



# **SOCIAL STRATIFICATION OF PEASANT FARMS IN UZBEKISTAN IN THE FIRST YEARS OF THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY**

**Mahmudov Mahmudkhon**

*Teacher, Department of Social Science, Andijan State Medical Institute*

## **ANNOTATION**

*This article covers the introduction of a new economic policy (NEP) in Turkistan ASSR and the issue of conflicts and complexities in the early years. In the conditions of the new economic policy, the processes of social stratification of Uzbek peasant farms and its peculiarities are analyzed.*

**KEYWORDS:** *new economic policy, Turkistan Assr, Uzbekistan SSR, peasant farms, credit, credit companies, food tax, rural dwellers, judiciary, rent, conservatism, cooperative.*

## **DISCUSSION**

After the national-territorial border in 1924, a new stage of agrarian changes began in Uzbekistan. In 1924-1925, 85 percent of the population of the country's labor - worthy population was employed in agriculture. The impact of agrarian sector products was almost 80 percent of the total gross output. 90 percent of the industry was engaged in the processing of agricultural raw materials. In such conditions, the conduct of Agrarian Reform was of deep social importance.

The land-water reform conducted in 1921-1922 years did not fully resolve the issue of landless and low-income peasants and the distribution of existing lands. This reform was mainly aimed at the issue of strengthening the lands at the disposal of local peasants with Russian peasants, who were transplanted into the country during the Tsarist Russia. Simply put, the agrarian reform of 1921-1922 years ended the foundations of colonial procedures of Tsarist Russia. However, the country continued to preserve much land and little land.

By the middle of the 20-ies of the XX century, a little moving were achieved in the socio-economic situation of the Uzbek villages. The reason was that in connection with the transition to a new economic policy (NEP), farmers were breathing freely. The replacement of food razvyorstka with food taxes, the restoration of some marketplaces allowed rural workers to sell their own surplus

products, increase agricultural crops. As a result, the supply of goods to peasant farms increased, the standard of living of the population rose slightly.

Other means of economic stimulus were also used in ensuring the growth of agriculture, which consisted in the introduction of a fixed currency, the establishment of a new order of lending, the expansion of lending by the state to farmers, the definition of benefits, the escalation of agricultural cooperation [1.184].

Tax affairs were regulated and began to pass from the food tax of a different appearance to a single agricultural tax. In the middle of 1923, decisions were made to reduce the size of the single agricultural tax from peasant farms in the Fergana region by half, complete exemption of small livestock farms from taxation and 50 percent reduction of the amount of taxes imposed on slightly larger farms. It was recognized that private and economic activities have different forms of rent, yollash, such as mergers and hocas to artels [2.269].

Attention was paid to the provision of cotton farms with goods, they were allowed to use hired labor, they were provided with water in the first place, a large part of the cotton farms were exempted from the horse-breeding tax, the food tax of low-income farms. This highly effective price policy and its full supply of goods had a positive impact on the mood of the farmers, their desire to grow more cotton. Only in 1924-1926 it was not surprising that



the cotton-growing area in the Republic increased by 31.6 percent [3.77].

In these years, the cooperative movement took a leading position in agriculture. In the early years of the new economic policy, credit cooperations were much more common in the Autonomous Republic of Turkistan and they gained a great reputation among peasant farms. Because, in the Uzbek villages, the need for low-power farmers to borrow money from their cash accounts was very large, and the main place in the villages was rich-judicial and commercial capital. In 1921-1922, 85-90 percent of the farmers borrowed from rich-landlords, granting of state loans had covered 15-20 percent of the farmers' farms, they were not able to pay the farmers' debts. In the conditions of the new economic policy, the provision of credit by the state and cooperatives of low-power farmers and, in general, farms engaged in agricultural production is significantly improved.

The idea of economic promotion of the individual peasant economy as a producer of small goods was manifested as an idea that determined in the development of specific measures to remove irrigation, cotton, horticulture, viticulture, cattle breeding from degradation, increase in the volume of products, as well as in the revival of commodity exchange between industry and agricultural production [5.21].

In October 1923, there were 314 credit companies in Turkistan, which united almost 58 thousand peasant farms. In particular, he was a member of 23000 peasant credit companies in the Sirdarya region, 16000 in the Fergana region, 8000 in the Samarkand region, 9 000 in the Zakaspy region and 2000 peasant credit companies in the Ettisuv region [6.179]. By the end of 1924, the agricultural credit companies of Turkistan reached 912 units, they merged into 18 units of the district union, while the members of these companies reached 233 thousand 500 people [7.20-28].

