

Zh.S. Mazhitova^{1*}, G.T. Isakhan²

¹Astana Medical University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

²State Archive of the city of Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

(E-mail: mazitova_69@mail.ru, isakhang@bk.ru)

Life fragments of Soviet citizens arrived from the PRC* for the development of virgin lands

Based on archival documents, the authors of the article examine the process of repatriation of Soviet citizens from the People's Republic of China to the virgin lands of Kazakhstan in the 1950s. The study reveals the issues of labour and housing arrangements for immigrants, as well as measures of district authorities to implement the Resolution of the Secretariat of the Regional Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan on the arrangement of citizens arriving from the PRC. Some repatriates who arrived for permanent residence were provided with housing by local authorities and became actively involved in agricultural and construction works. At the same time, the authors note that there were serious shortcomings in the material and domestic arrangements of the Soviet citizens arriving from the PRC. To solve those and other problems, the Agricultural Department of the CPSU Central Committee of the Union Republics sent responsible party and state officials to the Kazakh SSR. Together with the local regional and district authorities, they travelled to the areas where the repatriates were settled and compiled reports and memoranda on the real material and domestic situation of the repatriates. The comprehensive recommendations of the inspection bodies to solve the problems of returnees were voluminous and often difficult to implement. The authors conclude that the issues of housing and employment of repatriates from the PRC were not fully solved due to objective and subjective reasons.

Keywords: history of Kazakhstan, development of virgin lands, repatriates, citizens arriving from the People's Republic of China, archive.

Introduction

For a long time, the land of Kazakhstan has been a place of active migration flows. As a rule, the intensification of migration processes was the result of a certain government decision. The displacement of entire peoples had a direct impact on the socio-economic development of the state. "The result was a changed national structure of the population. Owing to the settlers who arrived in Kazakhstan, the economy developed rapidly, primarily industry. Kazakhstan in the twentieth century became a new homeland for many thousands of immigrants" [1].

In the first years after the end of the Great Patriotic War, the problems of the impending food crisis in the USSR began to come to the fore. Theoretically, there were two possible solutions to that problem. Firstly, the intensification of the entire economy, which implied transferring it to market mechanisms of functioning. The second option was extensive, which implied solving food hunger by significantly increasing the area sown with grain crops. The second option was the most suitable for solving the problem in the short term; besides, the intensive way of economic development was sufficiently long-term, so the result was seen in the long term. In addition, and most importantly, it contradicted the fundamental principles of Soviet ideology.

Therefore, it is no coincidence that one of the main tasks put on the agenda by the state in the 1950s was the development of virgin and fallow lands in Kazakhstan, Siberia, the Volga region and the Urals. Mass ploughing of virgin lands after February-March Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee in 1954 (which was supposed to devote 25 million hectares of land for virgin lands in Kazakhstan) required the mobilization of a huge mass of both internal and external manpower, including the repatriation of Soviet citizens. "The Soviet experience of mobilisation of the country's forces during the virgin campaign is in many respects interesting and diverse. It combined both achievements and failures of the Soviet system" [2; 66—67].

*Corresponding author email: mazhitova_69@mail.ru

* People's Republic of China

Experimental

The use of methods for collecting sources and literature was implemented in several stages. At the first stage, the authors studied the theoretical and methodological aspects of the problem through the analysis of humanities literature, both domestic and foreign, which made it possible to create a theoretical basis for the article. At the second stage, the collection and systematization of documentary material in the archives of Kazakhstan and Russia took place. The next stage is related to the analysis of the received historical data. During the study generally accepted research methods of historical science were used.

Results

The issues of the repatriation of Soviet citizens from the People's Republic of China (PRC) to the virgin lands of Kazakhstan have repeatedly become the subject of researchers' studies [3–7]. The authors, considering the issues of everyday life and the provision of labour resources for re-emigrants, used materials from the central and regional archives, in particular, the archives of the Kustanai and Pavlodar regions. In this article, we operate with archival materials from the Akmola Regional Archives and the Russian State Archives of Contemporary History, which have not been fully introduced into scientific circulation. In carrying out the repatriation of Soviet citizens, the state was guided by different goals, first of all, the economic one. In the conditions of extensive economic development, the Soviet Union needed huge labour resources, and only after that other issues, i.e., political, cultural, etc., were put on the agenda.

Migration flows to the territory of Kazakhstan in the 1950s were associated with the active development of virgin and fallow lands. In this matter, the Soviet leadership was solving an important task — the return of the able-bodied population to the USSR, because it was necessary for the agrarian-industrial development of the republics. That event led to a significant increase in the population. So, “just at the first stage of the mass development of virgin lands (1954—1956), more than 640 thousand people arrived in Kazakhstan, which amounted to 45.3 % of the total rural population living in the virgin land. And if for 1954—1958, the population of Kazakhstan increased by 24 %, then in those areas where virgin lands were developed — by 40—50 %” [1; 17].

The increase in labour resources was mainly due to intra-union relocations, as well as repatriated citizens from the PRC. So, the Council of Ministers of the USSR in Resolution No. 751—329 of April 13, 1954, allowed the entry into the USSR from the PRC in June–August 1954 for families of Soviet citizens, who expressed a desire to leave for the USSR in areas of virgin and fallow lands development, with the direction them for work and permanent residence in state farms, machine-tractor stations (MTS) and collective farms.

