

Rural Economy in Bukhara Region Reforms Implemented (1955-1980)

Jurayev Isomiddin Ismoilovich

Teacher of Social Sciences Department at Zarmed University

Abstract: In his discourse entitled "Pressing Challenges of Production, Industry, and Prospects for Technological Advancement," presented on September 2-3, 1955, in Tashkent, N.A. Mukhitdinov, a prominent figure within the government of the Uzbek SSR, examined the themes of specialization and cooperation. These subjects encapsulated the production dilemmas spanning from 1950 to 1980. His address emphasizes not the integration of agrarian and industrial sectors but rather the formation of industrial unions and complexes. During this period, issues about specialization and cooperation within Uzbekistan's industrial enterprises had been insufficiently addressed, leading to a lack of adequate consideration in the formulation of industrial construction strategies. This negligence is ascribed to a propensity among numerous organizations to overlook this economic element and the progressive methodologies of production organization until the last possible moment.

Keywords: Uzbek SSR, agrarian-industrial complex, specialization and cooperation, technology, centralization, congress, Central Committee.



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

Introduction. The last decade of the past century marked a period of profound transformation for all nations residing in Uzbekistan. During the years of the Russian Empire and Soviet governance, the quest for liberation from autocracy afforded the Uzbek people the opportunity to secure a rightful place within the global community. Independence fostered possibilities for examining the past and engaging in a fair assessment. At the same time, the newly independent Republic of Uzbekistan faces important challenges: on one hand, to eliminate the long-standing vestiges of a totalitarian regime, and on the other hand, to address existing issues across all sectors in this new phase of development by implementing reforms in the social-economic, political, cultural, and moral-educational spheres.

Literature Review. One of the urgent themes within the field of historical studies today is the need to explore the causes behind the economic dependency of Uzbekistan during the Soviet regime. This includes the structures formulated by the Communist Party, work methods and forms, and the intricate interconnections among all republics. Overall, this necessitates a responsible approach to studying the problems, contradictions, and socioeconomic development

difficulties of that era, ensuring comprehensive coverage of events, adhering to historical accuracy devoid of bias, and fulfilling the tasks of preserving continuity and integrity in historical narratives.

Analysis and Discussion of Results. Transitioning agriculture to an industrial base necessitates comprehensive mechanization of primary operations, the centralization of production, and the refinement of organizational forms. The establishment of complexes capable of centrally producing finished goods and delivering them to consumers holds significant importance. The transition to agrarian-industrial unions and complexes from auxiliary enterprises embodies the objective logic of our construction efforts.

The socio-economic significance of such unions lies not only in augmenting the productivity and viability of agriculture but also in creating objective conditions to equalize the living standards of agricultural and industrial workers. This includes the payment for labor by state industrial enterprises and agricultural collectives, as well as the provisions for social insurance and pensions, all of which contribute, albeit modestly, to the rising quality of work and the skills of employees.

As anticipated during the XXIV Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, these unions were expected to become fundamental links in the framework of social production in the future. However, the newly formed collaborative structures did not assume the position of the principal elements within the national agricultural system. Despite the emergence of these unions, the overall structure of the nation's economy did not undergo significant transformation, and a higher phase of agricultural reforms remained uninitiated. A resolution adopted on May 28, 1976, by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union emphasized that enhancing agricultural production through specialization and concentration based on extensive cooperation is pivotal. The transition of agriculture to a modern industrial foundation was posited as the primary pathway for the further development of socialism in the countryside. This indicated a new phase in the practical implementation of Leninist cooperative planning in the context of advanced socialism.

As the party and state address the responsibilities of current agrarian policy, it is crucial to recognize that the core, central component of the agro-industrial complex is agriculture itself. The fundamental basis for its further development hinges on the gradual increase of capital investments. Between 1965 and 1980, the amount allocated by the Soviet government to develop this particular sector was 4.1 times greater than in all previous years, totaling 395.4 billion soums, which constituted 80.5 percent of the total capital investment budget. From this point onward, we will also allocate substantial financial and material resources to agriculture, continuing to transition the sector onto an industrial foundation. However, from now on, primary attention will be directed toward the returns on capital investments, enhancing agricultural productivity, and deepening interrelations and improvements across all branches of the agro-industrial complex. These aspects characterize the essential features of agrarian policy in the 1980s.