However, it should also be noted that in addition to success in the cooperative movement, its capabilities are not fully utilized. This was also partly due to the ideology of the economy. They were evident in matters of granting loans and accepting members to cooperatives. He would not have accepted anyone into the cooperative. Classifical there was a choice. The poor were given priority.

In the conditions of socio-economic backwardness of the republics of Central Asia, the issues of granting and using of permission to the activities of private capital have become complicated. With the introduction of a new economic policy, private capital in Turkistan Assr has become widespread, mainly in trade and small-scale industries, as well as in the field of debt and credit. In

the first period of NEP, the gross share of private capital in Turkistan was much higher in all sectors of the economy than in other regions. This is explained by the fact that the socialist ukland in the republics of Central Asia is much weaker, feudal-patriarchal relations in the country are preserved. In the Central Asian republics, 67 percent of the retail trade turnover in 1925-1926 was owned by private capital, while in the union the figure was 40,7 percent [8.101-102]. In the trade in rural areas, the salinity of private capital was even higher. For example, in the Samarkand region in 1925, private capital occupied 90 percent of retail trade turnover in rural areas. In 1926, more than 34 percent of the total amount of loans received by farmers in some Pakhtakor districts fell to the private equity index [9.81]. According to the inspections conducted by the Agricultural Bank of the USSR of Uzbekistan, 316 or 52.3 percent of 604 peasant farms studied in 1925-1926 in 7 villages in the Asaka district of Fergana region received loans from private persons for conducting economic activities [10.11].

Despite the silences in the agrarian sector a little earlier, the main issues related to the restoration of Agriculture have not yet been resolved, the situation remains complicated. In 1924, the lands used in agriculture accounted for only 58.7 percent of the existing crop areas in the Republic, while the gross agricultural output was 47.2 percent of the level in 1913 [11.15].

One of the priority factors in raising the rural economy was the escalation of large-scale agrarian reform at that time. The need for its implementation was interrupted by the problems that arose. Because, in the country, there was still a desolation. By 1925 year, 13 of every 100 farms did not have land to be sown. Landless and up to 2 desyatina landless farms accounted for 71,8 percent [3.84]. During this period, poor peasants in the Uzbek village formed the majority of the population. In 1925, the middle-class peasants were 2-3 times less than the low-class peasants. In 1926 year in Zarafshan and Ferghana regions, 52 percent of the farm had little land than a desyatina. Farms with less than 2 desyatina land in Zarafshan region accounted for 54 percent, and 42 percent in Tashkent and Samarkand regions [12.1].

It was also distinguished by the fact that the villages of Uzbekistan were divided into specific tiny and small land plots. The small peasant farms were concentrated mainly in small areas, which were irrigated from time immemorial, more in the Fergana Valley, Tashkent, Zarafshan and Khorezm regions. 25 percent of the land plots belonging to peasant farms in the Fergana Valley were located in the army villages. Half of these lands were in the territory of other volost villages. In the Zarafshan region, on



average, one farm had 2.5 land plots, in Khorezm an average of 1.5 land plots. Such a form of land ownership also caused certain difficulties. Because, peasant farms he went to the end land in the village, or went to the land in this village, and the peasant could take most of their time. It would have been an additional strain on the peasants, especially when watering the crops or plowing the land. The fact that the land plots were located without such a slope created the conditions for such tiny lands to eventually accumulate in the hands of some wealthy people. Because, in most cases, it is from the village that the peasants, who are tired of participating in this village, would have to send their plots to the rich cheaper-to buy collateral [11.37-38].

The fact that farming was based on more irrigation also caused certain complexities. In Fergana, Tashkent, Zarafshan, Khorezm regions, almost all agricultural lands were irrigated lands. The irrigated lands in the Surkhandarya region were 67.6 percent, in the Samarkand region 67.4 percent, in the Kashkadarya region 59.3 percent. Irrigated lands by the Republic accounted for 87 percent of all crop areas. Watering peasants were obliged to spend a lot of labor and money from farms. Because, such work as regular cleaning of irrigation networks, that is, ditches and channels, building dams where necessary, repairing them, required a very large workforce [13.59].