As of October 29, 1954, 27,216 people (6,005 families) of Soviet citizens arrived in the Soviet Union from the People's Republic of China, who were placed in the areas of development of virgin and fallow lands. 4005 families — 20486 people were sent to work in state farms and 2000 families — 6731 people were sent to machine and tractor stations. The state farms and MTS of the Kazakh SSR accommodated 2269 families — 10664 people [8; 5] (Table 1).

Table 1

Information on accommodation of Soviet citizens arrived from the PRC in the Kazakh SSR

	Total families arrived	Accommodated in state farms	Accommodated in MTS
Kustanai region	806	506	300
Pavlodar region	316	116	200
Karaganda region	314	314	—
Aktobe region	207	207	—
Akmola region	202	—	202
Kokchetav region	201	—	201
North-Kazakhstan region	92	—	92
West-Kazakhstan region	131	131	—
Total:	2269	1274	995

The arrived citizens were accommodated in 230 state farms and 278 MTS [8, sh. 8].

The Soviet state guaranteed repatriates “free entry to the USSR, duty-free import of luggage and the provision of certain social benefits. The repatriates were told that they were subject to all the rights of citi-

zens of the USSR, including electoral rights. At the same time, they were forbidden to leave the place of work established by the state” [9].

The vast majority of those arriving in Kazakhstan were natives and citizens of the Soviet Union who had fled abroad during 1918—1932. Most of the re-emigrants were of Russian nationality, with a few Ukrainian and German families [10; 11—19].

If we talk about those who arrived from the PRC in 1954 to 1961, then in total, in an organized manner and in accordance with all the necessary rules, citizens from the People’s Republic of China arrived in the territory of the Kazakh SSR annually in the number of repatriates — 12,624 families, including — 134,117 people [11].

Judging by the archival materials, the republic’s leadership kept the issue of the household, housing and labour arrangement of the repatriates under special control. Immigrants from the PRC on arrival were to be provided with housing, livestock, a backyard and food. For the economic arrangement, as well as for other virgin lands the migrants, who arrived according to the organizational set, were to be given loans in the amount of 10—15 thousand rubles and loans on preferential terms*. In addition, the local leadership was supposed to employ the migrants in their specialty, and in case of impossibility, send them to training in specialties that were in demand on the virgin lands.

The real picture of the repatriates’ arrival in the republic was contradictory. On the one hand, the leaders of the majority of MTS and state farms properly organized the reception of new arrivals, provided them with work and housing. On the other hand, serious mistakes were made in the work of local leaders, since the material and everyday life of some Soviet citizens who arrived from the PRC left much to be desired. In a number of regions of the republic, the supply of industrial and food products was poorly organized; the necessary measures were not taken to provide comfortable housing. There were cases when the arriving Soviet citizens were not provided with work in their specialty. To resolve issues of a political nature, since many repatriates “have correspondence with China and it is possible that such shortcomings are reported to China” [8; 2], as well as the elimination of shortcomings in the material and living arrangement of Soviet citizens who arrived from the PRC, the Agricultural Department of the Central Committee of the CPSU for the Union republics considered it expedient to send a group of senior officials of the Ministry of Agriculture of the USSR, the Ministry of State Farms of the USSR and the Central Committee of the Komsomol to the Kazakh SSR. The workers from the Soviet party activists who arrived in the republic, together with local executives, having collected information about the resettlement and everyday life of the repatriates, presented to the CPSU Central Committee memoranda and information about the arrangement of Soviet citizens who had arrived from the PRC.

So, in the report “On the labour and household arrangement of citizens arrived in Akmola region from the People’s Republic of China”, prepared by S. Komarov, head of the agricultural department of the regional committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, it is noted that from November 6 to 15, 22 responsible party and Soviet workers of the region, together with district party committees checked each family that had arrived from the PRC. The check covered the following issues: labour arrangement, household provision with apartments, fuel, vegetables, cultural services. During the check, the members of the commission held group and individual conversations with the displaced persons. The results of the work carried out by the commission were as follows. The main wave of migrants arrived for permanent residence in the Akmola region in July 1954.

The repatriates were sent to work in 20 MTS of the Akmola region. On July 18, 1954, there was “a certain disaggregation of the families that arrived (they got married). Some families found their relatives and, with the permission of the district leaders, left for other regions, individual families took jobs in their field of study in the city of Akmolinsk and other places within the region” [10; 3]. As a result, as of November 15, 1954, citizens who arrived from the People’s Republic of China and were sent to the MTS of Akmola region, there were 195 families (instead of 202) with 585 family members, including 346 able-bodied people, 271 of them were employed [10; 9] (Table 2).

* The assistance provided by the Government to citizens who arrived from the PRC in the form of loans for the construction of houses was not used at the time of the state inspection of the material and living conditions of the repatriates. For example, «Secretaries of the regional party committee (Pavlodar region. — *authors*) comrades Afonov and Romanov and the heads of the regional executive committee until recently did not know about the benefits provided». R.S.A.N.H. F. 5. Reg. 45.C. 4.Sh. 10.