In Uzbekistan, the integration of agriculture and industry commenced in 1963, culminating in that year in the establishment of the "Khalqobod" which combine the vineyard and horticulture sectors. Subsequently, an agrarian-industrial union named after U. Yusupov was formed. Over the years, the process of corporatization expanded and deepened significantly. However, certain issues arose within the system that hindered the development of associations without addressing those problems. Thus, Uzbekistan's experience in agricultural and industrial production assists in identifying the barriers that impinge upon this progress. In particular:

- The inadequacy of the organizational structure of the agricultural economy;
- The scarcity of material and technical resources;

- The lack of scientifically based development of types of agricultural production systems and agro-industrial complexes. It is worth noting that corporatization within the agrarian-industrial framework encompasses both sectoral issues at the level of agricultural branches and complex problems at the enterprise level. In the Bukhara region during the 1960s and 1970s, there was an active development of specialization in agriculture and the integration of agro-industrial processes, aiming to transform it into a unified agro-industrial complex. During this period, the CPSU intensified its initiatives to enhance “scientific strength and a comprehensive approach, significantly increasing capital investments in agriculture and achieving greater returns from them, fostering increased productivity and optimizing the management mechanisms in this sector, as well as improving interrelations across the entire agro-industrial complex.”

In the preceding phases of agrarian policy, this process had not been adequately addressed, especially concerning theoretical and ideological influences. In 1975, despite adverse weather conditions, collective farms achieved 106% of the state plan for vegetable production, 104% for potato production, and 105% for other crops. The “Uzplodovoshvinprom” entity produced an average of 227 quintals of vegetables per hectare. In the Tashkent region, under the leadership of B. Prudnikov's team, an impressive yield of 251 quintals of diverse vegetable products per hectare was achieved on a 27-hectare field. Similarly, the brigade led by Kambarov in the "Sokh" collective farm recorded a yield of 223 quintals of potatoes per hectare from 61 hectares of land.

The Bukhara agro-industrial production association was established in 1976 under the directives of the USSR Council of Ministers and the Ministries of Fruit and Vegetable Production. At its inception, the Bukhara agro-industrial production association was affiliated with the Ministry of Fruit and Vegetable Production. The structure of the Agro-Industrial Complex (AIC) in 1976 included:

- Leadership
- Human Resources Department
- Accounting Division
- Planning Department
- Agriculture
- Crop Production
- Livestock Raising

Despite adhering to the requirements and guidelines set by the state planning committee regarding the structural arrangement of these departments, the economic efficiency was notably low. Moreover, the implementation of decisions made in the field suffered from inadequate oversight. Specifically, in the specialized “Galosiy” collective farm, the yield of grapes remained consistent over several years at 128 quintals per hectare, necessitating 1.6 man-days per quintal of produce. In contrast, the average productivity in the entire Bukhara region lagged by a factor of 7.4, and costs were 14 times higher in comparison.

The “October 50th Anniversary” collective farm, located in the Romitan district of Bukhara, was considered a comprehensive livestock complex. Prior to its establishment, the farm comprised 1,450 heads of cattle rearing, integrating them with four farms focused on cotton production. Annually, the farm delivered 850 tons of milk and approximately 100 tons of meat to the state. After the establishment of the complex, the number of cattle was reduced by 100 heads within two years, yet the state received an additional 388 tons of milk. Previously, the average yield per milking cow was between 1,500 to 1,600 liters, but this year it was aimed to achieve a target of 2,180 kg.

In the agro-industrial complex, the primary focus was on enhancing breed structures and improving livestock quality, along with ensuring adequate nutrition for the animals. According to the project plan, the complex necessitated the services of 36 personnel. Key roles included an accounting economist, senior zootechnician, brigade leader, veterinary doctor, technician, seed specialist, laboratory accountant, and food preparer, all of whom were considered essential employees of the complex. The latter three positions were primarily operational in nature. Additionally, the staff would encompass eight milkers, five livestock caretakers, three tractor drivers, two calf tenders, one general laborer, and two milk transporters.

A significant issue within the complex was the shortage of qualified personnel, particularly as engineering services were not included in the complex's design, which was a rather surprising oversight.

It is imperative to note that in achieving the high-level development of agriculture, alongside various other factors, significant measures have been undertaken by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan and the republican government aimed at implementing the centralization and specialization of production. In the report delivered by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev at the XXIV Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he emphasized that “in the coming years, the specialization of agricultural production and the introduction of industrial methods for the cultivation of meat, milk, and other products will be further developed. This is a natural progression. The discussion centers on the processes that will define the future of our agriculture.” This statement serves to substantiate the aforementioned issues.

