

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716  
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

### International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 10 Volume: 78

Published: 29.10.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Dilshad Rustambekovich Akhmedov  
Andizhan State University  
Researcher, Republic of Uzbekistan

## THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC RESTRICTION OF EARLY ECONOMY IN THE THRESHOLD OF COLLECTIVIZATION IN UZBEKISTAN

**Abstract:** In this article has been described political and economic restriction of early economy in the threshold of collectivization in Uzbekistan by the archive materials and scientific literatures as well.

**Key words:** policy, kulak, peasant, collectivization, Uzbekistan, economy, agriculture.

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Akhmedov, D. R. (2019). The political and economic restriction of early economy in the threshold of collectivization in Uzbekistan. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 10 (78), 463-466.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-10-78-85> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.10.78.85>

**Scopus ASCC:** 1202.

### Introduction

On the eve of the massive collectivization of agriculture, the Soviet government pursued a policy of political and economic restraint on the wealthy, dehumanizing peasant population, called the “kulak” in 1928-1929. Politically restrictive measures of “kulak” farms have been reflected in their deprivation of suffrage. There were excessive party leaders in the implementation of this political action. In many cases, as well as the “kulak” farms, the average and poor peasants were denied their suffrage.

The policy of earning farms is mainly based on the amount of agricultural taxes they pay, as well as the use of hired labor in agriculture. It is well known that in the context of the New Economic Policy (NEP), private entrepreneurship in Turkestan and later in Uzbekistan was allowed, and in agriculture the use of hired labor was partly for farmers. As a result, the commodity-money relations were developing, the volume of production increased significantly, and the income of individual entrepreneurs and peasants increased significantly. This increase in income put them at risk of being overheard.

### Research methods.

According to the Andizhan district election commission on September 1, 1929, up to that time, 21,928 people were deprived of the right to vote. Of these, 4133 were small businessmen, 3415 were

“kulaks”, 2,543 were traders, and 5620 were clergymen [1, p.41].

The class policy of the Communist Party, which has been popular during these years, has been clearly reflected in the different approaches to the different social strata in terms of lending to peasant farms. The agricultural cooperative used restrictive policies to provide loans to middle and relatively wealthy peasant farms. According to a study of Uzelhozbank for 1926-1927, 24 existing credit unions with 13,621 members distributed loans according to social strata: 69.7% of the total loan amount and 73.9% of the loan amount to the poor and poor households. Medium-term farms were granted 29.3% of loan and 25.4% of loan amount, and 1.0% of loans and 0.7% of debt for kulak farms [2, p.51].

In the 1928-1929 business year (starting on October 1 - DA), class divide was strictly followed in lending to peasant farms. During these years, the amount of loans to ear farms decreased from 0.9% to 0.5% across the country [3, p.351]. At the same time, the loan to kulak farms is set at one and a half times higher interest rates than poor farmers.

On September 7, 1928 the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR issued a resolution “On measures of economic support for the rural poor” [4, p.68].

As a result of this decision, government loans to ear farms, which are members of agricultural

## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA (India)</b>	<b>= 4.971</b>	<b>SIS (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland)</b>	<b>= 6.630</b>
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b>	<b>= 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia)</b>	<b>= 0.126</b>	<b>PIF (India)</b>	<b>= 1.940</b>
<b>GIF (Australia)</b>	<b>= 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b>	<b>= 8.716</b>	<b>IBI (India)</b>	<b>= 4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b>	<b>= 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b>	<b>= 5.667</b>	<b>OAJI (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.350</b>

cooperatives, decreased from 42.4% to 24.9% [5]. This has been a decisive step towards getting the kulaks out of the agricultural credit system.

Taxes from kulak farms have also steadily increased. This has also been an important tool in limiting the ability of the kulak. In the 1924-1925 business year, kulak farms paid 17 percent of total agricultural taxes, but in 1925-1926, this amount increased by 21 percent [6, p.248].

The decision of the Central Committee of the CPC (b) "On the State of the Economy and Economic Policy", adopted in April 1926, emphasized the need to further increase the tax on wealthy kulak farms [7, p.319-320]. According to this decision, 8% of wealthy households would have to pay 34% of all agricultural taxes [8, p.249]. Because of this unfairness in the tax system, many peasants have abandoned their farms, unable to afford tax and administrative procedures. They could do this to get into the category of the poor. They believed that it would be easy for the poor. Hodzhimuhammad Azimov, a resident of the city of Sharifboy in Andizhan, had eight friends. She is being "listened" for using her hired labor in her husband's business, has several cows and sheep and a private teahouse and is required to pay a tax of 15,000 rubles. Unable to pay such tax, Hadji Murad Azimov sold all of his property and avoided an unfair tax [9].