Table 2

Information on the labour and household arrangement of families arrived from the People's Republic of China to the MTS region

MTS	Total families arrived	Of them			Available			People employed	Not employed
		Disaggregated	Total families left	Incl. moved out of the region	Number of families	Family members	Able-bodied person		
Semenovskaya	9		3	1	6	29	19	15	4
Atbasar	20	–	11	3	9	29	20	15	5
Novoselskaya	20	–	4	4	16	44	30	25	5
Ishimskaya	10	–	2	–	8	33	20	15	5
Krasivinskaya	12	–	–	–	12	28	14	14	–
Zaporozhskaya	10	–	–	–	10	35	22	14	8
Erkenshiliks	10	–	3	2	7	32	21	16	5
Netsvetaevskaya	10	–	3	1	7	34	18	15	3
Novokolutonskaya	9	–	–	–	9	29	14	8	6
Zhuravlevskaya	10	–	–	–	10	28	12	12	–
Karashalgigskaya	11	–	–	–	11	33	23	20	3
Sandyktavskaya	12	–	–	–	12	50	25	19	6
Preobrazhenskaya	10	–	2	–	8	16	10	7	3
Balkashinskaya	10	–	–	–	10	24	15	12	5
Veselovskaya	9	–	1	1	8	29	17	11	6
Novocherkasskaya	10	2	–	–	12	55	29	29	–
Organizator	10	2	7	–	5	13	10	8	2
named after Telman	10	1	–	–	11	44	27	16	11
Total	202	5	36	12	171	585	346	271	75

According to the official data, the living conditions of the arrived citizens were generally satisfactory. For example, some families bought houses, joined collective farms, and some received government loans for the construction of residential buildings, for the purchase of cows. More or less favourable living conditions were created within the Veselovskaya MTS: 9 families with a total of 36 people lived here, of which 17 were able-bodied citizens, 4 school-age children, and 9 preschool children. All school-age children were enrolled in studies. All able-bodied citizens worked on this collective farm. However, that was perhaps an isolated case, an exception to the general rule.

The memorandum of the deputy head of the propaganda and agitation department of the regional committee of the CPC I. Shendrik indicated that 10 families arrived at the Netsvetaevskaya MTS of the Izobilny state farm, and “for 20 days they were not given any work. After such a reception, 3 families immediately left the MTS: 2 families — to Rudnik Turgaystroy, the other — to the Molotov region. With the exception of Vasilenko, Bronnikova (the first works as a driver, the second as an assistant cook), the rest are not employed. This causes discontent and uncertainty (among the repatriates — the authors) in the future” [10; 115, 116]. The inspection revealed that the living conditions of the arrived citizens were extremely unattractive. “People live, so to speak, in terrible conditions. In one room, 20—25 square meters in size, 3 families are accommodated (one of 8 people, the second of 5 and 3 people). There is no need to talk about any sanitary requirements here. There is a foul smell in the room. Everyone sleeps on bunks — all families together, in a row. They are not provided with fuel. On cold days, many of them fell ill with colds, especially children” [10; 116, 117].

The situation with the provision of food was especially difficult. “Over the past months, the families that have arrived on the spot have not received bread, that is, they cannot buy baked bread. In order to meet the needs for bread, they have to travel by passing cars to the mines of Jalymbet and Bestyube every 7—10 days. On October 18, at the time of my arrival, many families had not had bread for 2 days already” [12, sh. 38].

The relations of repatriates with the local population, who saw them as “traitors” to the Motherland left it at the turning points of Soviet history, did not always develop favourably. “There is no explanatory work

among the local population, it is not told what should be their attitude towards the citizens who arrived from China. It is no accident that there are unhealthy conversations of the following content: “You damned Chinese, came in large numbers here to devour us, etc.” [10; 118].

Unfortunately, local authorities did not always pay due attention to the processes of social adaptation of newly arrived citizens. At first, the work of the authorities in this direction was ineffective. Since in this regional centre, one could often hear the words addressed to the repatriates: “...citizens treat these citizens rudely, calling them “white bandits, traitors to the Motherland, parasites, etc.” [10; 110].

A similar situation has developed in the Koktenkul state farm of the Zhana-Arkinsky district of the Karaganda region. The Koktenkul state farm was organized from a former prison camp, the main contingent of which were former prisoners. 33 families of 175 people came to this state farm from the PRC. The residence of the repatriates in this state farm was complicated by the fact that it “has more than 500 workers and employees, about half of whom were formerly convicted several times for hooliganism, theft and under Article 58” [8, sh. 16]. People who arrived from the PRC in the first days of being among the convicts, hearing from them “endless swearing, bad language, drunkenness and threats, were very afraid of local people, many of the arrivals wanted to apply for dismissal and go back” [8; 17]. The moral and psychological climate of the arriving population was worsened by attacks from the “irresponsible strata of the population”. So, “...convicted women — Olga Subacheva, Sukhareva, Muravchik, Brykina and others call the people, who arrived, Chinese, openly say such words as: “You then fled to China, why did you come here now, who invited you here, etc...” [8; 17, 18].

