were determined, and special brigades were formed to build houses for displaced residents. The members of this construction team were exempted from any other work, and they were given the task to be engaged only in construction work and to complete the houses by November 15 [10]. For this purpose, a special group has been formed under the Executive Committee. However, despite the establishment of such a strict discipline and the fact that the work was transferred to a full shift system, by "Uzpereselenstroy" as of September 1951, only 18% of the completed houses were put into use, is there a plan? It is noted that *рѣа* is fulfilled by 5% [10]. As a result, many of the households that were displaced due to the housing problem decided to return to their previous places of residence. Some of them, who could not afford to go back or believed in the promises of the resettlement department and the leadership, were forced to live in temporary housing, sheds and basements.

In conclusion, the consequences caused by the Soviet totalitarian regime in Uzbekistan in the 50s and 60s of the 20th century had a negative impact on the socio-economic and spiritual life of the republic. However, the Uzbek people, who have a glorious past, a rich history, a settled cultural lifestyle, and are distinguished by their high spirituality and culture, have always managed to preserve their identity.

## References:

1. Ismailov E. Tselina rastsvetaet. Tashkent: "Uzbekistan", 1975.
2. Rybakovsky L.L. Migration naselenia. Three stages of the migration process: essays and theories and methods Issledovania. Moscow: ISPI RAN, 2003.
3. State archive of Samarkand region. Fund 74, list 1, case 603, sheets 22, 23.
4. Mirzaaliev U.B. Specific characteristics of historical-demographic processes in Uzbekistan (in the case of Syrdarya and Jizzakh regions, 1956-2020). T.f.b. Dissertation written for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)... Tashkent, 2022.
5. Kholmomnirov H.E. The influence of Soviet colonial policy on migration processes in Uzbekistan: Tarikh fan.nom. diss. Tashkent: 2007.
6. State archive of Samarkand region. Fund 74, list 1, case 952, sheet 49.
7. Own MA 2347 fund, list 1, case 7, sheet 4.
8. Abbasov B.B. The role of the migration factor in socio-economic processes in the villages of Uzbekistan in 1946-1965 (based on the materials of the Fergana Valley).
9. UzMA fund 2347, list 1, case 46.
10. State archive of Samarkand region, fund 74, list 1, case 603, sheet 4.