Analysis of the social structure of farms shows that on the eve of the second land reform in Uzbekistan more than 30 percent of fertile land was under the "rich kulaklar". However, ear and tiny helper farms in the Fergana region were 39 percent owned by land. In the Samarkand region, 32,7 percent of all lands were in the hands of ears and tiny pomeshchiks. The situation in other regions was similar in appearance [14.32].

The economic relations between the landowners were built on the basis of rent. Low income peasants, landowners and herdsman used to rent land and working weapons. That is, during this period 2 desyatina farms with land were also forced to acquire additional rented land [3.85].

In the agricultural regions of Uzbekistan, especially the Fergana region, where cotton is sown, Khujand, Mirzachul, Payarik, Damarik, Gijduvan and some other district rental relations were highly developed. Sharebay rentals were common, and this was especially the predominance in the Ferghana region. In this region, peasants with a land of up to 3 desyatina were usually forced to rent a share from large landowners. At the same time, farms with a check land of more than 7 desyatina were giving land for rent [15.121].

In 1925, 80 percent of lands were leased in Samarkand, Tashkent and Fergana regions. Large

landowners living in villages rent 95 percent of their land, and merchants living in cities rent almost all land to landless or low-income peasants. This case was evaluated in his time as "earning without labor", "exploitation of poor peasants by rich-ears".

The majority of landowners for rent were low - income peasants. If 78.5 percent of the farmers receiving land for rent in Kitab district of Kashkadarya region were farms with a land of up to 1.3 desyatina, 59 percent of the tenants of Khorezm region had land of up to 2 desyatina [16.5].

In all regions of Uzbekistan, the majority of poor peasants and low-power middle-class peasants could rent land, horses and equipment. According to statistical analysis in 1925 year, in this year 29,2 percent of peasant farms in the Republic were deprived of working animals. In terms of regions, this situation was as follows: 45.6 percent in Fergana region, 27.5 percent in Samarkand region, 26.4 percent in Tashkent region, 13.8 percent in Khorezm region, 7.7 percent in Kashkadarya region, 7.2 percent in Zarafshan region without working animals [17.36-56]. Apparently, non-animal farms of work made up the majority, mainly in the regions where cotton is grown. One of the reasons for this is explained by the difficulty in providing forage for working animals in peasant farms, as cotton is sown mainly on the ground in the cotton-growing regions.

In 1925 year, the main part of the working animals was collected in the hands of certain strata of people, that is, in the hands of large landowners. In these years, more than 10 percent of farms with more than 50 desyatina land have more than 4-5 working animals [17.56].

At the disposal of "helper-rich" farms, along with working animals, a large part of agricultural equipment was also collected. On the eve of the land-water reform, the main agricultural instruments in the Republic were plow, hoe, sickle and trowel. Even these simple agricultural tools were not even in many peasant farms. For example, according to the analysis in 1925, non-farm in Samarkand region accounted for 54.8 percent, in Tashkent region 43.6 percent, in Fergana region 35.2 percent, in Zarafshan region 12 percent. In some places, these percentages were even more numerous. For example, in the village of Tulkiabad in Balikchi district of Fergana region, 91,2 percent of farms without plow, 76,3 percent in the village of Kumtepa and 66,4 percent in the village of Khujaabad [18.33].

Farms without agricultural tools also rented the necessary tools. 25 percent of all peasant farms in Samarkand, Tashkent, Fergana and Khorezm regions used agricultural equipment for rent. The terms of rent were in different views, that is, to give a certain part of the crop grown for the use to the owner of the



instrument, or to produce on the land of the owner of the instrument, etc.

As can be seen from the above information, on the eve of the land-water reform, a large part of the peasant farms in Uzbekistan were either landless or low-income, as well as in need of working animals and working weapons. They are those who are forced to rent these things, in the end, the Tsarist relations in the Republic are widely spread.

The herdsmen rented a certain piece of land from the landowner, to which he received a certain agreed portion of the dressing, which he had harvested and grown, processing it with his own power, work animal and equipment.

Some herdsmen also rented a land-based business animal, work weapons and accommodation. In such cases, the choricor has left only a quarter of the grown crop. The main part of the harvest remained in the hands of the landowner. In 1923-1925, the government developed laws on the restriction of domestic Tsarist relations to some extent. During this period, the part of the cultivated crop that touched the choricors was increased. If in 1915 51,6 percent of the landowners gave half of the landowners, then in 1925 the amount of such landowners decreased by 31.5 percent [14.78]. But despite this, the poverty of the living standards of the choricors was still preserved. The crop that remains at the disposal of the choricors was in most cases not done for their needs. Under such conditions, they would be stuck in debt.