Fragments of life on this state farm are vividly illustrated by the pages of a letter from the repatriate Lukmanov addressed to the vice-consul of the USSR Consulate General in Urumqi I.I. Ivanov. Dwelling in this letter on the characteristics of the environment, Lukmanov noted: “...the majority (of the prisoners. — *the authors*) are engaged in theft and all kinds of fraud. So, for example, someone, who works with me at the same company in a warehouse, gives hints to steal government grain with him” [8; 11]. The disseminated contradictory information from the virgin areas by the newly arrived repatriates caused serious concern of the authorities, since “this may be known to the Soviet citizens living in Xinjiang and this will harm further work on repatriation. Moreover, hostile elements are already spreading rumours among local Soviet citizens that repatriated Soviet citizens are being placed in concentration camps” [8; 10].

The actions of local authorities on the employment and settlement of the newly arrived displaced persons were met with controversial assessment by the local population. So, if some virgin lands were sympathetic to the creation of conditions for the life of immigrants, others saw them as competitors and a burden for the economy. A worker of the Cherkassky grain farm of the Sovetsky district of the North Kazakhstan region in his letter to the editorial office of the Selskoehozyaistvo newspaper noted: “I ask you to explain why it so happened that people who came to develop virgin lands in the bare steppes were in a worse position compared to citizens who came as migrants to the existing collective farms. We are very unhappy with the actions of the local authorities. The settlers, albeit temporarily, are provided with housing, which we, virgin lands workers, do not have” [12; 106]. The documents contain a lot of materials about the lukewarm attitude of trade workers towards migrants. So, the seller of the general store Dyusekeeva refused to sell fats and flour to the settlers, explaining her refusal by the fact that “it was necessary to bring lard from China” [8; 38].

Although it is worth emphasizing that there were no sharp conflicts on ethnic grounds among the local population and the newcomers. In any case, we did not find such materials in archival documents. Most likely, this was due to the fact that virgin lands in these years became a place of residence and work for people of different nationalities, religions, social status [13]. This circumstance, on the one hand, brought people together, since they had to develop virgin and fallow lands equally in difficult climatic conditions and create the infrastructure of the “unafraid bird” region. On the other hand, the perception of the repatriates as “strangers”, “white bandits” caused a feeling of cool attitude towards them from the “real” virgin lands workers, which, in turn, made it difficult for the social adaptation of the settlers.

The issue of housing and living conditions was particularly relevant. People were housed in unfinished premises, which did not have heating stoves, floors, or a yard for livestock. The situation that has arisen in most cases, according to the inspectors, was associated with a negligent attitude towards the performance of their duties on the part of the authorized branches of the Agricultural Bank and the MTS Directorate. Since the loans issued by the state for the construction of residential buildings and the purchase of livestock were not used, moreover, many did not know about these loans at all. Almost every report indicated difficulties in providing winter clothing and footwear: “People are not at all provided with warm clothes, vegetables, bread,

meat, fats, etc. All people working on the collective farm walk half-barefoot” [10; 110]. Or “in total 52 pairs of felt boots, one short fur coat and up to 20 warm shawls are required for citizens (Kalininsky district. — *authors*). In addition, during the entire time, not a single kilogram of sugar and other confectionery products, cereals were sold to citizens, hence we request to provide them with these food products. Absolutely on sale (in all stores) there are no lamps and glasses, therefore, the situation with lighting is extremely bad, they use oil lamp (“zhirovik”) everywhere (a primitive device)” [10; 79—80]. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that this situation did not develop everywhere, and there are many examples of how local authorities tried to create optimal conditions for living and finding jobs for arrived Soviet citizens.

The issue of employment of the newly arrived citizens was difficult to resolve. The shortcomings in the labour arrangement lie in the fact that in a number of machine and tractor stations, and especially on state farms, a large number of able-bodied workers worked in low-paid jobs — watchmen, cleaners, and general laborers. For example, 97 people worked in 10 MTS of Galkinsky, Lebyazhinsky, Lozovsky districts of Pavlodar region. Among them, 8 drivers, tractor drivers, turners, locksmiths, 11 carpenters, 14 people worked as helmsmen on combine harvesters and fuel accountants in tractor brigades, 3 medical workers, 3 laboratory assistants, 6 bookkeepers and accountants, 3 cooks, 3 groomsmen, 4 watchmen and cleaners and 42 people worked as laborers [8; 37]. Another problem is incorrect accounting and low wages. The data on the wages of 10 workers, taken from the accountant’s statement is given in Table 3.

Table 3

Data on wages of 10 workers

No.	Surname, name and patronymic name	Number of days worked in October	Amount of accrued earnings	Earnings for the 1st working day	Notes
1	Zertsalov Ivan Leonidovich	8.5	28—45	3—25	
2	Korobeinikova Yelena V.	18.0	61—42	3—32	
3	Kobylin Abram Osipovich	20.0	78—45	3—90	carpenter
4	Makarova Kseniya Ivanovna	16.0	60—86	3—80	
5	Spirina Claudiya Fedorovna	18.0	59—13	3—30	
6	Samsonkin Grigory S.	16.0	65—01	4—05	carpenter
7	Gorovitsky Vadim Paulovich	20.05	94—04	4—60	carpenter
8	Tretyakov Georgy Mitrofanovich	18.0	73—37	4—07	carpenter
9	Saturova Kaleriya G.	8.5	55—01	6—50	
10	Mashinsky Ivan Al.	23.0	96—91	4—20	carpenter

Table 4 demonstrates that workers in October 1954, received half and three times less than the lowest rate of time workers and piece workers, were paid according to the existing wage scale:

Table 4

Tariff scale of remuneration

	Daily wages of a time worker	Daily wages of a piece worker
III category	9—75	12—81
IV category	10—87	14—56
V category	12—83	16—50

The inspection revealed that the reason for the low wages was mainly due to inadequate labour accounting. Work orders were issued without any indication of the amount of work or the unit cost and were usually issued retroactively, and on several days at a time. Here is a copy of such a work order:

“Zertsalova’s brigade.