From year to year, the pressure on the "kulak" farms through taxes has increased. Not only was the earliest agricultural income, but also a large tax on housing and livestock. At the 3<sup>rd</sup> Congress of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan in November 1927, it was also emphasized the need to "put pressure on the earliest farms through raising taxes" [10, p.338]. On the eve of massive collectivization, the village has improved its tax system, which is adapted according to the class categories. The most affected were the "deaf" and average farmers. According to the decision of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR and the Council of People's Commissars of April 21, 1928 "On the Uniform Agricultural Tax" introduced the procedure for increasing the amount of tax for the kulak farms. Accordingly, the maximum "kulak" tax rates increased by 25-30% [11, p.96].

In 1926-1927, the tax paid by one "kulak" farm was 77 rubles per 100 rubles, and in the 1928-1929 business year it was 267 rubles 45 kopeks [12, p.53]. That is to say, within one and a half year, the agricultural tax on earning has increased by 2.7 times. Restrictions and squeezing of ear farms were also seen in the provision of agricultural machinery and equipment. Since 1928, the sale of agricultural machines and equipment to the kulak farms has been completely stopped, and in 1928-1929 the tractors at the disposal of the ear farms have been confiscated in favor of the state.

On December 5, 1928, the Fourth Session of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR adopted "The Land All-Union Law on Land and the Common

Factor of Land Use" [13, p.96-108]. The general purpose of the law was to strengthen the collective use of land and to limit the number of farms. The law establishes a rigorous procedure for renting land, in which the peasant farms are no longer able to rent land. The law also states that hired labor in agriculture is only possible in the work of the employer itself, and may be used only as a helper [14, p.105].

The Communist Party and the Soviet government's agrarian policy of 1929 triggered mass protests in the village and aggravation of class conflicts. This year, efforts were being made to limit and suppress the "kulaks". Various activities have been developed and decisions have been made on this issue.

The Soviet government issued a decree on February 20, 1929 "On the Procedure for the Application of the Labor Code in the Early Farms" and on May 21, 1929 "On the Signs of Ear Labor, which the Labor Code should apply" [15, p.108].

The May 21 decision provided for the identification of kulak farms that would be included in the individual tax regime on the following five criteria: a) use of chronic labor; b) availability of milling, scraping, confectionery and similar production facilities; c) renting agricultural machines on a regular basis; d) Lease of seasonal or seasonal labor, work animals and buildings; d) The presence of family members engaged in commerce, usury, mediation and earning unskilled income [16, p.109]. The resolution states that the executive committees of the republic, county and county may change these signs to suit local conditions.

On July 6, 1929, the Council of People's Commissars of the UzSSR issued a resolution "On the signs of the kulak farms that do not use privileges". Early farms listed under the Decree are deprived of the privileges established by the Resolution of the USSR People's Commissar of 19 March 1929 "On the Uniform Agricultural Tax" [17]. In August 1929, the Council of People's Commissars of the UzSSR developed a draft resolution on the accounting of the ear farms liable under the Labor Code (KZOT) [18].

In 1929, 29,000 farms in the Central Asian republics, including 15,500 in Uzbekistan, were required to pay individual taxes on this designation [19, p.115].

Various penalties were imposed on non-performing farms. Local Soviets were granted the right to confiscate property of non-taxed ear farms. In addition, farmers have been arrested for failing to meet their obligations. In 1929, in the Poyarik district of the Samarkand district, there was an event to liquidate "pomeschchik" and rich farms. During the event, confiscated property of Alloyor Muhammadraimov totaling 55,536 sums, Asar Kuliev's 3941 sums, Alibek Abdushukurov 1205 sums, Mirodil Holmurodov's 1938 sums, Kozi Hamro Umrzakov 1088 sums, Muhammadmurod

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Khojaliyev's 1872 sums. Some of the confiscated property has been handed over to companies, and work and livestock have been distributed to poor swamps [20, p.43]. In 1929, 182,000 peasants from the USSR were sued for failing to pay taxes [21, p.123].

