



CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY

Journal homepage: <https://cajssh.centralasianstudies.org>



Analysis of Relative Processes Related to Wage in Agriculture

Allomurodov Nurali Yakub ugli

Denov entrepreneurship and Teacher of Pedagogical Institute

Abstract:

In this article, in the 50s of the 20th century, the procedures for paying wages to rural residents of the southern regions of the Republic, the changes that occurred in this regard, as well as the mistakes and defects made, analytical opinions are presented based on primary sources.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 09-Sep-23

Received in revised form 15-Sep-23

Accepted 30- Oct-23

Available online 11-Nov-2023

Key word: agriculture, labor, interest, efficiency, social protection, collective farm, state farm, center.

Introduction

Although the Soviet government, in many of its adopted programs, aimed to improve the household lifestyle and increase the social well-being of the population, in practice it considered the issues of social protection as a secondary task. In particular, in this period, the above principle prevailed in terms of payment for the labor of the villagers. In the period under study, despite the fact that the material benefits created by the hard work of the agrarian workers served to enrich the state treasury, the impoverishment of the representatives of the sector continued regularly.

Despite the insufficient payment of wages, members of the collective farm were forced to work in the fields from morning to night. The procedure for applying severe penalties for non-fulfillment of the labor day minimum was still ongoing. Managers at all levels considered punishment as the main means of strengthening labor discipline. During this period, the wages of workers of state farms, that is, state farms, were also very low. For example, in 1946, the wages of industrial workers were 453 rubles, while the wages of state farm workers were 165 rubles[1]. Of course, in the first years after the war, the political leadership of the Union and the republic, in order to mobilize all resources for the development of agriculture, tried to change the existing procedures of encouraging the work of rural workers, calculating working days, and paying for labor. On April 19, 1948, the Council of Ministers

of the USSR adopted a decision "On measures to improve the organization of labor in collective farms, increase labor productivity and regulate it" [2]. This decision slightly improved the payment procedure for the members of the collective farm. In addition, the monetary reform carried out in 1947 was an important factor in influencing the financial situation of the rural population. In addition, the decision of the Council of Ministers of the USSR on February 4, 1949 "On the development of cotton cultivation in collective farms and state farms" was also important in strengthening the rural economy and increasing the income of farms [3]. 4 billion 76 million in 1949 for the cotton harvest handed over to the state by the growers of the republic. rubles including 904 mln. received a reward in the amount of rubles[4]. It can be seen that the life of the Uzbek farmer has also begun to fall into the tracks. This can be seen from the increase in the amount of wages paid to the villagers of Surkhan oasis. For example, in 1948, agricultural communities in the region received 87 million rubles for the cotton crop, and by 1949, they received 283 million rubles. they received money in the amount of rubles[5].

Materials and Methods.

The measures taken to increase cotton prices and increase the income of collective and state farms helped to strengthen the economic situation of farms to a certain extent and relatively improve the material living standards of farmers. But the post-war years and the beginning of the 1950s were a difficult time for the vast majority of people, especially the rural population. The administrative system of management, voluntarist views consisting of dry nonsense had a harmful effect on the development of agriculture and the social protection system in general. In Provardi, the issue of the human factor was pushed to the next place. As a result, the residual principle of allocating funds for the social sphere became a priority. For this reason, there were shortcomings in the field of organizing housing and cultural household construction in rural areas, as well as the measures taken to improve the material well-being of the rural population were insufficient. There was a severe shortage of housing, schools, and hospitals in the villages.

The system of payment of wages to agricultural workers did not fully meet the demand. In addition, rural workers were not paid monthly wages. Even collective farmers were deprived of receiving old-age pension. The wages paid did not cover daily needs. That's why the villagers lived off the farms. In the years after the war, the estate was the main source of material support for the villagers. However, the state did not provide any assistance to the owners of estates. On the contrary, in the first years after the war, he reduced the estates of collective farmers several times. For example, in September 1946, according to the decision of the VKP (b) MQ and the government of the USSR "On measures to end the violation of the agricultural charter on collective farms", 752 hectares of land belonging to the families of 6137 collective farmers in the Surkhondarya region are in excess of the standards set by the charter. was withdrawn[6].