4 / XI-54 y. Stacking parts.

5 / XI-54 y. Stacking parts.

6 / XI-54 y. Stacking parts.

10 / XI-54 y. Furrowing, padding walls, filling sawdust to the 2nd floor” [8; 50].

This work order did not reflect the amount of work done or its cost, leading to the conclusion that the office administration had cheated and overcharged the settlers.

Some heads of state farms and MTS were callous in their attitude to the creation of normal working conditions. For example, “Tamara Grigulevich, a record-keeper at the Chapaev state farm, walked 16 kilometres every day in order to measure field work. In addition, she had to walk around huge fields in the process of measuring. Meanwhile, a large number of working horses were not used at the state farm” [8; 51].

The citizens who arrived were not always employed in accordance with their wishes and professions. Here it is worth noting the mistakes made by Soviet consular officials in the PRC in selecting Soviet citizens to be sent to the USSR. A Decree of the USSR Council of Ministers of April 18, 1954 instructed the Soviet Embassy in the PRC to issue entry permits for Soviet citizens who were able to work on state farms, collective farms, and MTS, as well as for their family members. However, among the new arrivals there was a large number of people who could not be used for work in agriculture — captains of ships, engineers in the mining, food and chemical industries, professors, railway workers and people from other professions who could not be used on the state farms. The sending of highly-qualified and long-serving non-agricultural specialists to the state farms resulted in the fact that the directors of the state farms were unable to employ them in their profession. The facts show that a large part of the intelligentsia was not employed in their specialisation on state farms and MTS (Table 5).

Table 5

Specialties of citizens who arrived from the PRC (selectively) [8, sh. 56]

No.	Name of specialties	Number of people	Of them who cannot be used in the MTS at work in the specialty
1	Railway engineers	3	3
2	Educators	13	11
3	Nurses	6	1
4	Economists	4	2
5	Commodity experts	5	5
6	Pharmacists	5	5
7	Painters	2	2
8	Locksmiths-turners	33	—
9	dressmakers	22	22
10	Sausage men	5	5
	other
	Total number of people of different specialties	192	59

There were exceptions, though. For example, in the Novocherkasskiy district, 29 of the able-bodied people who arrived were employed. Most likely, this positive situation was due to the fact that the citizens who arrived had agricultural specialties. “Chauffeurs — 4 people, tractor drivers — 2 people, motorists — 1 person and carpenters — 2 people, from among women — 3 people, work in irrigation workshop. The rest take part in construction work” [10; 68].

Undoubtedly, it is worth noting that the local authorities made efforts to find employment and obtain the necessary education for the repatriates. Archival materials show that many of them were employed at their place of residence. Despite the fact that “all workers (arrived. — *authors*) have a conscientious attitude to work, and some are not badly involved in social work” [10; 92], not everyone managed to find a job in their specialty. Moreover, the repatriates had to change their profession and take jobs that were popular in the virgin lands: labourer, cattle breeder, mechanic, installer, etc. Thus, a telegrapher became a storekeeper and a dental technician became a stove-maker [10; 92] (Table 6) (Sample data).

Table 6

About employment of arrived citizens

No.	Full name	Year of birth	Name of MTS	Number	Specialty	What and where they work
1	Serebryannikov A.I.	1896	Preobrazhenskaya	2	telegraph operator	storekeeper at MTS
2	Yegorov D.P.	1895	Balkashinskaya	2	dental technician	stove-maker at MTS
3	Pukasova T.A.	1923	Balkashinskaya	2	Chinese language teacher	bookkeeper at the Kalinin collective

						farm
4	Kuritsin I.V.	1933	Balkashinskaya	2	film projectionist	handyman
5	Nastavin A.S.	1903	Balkashinskaya	2	surveyor	handyman
6	Rudeikis G.N.	1917	Novoselskaya	3	musician, chauffeur	collective farmer of the Chapayev collective farm
7	Loi A.I.	1904	Novoselskaya	4	Russian language teacher	collective farmer of the Chapayev collective farm
8	Dymova R.F.	1905	Novoselskaya	2	dressmaker	oil depot watchman of Spass.MTS
9	Fomin O.I.	1901	Novoselskaya	2	laboratory assistant-bacteriologist	handyman at MTS
10	Glukhov	–	Novocherkasskaya		Graduated from Harbin Polytechnic Institute with a degree in electrical engineer	handyman

In many farms, the issue of supplying returnees with food and clothing was not resolved in a timely manner. The indifference, “irresponsible, if not more criminal” and negligent attitude on the part of local leaders is striking in addressing this issue [10; 117]. “The newly arrived Soviet citizens were not provided with potatoes and vegetables, although it was possible to do so in the collective farms of Novoselskaya MTS. Meat, food, flour were not sold to them, neither through the village cooperative stores (“selpo”), nor through the agricultural cartel. People were buying food at exorbitant prices from the collective farmers” [10; 99].