Fines, confiscation, deprivation of suffrage, and imprisonment are common types of punishment. This was to repress the active, entrepreneurial stratum of peasants. That is why mass protests of farmers have intensified throughout the country, even with armed protests. In 1929 there were about 1,300 revolutions in the country. Protest actions have also been manifested in crop extinction, killing livestock and damaging collective property. At the same time, there have been cases of "terrorist attacks" in response to government terror, that is, attempts by local leaders and activists to construct collective farms. In 1929 620 terrorist acts were registered in Central Asian republics.

Before the Soviet government embarked on a policy of mass collectivization, Uzbeks pursued a

policy of restraining wealthy, enterprising peasant farms. This restriction policy was manifested in various ways and forms, and the average farmer suffered most. In most cases, average peasants were listed as "kulak". Even during the land-water reform of 1925-1929, the largest part of farms that were liquidated were middle-income farmers.

The Soviet government regarded only the poorest peasants as their reliable support and turned them against middle and wealthy peasants. Hatred between different social strata of the Uzbek village. The peasant farmers, who were prosperous because of their hard work during that period, stopped their economic activities, fearing that they would be caught off guard. This, of course, has had a profound effect on the decline in gross agricultural production.

In the second half of the 20s, heavy peasant farms were heavily taxed. The taxes were so high that it became impossible to fulfill them. Many "kulak" farms have been prosecuted for failing to meet their tax obligations. However, the arrest and deportation of "kulaks" at that time was not a public campaign.

## References:

1. (n.d.). Andizhan Regional State Archives, fund 189, list 1, col. vol. 392, page 41.
2. Jamalov, O.B. (1950). *Socio-economic prerequisites for the continuous collectivization of agriculture in Uzbekistan*. Tashkent: State Publishing House, UzSSR.
3. Kraev, M.A. (1954). *The victory of the collective farm system in the USSR*. - Moscow.
4. (1957). *Collectivization of agriculture. The most important decisions of the Communist Party and the Soviet government. 1927-1935*. Ed. USSR Academy of Sciences. - Moscow.
5. Kraev, M.A. (1954). *The victory of the collective farm system in the USSR*. - Moscow.
6. Trifonov, I.Ya (1975). *The elimination of the exploiting classes in the USSR*. - Moscow: 1975.
7. (1971). *The CPSU in resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee. T. 3*. - Moscow: Politizdat.
8. Trifonov, I.Ya. (1975). *The elimination of the exploiting classes in the USSR*. - Moscow.
9. (n.d.). Andizhan Regional State Archives, fund 59, list 1, col. Vol.15.
10. (1987). *The Communist Party of Uzbekistan in resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee of the Uzbek SSR*. Volume 1. - Tashkent: Uzbekistan.
11. (1986). *The history of the peasantry of the USSR. History of the Soviet peasantry. Volume 2*. Moscow.
12. Ivnitsky, N.A. (1972). *The class struggle in the countryside and the elimination of the kulaks as a class (1929-1932)*. Moscow: Nauka.
13. (1957). *Collectivization of agriculture. The most important decisions of the Communist Party and the Soviet government. 1927-1935*. Moscow: Publishing. USSR Academy of Sciences.
14. (1957). *Collectivization of agriculture. The most important decisions of the Communist Party and the Soviet government. 1927-1935*. Moscow: Publishing. USSR Academy of Sciences.
15. (n.d.). Central State Archives of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Fund 837, list 8, works 311, pages 108-110.
16. (n.d.). Central State Archives of the Republic of Uzbekistan Fund 837, List 8, works 311.
17. (n.d.). Central State Archives of the Republic of Uzbekistan Fund 837, List 8, works 311, p.111.
18. (n.d.). Central State Archives of the Republic of Uzbekistan Fund 837, List 8, works 311.

<b>Impact Factor:</b>	<b>ISRA (India) = 4.971</b>	<b>SIS (USA) = 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland) = 6.630</b>
	<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126</b>	<b>PIF (India) = 1.940</b>
	<b>GIF (Australia) = 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ) = 8.716</b>	<b>IBI (India) = 4.260</b>
	<b>JIF = 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667</b>	<b>OAJI (USA) = 0.350</b>

---

19. Ivnitsky, N.A. (1972). *The class struggle in the countryside and the elimination of the kulaks as a class (1929-1932)*. Moscow: Nauka.
20. Abdullaev, M.G. (2002). *Soviet policy of "kulak" in Uzbekistan and its tragic*

- consequences (1929-1945)* / PhD Dissertation in History. Tashkent.
21. Golovanov, A.A. (1992). *The peasantry of Uzbekistan: the evolution of social status (1917-1938)*. Tashkent: Fan.