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Abstract:
In the surkhandarya region, the old administrative-command methods were abandoned and the transition to a new type of farm began. Instead of the previous collective farms and state farms, peasant, company and farms were established. The population began to be distributed land for farmland. In the agricultural cooperative, the family contractor was widely used.

Introduction.
Agrarian reforms carried out in Uzbekistan in 1991-2015 were carried out in stages. In the surkhandarya region, the transition to a new type of farm began, abandoning the old administrative-command methods. Instead of the previous collective farms and State Farms, farmers, companies and farms were established[2]. The population began to be distributed land for farmland. In the agricultural cooperative, the family contractor was widely used.

As a result of the studies carried out, the following cases were identified that interfere with the development of farms:

Serious mistakes were made in the selection of personnel in the organization of farms. If in 1991-1994, nomutakhassis people entered farming through acquaintance, then in 2004-2007, as a result of the hasty holding of competitions, people who were completely unrelated to the agrarian sphere again settled in this network. As if this did not happen, a large part of the specialists of the agrarian sector...
were excluded from the agricultural sectors. In places, such vices as familiarity, bribery, taste have flared up. These circumstances negatively affected the general state of Agriculture. It is noteworthy that no one paid attention to this in Uzbekistan if at least 5 years of special professional experience is required to own (purchase) farm land in Denmark[1]. This situation caused difficulties in fulfilling state obligations.

In 2007, when the activities of the farms established on the basis of the Raim Bohriev company in the Muzrabad district were investigated in field conditions, two farms were compared, drinking water from one ditch, with the same soil conditions.

The first was a former teacher who founded The "Star Mahliyo" farm. The farm was located at the beginning of the water and had no difficulty in watering the fields. Received mineral fertilizers issued by the state on time. But the lack of experience and training in agriculture did not fulfill the plan for the preparation of cotton and grain. In the case of October 9, 2007, barely 30% of the cotton crop was harvested from the first skin itself. There is no technique. During the cotton season, the Pickers had a hard time providing conditions[4].

The second is a farm founded by the agronomist Wolf Mominov with higher education, who for many years worked as the head of the department at the State Farm and the company. Its field is located at the end of the Brook. Therefore, it was much more difficult to water the crop. But he was able to achieve a high level of yield due to his high experience and qualifications. In the case of October 6, 2007, the farm performed by 90% of the first harvest itself[3].

**Materials and Methods**

What is remarkable is that before my first skin was finished, the second skin Cotton was also open and ready in the field. The farmer also followed a grain-making plan with more than one that year. Of his grain-only income, he purchased one tractor and two trailers in 2007[8].

1. When several more farm activities were studied in this farm, it turned out that some of them had 8 classes of education, were people who did not even understand agriculture, Agronomy, accounting Tukul, simple mathematical accounting. Such a situation led to the awakening of negative thoughts about farmers in the authorities.

2. The preparation and service provider did not timely execute the contract agreements concluded on the cultivation of agricultural products of supply offices. In doing so, the inability of farmers to get timely and sufficient fuel created serious difficulties in organizing the work. This ultimately affected the level of productivity. Especially in 2011-2016, chemical fertilizer organizations deliberately entered into contracts with farmers at the beginning of the year, not providing mineral fertilizers and service prices, and at the time of the end of the year they sent huge sum payments to farmers for their poor-quality work[5]. It became common to sue farmers who demanded their own fee or refused such a large fee. As a result, there was an artificial indebtedness in farms.

3. Violent interference of individual provincial and district governors in the work of farms. This situation was especially evident during the cotton season. Usually, after the first pick, the field is usually watered and prepared for the second pick for 20 days. Well-brewed cotton is accepted for 2 sort[7]. But very strong pressure was exerted on the farmers, pickers were put into the field, which were not yet ready, and an attempt was made to fulfill the state plan. As a result, the plucked Cotton was taken for 5 sort. For the next filed cotton, insects absolutely did not receive money. Because the cotton they pick is immature, which consists mainly of a raw blind;
4. The presence of barriers in banks to the provision of funds and loans to farmers and their free use. On the sad side, the farmer could not dispose of it freely, no matter how much money he had in the bank.

5. A large part of the farmers did not have sufficient knowledge, qualifications and understanding of the market economy, banking and finance, trade and modern management. In many cases, farms received large amounts of loans from banks without a thorough plan and without taking into account their capabilities. As a result of improper use of Bank funds, they were unable to return their debt on time and remained a casod. Of particular concern was the fact that some of such farmers were agricultural specialists with higher education. There have also been cases when some farmers could not get full, spending loans from banks on other jobs that have nothing to do with agriculture.

6. Farmers who were starting livestock activities in the mountainous regions did not receive sufficient support from the state. Because in mountainous areas it is possible to easily engage in animal husbandry only when the weather is favorable.

Livestock cannot be raised in mountainous areas during drought years or severe frosts. The difficulties were relatively easy to overcome, as the collective farms and state farms before had extensive pastures, irrigated areas, labor and vehicles at their disposal. But at the time of the liquidation of collective farms and state farms, the existing livestock complexes in them were also liquidated. Livestock raised on farms in most cases were robbed. This is why the newly created farms were forced to start work from scratch. The loan funds allocated to these farms did not allow at the same time to build a farm building, buy trucks, livestock and collect feed. These funds were enough for only one of the above. Land from irrigated areas was not allocated for the collection of feed to livestock farms on the mountain. As a result, livestock farmers had difficulty keeping the purchased livestock and not being able to provide the necessary feed. In particular, in the winter of the 2008 famine, many herders in the mountainous areas of Surkhandarya suffered very hard[5]. No practical assistance was provided to them by the authorities.

Obstacles in farming activities did not allow this type of farm to work fully. As a result, about half of the able-bodied population in the village was deprived of the opportunity to work in agriculture. Unemployment increased in the village. The reforms carried out in agriculture did not show effective results in the southern regions. The southern regions did not fully ensure an increase in the welfare of the population by increasing the production of agricultural products[6]. Many farms in Surkhandarya region were unable to pay their farm workers for years because they worked at a loss. The workers would go to work in the field only in the hope of getting gooseberries, a little grain and planting summer crops in a grain-free area. The standard of living of the rural population of the regions of the south of the Republic decreased. All this led to the emergence of crisis situations in the Agriculture of the southern regions.

The preparation and service provider did not timely execute the contract agreements concluded on the cultivation of agricultural products of supply offices. In doing so, the inability of farmers to get timely and sufficient fuel created serious difficulties in organizing the work. This ultimately affected the level of productivity. Especially in 2011-2016, chemical fertilizer organizations deliberately entered into contracts with farmers at the beginning of the year, not providing mineral fertilizers and service prices, and at the time of the end of the year they sent huge sums to farmers for their poor-quality work. It became common to sue farmers who demanded their own fee or refused such a large fee. As a result,
there was an artificial indebtedness in farms.

**Conclusion**

It should be noted that the role of farms in today's agricultural development is immeasurable. After all, this form of farm is built on the basis of material interest and makes an important contribution to the economic development of society. The agraclaster system implemented in all districts of the region, together with a worthy contribution to the economy of the district, laid the foundation for raising the standard of living of agricultural workers and an increase in their family income.
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