Reports by officials abounded with the facts of “under-weighting”, “cheating”, “speculation”, “concealment of goods”, “usury”, etc. with regard to the returnees both on the part of the MTS management and ordinary residents. Understandably, this attitude on the part of the locals caused anxiety and frustration among the Soviet citizens who arrived from China. It is no coincidence that the inspectors’ reports repeatedly express concern about this: “The attitude to the arrangement and material provision of these families on the part of the MTS management and local party leaders is so criminally irresponsible that, despite their ignorance or, more correctly, poor knowledge of Soviet laws and procedures and fear of speaking openly, many of the newcomers ran out of patience and they concluded the conversation by saying: “We cannot understand why we were brought here, just to laugh or make fun of us?” [10; 118].

A note by the Secretary of the Regional Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan N. Zhurin to the Central Committee of the CPSU “On the labour and domestic arrangement of Soviet citizens who arrived in Akmola oblast from the People’s Republic of China” of 1 December 1954 noted: “...the Bureau of the Regional Party Committee reviewed the materials of the inspection of the labour and domestic arrangement of the citizens who arrived from China and obliged the Department of Agriculture, the manager of the regional office of the agricultural bank, district executive committees, district party committees and directors of MTS to take measures to eliminate deficiencies in this matter and to ensure the proper labour and domestic arrangement of citizens who arrived from China” [10; 109].

Conclusions

It is clear from the above that the issues of housing and labour arrangements for repatriates from the PRC were not solved in full due to objective and subjective reasons. The Party, Soviet, trade union and economic organizations, state farm and MTS administrations paid little attention to the needs of the returnees. The unsettled nature of life on the virgin land inevitably led to internal and external migration, when repatriates left the virgin land in search of better work or close relatives. For example, the Resolution of the Bureau of the Almaty Regional Committee of the CPC of May 24, 1954 noted the insufficiency of measures for labour and economic arrangements of the Soviet citizens arriving from the PRC, as a result of which “422 arriving households were forced to leave the original places of settlement in other regions of Kazakhstan, Uzbek and Kirghiz SSR [10; 110]. A similar situation was developing in other republics of the USSR. Thus, the Prosecutor’s Office of the Osh Region of the Kyrgyz SSR reported: “Finding themselves in difficult conditions and not feeling the care of the collective farm management and local authorities, many of the newcomers began to leave the collective farms and go to the Kazakh SSR” [14; 86]. Young people were actively

leaving the districts of the virgin lands. Many of them were sent to the cities to study in Soviet educational institutions.

Often the directors of the MTS themselves facilitated the transfer of newcomers to other districts, organisations and institutions in order to get rid of the concern for their placement, and in a number of cases the assignment to collective farms was of an administrative nature. Thus, the directors of the Lozov, Turksib and Nadarovsk MTS in the Lozov district of Pavlodar oblast, unwilling to show concern for employment and provision of housing, transferred 10 families to collective farms. The heads of these families objected to being sent to the collective farms, but their voices were not listened to. Moreover, the chairmen of the collective farms invited them to submit applications for admission to the collective farm, warning them that otherwise they would not be given foodstuffs. The heads of families Dumskikh N.A. and Van T.I., who were sent from the Lozova MTS to the Voroshilov collective farm, according to their verbal statement, repeatedly asked to be released from their work at the collective farm, but each time they listened to insults from the collective farm chairman, comrade T. Butt and the foreman, comrade T. Gulayev [8; 35].

The fate of repatriates in Kazakhstan developed differently. Some of them put down deep roots in the virgin land and became active participants in the development of virgin and fallow lands, while others attempted to make their way to a “new” life in other parts of the Soviet Union. If at first the repatriates left in Kazakhstan held on to each other, observed customs, celebrated weddings, etc., then over time these ties weakened and led to their gradual dissolution into the local socio-cultural environment.

The results of the inspections were discussed at republican level and reported to the CPSU Central Committee. They were followed up by appropriate instructions and measures to improve the material and domestic conditions of the returnees. It is worth noting that the problems of the repatriates were gradually solved by the local authorities, and most probably positively, as over time “the people who arrived from the PRC got used to the local conditions and residents. Apart from 3-4 families (former residents of the town), all the other families are willing to work and live permanently. All conditions are now in place for this: they are starting to breed cattle, they have been allocated plots of land for a vegetable garden, they all have fuel and food for the winter. Many of them... want permission for their relatives to leave China... for this state farm” [8; 21].