The state did not have the opportunity to provide loans to all peasant farms, as well as herdsmen during this period. Therefore, peasants in need of money received money mainly from rich-poor people in debt for severe conditions evasion. In the villages there were loan defendants to those in need. In 1925-1926, 52.3 percent of farmers in Asaka district of Fergana region borrowed money from private individuals. Farmers have paid a very large percentage of the debt they have received. The percentage of debts is from 120 to 225 percent in some parts of Uzbekistan [19.214]. The terms of the natural loan taken from private individuals were even more severe.

Well, the wide spread of Tsarist relations was hindering the development of agriculture. This was one of the problems that should be solved in the agrarian sector of the country.

As for 1925 in Uzbekistan, along with the issue of land, the problem of increasing the fertility of agriculture was also acute. Insufficient development of productive forces, low efficiency of agrarian production, the predominance of feudal-patriarchal forms in production relations hindered the processes of economic growth, the increase in the material well-being of the urban and rural population.

In general, the authorities of the Bolsheviks in Uzbekistan, as at the initial stage of agrarian reforms, in 1925-1929, initially denied the historically tested economic means of social reconstruction of the village, the important experience of resolving the issue of peasants in the "capitalist countries". The Bolshevik leaders of the communist metropolis chose violence as the main weapon of rebuilding socio-economic relations, relying on the fantastic beliefs of marxism. Because although the new economic policy somewhat softened the methods inherent in the era of "military communism", the general strategic path remained unchanged.

## REFERENCES

1. *Ўзбекистоннинг янги тарихи. Иккинчи китоб. Ўзбекистон совет мустамлакачилиги даврида. Тузувчилар: М.Жўраев, Р.Нуруллин, С.Камалов ва бошқалар. – Тошкент: Шарқ, 2000. – 688 б.*
2. *Ўзбекистон тарихи (1917-1991 йиллар). Биринчи китоб. 1917-1939 йиллар /Масъул муҳаррирлар Р.Абдуллаев, М.Раҳимов, Қ.Ражабов. – Тошкент: O'zbekiston, 2019. – 560 б.*
3. *Голованов А.А. Крестьянство Узбекистана: эволюция социального положения. 1917-1937 гг. – Ташкент: Фан, 1992. – 162 с.*
4. *Ўзбекистон Республикаси Марказий давлат архиви (ЎзР МДА), Р-90-фонд, 1-рўйхат, 1271-иш.*
5. *Ғойибназаров Ш. Ижтимоий ривожланиш сабоқлари. 20-йиллар таҳлили. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон, 1994. – 192 б.*
6. *Аминова Р.Х. Аграрные преобразования в Узбекистане в годы перехода Советского государства к НЭПу. – Ташкент: Наука, 1965. – 345 с.*
7. *ЎзР МДА, Р-236-фонд, 1-рўйхат, 678-иш.*
8. *ЎзР МДА, Р-197-фонд, 3-рўйхат, 905-иш.*
9. *ЎзР МДА, Р-197-фонд, 3-рўйхат, 614-иш.*
10. *Два года работы правительства Узбекской Советской Социалистической Республики 1926 – 1927 – 1928. – Самарканд: 1928.*
11. *Джамалов О.Б. Социально-экономические предпосылки сплошной коллективизации сельского хозяйства в Узбекистане. – Ташкент: Госиздат УЗССР, 1950. – 256 с.*
12. *ЎзР МДА, Р-90-фонд, 1-рўйхат, 23-иш.*
13. *Кунакова Л.З. Земельно-водная реформа в Узбекистане (1925-1929 гг.) – Фрунзе: Мектеп, 1967. – 300 с.*
14. *Зелькина Е. Очерки по аграрному вопросу в Средней Азии. – Москва: 1930.*
15. *ЎзР МДА, Р-90-фонд, 1-рўйхат, 324-иш.*
16. *Материалы статистико-экономического обследования сельского хозяйства*



*Хорезмского округа УзССР. – Ташкент:  
1930.*

17. Бюллетень *Центрального  
статистического управления  
Узбекистана. 1925. №2.*
18. *Современный кишлак Средней Азии. Вып.  
V. – Ташкент: 1927.*
19. *Современный кишлак Средней Азии. Вып.  
III. – Ташкент: 1926.*