From March 26 to 27, 1984, the All-Union Economic Congress held in Moscow particularly addressed the economic matters of the Bukhara region within the Republic of Uzbekistan, focusing on issues of experimentation and reconstruction. Additionally, the congress deliberated on the cultivation of agricultural products within the Bukhara region, the recycling of these products, and the expansion of the raw material base.

The current level of development of auxiliary enterprises has significantly increased. The branches of auxiliary enterprises within the collective and state farms of the republic have shown notable growth during the previous and ongoing five-year plans. As of the end of 1985, the population of the region constituted 1.017 million individuals, encompassing 89 diverse nationalities and ethnic groups. The region consisted of 10 districts, 10 cities of regional subordination, 3 urban settlements, and 84 village councils. In the Bukhara region, 80 production enterprises were operational. The most severe impact was felt in the light industry sector, particularly in the cotton processing and food production domains. In 1985, the total production output reached 422 million sums. Notably, the Bukhara textile enterprise, classified as a large production facility, exceeded 172 million sums in product output. The total agricultural production amounted to 413 million tons. By November 1984, the region had harvested 384 thousand tons of cotton.

Throughout the entire republic, the average annual growth of national income diminished, leading to a per capita national income in 1986 that was seven times less than that of 1965. A significant error in the Bukhara region was that, despite being recognized as a leading area for agricultural production both within the republic and across the Soviet Union, the region produced agricultural products solely based on orders from the central authorities. “In the years 1985-1986, a marked decrease in cattle breeding was observed in the districts of Bukhara, Gidjduvan, and Shofirkon. In the districts of Qorako‘l, Peshku, and Vobkent, certain deficiencies in cattle breeding were not significantly addressed. From January to August 1985, a total of 9,275 tons of live-weight cattle were raised in the region's agricultural sectors, which constituted 62.2% of the annual plan. Furthermore, milk production reached 36,235 tons, representing 68.2% of the target, while egg production amounted to 38,735 thousand units, equivalent to 75.6% of the planned target. In the Vobkent district, meat production severely decreased by 30%, in Sverdlov district by 20%, in

Romitan district by 17.5%, and in Bukhara city by 24%. The structure of the Agricultural-Industrial Complex (AIC) at the grassroots level determines the conditions and effectiveness of their establishment and operations, with social issues within towns and rural areas being addressed at the AIC and associated levels. However, the foundation for addressing these issues lies in the establishment of the Agricultural-Industrial Complexes and independent complexes, including cotton-growing complexes. Consequently, there arose a necessity to develop the fundamental proportions and parameters of these complexes, along with the parameters for organizational agricultural structures. As agricultural production intensifies, the principal trends in specialization have become increasingly apparent. The process of harmonizing agricultural and industrial outputs has manifested itself in highly specialized enterprises such as grape and vine cultivation.

Conclusion. Transitioning agriculture to an industrial foundation necessitated the comprehensive mechanization of primary tasks, along with the centralization of production and the enhancement of its organizational forms. The establishment of complexes responsible for producing finished products and delivering them to consumers played a crucial role in this centralization process. The socio-economic significance of such integrations lies not only in augmenting the efficiency and productivity of agriculture but also in creating objective conditions to equalize the living standards of agricultural and industrial workers: ensuring fair remuneration for the labor of employees at state industrial and agricultural enterprises and collective farms, improving the conditions of social insurance and pension provisions, and promoting the aesthetic aspects of production alongside the professional qualifications of the workforce. However, despite these advancements, improvements in living and working conditions did not materialize.

References

1. Muksimov S. Increasing the production of Karakul products and reducing their cost. – Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 1969. – P. 265.
2. From the materials of the XXVI Congress of the CPSU, pp. 62-63.
3. Kurbanov F., Niyozov A. Konnimekh (Bukhara region, history of the state pedigree state farm “Konnimekh”) // Uzbekistan collective and state farms (Essays) Book 3. Tashkent: Uzbekistan. 1972. – P. 115.
4. The economic policy of the CPSU: A textbook (Abalkin L.I., Belik Yu.A., Vladimirov B.G., and others) –T.: Uzbekistan, 1982. – P. 259.
5. National Economy of the USSR. State Sb., Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 1973.
6. Jurayev Isomiddin Ismoilovich, “On the history of specialization of agricultural branches in Uzbekistan in the 1950s-80s”. Scientific Bulletin of Bukhara State University, 12/2024. – P. 42- 47.
7. Nasilloev Sunnat Shavkat oglu. “Problems and solutions of training scientific personnel through postgraduate studies in agricultural sciences in the Uzbek SSR (on the example of the 1960s-1970s)”, Scientific Bulletin of Bukhara State University, 12/2024. – P. 47-51.