References

- 1 Игнатъева Л.Н. Роль миграции в формировании населения Казахстана: 1926—1959 гг.: автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук / Л.Н. Игнатъева. — Барнаул, 2006. — 24 с.
- 2 Мажитова Ж.С. Участие комсомола и молодёжи Татарской АССР в освоении целины в 1950-е годы (по материалам архива города Нур-Султана) / Ж.С. Мажитова, А.Ж. Жалмурзина // Вестн. Казах.нац. пед. ун-та. Сер. Ист. и соц.-полит. науки. — 2020. — № 4 (67). — С. 66–70.
- 3 Кузнецова О.В. Архивные документы на реэмигрантов из Китая как исторический источник / О.В. Кузнецова // Археология Южного Урала: материалы III Междунар. конф. — Уфа: Информреклама, 2003. — С. 54–57.
- 4 Аблажей Н.Н. Репатрианты из КНР в районах освоения целинных и залежных землях (1954–1962 гг.) / Н.Н. Аблажей // Гуманитарные науки в Сибири. — 2008. — № 2. — С. 104–106.
- 5 Мендыкулова Г.М. История миграций между Казахстаном и Китаем в 1860–1960-е гг. / Г.М. Мендыкулова, Б.Ж. Атантаева. — Алматы: Изд-во «Са-Ға», 2008. — 232 с.
- 6 Алпыспаева Г.А. Хозяйственно-бытовое и трудовое устройство граждан-репатриантов из КНР в Казахстан в годы целины / Г.А. Алпыспаева, Ш.Н. Саяхимова // «Россия и Китай: история и перспективы сотрудничества»: материалы VI Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. — Благовещенск: Благовещенский государственный педагогический университет, 2016. — С. 117–123.
- 7 Аблажей Н.Н. Казахский миграционный маятник «Казахстан–Синьцзян». Эмиграция. Репатриация. Интеграция / Н.Н. Аблажей. — Караганды: Болашак Баспа, 2014. — 273 с.
- 8 РГАНИ. — Ф. 5. — Оп. 45. — Д. 4.
- 9 Литвинцев Г.М. Нас ещё долго звали китайцами / Г.М. Литвинцев [Электронный ресурс]. — 2011. — Режим доступа: <http://www.old.russianchina.org/articles/2011/03/25/3335>.
- 10 ГАОО. — Ф. 1. — Оп. 1. — Д. 1982.
- 11 Атантаева Б.Ж. Казахстанско-китайские межгосударственные миграции в середине XIX–начале XXI вв.: автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. / Б.Ж. Атантаева [Электронный ресурс]. — 2008. — Режим доступа: http://cheloveknauka.com/kazhastansko-kitayskie-mezhgosudarstvennye-migratsii-v-seredine-xix-nachale-xxi-vv_
- 12 ГАОО. — Ф. 1. — Оп. 1. — Д. 1915.

13 ГААО. — Ф. 1. — Оп. 1. — Д. 1982. — Л. 78.

14 РГАНИ. — Ф. 5. — Оп. 45. — Д. 127.

Ж.С. Мажитова, Ғ.Т. Исахан

Тың игеруге ҚХР-дан келген кеңес азаматтарының өмірінің фрагменттері

Мақалада авторлар мұрағат құжаттарына сүйене отырып, 1950 жылдардағы Қытай Халық Республикасынан Қазақстанның тың жерлеріне кеңестік азаматтардың оралу процесін зерттеген. Қоныс аударушылардың еңбек және тұрғын үй-тұрмыстық жағдайын қамтамасыз ету мәселелері, сондай-ақ, ҚХР-дан келген азаматтарды орналастыру туралы Қазақстан Компартиясы облыстық комитеті хатшылығының қаулысын орындау бойынша облыс билігінің шаралары көрсетілген. Тұрақты тұрғылықты жеріне келген оралмандардың бір бөлігі жергілікті билік тарапынан баспанамен қамтамасыз етілген, олар ауыл шаруашылығы мен құрылыс жұмыстарына белсене араласқан. Сонымен бірге, авторлар ҚХР-дан келген кеңестік азаматтардың материалдық және тұрмыстық өмірінде елеулі кемшіліктер болғанын атап өтеді. Осы және басқа да мәселелерді шешу үшін КОКП Орталық Комитетінің одақтас республикалар бойынша ауыл шаруашылығы бөлімі Қазақ КСР-не жауапты партия және үкімет қызметкерлерін жіберген. Олар оралмандар қоныстанған аймақтарға жергілікті облыстық және аудандық билік органдарымен бірге аттанып, оралмандардың нақты материалдық-тұрмыстық жағдайлары туралы мәліметтер мен баяндамалық есептерді жасады. Тексеруші органдардың оралмандардың мәселелерін шешуге арналған кешенді ұсыныстары көлемді болған және көбінесе орындау қиынға соққан. Авторлар ҚХР-дан келген оралмандарды тұрғын үймен, шаруашылықпен және еңбекпен қамтамасыз ету мәселелері объективті және субъективті себептерге байланысты толық шешімін таппаған деген қорытынды жасаған.

Кілт сөздер: Қазақстан тарихы, тың игеру, оралмандар, Қытай Халық Республикасынан келген азаматтар, мұрағат.