Results and discussion.

The system of payment of wages to agricultural workers did not fully meet the demand. In addition, rural workers were not paid monthly wages. Even collective farmers were deprived of receiving old-age pension. The wages paid did not cover daily needs. That's why the villagers lived off the farms. In the years after the war, the estate was the main source of material support for the villagers. However, the state did not provide any assistance to the owners of estates. On the contrary, in the first years after the war, he reduced the estates of collective farmers several times. For example, in September 1946, according to the decision of the VKP (b) MQ and the government of the USSR "On measures to end

the violation of the agricultural charter on collective farms", 752 hectares of land belonging to the families of 6137 collective farmers in the Surkhondarya region are in excess of the standards set by the charter. was withdrawn[6].

Despite the fact that there are favorable conditions for the cultivation of apples and fruits in the republic, the consumption of these products was approximately 8-9 times less than the physiological norms established in the 1950s. But after the plenum of September 1953, significant changes occurred in the material condition of the villagers. For example, the tax policy was regulated, the mandatory norms for the delivery of products to the state were reduced, and the purchase and preparation prices were increased. This created some conditions for the growth of agricultural forces and the increase of farm incomes. According to the decisions of the plenum, the money and kind payments paid per working day have been increased to some extent.

In 1953-1955, important steps were taken in the field of regulation of the system of advance payments to collective farmers. On March 6, 1956, the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR adopted the decision "On monthly advances to collective farmers and payment of wages and additional wages for the labor of collective farmers"[10]. According to this decision, the procedure for giving advances to rural workers was regulated. By the end of the 50s of the 20th century, there were changes in the average wages of collective farmers. For example, in 1956, the collective farm named S.M. Kirov in Sherabad district of Surkhondarya region delivered 4,632,000 rubles of gross income, of which 890,000 rubles were awarded to collective farmers[11]. However, in collective farms, the priority was to pay for labor in the form of products along with money. This had a serious impact on the population's connection to the market and the ability to buy the necessary products for their needs at the free purchase price. But despite this, the income of the population increased to a certain extent. For example, in 1957, Ch. Boboyev, a member of the collective farm named after K. Marks in Sariosia district, Surkhondarya region, received 36,500 rubles and 46 centners of grain at the end of the year. This was 10,200 rubles more than in 1956. Or the family of Boytora Kholikulov, a member of the collective farm named after Lenin in Zharkurgan region, received 50,960 rubles of income at the expense of the farm[12].

Conclusion.

It can be seen from the above figures that the main indicator of labor productivity is definitely related to the salary paid for the work done. During this period, "state farming" activities, which were a clear manifestation of the transfer of collective farms to the state, were also widespread. In 1958, 45 complex mechanized cotton-growing brigades were transferred to the farm account in Surkhondarya region alone. However, in such farms, a uniform system of payment for labor was the priority, and the procedure for payment of wages based on the labor and skills of workers was not established.

References

1. Own MA fund 1619, list 13 case 381, sheet 287.
2. Collection of guidance materials on collective farm construction. – Moscow, 1949, – pp. 234-236.
3. Development of agriculture in the post-war years (1946-1970) - Moscow, 1972. - P. 189.
4. History of Uzbekistan Volume 4 2018.
5. State archive of Surkhondarya region. Fund 446, record 1, case 47, sheet 16.
6. State archive of Surkhondarya region. Fund 446, list 1, case 39, sheets 132-38.

7. Sherabad district state archive fund 42, record 1, case 468, sheet 48.
8. Archives of the Office of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Fund 58, list 155, case 38, sheet 24.
9. Fund 1619 of the Republic of Uzbekistan, list 4, case 4006, sheets 36-79.
10. Development of agriculture in the post-war years (1946-1970). – Moscow, 1972, – P.291.
11. State archive of Surkhandarya region. Fund 446, record 1, case 137, sheet 232.
12. State archive of Surkhandarya region. Fund 446, record 1, case 137, sheet 336.