Ж.С. Мажитова, Ғ.Т. Исахан

Фрагменты жизни советских граждан, прибывших из Китайской Народной Республики, на освоение целины

Авторы статьи, опираясь на архивные документы, исследовали процесс репатриации советских граждан из Китайской Народной Республики в целинные земли Казахстана в 1950-е гг. В статье раскрыты вопросы трудового и жилищно-бытового устройства переселенцев, а также меры районных органов власти по реализации Постановления Секретариата обкома Коммунистической партии Казахстана по устройству граждан, прибывших из КНР. Местными властями прибывшим на постоянное место жительства некоторым репатриантам было предоставлено жилье, они стали активно принимать участие в сельскохозяйственных и строительных работах. Вместе с тем, авторами отмечено, что в материально-бытовом устройстве советских граждан, прибывших из КНР, имелись серьезные недостатки. Для решения этих и других вопросов Сельскохозяйственный отдел ЦК КПСС по союзным республикам командировал в Казахскую ССР ответственных партийных и государственных работников. Выехав совместно с местными областными и районными органами власти в районы расселения репатриантов, они составили отчеты и докладные записки о реальном материально-бытовом положении репатриантов. Комплексные рекомендации проверяющих органов по решению возникших проблем репатриантов получились объемными и, зачастую, трудновыполнимыми. Авторы пришли к выводу, что вопросы жилищно-бытового и трудового устройства репатриантов из КНР в полном объеме в силу объективных и субъективных причин не решались.

Ключевые слова: история Казахстана, освоение целины, репатрианты, граждане, прибывшие из Китайской Народной Республики, архив.

References

- 1 Ignateva, L.N. (2006). Rol migratsii v formirovanii naseleniia Kazakhstana: 1926–1959 gg. [The role of migration in the formation of the population of Kazakhstan: 1926–1959 gg.]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Barnaul, 24 [in Russian].
- 2 Mazhitova, Zh.S., & Zhalmurzina, A.Zh. (2020). Uchastie komsomola i molodezhi Tatarskoi ASSR v osvoenii tseliny v 1950-e gody (Po materialam arkhiva goroda Nur-Sultan) [Participation of the Komsomol and the youth of the Tatar ASSR in the development of virgin lands in the 1950s (Based on materials from the Nur-Sultan city archive)]. *Vestnik Kazakhskogo natsionalnogo*

universiteta. Seriya Istoricheskie i sotsialno-politicheskie nauki — Bulletin of the Kazakh National University. Series Historical and socio-political sciences, 4(67) [in Russian].

3 Kuznetsova, O.V. (2003). Arkhivnye dokumenty na reemigrantov iz Kitaia kak istoricheskii istochnik [Archival documents on re-emigrants from China as a historical source]. Proceedings from Archeogeography of South Ural: *III Mezhdunarodnaia konferentsiia — 3rd International Scientific and Practical Conference* (pp. 54–57). Ufa: Informreklama [in Russian].

4 Ablazhei, N.N. (2008). Repatrianty iz KNR v raionakh osvoeniia tselinnykh i zaleznykh zemliakh (1954–1962 gg.) [Repatriates from China in the areas of virgin and fallow lands development (1954–1962)]. *Gumanitarnye nauki v Sibiri — Humanities in Siberia, 2* [in Russian].

5 Mendykulova, G.M., & Atantaeva, B.Zh. (2008). Istoriia migratsii mezhdur Kazakhstanom i Kitaem v 1860–1960-e gg. [The history of migrations between Kazakhstan and China in the 1860s–1960s]. Almaty: Izdatelstvo «Sa-Ga» [in Russian].

6 Alpyspaeva, G.A., & Saiakhimova, Sh.N. (2016). Khoziaistvenno-bytovoe i trudovoe ustroistvo grazhdan-repatriantov iz KNR v Kazakhstan v gody tseliny [Household and labor arrangement of citizens-repatriates from the PRC to Kazakhstan during the virgin lands development]. Proceeding from “Russia and China: history and perspectives of cooperation”: *VI Mezhdunarodnaia nauchno-prakticheskaiia konferentsiia — 4th International Scientific and Practical Conference*. (pp. 117–123). Blagoveshchensk: Blagoveshchensk State Pedagogical University [in Russian].

7 Ablazhei, N.N. (2014). Kazakhskii migratsionnyi maiatnik «Kazakhstan–Sintzian». Emigratsiia. Repatriatsiia. Integratsiia [Kazakh migration pendulum “Kazakhstan–Xinjiang” Emigration. Repatriation. Integration]. Karaganda: Bolashaq Baspa [in Russian].

8 RSACH [Russian State Archives of Contemporary History]. — F. 5. — Op. 45. — D. 4 [in Russian].

9 Litvintsev, G.M. (2011). Nas eshche dolgo zvali kitaitkami [We were called Chinese for a long time]. Retrieved from <http://www.old.russianchina.org/articles/2011/03/25/3335> [in Russian].

10 SAAR [State Archives of Akmola Region]. — F. 1. — Op. 1. — D. 1982 [in Russian].

11 Atantaeva, B.Zh. (2008). Kazakhstansko-kitaiskie mezhgosudarstvennyie migratsii v seredine XIX–nachale XXI vv. [Kazakh-Chinese interstate migrations in the middle of the 19th — early 21st centuries]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Retrieved from <http://cheloveknauka.com/kazahstansko-kitayskie-mezhgosudarstvennyie-migratsii-v-seredine-xix-nachale-xxi-vv> [in Russian].

12 SAAR [State Archives of Akmola Region]. — F. 1. — Op. 1. — D. 1915 [in Russian].

13 SAAR [State Archives of Akmola Region]. — F. 1. — Op. 1. — D. 1982. — L. 78 [in Russian].

14 RSACH [Russian State Archives of Contemporary History]. — F. 5. — Op. 45. — D. 127 [in Russian].